medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Type of article: Review article

Title of the article: Intention of health care workers to accept COVID-19 vaccination and related factors: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Running title: COVID-19 vaccination acceptance

Contributors

Petros Galanis[1], Irene Vraka[2], Despoina Fragkou[3], Angeliki Bilali[4], Daphne Kaitelidou[5]

[1] Assistant Professor, Clinical Epidemiology Laboratory, Faculty of Nursing, School of Health Sciences, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

[2] MD, PhD, Department of Radiology, P & A Kyriakou Children's Hospital, Greece

[3] MSc, Clinical Epidemiology Laboratory, Faculty of Nursing, School of Health Sciences, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

[4] PhD, Hospital Waste Management Unit, P & A Kyriakou Children's Hospital, Greece

[5] Professor, Center for Health Services Management and Evaluation, Faculty of Nursing, School of Health Sciences, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

Corresponding author: Petros Galanis, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Nursing, Center for Health Services Management and Evaluation, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 123 Papadiamantopoulou street, zip code: GR-11527, Athens, Greece, telephone: 0030-2107461471, e-mail: pegalan@nurs.uoa.gr

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Considering medical and economic burden of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), a high COVID-19 vaccination coverage among health care workers (HCWs) is an urgent need. The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to estimate the intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination and to find out related factors. We searched PubMed, Medline, Scopus, Web of Science, ProQuest, CINAHL and medRxiv until July 14, 2021. The heterogeneity between results was very high and thus we applied a random effect model to estimate pooled effects. We performed subgroup and meta-regression analysis to identify possible resources of heterogeneity. Twenty four studies**,** including 39,617 HCWs met the inclusion criteria. The overall proportion of HCWs that intend to accept COVID-19 vaccination was 63.5% (95% confidence interval: 56.5-70.2%) with a wide range among studies from 27.7% to 90.1%. The following factors were associated with increased HCWs' willingness to get vaccinated against COVID-19: male gender, older age, white HCWs, physician profession, higher education level, comorbidity among HCWs, seasonal influenza vaccination, stronger vaccine confidence, positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine, fear about COVID-19, individual perceived risk about COVID-19, and contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients. The reluctance of HCWs to vaccinate against COVID-19 could diminish the trust of individuals and trigger a ripple effect in the general public. Since vaccination is a complex behavior, understanding the way that HCWs take the decision to accept or not COVID-19 vaccination will give us the opportunity to develop the appropriate interventions to increase COVID-19 vaccination uptake.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Keywords: COVID-19; Vaccination; Health Care Workers; Intention; SARS-Cov-2

Key Messages

- The overall proportion of health care workers that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was moderate.
- Several factors affect health care workers' willingness to get vaccinated against COVID-19.
- COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among health care workers should be eliminated to inspire the general public towards a positive attitude regarding a novel COVID-19 vaccine.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1. Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic causes a substantial number of deaths and has a tremendous impact on the world economy [1, 2]. Globally, as of 15 July 2021, there have been more than 187 million cases of COVID-19 and more than 4 million deaths [3].

Seasonal influenza vaccination among health care workers (HCWs) is an effective infection control measure in health care settings [4, 5]. Also, the importance of HCWs vaccination against H1N1 during the 2009/2010 influenza pandemic has already been reported [6, 7]. Seasonal influenza immunization is a priority in countries with a high proportion of elderly [8–10]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have identified HCWs as a population with significantly elevated risk of being infected from the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Thus, there is a recommendation for the rapid and prioritized vaccination of HCWs against COVID-19 to protect them and the public health [11–13].

HCWs' vaccination against infectious diseases is of utmost importance to prevent the spread of viruses, especially in health care facilities with patients. A great number of studies have already addressed the factors that influence vaccines' acceptance by HCWs [14–19]. Several factors are identified in systematic reviews and meta-analyses such as desire for self-protection, desire to prevent illness in family or friends, perceived severity and risk of the disease, perceived safety and effectiveness of vaccination, more favorable attitudes toward vaccination, etc.

COVID-19 vaccination acceptance among HCWs is essential to decrease the spread of the SARS-CoV-2 and to protect public health. Moreover, HCWs could inform and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

educate people about COVID-19 vaccines building confidence in vaccines and promoting acceptance. To date, no systematic review and meta-analysis has investigated the willingness of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination. Thus, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis to estimate the intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination and to find out related factors.

2. Materials and methods

2.1.Data sources and strategy

We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines for this systematic review and meta-analysis [20]. We searched PubMed, Medline, Scopus, Web of Science, ProQuest, CINAHL and pre-print services (medRxiv) for articles published from January 1, 2020 to July 14, 2021. Through the databases, in the query box we used the following strategy in all fields: ((("health care worker*" OR "healthcare worker*" OR "healthcare personnel" OR "health care personnel" OR "health personnel" OR "health care professional*" OR "healthcare professional*" OR HCWS OR HCW OR HCPS OR HCP OR staff OR "nursing staff" OR employee* OR professional* OR personnel OR worker* OR doctor* OR physician* OR clinician* OR nurs* OR midwives OR midwife* OR paramedic* OR hospital* OR practitioner*) AND (vaccin*)) AND (intent* OR willing* OR hesitancy)) AND (COVID-19 OR COVID19 OR COVID OR SARS-CoV* OR "Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus*" OR coronavirus*). Also, we examined reference lists of all relevant articles that we found during the search process. Finally, we removed duplicates.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2.2.Selection and eligibility criteria

Study selection was performed by two independent reviewers, while a third, senior reviewer resolved the discrepancies. Firstly, we screened title, then abstract of the records and finally the full-text. We applied the following inclusion criteria: studies examining HCWs' intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination and related factors; studies that were written in English; studies included all types of HCWs working in clinical settings. On the other hand, we excluded qualitative studies, reviews, case reports, protocols, editorials, and letters to the Editor. Also, we excluded studies including students of health sciences, retired HCWs, patients, and general population.

2.3.Data extraction and quality assessment

We extracted the following data from each study: authors, location, sample size, age, gender, study design, sampling method, assessment of intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination, response rate, data collection time, type of publication (journal or pre-print service), number of HCWs with intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination, type of occupation (physicians, nurses, assistant nurses, paramedical staff, etc), factors related with intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination, and the level of analysis (univariate or multivariable). Assessment of intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination was referred to vaccine acceptance (e.g., binary yes/no answer, five or eleven point Likert-type scale). Perceived risk of COVID-19 is a combination of subjective perception of disease severity and susceptibility [21]. Fear of COVID-19 among HCWs mainly includes fear of getting sick with the disease and fear of infecting patients, family members, and friends [22]. Attitudes toward COVID-19 vaccination are defined as expressions of hesitancy or support measuring usually in Likert scales [23].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Two independent reviewers used the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tools to assess quality of studies (poor, moderate or good quality). An 8-point scale is used for cross-sectional studies with a score of ≤3 indicates poor quality, a score of 4-6 points indicates moderate quality, and a score of 7-8 points indicates good quality [24]. The Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tool for cross-sectional studies includes eight different assessment domains e.g., inclusion criteria for the sample, detailed description of the settings, exposure and outcome measurement, identification of confounding factors and strategies to eliminate them, and statistical analysis.

2.4.Statistical Analysis

For each study we divided the number of HCWs with intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination with the sample size to calculate the proportion of HCWs with intention to accept vaccination and the relative 95% confidence interval (CI). Then, we transformed the proportions with the Freeman-Tukey Double Arcsine method before pooling [25]. Studies that used Likert scales to assess the intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination considered the answers “agree”/“strongly agree” as a positive answer. We used the I^2 and Hedges Q statistics to assess between-studies heterogeneity. I^2 values higher than 75% indicate high heterogeneity and a p-value<0.1 for the Hedges Q statistic indicates statistically significant heterogeneity [26]. The heterogeneity between results was very high and thus we applied a random effect model to estimate pooled effects [26]. We considered sample size, age, gender, response rate, data collection time, publication type (journal or pre-print service), type of occupation, studies quality, and the continent that studies were conducted as pre-specified sources of heterogeneity. Due to the limited variability of data in some variables, we decided to perform subgroup analysis for publication type, studies quality, and the continent that studies were conducted and meta-regression analysis for sample size, gender

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

distribution, and data collection time as the independent variables. We conducted a leave-one-out sensitivity analysis to determine the influence of each study on the overall effect. This type of analysis performs sequent meta-analyses by leaving out exactly one study at each meta-analysis. In that case, we can investigate the way that each study affects the overall effect size estimate identifying influential studies. The Egger's test was used to assess the publication bias with a P-value<0.05 indicating publication bias [27]. We did not perform meta-analysis for the factors related with intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination since the data were highly heterogeneous and limited. We used OpenMeta[Analyst] for the meta-analysis [28].

3. Results

3.1.Identification and selection of studies

Flowchart of the literature search according to PRISMA guidelines is presented in Figure 1. Initially, we identified 3022 potential records through electronic databases and 730 duplicates were removed. After the screening of the titles and abstracts, we removed 2114 records and we added one more record found by the reference lists scanning. We included 24 studies in this systematic review and meta-analysis that met our inclusion criteria.

Please insert Figure 1, about here

3.2.Characteristics of the studies

Main characteristics of the 24 studies included in this review are presented in Table 1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

A total of 39,617 HCWs were included in this systematic review with a minimum of 208 HCWs [29] and a maximum of 12,034 HCWs [30] among studies. Ten studies were conducted in Asia (China, Turkey, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Vietnam, Kuwait and Hong Kong) [31–40], six studies in North America (USA and Canada) [30, 41–45], four studies in Europe (France, Germany and Greece) [46–49], three studies in Africa (Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eastern Cape and Zambia) [29, 50, 51], and one study was multicenter (France, Belgium and Canada) [52]. Females were more in 19 studies [30–37, 39–47, 51, 52], while males were more in four studies [29, 38, 49, 50]. All studies were cross-sectional, while 23 studies used convenience sampling method and one used snowball sampling method [44]. Nineteen studies were published in journals [30, 31, 34, 36–40, 42–52] and fine studies in pre-print services [29, 32, 33, 35, 41]. One study did not report data regarding age [48], one regarding gender distribution [48], and 12 regarding response rate [29, 34, 37, 39, 40, 44–46, 48–51]. Ten studies used a yes/no answer to assess intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination [30, 35, 36, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46, 50, 51], nine studies used a yes/no/uncertain answer [29, 31, 32, 34, 37, 38, 40, 44, 52], and five studies used Likert-type scales [33, 42, 47–49].

Intention of HCWs to accept vaccination and study population in the studies included in this systematic review are presented in Table 2. Intention ranged from 27.7% [50] to 90.1% [51]. Percentage of physicians that participated in studies ranged from 12.1% [34] to 60.6% [52], while percentage of nurses ranged from 12.5% [40] to 100% [31, 33]. Four studies did not report detailed data regarding study population [32, 38, 48, 49].

Please insert Tables 1 and 2, about here

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

3.3.Quality assessment

Quality assessment of cross-sectional studies included in this review is shown in Table 3. Quality was moderate in six studies [29, 32, 34, 42, 47, 48] and good in 18 studies [30, 31, 33, 35, 37–41, 43–46, 49–52].

Please insert Table 3, about here

3.4.Meta-analysis

The overall proportion of HCWs that intend to accept COVID-19 vaccination was 63.5% (95% CI: 56.5-70.2%) (Figure 2). The heterogeneity between results was very high (I^2=99.59%, p-value for the Hedges Q statistic<0.001). A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis showed that no single study had a disproportional effect on the pooled proportion, which varied between 62.1% (95% CI: 55.3-68.7%), with Adeniyi et al. [51] excluded, and 65.0% (95% CI: 58.1-71.6%), with Nzaji et al. [50] excluded (Supplementary Figure S1).

According to subgroup analysis, the proportion of HCWs that intend to accept COVID-19 vaccination was higher for the studies that were published in journals (64.9% [95% CI: 57.0-72.4%], I^2=99.66) than those in pre-print services (58.0% [95% CI: 43.2-72.2%], I^2=98.75). Moreover, the proportion was almost the same for the studies with moderate quality (62.0% [95% CI: 49.5-73.8%], I^2=98.86) and those with good quality (64.0% [95% CI: 55.4-72.1%], I^2=99.68). The proportion of HCWs that intend to accept COVID-19 vaccination was higher in studies that were conducted in Europe (65.5% [95% CI: 50.0-79.6%], I^2=99.22) and Asia (69.0% [95% CI: 59.4-77.9%], I^2=98.84) compared to those in Africa (56.7% [95% CI: 12.2-95.2%], I^2=99.77) and North America (52.9% [95% CI: 40.8-64.9%], I2=99.78). Meta-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

regression showed that the closer each study was performed to now, the more likely HCWs were to accept COVID-19 vaccination (coefficient=0.024, [95% CI: 0.006-0.042], p=0.008). Also, the proportion of HCWs that intend to accept COVID-19 vaccination was independent of the sample size (p=0.17), and gender distribution (p=0.15). P-value<0.05 for Egger's test implied potential publication bias.

Please insert Figure 2, and Supplementary Figure S1 about here

3.5.Factors related with intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination

Twenty studies [30, 31, 33, 35–47, 49–52] investigated factors related with intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination, while 18 studies [30, 31, 33, 35–41, 43–46, 49–52] used multivariable analysis to control confounding (Table 4). Statistically significant factors are presented in Table 4 and were discussed in the following paragraphs.

We found that several demographic characteristics were associated with COVID-19 vaccination acceptance. Profession was an important predictor since six studies [40–42, 46, 47, 50] found that physicians were more prone to get vaccinated against COVID-19 than other HCWs and especially nurses and paramedical staff. Male HCWs [30, 31, 37, 43–47, 49, 50, 52] and white HCWs [30, 43, 44] were more likely to be vaccinated. A great number of studies [30, 37, 42–46, 49, 52] found that older age was associated with an increase in COVID-19 vaccine acceptance. Higher education level [30, 39, 40, 44, 49, 51], increased outcome [44], and work in healthcare facilities in urban areas [30, 44] were related with increased COVID-19

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

vaccine acceptance. Also, HCWs with chronic conditions were more likely to be vaccinated against COVID-19 [31, 44].

Flu vaccination during previous season was associated with intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination [31, 37, 39, 44, 46, 51, 52]. Stronger vaccine confidence [33] and positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine [35, 37, 39, 44, 50–52] increased HCWs' willingness to get vaccinated against COVID-19. Fear about COVID-19 [46], individual perceived risk about COVID-19 [38, 39, 44, 46], and weaker complacency about the COVID-19 [33] were related with increased COVID-19 vaccination acceptance. Complacency was measured on a 7-point Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree). HCWs exposed and in contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients [31, 44, 45] and those with a previous COVID-19 infection [37] were more likely to accept COVID-19 vaccine.

Please insert Table 4, about here

4. Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis that assesses the intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination and related factors. Twenty-four papers met our inclusion criteria and the primary reasons that other papers were excluded from this review include irrelevant research question, study population other than HCWs, and other types of publications (e.g. qualitative studies, reviews, case reports, protocols, editorials, and letters to the Editor). We found that the proportion of HCWs that intend to accept COVID-19 vaccination was moderate (63.5%) with a wide range among studies from 27.7% to 90.1%. This moderate level of acceptance may be attributable to several reasons, e.g. inadequate knowledge among HCWs regarding COVID-19 [37, 53], negative attitude towards the disease [53, 54], and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

feelings of fear and anxiety during the COVID-19 pandemic [55–58]. Also, concerns raised for COVID-19 vaccination are related with inadequate knowledge about such new vaccines regarding the long term side effects, effectiveness, efficacy etc. Better knowledge of COVID-19 among HCWs affects their attitude, increases their confidence, and promotes preventive measures such as the vaccination [59–61]. According to our subgroup analysis, the proportion of HCWs that intend to accept COVID-19 vaccination was higher in studies in Europe and Asia than those in North America and Africa. This finding is in accordance with a study [62] in 10 countries in Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe, Asia Pacific, and the Middle East where the influenza vaccination coverage rate in general population was much higher in Europe than in Asia and Africa. This difference may be attributable mainly to the fact that a national influenza vaccination policy and recommendations for seasonal influenza vaccination are standard in developed countries but this is not the case in many developing countries in Africa. Also, the availability of influenza vaccines is low in Africa [63], while the number of influenza vaccines per capita is much higher in high-income countries compared to lower and middle-income countries (median number; 139.2 vs. 6.1 per 1000 population) [64].

The positive effects of the influenza vaccine in health outcomes and in financial terms are well known [10, 65–67], but the vaccination rate is low even among HCWs. A meta-analysis [19] with 45 studies in mainland China found that the influenza vaccination rate was 17.7%, 9.4%, 7.8%, and 3.5% for HCWs, general population, pregnant women, and people with chronic conditions respectively. A similar finding was found in studies in Europe (United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Spain) where HCWs received influenza vaccination more often than the general population but in low levels, ranging from 15% to 29% [68]. A meta-analysis [69] included studies in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Italy found that the proportion of influenza vaccination among nurses and ancillary workers was 13.47% and 12.52% respectively. Influenza vaccination coverage is higher in the USA (80.6%) [70] and Canada (ranging from 35.5% to 51%) [71, 72], but still lower than the national Healthy People 2020 target of 90% [73].

We found a difference in intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination between the professions, with physicians most inclined to get vaccinated compared to other HCWs and especially nurses and paramedical staff. This finding is confirmed by two meta-analyses [69, 74] including studies in Italy, where the prevalence of influenza vaccination among physicians was 23.18% [74], among nurses was 13.47%, and among ancillary workers was 12.52% [69]. Several other studies [70, 75, 76] worldwide confirm the fact that the influenza vaccination coverage among physicians is the highest. In general, physicians are more prone to accept vaccination than other HCWs, e.g. the full hepatitis B vaccination coverage among physicians is 2.6 times higher than nurses [18]. Several reasons could be behind this observation such as greater misconceptions about vaccines among nurses and other HCWs, less fear and care about infectious diseases, less knowledge and more doubt about vaccine efficacy. This finding is a major concern in health care settings especially during the COVID-19 pandemic since nurses and assistant nurses have more and longer direct contact with patients than other HCWs [77]. Also, the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies is higher among frontline health care workers and health care assistants [78] indicating that nurses and assistant nurses represent a high-risk group for SARS-CoV-2 infection.

We found that older age was related with an increase in willingness to get vaccinated against COVID-19. This finding is unsurprising since HCWs are quite familiar with the fact that older age is one of the strongest risk factors for COVID-19 mortality [79–

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

81]. Therefore, it is more probable for older HCWs to take the COVID-19 vaccine due to their own self-interest. In a similar way, we found that HCWs with chronic conditions were more prone to get vaccinated against COVID-19. This finding makes sense since HCWs with comorbidity is a high-risk group for complications and death from COVID-19 as this is the case for the general population also according to several meta-analyses [80–84]. Older HCWs with comorbidity confront COVID-19 with fear and anxiety affecting critically their decision to accept a COVID-19 vaccine. An interesting result in our review is that male gender was associated with greater likelihood of taking COVID-19 vaccine. Two reviews regarding influenza vaccination [19] and hepatitis B vaccination [18] did not find any relation between gender and vaccination coverage. A possible explanation for our observation could be that the individual perceived risk about COVID-19 is higher among male HCWs.

According to our study, being vaccinated against flu during previous season was associated with COVID-19 vaccine acceptance. Similarly, HCWs with vaccine confidence and positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine were more likely to be vaccinated against COVID-19. These findings are of utmost importance since the WHO named vaccine hesitancy as one of the top ten threats to global health in 2019 [85]. Health care workers especially at primary care should communicate in a clear way the message that vaccines are safe and effective to improve vaccination coverage in communities [86]. Since a safe and effective COVID-19 vaccine seems to be the only solution for this pandemic, the positive attitude of HCWs towards vaccination is imperative. Vaccine hesitancy among HCWs with regard to other vaccines, such as seasonal influenza vaccine already exists.[87–89] In case of the COVID-19 vaccine the situation can be worse since vaccine hesitancy is fuelled by fake news and conspiracy theories [90]. The reluctance or refusal of HCWs to vaccinate against

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

COVID-19 could diminish the trust of individuals and trigger a ripple effect in the general public [91, 92]. There is a need to build confidence and trust in communities to rollout successfully a COVID-19 vaccine.

Additionally, we found that individual perceived risk about COVID-19 was related with increased COVID-19 vaccination acceptance among HCWs. HCWs may be reluctant to receive a novel COVID-19 vaccine when they believe that it is not protect against a significant personal threat. On the other hand, the self-perceived susceptibility to and seriousness of a vaccine infectious disease such as COVID-19 may increase vaccine acceptance [93]. This association has already observed in case of COVID-19 not only in the general public [94] but also in HCWs[48]. A warning sign to public health safety is that vaccine hesitancy is greater among nurses than among physicians [95–97].

Our study is subject to several limitations. In particular, more than the half of studies was of moderate quality, while four out of 24 studies were published in pre-print services which do not apply peer-review process. We performed subgroup analysis according to studies quality and publication type to overcome this limitation. The statistical heterogeneity in results was very high due probably to variability in study designs and populations. In that case, we applied a random effects model and we performed subgroup and meta-regression analysis. We included all studies conducted till to July 14, 2021 but vaccines are now available and HCWs attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination could be changed for this reason. Our meta-regression analysis showed that the proportion of HCWs that intend to accept COVID-19 vaccination was independent of the data collection time but studies of current attitudes should be performed. Data with regards to the factors related with intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination were limited, while five studies used multivariable

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

models to eliminate confounding. We consider this as a potential area for future study. Moreover, all the studies included in this review were cross-sectional studies making causal inferences impossible. Finally, the proportion of HCWs that intend to accept COVID-19 vaccination may be an overestimation since studies evaluated self-reported answers that could be subject to social desirability bias, with HCWs knowing that the general public expects a high COVID-19 vaccination coverage among them.

Conclusion

HCWs are identified worldwide as priority recipients of the novel COVID-19 vaccine since they represent a high-risk group for SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission risk of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical settings between patients and HCWs is high. Also, HCWs serve as trusted community workers on public health topics and their role in promoting COVID-19 vaccine acceptance is critical. Thus, COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among HCWs should be eliminated to inspire the general public towards a positive attitude regarding a novel COVID-19 vaccine. We found a great variability of COVID-19 vaccination acceptance among HCWs worldwide and knowledge of the factors that influence this acceptance would be essential to provide information about vaccination programs, determine priority groups for vaccination, take extra protective measures, etc. Knowledge of the factors that affect intention of HWCs to accept COVID-19 vaccination is limited and there is an urgent need for further studies to make more valid inferences. Since vaccination is a complex behavior, understanding the way that HCWs take the decision to accept or not COVID-19 vaccination will give us the opportunity to develop the appropriate interventions to increase COVID-19 vaccination uptake and promote vaccination programs worldwide.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgments: none

Funding: none

Author contributions

P.G, D.F. and D.K. were responsible for the conception and design of the study. P.G, I.V., D.F., A.B., and D.K. were responsible for the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data. All the authors drafted the article or revised it critically for important intellectual content.

Figure 1. Flowchart of the literature search according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis.

Figure 2. Forest plot of the proportion of HCWs that intend to accept COVID-19 vaccination.

Supplementary Figure S1. A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis of the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

[1] Cacciapaglia G, Cot C, Sannino F. Second wave COVID-19 pandemics in Europe: a temporal playbook. *Sci Rep* 2020; 10: 15514.

[2] Looi M-K. Covid-19: Is a second wave hitting Europe? *BMJ* 2020; m4113.

[3] World Health Organization. *WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard*, https://covid19.who.int/ (2020).

[4] Poland GA, Tosh P, Jacobson RM. Requiring influenza vaccination for health care workers: seven truths we must accept. *Vaccine* 2005; 23: 2251–2255.

[5] National Advisory Committee on Immunization (NACI). Statement on influenza vaccination for the 2008-2009 season. An Advisory Committee Statement (ACS). *Can Commun Dis Rep* 2008; 34: 1–46.

[6] Fiore AE, Uyeki TM, Broder K, et al. Prevention and control of influenza with vaccines: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP), 2010. *MMWR* 2010; 59: 1–62.

[7] National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, CDC, Centers for, Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Use of influenza A (H1N1) 2009 monovalent vaccine: recommendations of the Advisory committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). *MMWR Recomm Rep* 2009; 58: 1–8.

[8] Bonanni P, Boccalini S, Bechini A. The expected impact of new vaccines and vaccination policies. *J Public Health* 2008; 16: 253–259.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[9] Bonanni P, Bonaccorsi G, Lorini C, et al. Focusing on the implementation of 21st century vaccines for adults. *Vaccine* 2018; 36: 5358–5365.

[10] Demicheli V, Jefferson T, Di Pietrantonj C, et al. Vaccines for preventing influenza in the elderly. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Epub ahead of print 1 February 2018. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004876.pub4.

[11] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *How CDC Is Making COVID-19 Vaccine Recommendations*, https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/recommendations-process.html (2020).

[12] World Health Organization. *WHO SAGE Roadmap For Prioritizing Uses Of COVID-19 Vaccines In The Context Of Limited Supply*, https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/who-sage-roadmap-for-prioritizing-uses-of-covid-19-vaccines-in-the-context-of-limited-supply (2020).

[13] World Health Organization. *WHO SAGE values framework for the allocation and prioritization of COVID-19 vaccination*, https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/who-sage-values-framework-for-the-allocation-and-prioritization-of-covid-19-vaccination (2020).

[14] Vasilevska M, Ku J, Fisman DN. Factors associated with healthcare worker acceptance of vaccination: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2014; 35: 699–708.

[15] Prematunge C, Corace K, McCarthy A, et al. Factors influencing pandemic influenza vaccination of healthcare workers—A systematic review. *Vaccine* 2012; 30: 4733–4743.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[16] Sheldenkar A, Lim F, Yung CF, et al. Acceptance and uptake of influenza vaccines in Asia: A systematic review. *Vaccine* 2019; 37: 4896–4905.

[17] Herzog R, Álvarez-Pasquin MJ, Díaz C, et al. Are healthcare workers' intentions to vaccinate related to their knowledge, beliefs and attitudes? A systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 2013; 13: 154.

[18] Auta A, Adewuyi EO, Kureh GT, et al. Hepatitis B vaccination coverage among health-care workers in Africa: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Vaccine* 2018; 36: 4851–4860.

[19] Wang Q, Yue N, Zheng M, et al. Influenza vaccination coverage of population and the factors influencing influenza vaccination in mainland China: A meta-analysis. *Vaccine* 2018; 36: 7262–7269.

[20] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Med* 2009; 6: e1000097.

[21] Rimal RN, Morrison D. A Uniqueness to Personal Threat (UPT) Hypothesis: How Similarity Affects Perceptions of Susceptibility and Severity in Risk Assessment. *Health Communication* 2006; 20: 209–219.

[22] Schimmenti A, Starcevic V. The four horsemen of fear: An integrated model of understanding fear experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Clinical Neuropsychiatry* 2020; 17: 41–45.

[23] Yaqub O, Castle-Clarke S, Sevdalis N, et al. Attitudes to vaccination: A critical review. *Social Science & Medicine* 2014; 112: 1–11.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[24] Santos WM dos, Secoli SR, Püschel VA de A. The Joanna Briggs Institute approach for systematic reviews. *Rev Latino-Am Enfermagem*; 26. Epub ahead of print 14 November 2018. DOI: 10.1590/1518-8345.2885.3074.

[25] Barendregt JJ, Doi SA, Lee YY, et al. Meta-analysis of prevalence. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2013; 67: 974–978.

[26] Higgins JPT. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2003; 327: 557–560.

[27] Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, et al. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997; 315: 629–634.

[28] Wallace BC, Schmid CH, Lau J, et al. Meta-Analyst: software for meta-analysis of binary, continuous and diagnostic data. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2009; 9: 80.

[29] Chawe A, Mfune RL, Syapiila P, et al. Knowledge, attitudes and practices of COVID 19 among Medical Laboratory Professionals in Zambia. *African Journal of Laboratory Medicine* 2020; 10: 1.

[30] Kuter BJ, Browne S, Momplaisir FM, et al. Perspectives on the receipt of a COVID-19 vaccine: A survey of employees in two large hospitals in Philadelphia. *Vaccine* 2021; 39: 1693–1700.

[31] Wang K, Wong ELY, Ho KF, et al. Intention of nurses to accept coronavirus disease 2019 vaccination and change of intention to accept seasonal influenza vaccination during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic: A cross-sectional survey. *Vaccine* 2020; 38: 7049–7056.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[32] Fu C, wei Z, Pei S, et al. *Acceptance and preference for COVID-19 vaccination in health-care workers (HCWs)*. Preprint, Epidemiology. Epub ahead of print 14 April 2020. DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.09.20060103.

[33] Kwok KO, Li KK, Wei WI, et al. *Are we ready when COVID-19 vaccine is available? Study on nurses' vaccine hesitancy in Hong Kong*. Preprint, Public and Global Health. Epub ahead of print 17 July 2020. DOI: 10.1101/2020.07.17.20156026.

[34] Kose S, Mandiracioglu A, Sahin S, et al. Vaccine hesitancy of the COVID□19 by health care personnel. *Int J Clin Pract*; 75. Epub ahead of print May 2021. DOI: 10.1111/ijcp.13917.

[35] Barry M, Temsah M-H, Alhuzaimi A, et al. *COVID-19 vaccine confidence and hesitancy among healthcare workers: a cross-sectional survey from a MERS-CoV experienced nation*. Preprint, Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS). Epub ahead of print 11 December 2020. DOI: 10.1101/2020.12.09.20246447.

[36] Huynh G, Tran T, Nguyen HN, et al. COVID-19 vaccination intention among healthcare workers in Vietnam. *Asian Pac J Trop Med* 2021; 14: 159.

[37] Kaplan AK, Sahin MK, Parildar H, et al. The willingness to accept the COVID□19 vaccine and affecting factors among healthcare professionals: A cross□sectional study in Turkey. *Int J Clin Pract*; 75. Epub ahead of print July 2021. DOI: 10.1111/ijcp.14226.

[38] Qattan AMN, Alshareef N, Alsharqi O, et al. Acceptability of a COVID-19 Vaccine Among Healthcare Workers in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2021; 8: 644300.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[39] Sun Y, Chen X, Cao M, et al. Will Healthcare Workers Accept a COVID-19 Vaccine When It Becomes Available? A Cross-Sectional Study in China. *Front Public Health* 2021; 9: 664905.

[40] Al-Sanafi M, Sallam M. Psychological Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance among Healthcare Workers in Kuwait: A Cross-Sectional Study Using the 5C and Vaccine Conspiracy Beliefs Scales. *Vaccines* 2021; 9: 701.

[41] Gadoth A, Halbrook M, Martin-Blais R, et al. Cross-sectional Assessment of COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance Among Health Care Workers in Los Angeles. *Ann Intern Med* 2020; 174: 882–885.

[42] Shaw J, Stewart T, Anderson KB, et al. Assessment of U.S. health care personnel (HCP) attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination in a large university health care system. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021; ciab054.

[43] Unroe KT, Evans R, Weaver L, et al. Willingness of Long-Term Care Staff to Receive a COVID-19 Vaccine: A Single State Survey. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2021; 69: 593–599.

[44] Shekhar R, Sheikh AB, Upadhyay S, et al. COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance among Health Care Workers in the United States. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2021; 9: 119.

[45] Dzieciolowska S, Hamel D, Gadio S, et al. Covid-19 vaccine acceptance, hesitancy, and refusal among Canadian healthcare workers: A multicenter survey. *Am J Infect Control* 2021; S0196-6553(21)00274–1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[46] Gagneux-Brunon A, Detoc M, Bruel S, et al. Intention to get vaccinations against COVID-19 in French healthcare workers during the first pandemic wave: a cross sectional survey. *The Journal of hospital infection*. Epub ahead of print 28 November 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhin.2020.11.020.

[47] Papagiannis D, Malli F, Raptis DG, et al. Assessment of knowledge, attitudes, and practices towards new coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) of health care professionals in greece before the outbreak period. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2020; 17: 1–14.

[48] Detoc M, Bruel S, Frappe P, et al. Intention to participate in a COVID-19 vaccine clinical trial and to get vaccinated against COVID-19 in France during the pandemic. *Vaccine* 2020; 38: 7002–7006.

[49] Nohl A, Afflerbach C, Lurz C, et al. Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccination among Front-Line Health Care Workers: A Nationwide Survey of Emergency Medical Services Personnel from Germany. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2021; 9: 424.

[50] Nzaji MK, Ngombe LK, Mwamba GN, et al. Acceptability of Vaccination Against COVID-19 Among Healthcare Workers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Pragmatic and Observational Research* 2020; 11: 103–109.

[51] Adeniyi OV, Stead D, Singata-Madliki M, et al. Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccine among the Healthcare Workers in the Eastern Cape, South Africa: A Cross Sectional Study. *Vaccines* 2021; 9: 666.

[52] Verger P, Scronias D, Dauby N, et al. Attitudes of healthcare workers towards COVID-19 vaccination: a survey in France and French-speaking parts of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Belgium and Canada, 2020. *Euro Surveill*; 26. Epub ahead of print January 2021. DOI: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.3.2002047.

[53] Ghimire P, Dhungel S, Pokhrel A. Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of healthcare workers Towards Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic. *J Nepal Health Res Counc* 2020; 18: 293–300.

[54] Limbu DK, Piryani RM, Sunny AK. Healthcare workers' knowledge, attitude and practices during the COVID-19 pandemic response in a tertiary care hospital of Nepal. *PLoS ONE* 2020; 15: e0242126.

[55] Apisarnthanarak A, Apisarnthanarak P, Siripraparat C, et al. Impact of anxiety and fear for COVID-19 toward infection control practices among Thai healthcare workers. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2020; 41: 1093–1094.

[56] Lu W, Wang H, Lin Y, et al. Psychological status of medical workforce during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. *Psychiatry Research* 2020; 288: 112936.

[57] Lima CKT, Carvalho PM de M, Lima I de AAS, et al. The emotional impact of Coronavirus 2019-nCoV (new Coronavirus disease). *Psychiatry Research* 2020; 287: 112915.

[58] García-Reyna B, Castillo-García GD, Barbosa-Camacho FJ, et al. Fear of COVID-19 Scale for Hospital Staff in Regional Hospitals in Mexico: a Brief Report. *Int J Ment Health Addict* 2020; 1–12.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[59] Zhang M, Zhou M, Tang F, et al. Knowledge, attitude, and practice regarding COVID-19 among healthcare workers in Henan, China. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2020; 105: 183–187.

[60] McEachan R, Taylor N, Harrison R, et al. Meta-Analysis of the Reasoned Action Approach (RAA) to Understanding Health Behaviors. *ann behav med* 2016; 50: 592–612.

[61] Huynh G, Nguyen T, Tran V, et al. Knowledge and attitude toward COVID-19 among healthcare workers at District 2 Hospital, Ho Chi Minh City. *Asian Pac J Trop Med* 2020; 13: 260–265.

[62] de Lataillade C, Auvergne S, Delannoy I. 2005 and 2006 seasonal influenza vaccination coverage rates in 10 countries in Africa, Asia Pacific, Europe, Latin America and the Middle East. *J Public Health Pol* 2009; 30: 83–101.

[63] Duque J, McMorrow ML, Cohen AL. Influenza vaccines and influenza antiviral drugs in Africa: are they available and do guidelines for their use exist? *BMC Public Health* 2014; 14: 41.

[64] Jorgensen P, Mereckiene J, Cotter S, et al. How close are countries of the WHO European Region to achieving the goal of vaccinating 75% of key risk groups against influenza? Results from national surveys on seasonal influenza vaccination programmes, 2008/2009 to 2014/2015. *Vaccine* 2018; 36: 442–452.

[65] Imai C, Toizumi M, Hall L, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the direct epidemiological and economic effects of seasonal influenza vaccination on healthcare workers. *PLoS One* 2018; 13: e0198685.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[66] Kliner M, Keenan A, Sinclair D, et al. Influenza vaccination for healthcare workers in the UK: appraisal of systematic reviews and policy options. *BMJ Open* 2016; 6: e012149.

[67] Dolan GP, Harris RC, Clarkson M, et al. Vaccination of healthcare workers to protect patients at increased risk of acute respiratory disease: summary of a systematic review. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 2013; 7 Suppl 2: 93–96.

[68] Blank PR, Schwenkglenks M, Szucs TD. Influenza vaccination coverage rates in five European countries during season 2006/07 and trends over six consecutive seasons. *BMC Public Health* 2008; 8: 272.

[69] La Torre G, Mannocci A, Ursillo P, et al. Prevalence of influenza vaccination among nurses and ancillary workers in Italy: systematic review and meta analysis. *Hum Vaccin* 2011; 7: 728–733.

[70] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Influenza Vaccination Coverage Among Health Care Personnel — United States, 2019–20 Influenza Season*, https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluvaxview/hcp-coverage_1920estimates.htm (7 December 2020).

[71] Baron G, De Wals P, Milord F. Vaccination practices of Quebec family physicians. Influenza vaccination status and professional practices for influenza vaccination. *Can Fam Physician* 2001; 47: 2261–2266.

[72] Lester RT, McGeer A, Tomlinson G, et al. Use of, effectiveness of, and attitudes regarding influenza vaccine among house staff. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2003; 24: 839–844.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[73] Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. *Increase the percentage of health care personnel who are vaccinated annually against seasonal influenza*, https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/immunization-and-infectious-diseases/objectives (2020).

[74] Mannocci A, Ursillo P, Bontempi C, et al. Prevalence of influenza vaccination among physicians and related enhancing and preventing factors in Italy. *RHC* 2010; 1: 27–34.

[75] Lu P, O'Halloran AC, Ding H, et al. Influenza Vaccination of Healthcare Personnel by Work Setting and Occupation—U.S., 2014. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2016; 51: 1015–1026.

[76] Reda Alenazi B, Mohamed Hammad S, Elwan Mohamed A. Prevalence of seasonal influenza vaccination among primary healthcare workers in Arar city, Saudi Arabia. *Electron Physician* 2018; 10: 7217–7223.

[77] Jiang L, Ng HL, Ho HJ, et al. Contacts of healthcare workers, patients and visitors in general wards in Singapore. *Epidemiol Infect* 2017; 145: 3085–3095.

[78] Galanis P, Vraka I, Fragkou D, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and associated factors in health care workers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Hosp Infect* 2020; 108: 120–134.

[79] Yanez ND, Weiss NS, Romand J-A, et al. COVID-19 mortality risk for older men and women. *BMC Public Health* 2020; 20: 1742.

[80] Mehraeen E, Karimi A, Barzegary A, et al. Predictors of mortality in patients with COVID-19-a systematic review. *Eur J Integr Med* 2020; 40: 101226.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[81] Sepandi M, Taghdir M, Alimohamadi Y, et al. Factors Associated with Mortality in COVID-19 Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Iran J Public Health* 2020; 49: 1211–1221.

[82] Mesas AE, Cavero-Redondo I, Álvarez-Bueno C, et al. Predictors of in-hospital COVID-19 mortality: A comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis exploring differences by age, sex and health conditions. *PLoS One* 2020; 15: e0241742.

[83] Miller LE, Bhattacharyya R, Miller AL. Diabetes mellitus increases the risk of hospital mortality in patients with Covid-19: Systematic review with meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2020; 99: e22439.

[84] Yu J-N, Wu B-B, Yang J, et al. Cardio-Cerebrovascular Disease is Associated With Severity and Mortality of COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Biol Res Nurs* 2020; 1099800420951984.

[85] World Health Organization. *Ten threats to global health in 2019*, https://www.who.int/news-room/spotlight/ten-threats-to-global-health-in-2019 (2020).

[86] Geoghegan S, O'Callaghan KP, Offit PA. Vaccine Safety: Myths and Misinformation. *Front Microbiol* 2020; 11: 372.

[87] Wilson R, Zaytseva A, Bocquier A, et al. Vaccine hesitancy and self-vaccination behaviors among nurses in southeastern France. *Vaccine* 2020; 38: 1144–1151.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[88] Lau LHW, Lee SS, Wong NS. The continuum of influenza vaccine hesitancy among nursing professionals in Hong Kong. *Vaccine* 2020; 38: 6785–6793.

[89] Di Martino G, Di Giovanni P, Di Girolamo A, et al. Knowledge and Attitude towards Vaccination among Healthcare Workers: A Multicenter Cross-Sectional Study in a Southern Italian Region. *Vaccines* 2020; 8: 248.

[90] Puri N, Coomes EA, Haghbayan H, et al. Social media and vaccine hesitancy: new updates for the era of COVID-19 and globalized infectious diseases. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* 2020; 1–8.

[91] MacDonald NE, Dubé E. Unpacking Vaccine Hesitancy Among Healthcare Providers. *EBioMedicine* 2015; 2: 792–793.

[92] Opel DJ, Heritage J, Taylor JA, et al. The architecture of provider-parent vaccine discussions at health supervision visits. *Pediatrics* 2013; 132: 1037–1046.

[93] Dubé E, Laberge C, Guay M, et al. Vaccine hesitancy: An overview. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* 2013; 9: 1763–1773.

[94] Malik AA, McFadden SM, Elharake J, et al. Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the US. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020; 26: 100495.

[95] Hollmeyer HG, Hayden F, Poland G, et al. Influenza vaccination of health care workers in hospitals--a review of studies on attitudes and predictors. *Vaccine* 2009; 27: 3935–3944.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[96] Keske Ş, Mutters NT, Tsioutis C, et al. Influenza vaccination among infection control teams: A EUCIC survey prior to COVID-19 pandemic. *Vaccine* 2020; 38: 8357–8361.

[97] Pless A, McLennan SR, Nicca D, et al. Reasons why nurses decline influenza vaccination: a qualitative study. *BMC Nurs* 2017; 16: 20.

Table 1. Main characteristics of the studies included in this systematic review.

Reference	Location	Sample size (n)	Age, mean (SD)	Females (%)	Study design	Sampling method	Assessment of intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination	Response rate (%)	Data collection time	Publication in
Gagneux-Brunon et al. (2020)[46]	France	2047	<30 years: 22.7%; 30-49: 47.3%; 50-64: 26.8%; >64: 3.1%	74	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no answer	NR	March 26 to July 2, 2020	Journal
Nzaji et al. (2020)[50]	Democratic Republic of the Congo	613	40.3 (11.7)	49.1	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no answer	NR	March 01 to April 30, 2020	Journal
Papagiannis et al. (2020)[47]	Greece	461	44.2 (10.8)	74	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Five point Likert-type scale (fully	92.2	February 10-25, 2020	Journal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

							disagree to fully agree)			
Wang et al. (2020)[31]	Hong Kong	806	<30 years: 21.6%; 30-39: 31.1%; 40-49: 27.1%; >49: 20.2%	87.5	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no/uncertain answer	5.2	February 26 to March 21, 2020	Journal
Detoc et al. (2020)[48]	France	1421	NR	NR	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Five point Likert-type scale (definitely no to certainly yes)	NR	March 26 to April 20, 2020	Journal
Fu et al. (2020)[32]	China	352	<30 years: 36.9%; 30-39: 31.8%; 40-49: 22.2%; >49: 9.1%	58.8	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no/uncertain answer	96.2	March 17-18, 2020	Pre-print service

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Kwok et al. (2020)[33]	Hong Kong	1205	40.8 (10.5)	89.7	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Eleven-point Likert-type scale (0=definitely no, 10=definitely yes)	78.9	March 16 to April 29, 2020	Pre-print service
Chawe et al. (2020)[29]	Zambia	208	<30 years: 50%; 30-39: 38%; >39: 12%	41.8	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no/uncertain answer	NR	June 10-29, 2020	Pre-print service
Gadoth et al. (2020)[41]	USA	609	<30 years: 14.6%; 30-39: 37.8%; 40-49: 22.3%; >49: 21.4%	68.8	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no answer	55.7	September 24 to October 16, 2020	Pre-print service
Verger et al. (2021)[52]	France, Belgium, Canada	2678	18-39 years: 34.4%; 40-59 years: 46.7%; >59	69.3	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no/uncertain answer	17.6	October to November, 2020	Journal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

			years: 18.9%							
Shaw et al. (2021)[42]	USA	5287	42.5 (13.6)	72.7	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Five point Likert-type scale (fully disagree to fully agree)	55.0	November 23 to December 5, 2020	Journal
Unroe et al. (2021)[43]	USA	8243	18-24 years: 12.7%; 25-40 years: 37%; 41-60 years: 38.9%; >60 years: 11.4%	86.8	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no answer	33	November 14-17, 2020	Journal
Shekhar et al. (2021)[44]	USA	3479	<40 years: 54%; ≥40 years: 46%	75	Cross-sectional	Snowball sampling	Yes/no/uncertain answer	NR	October 7 to November 9, 2020	Journal
Kose et al. (2021)[34]	Turkey	1138	<25 years: 89.6%;	72.5	Cross-	Convenience	Yes/no/uncertain	NR	September 17-20,	Journal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

			≥25 years: 10.4%		sectional	sampling	answer		2020	
Kuter et al. (2021)[30]	USA	12,034	<40 years: 51%; 40-64 years: 39.2%; >64 years: 3.6%	71.7	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no answer	34.5	November 13 to December 6, 2020	Journal
Barry et al. (2020)[35]	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia	1512	21-30 years: 25.5%; 31-40 years: 44.8%; 41-50 years: 19.7%; >50 years: 10.1%	62.4	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no answer	75.3	November 4-14, 2020	Pre-print service
Huynh et al. (2021)[36]	Vietnam	410	39.3 (9.3)	68.8	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no answer	48.0	January to February, 2021	Journal
Kaplan et al. (2021)[37]	Turkey	1574	39.4 (10.8)	58.8	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no/uncertain answer	NR	December 25-31, 2020	Journal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Qattan et al. (2021)[38]	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia	673	<39 years: 67.1%; ≥39 years: 32.9%	39.8	Cross-sectional	Snowball sampling	Yes/no/uncertain answer	91.4	December 8-14, 2020	Journal
Nohl et al. (2021)[49]	Germany	1296	<40 years: 63.8%; ≥40 years: 36.2%	21.8	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Five point Likert-type scale (fully disagree to fully agree)	NR	December 4, 2020 to January 15, 2021	Journal
Dzieciolowska et al. (2021)[45]	Canada	2761	44.0 (6.5)	72.2	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no answer	NR	December 15-28, 2020	Journal
Sun et al. (2021)[39]	China	505	32.4 (8.9)	77.4	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no answer	NR	January 4-6, 2021	Journal
Al-Sanafi & Sallam (2021)[40]	Kuwait	1019	34 (9.7)	61.4	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no/uncertain answer	NR	March 18-29, 2021	Journal
Adeniyi et al. (2021)[51]	Eastern	1308	26-55 years: 79.1%; >55 years:	81.5	Cross-	Convenience	Yes/no answer	NR	November to	Journal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	Cape		20.9%		sectional	sampling			December, 2020	

NR: not reported

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Intention of health care workers to accept vaccination and study population in the studies included in this systematic review.

Reference	Intention to accept vaccination, n/N (%)	Physicians (%)	Nurses (%)	Assistant nurses (%)	Paramedical staff (%)	Pharmacists (%)	Others (%)
Gagneux-Brunon et al. (2020)[46]	1574/2047 (76.9)	21.1	18.1	10.7		24.5	25.6*
Nzaji et al. (2020)[50]	170/613 (27.7)	27.2					72.8†
Papagiannis et al. (2020)[47]	200/461 (43.4)	30.5	47.5		19		
Wang et al. (2020)[31]	322/806 (40.0)		100				
Detoc et al. (2020)[48]	1158/1421 (81.5)						
Fu et al. (2020)[32]	269/352 (76.4)						
Kwok et al. (2020)[33]	759/1205 (63.0)		100				
Chawe et al. (2020)[29]	97/208 (46.6)						100‡

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Gadoth et al. (2020)[41]	197/609 (32.3)	39.9[§]	33.8				26.3[‖]
Verger et al. (2021)[52]	2132/2678 (79.6)	60.6	39.4				
Shaw et al. (2021)[42]	3040/5287 (57.5)	19.5	22.7	17.8	6.2	2.4	31.4[‖]
Unroe et al. (2021)[43]	3704/8243 (44.9)		19.4	43.6			37*
Shekhar et al. (2021)[44]	1247/3479 (35.8)	35	45				20[‖]
Kose et al. (2021)[34]	276/439 (62.9)	12.1	69.7				18.2*
Kuter et al. (2021)[30]	7666/12,034 (63.7)						
Barry et al. (2020)[35]	1058/1512 (70.0)	42.1	50.1[¶]				7.8[**]
Huynh et al. (2021)[36]	312/410 (76.1)	17.1	35.6		16.6		30.7[††]
Kaplan et al. (2021)[37]	1332/1574 (84.6)	66.8	17.5		7.3	4.4	4[‡‡]
Qattan et al. (2021)[38]	340/673 (50.5)						

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Nohl et al. (2021)[49]	739/1296 (57.0)						
Dzieciolowska et al. (2021)[45]	2233/2761 (80.9)	18.8	23.1				58.1*
Sun et al. (2021)[39]	387/505 (76.7)	40.8	53.3				5.9*
Al-Sanafi & Sallam (2021)[40]	849/1019 (83.3)	28.7	12.5			20.2	38.6*
Adeniyi et al. (2021)[51]	1179/1308 (90.1)	13.5	45.2	28.7	8.1	4.7	

* midwives, physiotherapists, administrative staff, laboratories staff, research staff; † nurses and others; ‡ laboratories staff; § physicians, nurse practitioners, physician, assistants, certified registered nurse anesthetists; ‖ personnel with or without patient contact; ¶ nurses with midwives; ** technicians and pharmacists; †† technical and administrative staff; ‡‡ dentists

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Quality of cross-sectional studies included in this systematic review.

	Gagneux-Brunon et al. (2020)[46]	Nzaji et al. (2020)[50]	Papagiannis et al. (2020)[47]	Wang et al. (2020)[31]	Detoc et al. (2020)[48]	Fu et al. (2020)[32]	Kwok et al. (2020)[33]	Chawe et al. (2020)[29]	Gadoth et al. (2020)[41]	Verger et al. (2021)[52]
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	√	√	√	√		√	√		√	√
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	√	√	√	√			√	√	√	√
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
5. Were confounding factors identified?	√	√		√			√		√	√
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	√	√		√			√		√	√
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Total quality	Good	Good	Moderate	Good	Moderate	Moderate	Good	Moderate	Good	Good

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3 (continued). Quality of cross-sectional studies included in this systematic review.

	Shaw et al. (2021)[42]	Unroe et al. (2021)[43]	Shekhar et al. (2021)[44]	Kose et al. (2021)[34]	Kuter et al. (2021)[30]	Barry et al. (2020)[35]	Huynh et al. (2021)[36]	Kaplan et al. (2021)[37]	Qattan et al. (2021)[38]	Nohl et al. (2021)[49]
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	√	√	√		√	√			√	
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

5. Were confounding factors identified?		√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?		√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Total quality	Moderate	Good	Good	Moderate	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3 (continued). Quality of cross-sectional studies included in this systematic review.

	Dzieciolowska et al. (2021)[45]	Sun et al. (2021)[39]	Al-Sanafi & Sallam (2021)[40]	Adeniyi et al. (2021)[51]
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	√		√	√
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	√	√	√	√
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	√	√	√	√
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	√	√	√	√
5. Were confounding factors identified?	√	√	√	√
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	√	√	√	√
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	√	√	√	√
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	√	√	√	√

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Total quality	Good	Good	Good	Good

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 4. Statistically significant factors related with intention of health care workers to accept COVID-19 vaccination.

Reference	**COVID-19 vaccination acceptance**	**Level of analysis**
Gagneux-Brunon et al. (2020)[46]	- Male gender (OR:1.88; 95% CI:1.38-2.56, p<0.001) - Older age (≥30 vs. <30 years, OR:1.66; 95% CI:1.32-2.09, p<0.001) - Physicians vs. nurses (OR:6.37; 95% CI:4.23-9.60, p<0.001) and assistant nurses (OR:7.76; 95% CI:4.98-12.08, p<0.001) - Flu vaccination during previous season (OR:4.69; 95% CI:3.59-6.11, p<0.001) - Fear about COVID-19 (OR:2.03; 95% CI:1.58-2.61, p=0.001) - Individual perceived risk (OR:2.48; 95% CI:1.93-3.2, p<0.001)	Multivariable
Nzaji et al. (2020)[50]	- Male gender (OR:1.17; 95% CI:1.15-2.6, p=0.008) - Physicians vs. others (OR:1.59; 95% CI:1.03-2.44, p=0.035) - Positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine (OR:11.49; 95% CI:5.88-22.46, p<0.001)	Multivariable
Papagiannis et al. (2020)[47]	- Male gender (p=0.001) - Less years of work experience (p=0.019)	Univariate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

	- Physicians vs. nurses (p<0.001) and paramedical staff (p<0.001)	
Wang et al. (2020)[31]	- HCWs with chronic conditions (OR:1.83; 95% CI:1.22-2.77) - HCWs exposed and in contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients (OR:1.63; 95% CI:1.14-2.33) - Flu vaccination during previous season (OR:2.03; 95% CI:1.47-2.81)	Multivariable
Kwok et al. (2020)[33]	- Younger age (b=-0.07; 95% CI: -0.12 to -0.01; p=0.02) - Stronger vaccine confidence (b=0.29; 95% CI:0.22-0.25; p<0.001 - Collective responsibility (b=0.12; 95% CI:0.06-0.19; p<0.001) - Weaker complacency (b=-0.11; 95% CI: -0.17 to -0.05; p<0.001)	Multivariable
Gadoth et al. (2020)[41]	- Physicians vs. nurses (p<0.05)	Multivariable
Verger et al. (2021)[52]	- Older age (40-59 vs. 18-39 years, OR:1.75; 95% CI:1.35-2.33, >59 vs. 18-39 years, OR:2.86; 95% CI:2.00-4.17) - Male gender (OR:1.89; 95% CI:1.44-2.49) - Flu vaccination during previous season (OR:2.70; 95% CI:2.00-3.57) - Positive attitude towards vaccines (OR:1.74; 95% CI:1.15-2.63) - Trust in science (OR:2.63; 95% CI:1.54-4.55)	Multivariable

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Shaw et al. (2021)[42]	- Older age (p<0.001) - Male gender (p<0.001) - Physicians vs. others (p<0.001)	Univariate
Unroe et al. (2021)[43]	- Older age (p<0.001) - Male gender (p<0.001) - White HCWs vs. others (p<0.001)	Multivariable
Shekhar et al. (2021)[44]	- Older age (p<0.001) - Male gender (p<0.001) - Asian and white HCWs vs. others (p<0.001) - Increased outcome (p<0.001) - Healthcare facilities in urban and suburban areas vs. rural areas (p<0.001) - Higher education level (p<0.001) - Flu vaccination during previous season (p<0.001) - Individual perceived risk (p<0.001) - HCWs with chronic conditions (p<0.001) - HCWs exposed and in contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients (p<0.001)	Multivariable

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Kuter et al. (2021)[30]	- Older age (40-64 vs. <40 years, OR:1.40; 95% CI:1.26-1.56, >64 vs. <40 years, OR:3.50; 95% CI:2.50-4.90) - Male gender (OR:2.41; 95% CI:2.12-2.75) - White HCWs vs. Black (OR:4.34; 95% CI:3.70-5.26) and Hispanic (OR:1.96; 95% CI:1.49-2.56) - Higher education level (Bachelor's or Master's degree vs. less than Bachelor's degree, OR:1.84; 95% CI:1.59-2.13, postgraduate degree vs. less than Bachelor's degree, OR:4.59; 95% CI:3.83-5.50) - Healthcare facilities in urban areas vs. rural areas (OR:2.44; 95% CI:1.85-3.33)	Multivariable
Barry et al. (2020)[35]	- Male gender (OR:1.55; 95% CI:1.12-2.14) - Positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine (OR:2.15; 95% CI:1.71-2.71)	Multivariable
Huynh et al. (2021)[36]	- Positive attitude towards vaccines (OR:4.36; 95% CI:2.35-8.09; p<0.001)	Multivariable
Kaplan et al. (2021)[37]	- Older age (p<0.05) - Routine uptake of adult vaccination (p<0.05) - Previous infection with COVID-19 (p<0.05) - Positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine (p<0.05)	Multivariable
Qattan et al. (2021)[38]	- Individual perceived risk (OR:2.09; 95% CI:1.07-4.09, p=0.031)	Multivariable
Nohl et al. (2021)[49]	- Male gender (p<0.001)	Multivariable

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	- Higher education level (p=0.013) - Older age (p=0.026)	
Dzieciolowska et al. (2021)[45]	- Male gender (OR:1.62; 95% CI:1.16-2.26, p=0.004) - Older age (>60 years vs. <30 years; OR:3.28; 95% CI:1.74-6.18, p<0.001) - HCWs exposed and in contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 (OR:3.88; 95% CI:2.29-6.58, p<0.001)	Multivariable
Sun et al. (2021)[39]	- Higher education level (postgraduate degree vs. less than Bachelor's degree, OR:2.35; 95% CI:1.14-4.88, p=0.021) - Living with elderly individuals (OR:1.93; 95% CI:1.07-3.46, p=0.028) - Flu vaccination during previous season (OR:4.73; 95% CI:2.29-9.79, p<0.001) - Individual perceived risk (OR:1.99; 95% CI:1.19-3.29, p=0.008) - Understanding of the COVID-19 vaccines (OR:2.32; 95% CI:1.36-3.98, p=0.002)	Multivariable
Al-Sanafi & Sallam (2021)[40]	- Dentists and physicians vs. nurses (p<0.001) - Male gender (p<0.001) - Higher education level (p<0.001)	Multivariable
Adeniyi et al. (2021)[51]	- Higher education level (p<0.001) - Positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine (p<0.001)	Multivariable

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	- Routine uptake of adult vaccination (p<0.001)	

b: coefficient beta regression; CI: confidence interval; HCW: health care worker; OR: odds ratio

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted August 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


Identification
Screening
Eligibility
Included
Records identified through PubMed searching (n=500), Medline (n=258), Scopus (n=386), Web of Science (n=210), ProQuest (n=1076), CINAHL (n=65), and medRxiv (n=527)
Records after duplicates removed (n = 2292)
Records screened (n = 2292)
Records excluded at first screening (title/abstract), for not meeting inclusion criteria (n = 2114)
1925=Not investigating research aim
187=Non primary research papers
2=retracted papers
Additional records through reference lists scanning (n = 1)
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 178)
Full-text articles excluded, for not meeting inclusion criteria (n = 155)
Studies included in the qualitative analysis (n = 24)
Studies included in the quantitative analysis (n = 24)

Studies	Estimate (95% C.I.)	Ev/Trt
Gagneux-Brunon et al. (France) 2020	0.769 (0.750, 0.787)	1574/2047
Nzaji et al. (Congo) 2020	0.277 (0.243, 0.313)	170/613
Papagiannis et al. (Greece) 2020	0.434 (0.389, 0.479)	200/461
Wang et al. (Hong Kong) 2020	0.400 (0.366, 0.434)	322/806
Detoc et al. (France) 2020	0.815 (0.794, 0.835)	1158/1421
Fu et al. (China) 2020	0.764 (0.718, 0.807)	269/352
Kwok et al. (Hong Kong) 2020	0.630 (0.602, 0.657)	759/1205
Chawe et al. (Zambia) 2020	0.466 (0.399, 0.534)	97/208
Gadoth et al. (USA) 2020	0.323 (0.287, 0.361)	197/609
Verger et al. ((France, Belgium, Canada) 2020	0.796 (0.781, 0.811)	2132/2678
Shan et al. (USA) 2021	0.575 (0.562, 0.588)	3040/5287
Unroe et al. (USA) 2021	0.449 (0.439, 0.460)	3704/8243
Shekhar et al. (USA) 2021	0.358 (0.343, 0.374)	1247/3479
Kose et al. (Turkey) 2021	0.629 (0.583, 0.673)	276/439
Kuter et al. (USA) 2021	0.637 (0.628, 0.646)	7666/12034
Barry et al. (Saudi Arabi) 2020	0.700 (0.676, 0.723)	1058/1512
Huynh et al. (Vietnam) 2021	0.761 (0.719, 0.801)	312/410
Kaplan et al. (Turkey) 2021	0.846 (0.828, 0.864)	1332/1574
Qattan et al. (Saudi Arabi) 2021	0.505 (0.467, 0.543)	340/673
Nohl et al. (Germany) 2021	0.570 (0.543, 0.597)	739/1296
Dzieciolowska et al. (Canada) 2021	0.809 (0.794, 0.823)	2233/2761
Sun et al. (China) 2021	0.766 (0.728, 0.802)	387/505
Al-Sanafi & Sallam (Kuwait) 2021	0.833 (0.810, 0.855)	849/1019
Adeniyi et al. (Eastern Cape) 2021	0.901 (0.885, 0.917)	1179/1308
Overall (I^2=99.6 % , P< 0.001)	**0.635 (0.565, 0.702)**	**31240/50940**



Studies	Estimate (95% C.I.)
Overall	0.635 (0.565, 0.702)
- Gagneux-Brunon et al. (France)	0.629 (0.557, 0.698)
- Nzaji et al. (Congo)	0.650 (0.581, 0.716)
- Papagiannis et al. (Greece)	0.643 (0.573, 0.711)
- Wang et al. (Hong Kong)	0.645 (0.574, 0.712)
- Detoc et al. (France)	0.626 (0.556, 0.694)
- Fu et al. (China)	0.629 (0.558, 0.698)
- Kwok et al. (Hong Kong)	0.635 (0.563, 0.704)
- Chawe et al. (Zambia)	0.642 (0.571, 0.710)
- Gadoth et al. (USA)	0.648 (0.578, 0.715)
- Verger et al. ((France, Belgium, Canada)	0.627 (0.557, 0.695)
- Shan et al. (USA)	0.637 (0.562, 0.710)
- Unroe et al. (USA)	0.643 (0.573, 0.709)
- Shekhar et al. (USA)	0.647 (0.580, 0.711)
- Kose et al. (Turkey)	0.635 (0.564, 0.704)
- Kuter et al. (USA)	0.635 (0.554, 0.712)
- Barry et al. (Saudi Arabi)	0.632 (0.560, 0.701)
- Huynh et al. (Vietnam)	0.629 (0.558, 0.698)
- Kaplan et al. (Turkey)	0.625 (0.555, 0.692)
- Qattan et al. (Saudi Arabi)	0.640 (0.569, 0.709)
- Nohl et al. (Germany)	0.638 (0.566, 0.707)
- Dzieciolowska et al. (Canada)	0.627 (0.556, 0.694)
- Sun et al. (China)	0.629 (0.558, 0.698)
- Al-Sanafi & Sallam (Kuwait)	0.625 (0.555, 0.693)
- Adeniyi et al. (Eastern Cape)	0.621 (0.553, 0.687)