

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275278313>

# Strategies for addressing vaccine hesitancy – A systematic review

Article in *Vaccine* · April 2015

DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.040 · Source: PubMed

CITATIONS

45

READS

167

5 authors, including:



Caitlin Jarrett

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medi...

8 PUBLICATIONS 323 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Rose Wilson

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medi...

10 PUBLICATIONS 131 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Heidi J Larson

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medi...

150 PUBLICATIONS 5,071 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



LSHTM ECDC research work [View project](#)



Parental factors influencing uptake of routine childhood vaccination in India [View project](#)

All content following this page was uploaded by [Rose Wilson](#) on 04 August 2015.


The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Vaccine

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/vaccine](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/vaccine)



## Strategies for addressing vaccine hesitancy – A systematic review<sup>☆</sup>

Caitlin Jarrett<sup>1</sup>, Rose Wilson<sup>1</sup>, Maureen O’Leary<sup>1</sup>, Elisabeth Eckersberger<sup>1</sup>,  
Heidi J. Larson<sup>\*,1,2,3</sup>, the SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy<sup>4</sup>

Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

### ARTICLE INFO

Article history:  
Available online xxx

Keywords:  
Vaccination hesitancy  
Vaccine hesitancy  
Interventions  
Strategies  
Literature reviews  
SAGE  
WHO

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this systematic review is to identify, describe and assess the potential effectiveness of strategies to respond to issues of vaccine hesitancy that have been implemented and evaluated across diverse global contexts.

**Methods:** A systematic review of peer reviewed (January 2007–October 2013) and grey literature (up to October 2013) was conducted using a broad search strategy, built to capture multiple dimensions of public trust, confidence and hesitancy concerning vaccines. This search strategy was applied and adapted across several databases and organizational websites. Descriptive analyses were undertaken for 166 (peer reviewed) and 15 (grey literature) evaluation studies. In addition, the quality of evidence relating to a series of PICO (population, intervention, comparison/control, outcomes) questions defined by the SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy (WG) was assessed using Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) criteria; data were analyzed using Review Manager.

**Results:** Across the literature, few strategies to address vaccine hesitancy were found to have been evaluated for impact on either vaccination uptake and/or changes in knowledge, awareness or attitude (only 14% of peer reviewed and 25% of grey literature). The majority of evaluation studies were based in the Americas and primarily focused on influenza, human papillomavirus (HPV) and childhood vaccines. In low- and middle-income regions, the focus was on diphtheria, tetanus and pertussis, and polio. Across all regions, most interventions were multi-component and the majority of strategies focused on raising knowledge and awareness. Thirteen relevant studies were used for the GRADE assessment that indicated evidence of moderate quality for the use of social mobilization, mass media, communication tool-based training for health-care workers, non-financial incentives and reminder/recall-based interventions.

Overall, our results showed that multicomponent and dialogue-based interventions were most effective. However, given the complexity of vaccine hesitancy and the limited evidence available on how it can be addressed, identified strategies should be carefully tailored according to the target population, their reasons for hesitancy, and the specific context.

© 2015 Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).

### 1. Introduction

The dynamic and challenging period of indecision around accepting a vaccination – often referred to as “vaccine hesitancy”<sup>5</sup>

– is being increasingly studied. Given the growing concern in many countries about vaccine hesitancy, the Strategic Advisory Group of Experts (SAGE) Working Group (WG) on Vaccine Hesitancy<sup>6</sup> asked that a review focused on strategies to address hesitancy be undertaken.

The purpose of this systematic review was to identify strategies that have been implemented and evaluated across diverse global contexts in an effort to respond to, and manage, issues of vaccine hesitancy. This review was conducted to inform the

<sup>☆</sup> Some of the authors are World Health Organization staff members. The opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the decisions, official policy or opinions of the World Health Organization.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [Heidi.Larson@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:Heidi.Larson@lshtm.ac.uk) (H.J. Larson).

<sup>1</sup> Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology (IDE), LSHTM.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, USA.

<sup>3</sup> Member of SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy.

<sup>4</sup> Members of SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy are listed in [Appendix](#).

<sup>5</sup> Vaccine hesitancy “refers to delay in acceptance or refusal of vaccines despite availability of vaccination services. Vaccine hesitancy is complex and context spe-

cific varying across time, place and vaccines. It includes factors such as complacency, convenience and confidence” (WHO SAGE meeting, October 2014).

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.who.int/immunization/sage/sage-wg-vaccine-hesitancy-apr12/en/> [accessed 02.02.15].

recommendations of the SAGE WG, building on the previous review of determinants of vaccine hesitancy [1].

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Search strategy

For the peer-reviewed literature, the following databases were searched for the period of January 2007–October 2013: Medline, Embase, PsychInfo, Cochrane, CINAHL Plus, Web of Science, LILACS, Africa-Wide Information (for these, the search range was 2007 to 9 October 2013); IBSS (2007 to 19th July 2013) and IMEMR (2007 to 10 October 2013). The applied search strategy was kept deliberately broad to try to capture the multiple facets of vaccine hesitancy and incorporated MeSH or equivalent terms [Appendix 1]. References in relevant papers were searched for further relevant studies.

For grey literature, an open-dated search ending, in October 2013, was conducted across several databases and organizational websites, which included: OpenGrey, New York Academy of Medicine, Global Health, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), Department for International Development (DFID), the Communication Initiative Network and the Polio Communication Initiative Network [see search terms in Appendix 2]. Direct email requests were sent to individuals/organizations identified by the SAGE WG.

### 2.2. Study selection – Part A (Identification, scope of literature and effect of evaluated interventions)

For peer-reviewed literature, studies were included against the following criteria: (i) contained research on vaccine hesitancy; (ii) included any of the keywords in the title or abstract: “strateg\*”, “intervent\*”, “campaign”, “evaluation”, “approach” or “program\*”; (iii) described or evaluated an intervention addressing hesitancy and reported a measure of the primary outcome, i.e. indicating a change in vaccination uptake or the secondary outcome, i.e. indicating a change in knowledge/awareness and/or attitudes; (iv) published between January 2007 and October 2013; (v) pertaining to any vaccines and vaccination programmes; (vi) published in any of the six official UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish).

Grey literature was selected based on the following inclusion criteria: (i) contained any of the keywords

“immunisation/immunization”, “vaccine”, “vaccination”, “strategy”, “intervention”, “evaluation”, “hesitancy”, “refusal”, “trust”, “confidence”, “acceptance”, “engagement”, “anxiety”, “concern”, “distrust”, “barrier”, “rejection”, “fear”; (ii) published anytime up to October 2013; (iii) English only. Literature was excluded if it was: (i) about non-human vaccines or vaccines not currently available (e.g. HIV); (ii) related to research and development of vaccines (e.g. efficacy trials) unless explicitly about public trust, confidence, concern or hesitancy.

The screening of titles and abstracts was shared between at least two authors; a sample of studies was independently coded by authors to ensure consistency.

### 2.3. Data extraction

#### 2.3.1. Part A

A data extraction form was developed by the authors and reviewed by the SAGE WG. For evaluation studies, information extracted included details about the specific hesitancy issue; type of intervention (dialogue-based, incentive-based, reminder–recall

based or multi-component), the type of participants, setting and target vaccine; and the findings related to the outcomes of interest.

#### 2.3.2. Part B (PICO & GRADE) – Study selection, risk of bias & analysis

The SAGE WG identified 15 PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome) questions [2] [Appendix 3] *a priori*, to examine population features likely to influence the effect of different interventions and to assess the quality of evidence for each PICO question using GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) [3]. The primary outcome of interest was defined as the uptake of all vaccines included in routinely recommended immunization.

The 15 PICO questions were developed under three intervention themes: (1) Dialogue-based, (2) incentive-based (non-financial), and (3) reminder–recall. Following an extensive discussion by the WG at the December 2013 meeting, it was decided to focus on the impact of single component approaches and exclude multi-component approaches. However, data were included where a multi-component intervention provided suitable data to assess the effect of its individual component parts.

Theme categories for PICO questions:

- i) **Dialogue-based**, including the involvement of religious or traditional leaders, social mobilization, social media, mass media, and communication or information-based tools for health-care workers (HCW);
- ii) **Incentive-based (non-financial)**, including the provision of food or other goods to encourage vaccination, and;
- iii) **Reminder/recall-based**, including telephone call/letter to remind the target population about vaccination.

Evaluated primary studies identified earlier (Part A) were included if they provided direct evidence relevant to one or more PICO questions and reported data for comparison groups. Reasons for excluding studies are presented in *Characteristics of excluded studies* [4].

#### 2.3.3. Assessment of risk of bias

The Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) quality assessment tool for quantitative studies [5] was applied to determine the risk of bias of all eligible studies. Two reviewers independently conducted the risk of bias assessment and data extraction; disagreements were settled through discussion.

#### 2.3.4. Data analysis

For studies which included pre- and post-control and intervention groups, only post-data were used to more accurately represent the effect of the intervention. Outcomes reported varied between studies, so available data were entered into *Review Manager* software as individual studies. The fixed-effects model was used for analysis and results reported as risk ratios between intervention and control groups.

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Part A – Identification, scope of literature and effect of evaluated interventions

The search of peer reviewed publications identified 33023 peer reviewed articles. After removing duplicates and screening for inclusion criteria, 1149 articles were included by full-text. Of these, 166 [6–172] evaluated and 983 described, but did not evaluate, an intervention. Among the evaluated studies included from the peer reviewed literature, 115 related to Outcome 1, 37 to Outcome 2, and 14 to both [Fig. 1].




Fig. 1. Search process flow chart (peer reviewed literature) – Vaccine hesitancy.

The grey literature search identified 4896 records. After removing duplicates and screening for inclusion criteria, 59 articles were included by full text. Of these, 15 evaluated [172–186] and 44 only suggested an intervention. Among the evaluated studies included from the grey literature, nine reported on Outcome 1, three on Outcome 2, and three on both [Fig. 2].

There were a total of 181 articles that evaluated interventions from the peer reviewed and grey literature search, combined.

The number of peer reviewed studies evaluating interventions peaked in 2011 (at 32 studies) and has remained relatively stable since (28 in 2012 and 25 in 2013) [Fig. 3].

Very few evaluated interventions were identified in the grey literature with one or two articles annually at most from 1996 to 2012. In 2013, eight relevant articles (47% of those identified through the grey literature search) were found [Fig. 4].

Across all the literature reviewed (1208 articles), only five (0.4%) used the actual term ‘hesitancy’ or ‘hesitant’ with reference to vaccines/vaccination [94,173–176]. These were all found in the peer-reviewed literature and were all published in 2013. Only one of these articles evaluated an intervention. This intervention was carried out in AMR and focused on childhood vaccines, targeting

vaccine hesitant parents using a multi-component strategy that focused on education techniques. More often articles used terms such as “refusal”, “distrust” and “acceptance” to discuss vaccination behaviour. This reflects the relative newness of the term “hesitancy”.

The majority (58%) of evaluation studies in the peer reviewed and grey literature were based in AMR<sup>7</sup> (110/189<sup>8</sup>), and primarily focused on influenza, HPV and childhood vaccines. In low- and middle-income regions, particularly SEAR and AFR, the focus was on Diphtheria, Tetanus, Pertussis (DTP) and polio. All regions had evaluated studies anticipating or researching acceptance of the newly introduced HPV vaccine.

<sup>7</sup> The World Health Organization (WHO) divides the world into six WHO regions, for the purposes of reporting, analysis and administration: WHO African Region (AFR), WHO Region of the Americas (AMR), WHO South-East Asia Region (SEAR), WHO European Region (EUR), WHO Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMR) and WHO Western Pacific Region (WPR).

<sup>8</sup> The total number of articles is more than (n = 166) (peer reviewed) and (n = 15) (grey literature) as some articles report on more than one WHO region.




Fig. 2. Search process flow chart (grey literature) – Vaccine hesitancy.

Most interventions (primarily in AMR and EUR) targeted parents, health-care workers (HCWs) and the local community. Interventions in the grey literature from AFR largely focused on the local community and religious leaders.

When mapped against the SAGE WG model of determinants of vaccine hesitancy [Appendix 4], interventions addressing individual and social group influences, particularly knowledge and awareness raising, were most common in both the peer reviewed and grey literature (157/341, 46%). Vaccine delivery and the role

of the HCWs were the primary focus of vaccine and vaccination-specific interventions (123/341<sup>6</sup>, 36%). The engagement of religious and other community leaders was most commonly used to address contextual influences such as religion, culture and gender [Fig. 5].

In both the peer reviewed and grey literature, across all regions, most interventions (97/127, 76%) were multi-component. Dialogue-based interventions were common in all regions except EMR; reminder–recall approaches featured predominantly in higher-income regions; and incentive-based interventions were




Fig. 3. Evaluated peer reviewed strategies by publication year (2007–2013) and WHO region (n = 172)\*. \*Total number of articles is more than (n = 166) as some articles report on more than one WHO region.




Fig. 4. Evaluated grey literature strategies by publication year (1996–2013) and WHO region (n = 17)\*. \*Total number of articles is more than (n = 16) as some articles report on more than one WHO region.

only found in AMR and AFR (single-component), and SEAR (part of a multi-component approach).

### 3.2. Which interventions have been most successful?

The most effective interventions employed multiple strategies. The interventions with the largest observed increases (>25%) in vaccine uptake (Outcome 1) were those that (not in order of importance): (1) directly targeted unvaccinated or under-vaccinated populations [13]; (2) aimed to increase vaccination knowledge and awareness [20]; (3) improved convenience and access to

vaccination [116]; (4) targeted specific populations (e.g. HCW) [9]; (5) mandated vaccinations or sanction against non-vaccination [46]; and (6) engaged religious or other influential leaders to promote vaccination [177]. The greatest increases (>20%) in knowledge, awareness or attitudes (Outcome 2) were observed with education initiatives, particularly those embedding new knowledge into routine processes (e.g. hospital procedures), which were most successful at increasing knowledge and changing attitudes [105]. For both outcomes, those that tailored interventions to specific populations and their specific concerns were most effective [23,38].




Fig. 5. Evaluated peer reviewed and grey literature strategies by the SAGE WG model of determinants of vaccine hesitancy (n = 344). \*Interventions could address more than one determinant of vaccine hesitancy.

### 3.3. Which interventions have been least successful?

Interventions associated with a less than 10% increase in uptake included those that focused on quality improvement at clinics (e.g. improved data collection and monitoring, extended clinic hours [8,58]), passive interventions (e.g. posters, websites [19,24,41]) and incentive-based interventions using conditional or non-conditional cash transfers. It must be noted that incentive-based interventions usually targeted general preventive health and not just vaccination [96,98]. Lastly, reminder–recall interventions were associated with variable changes in uptake [57,75,88].

### 3.4. Part B – PICO & GRADE

Of 129 studies available, only 13 studies met the inclusion criteria for GRADE evaluation. The methodological quality (risk of bias) of each is set out in Appendix 5. Further study details are presented in Appendix 6.

The delivery of interventions varied as did the outcomes. Consequently only one outcome (two studies) for a single vaccine was pooled; meta-analysis was not feasible for any other outcome [64,66]. Summary of relative risk ratios (RR) and evidence quality (GRADE) for each question are presented in Appendix 3. Of the 15 PICO questions, only 10 could be addressed, often with only 1 study with evidence.

## 4. Dialogue-based interventions

Eleven studies evaluated by PICO and GRADE deployed dialogue-based interventions (explained below). There was appreciable variability in the quality of evidence supporting the use of these interventions and their impact varied considerably, by type of intervention, by vaccine and by setting.

For polio, the **involvement of religious or traditional leaders** in populations with low baseline uptake indicated a large, positive effect (RR 4.12 [3.99, 4.26]) on vaccine uptake but the evidence quality was assessed as very low [65] (Nigeria). The grey literature also reinforced that religious and traditional leader involvement can have a positive impact [3,5,177,178] as in west and central francophone African countries, Afghanistan, India and Europe.

Four studies using **social mobilization** among parents in low-income settings found a positive effect on measles (RR 1.63 [1.39, 1.91]) [78] (Pakistan), DTP3 (RR 2.17 [1.8, 2.61]) [78] (Pakistan), DTP1 (RR 1.54 [1.1, 2.15]) [106] (Nigeria), and polio (RR 1050.00 [147.96, 7451.4]) [66] (Pakistan) [64] (India) vaccine uptake. The quality of evidence for each outcome ranged from moderate (measles, DTP3), to low (polio) and very low (DTP1). Two studies targeting polio vaccination refusals reported large increases in uptake. In the grey literature, inclusion of social mobilization as a component appeared to have a positive, albeit varied effect and was not always quantified.

Two studies evaluating **social media** interventions found a positive effect on uptake for MCV4/Tdap (RR 2.01 [1.39, 2.93]) [102] (Australia) and seasonal influenza (RR 2.38 [1.23, 4.6]) [157] (Australia) although the evidence was assessed as low and very low quality. In the grey literature, one study [178] in Slovenia reported on the use of social media with other strategies for A(H1N1), however its effect was not independently measured, achieved low utilization, and became a source of negative social media rumours.

A study on **mass media** to target parents with low awareness of health services found an association with increased uptake of all routinely recommended vaccines (RR 1.57 [1.4, 1.75]) [179] (India). The quality of evidence was moderate. Three grey literature studies reported on the use of mass media for A(H1N1) [178] (Europe), routine childhood immunization [177] (west and central francophone

African countries) and polio [3] (Afghanistan) but their impact was not independently measured from other intervention components.

**Communication tool-based training for health-care workers** had a positive impact on uptake of EPI vaccines (RR 3.09 [2.19, 4.36]) [92] and DTP3 (RR 1.54 [1.33, 1.79]) [79] in India and Pakistan respectively, among rostered patients; evidence quality was assessed as moderate and low respectively.

One study [10] (Turkey) assessed the impact of **information-based training for health-care workers** on uptake for rostered patients, with varying results. There was little or no increase in uptake of DTP/OPV-1 (RR 0.99 [0.93, 1.06]), DTP/OPV-2 (RR 1.04 [0.97, 1.12]), BCG (RR 1.01 [0.95, 1.08]) and measles (RR 1.02 [0.96, 1.09]), a moderate increase in uptake of HepB-2 (RR 1.63 [1.49, 1.79]), HepB-3 (RR 1.89 [1.74, 2.04]) and DTP/OPV-3 (RR 1.42 [1.33, 1.51]), and a substantial increase in uptake of HepB-1 (RR 2.83 [2.6, 3.08]); but the evidence quality was very low for all.

## 5. Non-financial incentives

The evidence for non-financial incentives for parents/communities located in low-income settings (India) was moderate for a large, positive effect on EPI vaccine uptake (RR 2.16 [1.68, 2.77]) [92].

## 6. Reminder–recall interventions

Two studies assessed the impact of reminder–recall interventions in low-income and under-vaccinated populations. The impact of reminder–recall interventions in low-income settings was positive for DTP3 (RR 1.26 [1.13, 1.42]) [146] (Pakistan) with moderate quality evidence. For settings with low baseline uptake, the effects were large and positive for scheduled childhood vaccines (RR 3.22 [1.59, 6.53]) [86] (Switzerland) but the quality of evidence was very low.

## 7. Discussion

### 7.1. Part A – Identification, scope of literature and effect of evaluated interventions

While there has been an increase in the number of articles on the issue of vaccine hesitancy, of those that include a discussion on interventions or strategies to address hesitancy, few go as far as evaluating them. Furthermore, the specific term “vaccine hesitancy” has only recently been used and the only evaluated intervention that explicitly addressed “hesitancy” comes from the United States.

Overall, many of the interventions were not different from traditional strategies to increase vaccine acceptance, with the majority focusing at individual and social group level and interventions being largely on knowledge and awareness raising. While knowledge and awareness raising strategies are important, they are inadequate, as evidenced by the finding that the most effective interventions used multi-component strategies. Furthermore the most effective interventions were tailored to *specific populations* and addressing *specific concerns*, pointing to the importance of understanding the drivers of vaccine hesitancy to inform the interventions.

The increasingly recognized domain of vaccine hesitancy needs new interventions to address new issues. In particular, the dearth of interventions identified in low-income countries needs attention.

### 7.2. Part B – PICO & GRADE

Despite the few studies available for GRADE and variability in the quality of the evidence, several interventions showed some

positive impact on vaccination uptake, including: social mobilization, mass media, communication tool-based training for HCW, non-financial incentives, and reminder–recall activities. None of these interventions were without shortcomings, and given the variability in context, target population and outcome, the potential application of these interventions must be cautiously considered when applying them in different circumstances.

## 8. Dialogue-based interventions

The impact of **religious or traditional leader involvement** in populations with low baseline uptake merits further investigation and evaluation. This type of intervention is important as it addresses one of the more difficult determinants of vaccine hesitancy, namely, misconceptions and community distrust. This intervention aligns itself with natural community processes – seeking out community leaders, and encouraging dialogue across multiple levels to both inform and influence. The success of the intervention could be attributed to the efforts made to understand the target audience, facilitate open dialogue, and integrate activities with familiar processes and systems.

The success of **social mobilization** interventions for populations refusing polio vaccination could also be attributed to the targeting of, and dialogue with, a clearly defined population. By comparison, the social mobilization interventions for measles and DTP were much less targeted; although positive outcomes appear to be due to meaningful dialogue at both the group and individual level.

**Social media** intervention studies suggest that this approach might work well for those who have already started their vaccination schedule, or who are familiar with social media in other aspects of their lives. However, there is important evidence that social media are also very open to exploitation if not managed well. Also those who initiate vaccination are probably not the most hesitant of populations and those with access to social media are not the most marginalized.

The use of **mass media** to target populations with low awareness of health services appears to be effective, however, the limited impact also suggests that there may be other underlying issues affecting the impact that need investigation and more tailored supporting interventions.

The provision of **communication tool-based training for HCW** generally had a positive effect (for EPI vaccines, DTP3) but the size of the effect and evidence quality varied. The observations about this example and mass media suggest that interventions that adopt a unidirectional (top down) approach to communication, may be successful among some individuals and groups, but not all; success is dependent on the nature and degree of hesitancy.

The impact of **information-based training for HCW** on uptake of several vaccines for rostered patients was generally poor. A possible explanation for these results is that there was no clear understanding of the underlying reasons for the low vaccination uptake and as such, the intervention was not appropriately targeted. Nonetheless, the intervention did achieve good success with HepB (all doses) and DTP/OPV (dose 3); one possible reason for this is that the HCW exhibited greater confidence but it is not clear whether this was an issue prior to the intervention.

## 9. Non-financial incentives

The moderate to large effect of non-financial incentives for parents/communities located in low-income settings on vaccination uptake is promising. In this study the target group was very disadvantaged and the food-based incentive, so closely linked with basic survival, was readily received. Furthermore, the baseline vaccination rates were very low (2%), and more likely to show

greater outcome changes with an intervention. It is possible that by addressing basic needs, this intervention simultaneously built confidence and reduced vaccine hesitancy because the target population felt that their other critical needs were being addressed. This approach could be particularly important for underserved groups.

## 10. Reminder–recall interventions

Although positive, the relatively low observed effect of reminder–recall interventions in low-income settings seems to reflect the limitations of using this kind of intervention alone. In this example, a complex set of issues was identified in the target population but the intervention only addressed one of them. Reminder–recall on its own is not enough to tackle multiple causes of hesitancy.

## 11. Limitations

This review may be subject to publication bias, in that unsuccessful interventions may be less likely to be documented in either the peer-reviewed or grey literature. Another reason for the paucity of relevant studies is that the PICO questions emphasize specific, single component strategies, but many evaluated strategies are neither designed nor presented in this way. Evaluated, multi-component interventions were identified but only overall impact data were presented. Therefore, outcome data for individual strategies to address vaccine hesitancy were not separately available.

## 12. Conclusion

Overall this review has found that, despite extensive literature searching, there are (1) few existing strategies that have been explicitly designed to address vaccine hesitancy; and (2) even fewer strategies that have quantified the impact of the intervention (14% (166/1149) of peer reviewed; 25% (15/59) of the grey literature). There is also an uneven geographical spread in the available literature, with most focusing on AMR and EUR.

Efforts to address issues of hesitancy are disparate. While a number of interventions did have a positive effect, wide variation was observed in the effect size between studies, settings and target populations. In addition, the high level of heterogeneity across study design and outcomes, coupled with few available studies, further limited our ability to draw many general conclusions about the effectiveness of different strategies.

Nonetheless, interventions to increase uptake that are multi-component and/or have a focus on dialogue-based approaches tend to perform better. Together, these interventions suggest that taking a comprehensive approach that targets multiple audiences and layers of social interaction are more likely to bring positive results. The evidence for non-financial incentives and reminder–recall activities was also of good quality, and carries the potential to bring positive change by addressing the more practical aspects of vaccination.

Vaccine hesitancy is a complex issue and no single strategy will be able to address it. There are some promising examples using uptake as a link, but many are incomplete and most are not directly comparable. One of the greatest drawbacks of the interventions identified is that many operate from an assumption-based rather than an evidence-based approach; appropriate evaluation is also lacking. On a more positive note, there is a growing body of research on the determinants of vaccine hesitancy which can help inform and refine currently used approaches that look promising but have not yet been fully implemented or evaluated.

Lastly, there is a clear need for more attention to understanding and addressing hesitancy at the community and social

network level – most interventions have historically focused on addressing individual level issues (e.g. knowledge, awareness) and vaccine/vaccination specific concerns (e.g. mode of delivery, vaccine risks) despite the large body of literature on the many other determinants of vaccine hesitancy.

## Funding

The LSHTM research group “The Vaccine Confidence Project” has received primary research funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, with additional support from the Center for Strategic and International Studies, EU Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI), GSK, National Institute for Health Research (UK), Novartis, and WHO. HL has done consulting on vaccine confidence with GSK and is a member of Merck Vaccine Strategic Advisory Board.

## Conflict of interest statements

None of the other authors had any potential conflict of interest.

## Appendix. SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy

Juhani Eskola, National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland (Chair of Working Group since April 2014); Xiaofeng Liang, Chinese Center for Disease Control, China (Member of SAGE until 2014, Chair of Working Group from March 2012 to April 2014); Mohuya Chaudhuri, Independent Journalist and Documentary Filmmaker, India; Eve Dubé, Institut National de Santé Publique du Québec, Canada; Bruce Gellin, Department of Health and Human Services, U.S.A.; Susan Goldstein, Soul City: Institute for Health and Development Communication, South Africa; Heidi Larson, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, U.K.; Noni MacDonald, Dalhousie University, Canada; Mahamane Laouali Manzo, Ministry of Health, Niger; Arthur Reingold, University of California at Berkeley, U.S.A.; Kinzang Tshering, Jigme Dorji Wangchuck National Referral Hospital, Bhutan; Yuqing Zhou, Chinese Centre for Disease Control, China with the WHO/UNICEF Secretariat; Robb Butler, World Health Organization, Denmark; Philippe Duclos, World Health Organization, Switzerland; Sherine Guirguis, UNICEF, U.S.A.; Ben Hickler, UNICEF, U.S.A.; Melanie Schuster, World Health Organization, Switzerland.

## Appendix B. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.040>

## References

- [1] Larson HJ, Jarrett C, Eckersberger E, Smith DM, Paterson P. Understanding vaccine hesitancy around vaccines and vaccination from a global perspective: a systematic review of published literature, 2007–2012. *Vaccine* 2014;32(19):2150–9.
- [2] Asking a good question (PICO), 2014. Available from: <http://www.usc.edu/hsc/ebnet/ebframe/PICO.htm>
- [3] Balslem H, Helfand M, Schünemann H, Oxman A, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64(4):501–6.
- [4] WHO SAGE working group dealing with vaccine hesitancy. In: *Strategies for addressing vaccine hesitancy – a systematic review*. 2014. [http://www.who.int/immunization/sage/meetings/2014/october/3.SAGE.WG.Strategies\\_addressing\\_vaccine\\_hesitancy\\_2014.pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/immunization/sage/meetings/2014/october/3.SAGE.WG.Strategies_addressing_vaccine_hesitancy_2014.pdf?ua=1)
- [5] Quality assessment tool for quantitative studies: effective public health practice project (EPHPP); 2009. Available from: <http://www.ephpp.ca/tools.html>
- [6] Cox AD, Cox D, Cryer R, Graham-Dotson Y, Zimet GD. Can self-prediction overcome barriers to Hepatitis B vaccination? A randomized controlled trial. *Health Psychol* 2012;31(1):97–105.

- [7] Gunn RA, Lee MA, Murray PJ, Gilchick RA, Margolis HS. Hepatitis B vaccination of men who have sex with men attending an urban STD clinic: impact of an ongoing vaccination program, 1998–2003. *Sex Transm Dis* 2007;34(9):663–8.
- [8] Duval L, George C, Hedrick N, Woodruff S, Kleinpeter MA. Network 13 partnership to improve the influenza, pneumococcal pneumonia, and hepatitis B vaccination rates among dialysis patients. *Adv Perit Dial* 2011;27:106–11.
- [9] Al-Tawil MM, El-Gohary EE, El-Sayed MH. Effect of infection control strategy on knowledge, attitude and practice towards hepatitis B transmission and prevention in vulnerable populations. *Int J Risk Saf Med* 2013;25(3):135–43.
- [10] Uskun E, Uskun SB, Uysalgenc M, Yagiz M. Effectiveness of a training intervention on immunization to increase knowledge of primary healthcare workers and vaccination coverage rates. *Public Health (Elsevier)* 2008;122(9):949–58.
- [11] Moss JL, Reiter PL, Dayton A, Brewer NT. Increasing adolescent immunization by webinar: a brief provider intervention at federally qualified health centers. *Vaccine* 2012;30(33):4960–3.
- [12] Schwarz K, Garrett B, Lee J, Thompson D, Thiel T, Alter MJ, et al. Positive impact of a shelter-based hepatitis B vaccine program in homeless Baltimore children and adolescents. *J Urban Health: Bull N Y Acad Med* 2008;85(2):228–38.
- [13] Stitzer ML, Polk T, Bowles S, Kosten T. Drug users' adherence to a 6-month vaccination protocol: effects of motivational incentives. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2010;107(1):76–9.
- [14] Campbell JV, Garfein RS, Thiede H, Hagan H, Ouellet LJ, Golub ET, et al. Convenience is the key to hepatitis A and B vaccination uptake among young adult injection drug users. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2007;91:64–72.
- [15] Andrews RM, Skull SA, Byrnes GB, Campbell DA, Turner JL, McIntyre PB, et al. Influenza and pneumococcal vaccine coverage among a random sample of hospitalised persons aged 65 years or more, Victoria. *Commun Dis Intell* 2005;29(3):283–8.
- [16] Nyamathi A, Liu Y, Marfisee M, Shoptaw S, Gregerson P, Saab S, et al. Effects of a nurse-managed program on hepatitis A and B vaccine completion among homeless adults. *Nurs Res* 2009;58(1):13–22.
- [17] Kharbanda E, Stockwell M, Fox H, Andres R, Lara M, Rickert V. Text message reminders to promote human papillomavirus vaccination. *Vaccine* 2011;29(14):2537–41.
- [18] Wright JD, Govindappagari S, Pawar N, Cleary K, Burke WM, Devine PC, et al. Acceptance and compliance with postpartum human papillomavirus vaccination. *Obstet Gynecol* 2012;120:771–82.
- [19] Gerend MA, Shepherd JE. Predicting human papillomavirus vaccine uptake in young adult women: comparing the health belief model and theory of planned behavior. *Ann Behav Med* 2012;44(2):293.
- [20] Spleen A, Klhusman B, Clark A, Dignan M, Lengerich E. An Increase in HPV-related knowledge and vaccination intent among parental and non-parental caregivers of adolescent girls, Age 9–17 years, in Appalachian Pennsylvania. *J Cancer Educ* 2012;27(2):312–9.
- [21] LaMontagne DS, Barge S, Le NT, Mugisha E, Penny ME, Gandhi S, et al. Human papillomavirus vaccine delivery strategies that achieved high coverage in low- and middle-income countries. *Bull World Health Organ* 2011;89(11):821–30B.
- [22] Galagan SR, Paul P, Menezes L, LaMontagne DS. Influences on parental acceptance of HPV vaccination in demonstration projects in Uganda and Vietnam. *Vaccine* 2013;31(30):3072–8.
- [23] Fiks AG, Grundmeier RW, Mayne S, Song L, Feemster K, Karavite D, et al. Effectiveness of decision support for families, clinicians, or both on HPV vaccine receipt. *Pediatrics* 2013;131(6):1114–24.
- [24] Cates JR, Shafer A, Diehl SJ, Deal AM. Evaluating a county-sponsored social marketing campaign to increase mothers' initiation of HPV vaccine for their preteen daughters in a primarily rural area. *Soc Market Q* 2011;17(1):4–26.
- [25] Hopfer S. Effects of a narrative HPV vaccination intervention aimed at reaching college women: a randomized controlled trial. *Prev Sci* 2012;13(2):173–82.
- [26] Mayne S, Karavite D, Grundmeier R, Localio R, Feemster K, DeBartolo E, et al. The implementation and acceptability of an HPV vaccination decision support system directed at both clinicians and families 2012; 2012. p. 616–24. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23304334>
- [27] Zimmerman R, Nowalk M, Lin C, Raymund M, Fox D, Harper J, et al. Factorial design for improving influenza vaccination among employees of a large health system. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2009;30(7):691–7.
- [28] Weaver FM, Smith B, LaVela S, Wallace C, Evans CT, Hammond M, et al. Interventions to increase influenza vaccination rates in veterans with spinal cord injuries and disorders. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2007;30(1):10–9.
- [29] Walter EB, Hellkamp AS, Goldberg KC, Montgomery D, Patterson B, Dolor RJ. Improving influenza vaccine coverage among asthmatics: a practice-based research network study. *J Clin Outcomes Manag* 2008;15(5):227–34.
- [30] Talbot TR, Dellit TH, Hebden J, Sama D, Cuny J. Factors associated with increased healthcare worker influenza vaccination rates: results from a National Survey of University Hospitals and Medical Centers. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2010;31(5):456–62.
- [31] Slaunwhite JM, Smith SM, Fleming MT, Strang R, Lockhart C. Increasing vaccination rates among health care workers using unit “champions” as a motivator. *Can J Infect Control: Off J Commun Hosp Infect Control Assoc-Can* 2009;24(3):159–64.
- [32] Schensul JJ, Radda K, Coman E, Vazquez E. Multi-level intervention to prevent influenza infections in older low income and minority adults. *Am J Community Psychol* 2009;43(3–4):313–29.

- [33] Quan K, Tehrani DM, Dickey L, Spiritus E, Hizon D, Heck K, et al. Voluntary to mandatory: evolution of strategies and attitudes toward influenza vaccination of healthcare personnel. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2012;33(1):63–70.
- [34] Payaprom Y, Bennett P, Alabaster E, Tantipong H. Using the health action process approach and implementation intentions to increase flu vaccine uptake in high risk thai individuals: a controlled before-after trial. *Health Psychol* 2011;30(4):492–500.
- [35] Panda B, Stiller R, Panda A. Influenza vaccination during pregnancy and factors for lacking compliance with current CDC guidelines. *J Matern-Fet Neonatal Med* 2011;24(3):402–6.
- [36] Nicholson MR, Hayes DM, Bennett AM. Partnering with nursing service improves health care worker influenza vaccination rates. *Am J Infect Control* 2009;37(6):484–9.
- [37] Nace DA, Hoffman EL, Resnick NM, Handler SM. Achieving and sustaining high rates of influenza immunization among long-term care staff. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2007;8(2):128–33.
- [38] Mouzoon ME, Munoz FM, Greisinger AJ, Brehm BJ, Wehmanen OA, Smith FA, et al. Improving influenza immunization in pregnant women and healthcare workers. *Am J Manag Care* 2010;16(3):209–16.
- [39] Maltezou HC, Maragos A, Raftopoulos V, Karageorgou K, Halharapi T, Remoudaki H, et al. Strategies to increase influenza vaccine uptake among health care workers in Greece. *Scand J Infect Dis* 2008;40(3):266–8.
- [40] Malmvall B, Franzen I, Abom P, MB H. The rate of influenza immunization to people aged 65 years and older was increased from 45% to 70% by a primary health care-based multiprofessional approach. *Qual Manag Health Care* 2007;16(1):51–9.
- [41] Lluçà A, Mena G, Olive V, Quesada S, Aldea M, Sequera VG, et al. Evaluating influenza vaccination campaigns beyond coverage: a before-after study among health care workers. *Am J Infect Control* 2013;41(8):674–8.
- [42] Lluçà A, García-Basteiro AL, Olivé V, Costas L, Ríos J, Quesada S, et al. New interventions to increase influenza vaccination rates in health care workers. *Am J Infect Control* 2010;38(4):476–81.
- [43] Kimura AC, Nguyen CN, Higa JI, Hurwitz EL, Vugia DJ. The effectiveness of vaccine day and educational interventions on influenza vaccine coverage among health care workers at long-term care facilities. *Am J Public Health* 2007;97(4):684–90.
- [44] Humiston SG, Bennett NM, Long C, Eberly S, Arvelo L, Stankaitis J, et al. Increasing inner-city adult influenza vaccination rates: a randomized controlled trial. *Public Health Rep* 2011;126:39–47.
- [45] Honda H, Sato Y, Yamazaki A, Kumagai A. A multifaceted intervention to increase the influenza vaccination rate of healthcare workers without a mandatory policy in Japan. In: 28th International Congress of Chemotherapy and Infection Incorporating the 14th Asia-Pacific Congress of Clinical Microbiology and Infection, vol. 42. 2013. p. S107.
- [46] Harris K, Maurer J, Black C, Euler G, Kadiyala S. Workplace efforts to promote influenza vaccination among healthcare personnel and their association with uptake during the 2009 pandemic influenza A (H1N1). *Vaccine* 2011;29(16):2978–85.
- [47] Gargano L, Pazol K, Sales J, Painter J, Morfaw C, Jones L, et al. Evaluation of multi-component interventions to increase influenza vaccine uptake in adolescents. *J Adolesc Health* 2011;48(2):S7–S.
- [48] Friedl A, Aegerter C, Saner E, Meier D, Beer JH. An intensive 5-year-long influenza vaccination campaign is effective among doctors but not nurses. *Infection* 2012;40(1):57–62.
- [49] Ferguson CD, Ferguson TE, Golledge J, McBride WJ. Pandemic influenza vaccination: will the health care system take its own medicine? *Aust J Rural Health* 2010;18(4):137–42.
- [50] Doratotaj S, Macknin M, Worley S. A novel approach to improve influenza vaccination rates among health care professionals: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *Am J Infect Control* 2008;36(4):301–3.
- [51] De Juanes J, de Codes G, Arrazola M, Jaén F, Sanz M, González A. Influenza vaccination coverage among hospital personnel over three consecutive vaccination campaigns (2001–2002 to 2003–2004). *Vaccine* 2007;25(1):201–4.
- [52] Camurdan MO, Camurdan AD, Beyazova U, Bideci A. The rate of seasonal influenza vaccination in diabetic children, the effect of recommendation and the factors influencing the acceptance of recommendation: an interventional study. *Balk Med J* 2012;29:434–9.
- [53] Cadena J, Prigmore T, Bowling J, Ayala BA, Kirkman L, Parekh A, et al. Improving influenza vaccination of healthcare workers by means of quality improvement tools. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2011;32(6):616–8.
- [54] Ballestas T, McEvoy SP, Doyle J. Co-ordinated approach to healthcare worker influenza vaccination in an area health service. *J Hosp Infect* 2009;73(3):203–9.
- [55] Ajenjo MC, Woeltje KF, Babcock HM, Gemeinhart N, Jones M, Fraser VJ. Influenza vaccination among healthcare workers: ten-year experience of a large healthcare organization. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2010;31(3):233–40.
- [56] Abramson ZH, Avni O, Levi O, Miskin IN. Randomized trial of a program to increase staff influenza vaccination in primary care clinics. *Ann Fam Med* 2010;8(4):293–8.
- [57] Moniz MH, Hasley S, Meyn LA, Beigi RH. Improving influenza vaccination rates in pregnancy through text messaging: a randomized controlled trial. *Obstet Gynecol* 2013;121(4):734–40.
- [58] Milkman KL, Beshears J, Choi JJ, Laibson D, Madrian BC. Using implementation intentions prompts to enhance influenza vaccination rates. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2011;108(26):10415–20.
- [59] Fiks A, Hunter K, Localio A, Grundmeier R, Bryant-Stephens T, Luberti A, et al. Impact of electronic health record-based alerts on influenza vaccination for children with asthma. *Pediatrics* 2009;124(1):69.
- [60] Ofstead CL, Sherman BW, Wetzler HP, Dirlam Langlay AM, Mueller NJ, Ward JM, et al. Effectiveness of worksite interventions to increase influenza vaccination rates among employees and families. *J Occup Environ Med* 2013;55(2):156–63.
- [61] Maltezou HC, Kalogriopoulou K, Pergialiotis V, Siahaniidou T, Skiathitou AV, Katerelos P, et al. Acceptance of a post-partum influenza vaccination (cocooning) strategy for neonates in Greece. *Vaccine* 2012;30:5871–4.
- [62] Lee I, Thompson S, Lautenbach E, Gasink LB, Watson B, Fishman NO, et al. Effect of accessibility of influenza vaccination on the rate of childcare staff vaccination. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2008;29(5):465–7.
- [63] Butteri MJ, Radu C, Huq F, Wiglesworth A, Durso SC, Bellantoni M. Flu in 15: a novel 15-minute education program to promote acceptance of the influenza vaccine among health care workers. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2010;11(7):523–7.
- [64] Ansari MA, Khan Z, Khan IM. Reducing resistance against polio drops. *J R Soc Promot Health* 2007;127(6):276–9.
- [65] Nasiru SG, Aliyu GG, Gasasira A, Aliyu MH, Zubair M, Mandawari SU, et al. Breaking community barriers to polio vaccination in northern nigeria: the impact of a grass roots mobilization campaign (Majigi). *Pathog Global Health* 2012;(106):166–71.
- [66] Ali S, Manzoor F, Sahi N, Sattar S. Vaccine refusal: an obstacle to a polio free world. *Prof Med J* 2010;17(1):145–50.
- [67] Lahariya C, Khandekar J, Ray TK, Meenakshi, Pradhan SK. Role of an area specific approach to increase community participation in pulse polio program in a locality of south Delhi. *J Commun Dis* 2007;39(4):245–8.
- [68] Goel S, Dogra V, Gupta S, Lakshmi P, Varkey S, Pradhan N, et al. Effectiveness of Muskaan Ek Abhiyan (the smile campaign) for strengthening routine immunization in Bihar, India. *Indian Pediatr* 2012;49(2):103–8.
- [69] Smith JG, Metzger NL. Evaluation of pneumococcal vaccination rates after vaccine protocol changes and nurse education in a tertiary care teaching hospital. *J Manag Care Pharm* 2011;17(9):701–8.
- [70] Wallace C, Corben P, Turahui J, Gilmour R. The role of television advertising in increasing pneumococcal vaccination coverage among the elderly, North Coast, New South Wales, 2006. *Aust N Z J Public Health* 2008;32(5):467–70.
- [71] Eckrode C, Church N, English Iii WJ. Implementation and evaluation of a nursing assessment/standing orders-based inpatient pneumococcal vaccination program. *Am J Infect Control* 2007;35(8):508–15.
- [72] Thomas PJT, Menzies RL. Evaluation of a targeted immunisation program for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander infants in an urban setting. *N S W Public Health Bull* 2008;19(5–6):96–9.
- [73] Tam PY, Visintainer P, Fisher D. Response to an education program for parents about adult pertussis vaccination. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2009;30(6):589–92.
- [74] Atchison C, Zvoc M, Balakrishnan R. The evaluation of a standardized call/recall system for childhood immunizations in Wandsworth, England. *J Community Health: Publ Health Promot Dis Prev* 2013;38(3):581–7.
- [75] Lemstra M, Rajakumar D, Thompson A, Moraros J. The effectiveness of telephone reminders and home visits to improve measles, mumps and rubella immunization coverage rates in children. *Paediatr Child Health* 2011;16(1):e1–5.
- [76] Porter-Jones G, Williams S, Powell C, Pusey L, Roberts RJ. Impact of a novel way to communicate information about MMR on uptake of MMR vaccine: a randomized controlled trial. *Public Health (Elsevier)* 2009;123(1):78–80.
- [77] Abdul Rahman MA, Al-Dabbagh S, Al-Habeeb Q. Health education and peer leaders' role in improving low vaccination coverage in Akre district, Kurdistan Region, Iraq. *East Mediterr Health J* 2013.
- [78] Andersson N, Cockcroft A, Ansari NM, Omer K, Baloch M, Foster AH, et al. Evidence-based discussion increases childhood vaccination uptake: a randomized cluster controlled trial of knowledge translation in Pakistan. *BMC Int Health Human Rights* 2009;9.
- [79] Usman HR, Rahbar MH, Kristensen S, Vermund SH, Kirby RS, Habib F, et al. Randomized controlled trial to improve childhood immunization adherence in rural Pakistan: redesigned immunization card and maternal education. *Trop Med Int Health* 2011;16(3):334–42.
- [80] Sasaki S, Igarashi K, Fujino Y, Comber AJ, Brunson C, Muleya CM, et al. The impact of community-based outreach immunisation services on immunisation coverage with GIS network accessibility analysis in peri-urban areas, Zambia. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2011;65(12):1171–8.
- [81] Prinja S, Gupta M, Singh A, Kumar R. Effectiveness of planning and management interventions for improving age-appropriate immunization in rural India. *Bull World Health Organ* 2010;88(2):97–103.
- [82] Pandey P, Goyal M. Informing resource-poor populations and the delivery of entitled health and social services in rural India. *J Am Med Assoc* 2007;298(16):1867–75.
- [83] Girard DZ. Recommended or mandatory pertussis vaccination policy in developed countries: does the choice matter? *Public Health* 2012;126(2):117–22.
- [84] Vora S, Verber L, Potts S, Dozier T, Daum RS. Effect of a novel birth intervention and reminder-recall on on-time immunization compliance in high-risk children. *Hum Vaccines* 2009;5(6):395–402.

- [85] Abbott P, Menzies R, Davison J, Moore L, Wang H. Improving immunisation timeliness in aboriginal children through personalised calendars. *BMC Public Health* 2013;13:598.
- [86] Muehleisen B, Baer G, Schaad UB, Heining U. Assessment of immunization status in hospitalized children followed by counseling of parents and primary care physicians improves vaccination coverage: an interventional study. *J Pediatr* 2007;151(6):704–6, 6.e1–2.
- [87] Hicks P, Tarr GA, Hicks XP. Reminder cards and immunization rates among Latinos and the rural poor in Northeast Colorado. *J Am Board Fam Med* 2007;20(6):581–6.
- [88] McElligott J, Darden P. Are patient-held vaccination records associated with improved vaccination coverage rates? *Pediatrics* 2010;125(3):467–72.
- [89] Fu LY, Weissman M, McLaren R, Thomas C, Campbell J, Mbafor J, et al. Improving the quality of immunization delivery to an at-risk population: a comprehensive approach. *Pediatrics* 2012;129(2):e496–503.
- [90] Uddin MJ, Larson CP, Oliveras E, Khan AI, Quaiyum MA, Saha NC. Child immunization coverage in urban slums of Bangladesh: impact of an intervention package. *Health Policy Plan* 2010;25(1):50–60.
- [91] Melinkovich P, Hammer A, Staudenmaier A, Berg M. Improving pediatric immunization rates in a safety-net delivery system. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2007;33(4):205–10.
- [92] Banerjee A, Duflo E, Jameel A, Glennerster R, Kothari D. Improving immunisation coverage in rural India: clustered randomised controlled evaluation of immunisation campaigns with and without incentives. *Br Med J* 2010;340:2220.
- [93] Igarashi KSS, Fujino Y, Tanabe N, Muleya CM, Tambatamba B, Suzuki H. The impact of an immunization programme administered through the Growth Monitoring Programme Plus as an alternative way of implementing Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses in urban-slum areas of Lusaka, Zambia. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* 2010;104(9):577–82.
- [94] Williams SE, Rothman RL, Offit PA, Schaffner W, Sullivan M, Edwards KM. A randomized trial to increase acceptance of childhood vaccines by vaccine-hesitant parents: a pilot study. *Acad Pediatr* 2013;13(5):475–80.
- [95] Samuels RC, Liu J, Sofis LA, Palfrey JS. Immunizations in children with special health care needs in a medical home model of care. *Matern Child Health J* 2008;12(3):357–62.
- [96] Robertson L, Mushati P, Eaton JW, Dumba L, Mavise G, Makoni J, et al. Effects of unconditional and conditional cash transfers on child health and development in Zimbabwe: a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet* 2013;381(9874):1283–92.
- [97] Taylor J, Rietberg K, Greenfield L, Bibus D, Yasuda K, Marcuse E, et al. Effectiveness of a physician peer educator in improving the quality of immunization services for young children in primary care practices. *Vaccine* 2008;26(33):4256–61.
- [98] Barham T, Maluccio J. Eradicating diseases: the effect of conditional cash transfers on vaccination coverage in rural Nicaragua. *J Health Econ* 2009;28(3):611–21.
- [99] Swenson CJ, Appel A, Sheehan M, Hammer A, Fenner Z, Phipps S, et al. Using information technology to improve adult immunization delivery in an integrated urban health system. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2012;38(1):15–23.
- [100] Beggs AE, Morrill-Kline KA, Wilhoite JE, Fick LB. Effect of an intervention on medical resident knowledge and adult immunization rates. *Fam Med* 2013;45:118–21.
- [101] Brigham K, Woods E, Steltz S, Sandora T, EA B. Randomized controlled trial of an immunization recall intervention for adolescents. *Pediatrics* 2012;130(3):507–14.
- [102] Stockwell MS, Kharbanda EO, Martinez RA, Lara M, Vawdrey D, Natarajan K, et al. Text4Health: impact of text message reminder–recalls for pediatric and adolescent immunizations. *Am J Public Health* 2012;102(2):15.
- [103] Cheema S, Vinnard C, Foster-Chang S, Linkin DR. A time off incentive was not associated with influenza vaccination acceptance among healthcare workers. *Influenza Res Treat* 2013:2013.
- [104] Kepka D, Coronado GD, Rodriguez HP, Thompson B. Evaluation of a radionovela to promote HPV vaccine awareness and knowledge among Hispanic parents. *J Community Health* 2011;36(6):957–65.
- [105] Gottvall M, Tyden T, Hoglund AT, Larsson M. Knowledge of human papillomavirus among high school students can be increased by an educational intervention. *Int J STD AIDS* 2010;21(8):558–62.
- [106] Oche MO, Umar AS, Ibrahim MTO, Sabitu K. An assessment of the impact of health education on maternal knowledge and practice of childhood immunization in Kware. Sokoto State *J Public Health Epidemiol* 2011;3(10):440–7.
- [107] Boom JA, Nelson CS, Laufman LE, Kohrt AE, Kozinetz CA. Improvement in provider immunization knowledge and behaviors following a peer education intervention. *Clin Pediatr* 2007;46(8):706–17.
- [108] Taddio A, Shah V, Leung E, Wang J, Parikh C, Smart S, et al. Knowledge translation of the HELPinKIDS clinical practice guideline for managing childhood vaccination pain: usability and knowledge uptake of educational materials directed to new parents. *BMC Pediatr* 2013;13:23.
- [109] Schechter NL, Bernstein BA, Zempsky WT, Bright NS, Willard AK. Educational outreach to reduce immunization pain in office settings. *Pediatrics* 2010;126(6):e1514–21.
- [110] Sheikh M, MacIntyre CR. The impact of intensive health promotion to a targeted refugee population on utilisation of a new refugee paediatric clinic at the children's hospital at Westmead. *Ethn Health* 2009;14(4):393–405.
- [111] Hsu CE, Zhang G, Yan FA, Shang N, Le T. What made a successful hepatitis B program for reducing liver cancer disparities: an examination of baseline characteristics and educational intervention, infection status, and missing responses of at-risk Asian Americans. *J Community Health* 2010;35(3):325–35.
- [112] Bertin M, Scarpelli M, Proctor AW, Sharp J, Robitson E, Donnelly T, et al. Novel use of the intranet to document health care personnel participation in a mandatory influenza vaccination reporting program. *Am J Infect Control* 2007;35(1):33–7.
- [113] Crosby R, Rager K, Hanson A, Ribes J. Does knowing about an HPV infection influence behavior change? a feasibility study of females attending a teen clinic. *J Pediatr Adolesc Gynecol* 2008;21(6):373–6.
- [114] Kennedy A, Glasser J, Covello V, Gust D. Development of vaccine risk communication messages using risk comparisons and mathematical modeling. *J Health Commun* 2008;13(8):793–807.
- [115] Djibuti M, Gotsadze G, Zoidze A, Mataradze G, Esmail LC, Kohler JC. The role of supportive supervision on immunization program outcome – a randomized field trial from Georgia. *BMC Int Health Hum Rights* 2009;9(Suppl. 1):S11.
- [116] Wang L, Li J, Chen H, Li F, Armstrong GL, Nelson C, et al. Hepatitis B vaccination of newborn infants in rural China: evaluation of a village-based, out-of-cold-chain delivery strategy. *Bull World Health Organ* 2007;85(9):688–94.
- [117] Looijmans-van den Al, van DJJ, Verheij TJ, van der SMA, van EGA, Riphagen-Dalhuisen J, et al. Effects of a multi-faceted program to increase influenza vaccine uptake among health care workers in nursing homes: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Vaccine* 2010;28(31):5086–92.
- [118] Baudier F, Tarrapey F, Leboube G. Pilot campaign to promote vaccination: description preliminary results of a regional French program. *Med Mal Infect* 2007;37(6):331–6.
- [119] Palmore TN, Vandersluis JP, Morris J, Michelin A, Ruprecht LM, Schmitt JM, et al. A successful mandatory influenza vaccination campaign using an innovative electronic tracking system. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2009;30(12):1137–42.
- [120] Slavin KE. American nurses association's best practices in seasonal influenza immunization campaign. *AAOHN J: Off J Am Assoc Occup Health Nurses* 2008;56(3):123–8.
- [121] McCarthy EA, Pollock WE, Nolan T, Hay S, McDonald S. Improving influenza vaccination coverage in pregnancy in Melbourne 2010–2011. *Aust NZ J Obstet Gynecol* 2012;52(4):334–41.
- [122] Miller BL, Ahmed F, Lindley MC, Wortley PM. Increases in vaccination coverage of healthcare personnel following institutional requirements for influenza vaccination: a national survey of U.S. hospitals. *Vaccine* 2011;29(50):9398–403.
- [123] Rakita RM, Hagar BA, Crome P, Lammert JK. Mandatory influenza vaccination of healthcare workers: a 5-year study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2010;31(9):881–8.
- [124] Ribner BS, Hall C, Steinberg JP, Bornstein WA, Chakkalal R, Emamifar A, et al. Use of a mandatory declination form in a program for influenza vaccination of healthcare workers. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2008;29(4):302–8.
- [125] Gerend MA, Shepherd JE. Using message framing to promote acceptance of the human papillomavirus vaccine. *Health Psychol: Off J Div Health Psychol Am Psychol Assoc* 2007;26(6):745–52.
- [126] Karanfil LV, Bahner J, Hovatter J, Thomas WL. Championing patient safety through mandatory influenza vaccination for all healthcare personnel and affiliated physicians. *Infect Control Hospital Epidemiol* 2011;32(4):375–9.
- [127] Link EA, Kreiter CD, D'Alessandro DM. An evaluation of pediatric residency education in conveying immunization knowledge. *Teach Learn Med* 2010;22(3):176–9.
- [128] Lechuga J, Swain GR, Weinhardt LS. Impact of framing on intentions to vaccinate daughters against HPV: a cross-cultural perspective. *Ann Behav Med* 2011;42(2):221–6.
- [129] Jackson C, Cheater F, Harrison W, Peacock R, Bekker H, West R, et al. Randomised cluster trial to support informed parental decision-making for the MMR vaccine. *BMC Public Health* 2011;11(475).
- [130] Helms C, Leask J, Robbins SC, Chow MYK, McIntyre P. Implementation of mandatory immunisation of healthcare workers: observations from New South Wales, Australia. *Vaccine* 2011;29(16):2895–901.
- [131] Van Buynder PG, Carcione D, Rettura V, Daly A, Woods E. Marketing paediatric influenza vaccination: results of a major metropolitan trial. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 2011;5(1):33–8.
- [132] Hu SY, Hong Y, Zhao FH, Lewkowicz AK, Chen F, Zhang WH, et al. Prevalence of HPV infection and cervical intraepithelial neoplasia and attitudes towards HPV vaccination among Chinese women aged 18–25 in Jiangsu Province. *Chin J Cancer Res* 2011;23(1):25–32.
- [133] Juraskova I, Bari RA, O'Brien MT, McCaffery KJ. Hpv vaccine promotion: does referring to both cervical cancer and genital warts affect intended and actual vaccination behavior? *Women's Health Issues* 2011;21(1):71–9.
- [134] Reiter PL, Stubbs B, Panozzo CA, Whitesell D, Brewer NT. HPV and HPV vaccine education intervention: effects on parents, healthcare staff, and school staff. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomark Prev* 2011;20(11):2354–61.
- [135] Fiks AG, Grundmeier RW, Biggs LM, Localio AR, Alessandrini EA. Impact of clinical alerts within an electronic health record on routine childhood immunization in an urban pediatric population. *Pediatrics* 2007;120(4):707–14.

- [136] Bandaly F, Asmar G, Motillon S. Impact of the vaccination recommendations against influenza on the perceptions and motivations of the professionals of an emergency-SMUR-Short stay medical unit department. *JEUR* 2009;22(3):81–5.
- [137] Levi BH. Addressing parents' concerns about childhood immunizations: a tutorial for primary care providers. *Pediatrics* 2007;120(1):18–26.
- [138] Kennedy A, Sapsis KF, Stokley S, Curtis CR, Gust D. Parental attitudes toward human papillomavirus vaccination: evaluation of an educational intervention, 2008. *J Health Commun* 2011;16(3):300–13.
- [139] Cox DS, Cox AD, Sturm L, Zimet G. Behavioral interventions to increase HPV vaccination acceptability among mothers of young girls. *Health Psychol* 2010;29(1):29–39.
- [140] Gust DA, Kennedy A, Weber D, Evans G, Kong Y, Salmon D. Parents questioning immunization: evaluation of an intervention. *Am J Health Behav* 2009;33(3):287–98.
- [141] Doherty K, Low KG. The effects of a web-based intervention on college students' knowledge of human papillomavirus and attitudes toward vaccination. *Int J Sex Health* 2008;20(4):223–32.
- [142] LaVela SL, Cameron KA, Priebe M, Weaver FM. Development and testing of a vaccination message targeted to persons with spinal cord injuries and disorders. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2008;31(1):44–52.
- [143] Polgreen PM, Septimus EJ, Parry MF, Beekmann SE, Cavanaugh JE, Srinivasan A, et al. Relationship of influenza vaccination declination statements and influenza vaccination rates for healthcare workers in 22 US hospitals. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2008;29(7):675–7.
- [144] Harari D, Illiffe S, Kharicha K, Egger M, Gillmann G, von R-KW, et al. Promotion of health in older people: a randomised controlled trial of health risk appraisal in British general practice. *Age Ageing* 2008;37(5):565–71.
- [145] Boivin JM, Poupon-Lemarquis L, Iraqi W, Fay R, Schmitt C, Rossignol P. A multifactorial strategy of pain management is associated with less pain in scheduled vaccination of children. A study realized by family practitioners in 239 children aged 4–12 years old. *Family Pract* 2008;25(6):423–9.
- [146] Usman HR, Akhtar S, Habib F, Jehan I. Redesigned immunization card and center-based education to reduce childhood immunization dropouts in urban Pakistan: a randomized controlled trial. *Vaccine* 2009;27(3):467–72.
- [147] Babcock HM, Gemeinhardt N, Jones M, Claiborne Dunagan W, Woeltje KF. Mandatory influenza vaccination of health care workers: translating policy to practice. *Clin Infect Dis* 2010;50(4):459–64.
- [148] Klein NP, Kissner J, Aguirre A, Sparks R, Campbell S, Edwards KM, et al. Differential maternal responses to a newly developed vaccine information pamphlet. *Vaccine* 2009;28(2):323–8.
- [149] Jung JJ, Elkin ZP, Li X, Goldberg JD, Edell AR, Cohen MN, et al. Increasing use of the vaccine against zoster through recommendation and administration by ophthalmologists at a city hospital. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2013;155(5):787–95.
- [150] Riphagen-Dalhuisen J, Burgerhof JG, Frijstein G, van der Geest-Blankert AD, Danhof-Pont MB, de Jager HJ, et al. Hospital-based cluster randomised controlled trial to assess effects of a multi-faceted programme on influenza vaccine coverage among hospital healthcare workers and nosocomial influenza in the Netherlands, 2009–2011. *Eurosurveillance* 2013;18(26).
- [151] Eckert LO, Hoppe KK. Achieving high coverage of H1N1 influenza vaccine in an ethnically diverse obstetric population: success of a multifaceted approach. *Infect Dis Obstet Gynecol* 2011;2011.
- [152] Sales JM, Painter JE, Pazol K, Gargano LM, Orenstein W, Hughes JM, et al. Rural parents' vaccination-related attitudes and intention to vaccinate middle and high school children against influenza following educational influenza vaccination intervention. *Hum Vaccines* 2011;7(11):1146–52.
- [153] Krawczyk A, Lau E, Perez S, Delisle V, Amsel R, Rosberger Z. How to inform: comparing written and video education interventions to increase human papillomavirus knowledge and vaccination intentions in young adults. *J Am Coll Health* 2012;60(4):316–22.
- [154] Jiménez-García R, H-BV, Rodríguez-Rieiro C, de Andrés AL, Miguel-Diez Jd, Trujillo IJ, et al. Are age-based strategies effective in increasing influenza vaccination coverage? The Spanish experience. *Hum Vaccines Immunother* 2013;8(2):228–33.
- [155] Watson-Jones D, Baisley K, Ponsiano R, Lemme F, Remes P, Ross D, et al. Human papillomavirus vaccination in Tanzanian schoolgirls: cluster-randomized trial comparing 2 vaccine-delivery strategies. *J Infect Dis* 2012;206(5):678–86.
- [156] Marek E, Dergez T, Rebek-Nagy G, Szilard I, Kiss I, Ember I, et al. Effect of an educational intervention on Hungarian adolescents' awareness, beliefs and attitudes on the prevention of cervical cancer. *Vaccine* 2012;30(48):6824–32.
- [157] Lau AYS, Sintchenko V, Crimmins J, Magrabi F, Gallego B, Coiera E. Impact of a web-based personally controlled health management system on influenza vaccination and health services utilization rates: a randomized controlled trial. *J Am Med Assoc* 2012;19(5).
- [158] Nan X, Madden K. HPV vaccine information in the blogosphere: how positive and negative blogs influence vaccine-related risk perceptions, attitudes, and behavioral intentions. *Health Commun* 2012;27(7):829–36.
- [159] Gainforth HL, Cao W, Latimer-Cheung A. Message framing and parents' intentions to have their children vaccinated against HPV. *Public Health Nurs* 2012;29(6):542–52.
- [160] Chan S, Pielak K, McIntyre C, Deeter B, Taddio A. Implementation of a new clinical practice guideline regarding pain management during childhood vaccine injections. *Paediatr Child Health (Canada)* 2013;18(7):367–72.
- [161] Ernsting A, Schwarzer R, Lippke S, Schneider M. 'I do not need a flu shot because I lead a healthy lifestyle': compensatory health beliefs make vaccination less likely. *J Health Psychol* 2013;18(6):825–36.
- [162] Vanderpool RC, Cohen EL, Crosby RA, Jones MG, Bates W, Casey BR, et al. "1–2–3 pap" intervention improves HPV vaccine series completion among Appalachian women. *J Commun* 2013;63(1):95–115.
- [163] Coady MH, Galea S, Blaney S, Ompad DC, Sisco S, Vlahov D. Project VIVA: a multilevel community-based intervention to increase influenza vaccination rates among hard-to-reach populations in New York city. *Am J Public Health* 2008;98(7):1314–21.
- [164] Gowda C, Schaffer SE, Kopec K, Markel A, Dempsey AF. A pilot study on the effects of individually tailored education for MMR vaccine-hesitant parents on MMR vaccination intention. *Hum Vaccines Immunother* 2013;9(2):437–45.
- [165] Luthy KE, Beckstrand RL, Pulsipher A. Evaluation of methods to relieve parental perceptions of vaccine-associated pain and anxiety in children: a pilot study. *J Pediatr Healthcare* 2013;27(5):351–8.
- [166] Khamphoxay P, Kaimook W, Apawan N. The effects of planned instruction on mother's knowledge, health beliefs and number of children receiving immunization in Sikhothaboung district, Vientiane, Lao P.D.R. *J Nurs Sci* 28(3).
- [167] Pollack H, Wang S, Wyatt L, Peng CH, Wan K, Trinh-Shevrin C, et al. A comprehensive screening and treatment model for reducing disparities in hepatitis B. *Health Aff* 2011;30(10):1974–83.
- [168] Nagata S, Saitoh A, Tsukahara Y, Vaida F, Sonobe T, Kamiya H, et al. Perinatal immunization education improves immunization rates and knowledge: a randomized controlled trial. *Prev Med* 2013;56(6):398–405.
- [169] Szilagyi PG, Humiston SG, Gallivan S, Albertin C, Sandler M, Blumkin A. Effectiveness of a citywide patient immunization navigator program on improving adolescent immunizations and preventive care visit rates. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2011;165(6):547–53.
- [170] Marshall G, Happe L, Lunacek O, Szymanski M, Woods C, Zahn M, et al. Use of combination vaccines is associated with improved coverage rates. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2007;26(6):496–500.
- [171] Jackson C, Cheater FM, Peacock R, Leask J, Trevena L. Evaluating a web-based MMR decision aid to support informed decision-making by UK parents: a before-and-after feasibility study. *Health Educ J* 2010;69(1):74–83.
- [172] Waisbord S, Shimp L, Ogdan EW, Morry C. Communication for polio eradication: improving the quality of communication programming through real-time monitoring and evaluation. *J Health Commun* 2010;15(Suppl. 1):9–24.
- [173] Gowda C, Schaffer SE, Kopec K, Markel A, Dempsey AF. Does the relative importance of MMR vaccine concerns differ by degree of parental vaccine hesitancy? An exploratory study. *Hum Vaccines Immunother* 2013;9(2):430–6.
- [174] Gowda C, Dempsey AF. The rise (and fall?) of parental vaccine hesitancy. *Hum Vaccines Immunother* 2013;9(8):1755–62.
- [175] Gilkey MB, McRee AL, Brewer NT. Forgone vaccination during childhood and adolescence: findings of a statewide survey of parents. *Prev Med* 2013;56(3–4):202–6.
- [176] Opel DJ, Diekema DS, Lee NR, Marcuse EK. Social marketing as a strategy to increase immunization rates. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2009;163(5):432–7.
- [177] Kondji D. Synthesis of the major realisations of EPI communication for west and Central Francophone African Countries. The Communication Initiative; 2006.
- [178] European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). Communication on immunisation: building trust. ECDC; 2012. Available from: <http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/publications/ter-immunisation-and-trust.pdf> [20.07.13].
- [179] Pandey D, Vanya V, Bhagat S, Vs B, Shetty J. Awareness and attitude towards human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine among medical students in a premier medical school in India. *PLoS ONE* 2012;7.