medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

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

Abstract

Background: 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.

Objective: To estimate the intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination and to find out related factors.

Design: We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis guidelines for this study.

Data sources: We searched PubMed, Medline, Scopus, Web of Science, ProQuest, CINAHL and medRxiv from January 1, 2020 to December 02, 2020.

Methods: 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.

Results: Eleven studies**,** including 8847 HCWs met the inclusion criteria. The overall proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was 55.9% (95% CI: 43.6-67.9%) with a wide range among studies from 27.7% to 81.5%. Intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination was higher in studies with moderate quality and in studies that were conducted in Europe. The following factors were associated with increased HCWs' willingness to get vaccinated against COVID-19: male gender, older age, physician profession, fewer work experience, 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.

Conclusions: HCWs represent a high-risk group for SARS-CoV-2 infection. The reluctance or refusal of HCWs to vaccinate against COVID-19 could diminish the trust of individuals and trigger a ripple effect in the general public. Since vaccination

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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 December 11, 2020. 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 .

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. Knowledge of the factors that affect intention of HWCs to accept COVID-19 vaccination is limited and there is an urgent need for further and more valid studies.

Keywords: COVID-19, vaccination, health care workers, intention, SARS-CoV-2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

Background

A second wave of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic is hitting worldwide threatening societies, with an immense number of deaths and a catastrophic economic impact [1,2]. Indicative, as of December 8, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) reported more than 66 million cases globally and more than 1.5 million deaths due to COVID-19 [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 noticed [6,7]. Seasonal influenza immunization is a priority in countries where the proportion of elderly is high [8–10]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the WHO and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has identified HCWs as a population with significant elevated risk of being infected from the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and has recommended the rapid and prioritized vaccination of HCWs against COVID-19 to protect the HCWs 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 settings with patients. There are plenty of research studying factors influence vaccines' acceptance by HCWs [14–19]. Several factors are identified in systematic reviews and meta-analyses, e.g. 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, seasonal influenza vaccination, and physician profession [14–19].

The positive attitude of HCWs towards the COVID-19 vaccination is imperative since they should accept the vaccination and promote vaccine acceptance in general public to achieve herd immunity as soon as possible. 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

Methods

Data sources and strategy

We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines [20] for this systematic review and meta-analysis and the respective checklist is presented in Web Table 1. We searched PubMed, Medline, Scopus, Web of Science, ProQuest, CINAHL and pre-print services (medRxiv) from January 1, 2020 to December 02, 2020. 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 and we removed duplicates.

Selection and eligibility criteria

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

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).

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 [21].

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 [22]. 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 [23]. The heterogeneity between results was very high and thus we applied a random effect model to estimate pooled effects [23]. 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 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. A funnel plot and the Egger's test were used to assess the publication bias with a P-value<0.05 indicating publication bias [24]. 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 [25].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

Results

Identification and selection of studies

Flowchart of the literature search according to PRISMA guidelines is presented in Figure 1. Initially, we identified 1442 potential records through electronic databases and 545 duplicates were removed. After the screening of the titles and abstracts, we removed 850 records and we added one more record found by the reference lists scanning. We included 11 studies [26–36] in this systematic review and meta-analysis that met our inclusion criteria.

Characteristics of the studies

Main characteristics of the 11 studies included in this review are presented in Table 1. A total of 8847 HCWs were included in this systematic review with a minimum of 123 HCWs [29] and a maximum of 2047 HCWs [26] among studies. Five studies were conducted in Europe (France, Malta and Greece) [26,27,29,30,32], three studies in Asia (China and Hong Kong) [31,33,34], two studies in Africa (Democratic Republic of the Congo and Zambia) [28,35], and one study in North America (USA) [36]. Females were more in six studies [26,30,31,33,34,36], while males were more in two studies [28,35]. All studies were cross-sectional using a convenience sample. Seven studies were published in journals [26–32] and four studies in pre-print services [33–36]. Three studies did not report data regarding age [27,29,32], three regarding gender distribution [27,29,32], and four regarding response rate [26,28,32,35]. Five studies used Likert-type scales to assess intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination [27,29,30,32,34], three studies used a yes/no/uncertain answer [31,33,35], and three studies used a yes/no answer [26,28,36].

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% [28] to 81.5% [32]. Percentage of physicians that participated in studies ranged from 20.4% [27] to 100% [29], while percentage of nurses ranged from 18.1% [26] to 100% [31,34]. Two studies did not report data regarding study population [32,33].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

Quality assessment

Quality assessment of cross-sectional studies included in this review is shown in Table 3. Quality was moderate in six studies [27,29,30,32,33,35] and good in five studies [26,28,31,34,36].

Meta-analysis

The overall proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was 55.9% (95% CI: 43.6-67.9%) (Figure 2). The heterogeneity between results was very high (I^2=99.25%, 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 53.1% (95% CI: 40.8-65.2%), with Fu et al. [33] excluded, and 58.8% (95% CI: 46.9-70.2%), with Nzaji et al. [28] excluded (Web Figure 1).

According to subgroup analysis, the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was almost the same for the studies that were published in journals (56.5% [95% CI: 39.8-72.5%], I^2=99.43) and those in pre-print services (54.9% [95% CI: 35.7-73.4%], I^2=98.75). Moreover, the proportion was much higher for the studies with moderate quality (62.4% [95% CI: 46.6-77.0%], I^2=98.78) compared to those with good quality (48.1% [95% CI: 28.4-68.2%], I^2=99.54). The proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was higher in studies that were conducted in Europe (65.6% [95% CI: 50.6-79.1%], I^2=99.06) compared to those in Asia (60.1% [95% CI: 40.5-78.2%], I^2=98.85) and Africa (36.7% [95% CI: 19.6-55.9%], I^2=95.86). Meta-regression showed that the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was independent of the sample size (p=0.13), gender distribution (p=0.56), and data collection time (p=0.66).

P-value<0.05 for Egger's test and the asymmetrical shape of the funnel plot (Web Figure 2) implied potential publication bias.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

Eight studies [26–31,34,36] investigated factors related with intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination, while five studies used multivariable analysis to control confounding [26,28,31,34,36] (Table 4).

We found that several demographic characteristics were associated with COVID-19 vaccination acceptance. Profession was the most frequent predictor since five studies [26–28,30,36] found that physicians were more prone to get vaccinated against COVID-19 than other HCWs and especially nurses and paramedical staff (odds ratios [ORs] ranged from 1.59 to 7.76). Male HCWs were more likely to be vaccinated than females with ORs ranged from 1.17 to 1.88 [26–28,30]. Three studies [26,27,29] found that older age was associated with an increase in COVID-19 vaccine acceptance, while Kwok et al. [34] found the opposite. Papagiannis et al. [30] found that fewer work experience increase the intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccine. Also, HCWs with chronic conditions were more likely to be vaccinated against COVID-19 [31]. Flu vaccination during previous season was associated with intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination with ORs ranged from 2.03 to 4.69 [26,31].

Stronger vaccine confidence [34] and positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine [28] increased HCWs' willingness to get vaccinated against COVID-19. Fear about COVID-19, individual perceived risk about COVID-19, and weaker complacency about the COVID-19 were related with increased COVID-19 vaccination acceptance [26,34]. Wang et al. [31] found that HCWs exposed and in contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients were more likely to accept COVID-19 vaccine.

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. We found that the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was moderate (55.9%) with a wide range among studies from 27.7% to 81.5%. This moderate level of acceptance may be attributable to several reasons, e.g. inadequate knowledge among HCWs regarding COVID-19 [37,38], negative attitude towards the disease [37,39], and feelings of fear and anxiety during the COVID-19 pandemic [40–

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

43]. 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. [27,29]. Better knowledge of COVID-19 among HCWs affects their attitude, increases their confidence, and promotes preventive measures such as the vaccination [44–46].

Although the positive effects of influenza vaccine in health outcomes and in financial terms are well known [9,47–49], the vaccination rate is low even among HCWs. In particular, low vaccination coverage was found in a meta-analysis [18] with 45 studies in mainland China where 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. Also, a systematic review [16] found that the median vaccination rate against seasonal influenza and H1N1 among HCWs in Asia is low (37.4%) although is higher than high-risk groups, students/military, and general population (37.3%, 35.5% and 14.3% respectively). Similar findings are found in studies in Europe (United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Spain) where HCWs receive influenza vaccination more often than the general population but in low levels, ranging from 15% to 29% [50]. A meta-analysis included studies in Italy found that the proportion of influenza vaccination among nurses and ancillary workers was 13.47% and 12.52% respectively [51]. Influenza vaccination coverage is higher in Canada, ranging from 35.5% to 51% [52,53] and much higher in USA approaching 80.6% during the 2019-2020 season among 2454 HCWs [54] but still lower than the national Healthy People 2020 target of 90% [55].

According to our subgroup analysis, the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was higher in studies in Europe than those in Asia and Africa. This finding is in accordance with a study [56] 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 Asia and Africa. Also, the availability of influenza vaccines is low in Africa [57], while the number of influenza vaccines per capita is much higher in high-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

income countries compared to lower and middle-income countries (median number; 139.2 vs. 6.1 per 1000 population) [58].

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 [51,59] including studies in Italy, where the prevalence of influenza vaccination among physicians was 23.18% [59], among nurses was 13.47%, and among ancillary workers was 12.52% [51]. Several other studies worldwide confirm the fact that the influenza vaccination coverage among physicians is the highest [54,60,61]. Also, a systematic review [62] with regards to pandemic influenza A vaccine (H1N1) 2009 found that physicians were more likely to accept influenza vaccine and to have a positive attitude toward vaccination. 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 [19]. 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 [63]. Also, the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies is higher among frontline health care workers and health care assistants [64] 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 [65–67]. 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 [66–70]. 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

[18] and hepatitis B vaccination [19] 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 [71]. 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 [72]. 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 [73–75]. In case of the COVID-19 vaccine the situation can be worse since vaccine hesitancy is fuelled by fake news and conspiracy theories [76]. The reluctance or refusal of HCWs to vaccinate against COVID-19 could diminish the trust of individuals and trigger a ripple effect in the general public [77,78]. 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 [79]. This association has already observed in case of COVID-19 not only in the general public [80] but also in HCWs [7,15]. A warning sign to public health safety is that vaccine hesitancy is greater among nurses than among physicians [81–83].

Our study is subject to several limitations. In particular, more than the half of studies was of moderate quality, while four out of eleven 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

performed subgroup and meta-regression analysis. Data with regards to the factors related with intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination were limited, while five studies used multivariable 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 intent 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.

Conclusions

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. 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.

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding source: None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

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 intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination.

Web Figure 1. A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis of the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination.

Web Figure 2. Funnel plot of the prevalence of the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination.

Web Table 1. PRISMA Checklist

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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] Looi M-K. Covid-19: Is a second wave hitting Europe? BMJ 2020:m4113. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m4113.

[2] Cacciapaglia G, Cot C, Sannino F. Second wave COVID-19 pandemics in Europe: a temporal playbook. Sci Rep 2020;10:15514. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-72611-5.

[3] World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. 2020.

[4] Poland GA, Tosh P, Jacobson RM. Requiring influenza vaccination for health care workers: seven truths we must accept. Vaccine 2005;23:2251–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2005.01.043.

[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, Finelli L, Euler GL, Singleton JA, et al. Prevention and control of influenza with vaccines: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP), 2010. Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 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, Bonaccorsi G, Lorini C, Santomauro F, Tiscione E, Boccalini S, et al. Focusing on the implementation of 21st century vaccines for adults. Vaccine 2018;36:5358–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.07.100.

[9] Demicheli V, Jefferson T, Di Pietrantonj C, Ferroni E, Thorning S, Thomas RE, et al. Vaccines for preventing influenza in the elderly. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2018. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD004876.pub4.

[10] Bonanni P, Boccalini S, Bechini A. The expected impact of new vaccines and vaccination policies. J Public Health 2008;16:253–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-008-0203-z.

[11] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. How CDC Is Making COVID-19 Vaccine Recommendations. 2020.

[12] World Health Organization. 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. 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. https://doi.org/10.1086/676427.

[15] Prematunge C, Corace K, McCarthy A, Nair RC, Pugsley R, Garber G. Factors influencing pandemic influenza vaccination of healthcare workers—A systematic review. Vaccine 2012;30:4733–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.05.018.

[16] Sheldenkar A, Lim F, Yung CF, Lwin MO. Acceptance and uptake of influenza vaccines in Asia: A systematic review. Vaccine 2019;37:4896–905. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.07.011.

[17] Herzog R, Álvarez-Pasquin MJ, Díaz C, Del Barrio JL, Estrada JM, Gil Á. Are healthcare workers' intentions to vaccinate related to their knowledge, beliefs and attitudes? A systematic review. BMC Public Health 2013;13:154. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-13-154.

[18] Wang Q, Yue N, Zheng M, Wang D, Duan C, Yu X, et al. Influenza vaccination coverage of population and the factors influencing influenza vaccination in mainland China: A

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

meta-analysis. Vaccine 2018;36:7262–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.10.045.

[19] Auta A, Adewuyi EO, Kureh GT, Onoviran N, Adeloye D. Hepatitis B vaccination coverage among health-care workers in Africa: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Vaccine 2018;36:4851–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.06.043.

[20] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 2009;6:e1000097. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097.

[21] Santos WM dos, Secoli SR, Püschel VA de A. The Joanna Briggs Institute approach for systematic reviews. Rev Lat Am Enfermagem 2018;26. https://doi.org/10.1590/1518-8345.2885.3074.

[22] Barendregt JJ, Doi SA, Lee YY, Norman RE, Vos T. Meta-analysis of prevalence. J Epidemiol Community Health 2013;67:974–8. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2013-203104.

[23] Higgins JPT. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ 2003;327:557–60. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557.

[24] Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ 1997;315:629–34. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629.

[25] Wallace BC, Schmid CH, Lau J, Trikalinos TA. Meta-Analyst: software for meta-analysis of binary, continuous and diagnostic data. BMC Med Res Methodol 2009;9:80. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-9-80.

[26] Gagneux-Brunon A, Detoc M, Bruel S, Tardy B, Rozaire O, Frappe P, et al. Intention to get vaccinations against COVID-19 in French healthcare workers during the first pandemic wave: a cross sectional survey. J Hosp Infect 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.11.020.

[27] Grech V, Gauci C, Agius S. Vaccine hesitancy among Maltese healthcare workers toward influenza and novel COVID-19 vaccination. Early Hum Dev 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2020.105213.

[28] Nzaji MK, Ngombe LK, Mwamba GN, Ndala DB, Miema JM, Lungoyo CL, et al. Acceptability of Vaccination Against COVID-19 Among Healthcare Workers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Pragmatic Obs Res 2020;11:103–9. https://doi.org/10.2147/POR.S271096.

[29] Grech V, Bonnici J, Zammit D. Vaccine hesitancy in Maltese family physicians and their trainees vis-à-vis influenza and novel COVID-19 vaccination. Early Hum Dev 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2020.105259.

[30] Papagiannis D, Malli F, Raptis DG, Papathanasiou IV, Fradelos EC, Daniil Z, et al. Assessment of knowledge, attitudes, and practices towards new coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) of health care professionals in greece before the outbreak period. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2020;17:1–14. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17144925.

[31] Wang K, Wong ELY, Ho KF, Cheung AWL, Chan EYY, Yeoh EK, 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;38:7049–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.09.021.

[32] Detoc M, Bruel S, Frappe P, Tardy B, Botelho-Nevers E, Gagneux-Brunon A. Intention to participate in a COVID-19 vaccine clinical trial and to get vaccinated against COVID-19 in France during the pandemic. Vaccine 2020;38:7002–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.09.041.

[33] Fu C, wei Z, Pei S, Li S, Sun X, Liu P. Acceptance and preference for COVID-19 vaccination in health-care workers (HCWs). Epidemiology; 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.09.20060103.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

[34] Kwok KO, Li KK, Wei WI, Tang KH, Wong SYS, Lee SS. Are we ready when COVID-19 vaccine is available? Study on nurses vaccine hesitancy in Hong Kong. Public and Global Health; 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.17.20156026.

[35] Chawe A, Mfune RL, Syapiila P, Zimba SD, Vlahakis P, Mwale S, et al. Knowledge, attitudes and practices of COVID 19 among Medical Laboratory Professionals in Zambia. Public and Global Health; 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.22.20199240.

[36] Gadoth A, Halbrook M, Martin-Blais R, Gray A, Tobin NH, Ferbas KG, et al. Assessment of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance among healthcare workers in Los Angeles. Public and Global Health; 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.18.20234468.

[37] 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. https://doi.org/10.33314/jnhrc.v18i2.2658.

[38] Kassa AM, Mekonen AM, Yesuf KA, Woday Tadesse A, Bogale GG. Knowledge level and factors influencing prevention of COVID-19 pandemic among residents of Dessie and Kombolcha City administrations, North-East Ethiopia: a population-based cross-sectional study. BMJ Open 2020;10:e044202. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-044202.

[39] 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. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242126.

[40] Apisarnthanarak A, Apisarnthanarak P, Siripraparat C, Saengaram P, Leeprechanon N, Weber DJ. Impact of anxiety and fear for COVID-19 toward infection control practices among Thai healthcare workers. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2020;41:1093–4. https://doi.org/10.1017/ice.2020.280.

[41] Lu W, Wang H, Lin Y, Li L. Psychological status of medical workforce during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. Psychiatry Res 2020;288:112936. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112936.

[42] Lima CKT, Carvalho PM de M, Lima I de AAS, Nunes JVA de O, Saraiva JS, de Souza RI, et al. The emotional impact of Coronavirus 2019-nCoV (new Coronavirus disease). Psychiatry Res 2020;287:112915. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112915.

[43] García-Reyna B, Castillo-García GD, Barbosa-Camacho FJ, Cervantes-Cardona GA, Cervantes-Pérez E, Torres-Mendoza BM, 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. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00413-x.

[44] Zhang M, Zhou M, Tang F, Wang Y, Nie H, Zhang L, et al. Knowledge, attitude, and practice regarding COVID-19 among healthcare workers in Henan, China. J Hosp Infect 2020;105:183–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.04.012.

[45] McEachan R, Taylor N, Harrison R, Lawton R, Gardner P, Conner M. Meta-Analysis of the Reasoned Action Approach (RAA) to Understanding Health Behaviors. Ann Behav Med 2016;50:592–612. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-016-9798-4.

[46] Huynh G, Nguyen T, Tran V, Vo K, Vo V, Pham L. Knowledge and attitude toward COVID-19 among healthcare workers at District 2 Hospital, Ho Chi Minh City. Asian Pac J Trop Med 2020;13:260–5. https://doi.org/10.4103/1995-7645.280396.

[47] Imai C, Toizumi M, Hall L, Lambert S, Halton K, Merollini K. 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. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0198685.

[48] Kliner M, Keenan A, Sinclair D, Ghebrehewet S, Garner P. Influenza vaccination for healthcare workers in the UK: appraisal of systematic reviews and policy options. BMJ Open 2016;6:e012149. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012149.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

[49] Dolan GP, Harris RC, Clarkson M, Sokal R, Morgan G, Mukaigawara 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 2:93–6. https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.12087.

[50] 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. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-8-272.

[51] La Torre G, Mannocci A, Ursillo P, Bontempi C, Firenze A, Panico MG, et al. Prevalence of influenza vaccination among nurses and ancillary workers in Italy: systematic review and meta analysis. Hum Vaccin 2011;7:728–33. https://doi.org/10.4161/hv.7.7.15413.

[52] 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 Med Fam Can 2001;47:2261–6.

[53] Lester RT, McGeer A, Tomlinson G, Detsky AS. Use of, effectiveness of, and attitudes regarding influenza vaccine among house staff. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2003;24:839–44. https://doi.org/10.1086/502146.

[54] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Influenza Vaccination Coverage Among Health Care Personnel — United States, 2019–20 Influenza Season. 2020.

[55] Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. Increase the percentage of health care personnel who are vaccinated annually against seasonal influenza. 2020.

[56] 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 Policy 2009;30:83–101. https://doi.org/10.1057/jphp.2008.40.

[57] 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. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-41.

[58] Jorgensen P, Mereckiene J, Cotter S, Johansen K, Tsolova S, Brown C. 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;36:442–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.12.019.

[59] Mannocci A, Ursillo P, Bontempi C, Sferrazza A, La Torre G. Prevalence of influenza vaccination among physicians and related enhancing and preventing factors in Italy. Rev Health Care 2010;1:27–34. https://doi.org/10.7175/rhc.v1i1.15.

[60] Lu P, O'Halloran AC, Ding H, Williams WW, Black CL. Influenza Vaccination of Healthcare Personnel by Work Setting and Occupation—U.S., 2014. Am J Prev Med 2016;51:1015–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2016.08.038.

[61] 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;10:7217–23. https://doi.org/10.19082/7217.

[62] Aguilar-Díaz F del C, Jiménez-Corona ME, Ponce-de-León-Rosales S. Influenza Vaccine and Healthcare Workers. Arch Med Res 2011;42:652–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcmed.2011.12.006.

[63] Jiang L, Ng HL, Ho HJ, Leo YS, Prem K, Cook AR, et al. Contacts of healthcare workers, patients and visitors in general wards in Singapore. Epidemiol Infect 2017;145:3085–95. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268817002035.

[64] Galanis P, Vraka I, Fragkou D, Bilali A, Kaitelidou D. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and associated factors in health care workers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Hosp Infect 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.11.008.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

[65] Yanez ND, Weiss NS, Romand J-A, Treggiari MM. COVID-19 mortality risk for older men and women. BMC Public Health 2020;20:1742. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09826-8.

[66] Mehraeen E, Karimi A, Barzegary A, Vahedi F, Afsahi AM, Dadras O, et al. Predictors of mortality in patients with COVID-19-a systematic review. Eur J Integr Med 2020;40:101226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eujim.2020.101226.

[67] Sepandi M, Taghdir M, Alimohamadi Y, Afrashteh S, Hosamirudsari H. Factors Associated with Mortality in COVID-19 Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Iran J Public Health 2020;49:1211–21. https://doi.org/10.18502/ijph.v49i7.3574.

[68] Mesas AE, Cavero-Redondo I, Álvarez-Bueno C, Sarriá Cabrera MA, Maffei de Andrade S, Sequí-Dominguez I, 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. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0241742.

[69] 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. https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000022439.

[70] Yu J-N, Wu B-B, Yang J, Lei X-L, Shen W-Q. Cardio-Cerebrovascular Disease is Associated With Severity and Mortality of COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Biol Res Nurs 2020:1099800420951984. https://doi.org/10.1177/1099800420951984.

[71] World Health Organization. Ten threats to global health in 2019. 2020.

[72] Geoghegan S, O'Callaghan KP, Offit PA. Vaccine Safety: Myths and Misinformation. Front Microbiol 2020;11:372. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2020.00372.

[73] Wilson R, Zaytseva A, Bocquier A, Nokri A, Fressard L, Chamboredon P, et al. Vaccine hesitancy and self-vaccination behaviors among nurses in southeastern France. Vaccine 2020;38:1144–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.11.018.

[74] Lau LHW, Lee SS, Wong NS. The continuum of influenza vaccine hesitancy among nursing professionals in Hong Kong. Vaccine 2020;38:6785–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.08.038.

[75] Di Martino G, Di Giovanni P, Di Girolamo A, Scampoli P, Cedrone F, D'Addezio M, et al. Knowledge and Attitude towards Vaccination among Healthcare Workers: A Multicenter Cross-Sectional Study in a Southern Italian Region. Vaccines 2020;8:248. https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines8020248.

[76] Puri N, Coomes EA, Haghbayan H, Gunaratne K. Social media and vaccine hesitancy: new updates for the era of COVID-19 and globalized infectious diseases. Hum Vaccines Immunother 2020:1–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/21645515.2020.1780846.

[77] MacDonald NE, Dubé E. Unpacking Vaccine Hesitancy Among Healthcare Providers. EBioMedicine 2015;2:792–3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2015.06.028.

[78] Opel DJ, Heritage J, Taylor JA, Mangione-Smith R, Salas HS, Devere V, et al. The architecture of provider-parent vaccine discussions at health supervision visits. Pediatrics 2013;132:1037–46. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2013-2037.

[79] Dubé E, Laberge C, Guay M, Bramadat P, Roy R, Bettinger JA. Vaccine hesitancy: An overview. Hum Vaccines Immunother 2013;9:1763–73. https://doi.org/10.4161/hv.24657.

[80] Malik AA, McFadden SM, Elharake J, Omer SB. Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the US. EClinicalMedicine 2020;26:100495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100495.

[81] Hollmeyer HG, Hayden F, Poland G, Buchholz U. Influenza vaccination of health care workers in hospitals--a review of studies on attitudes and predictors. Vaccine 2009;27:3935–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2009.03.056.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

[82] Keske Ş, Mutters NT, Tsioutis C, Ergönül Ö. Influenza vaccination among infection control teams: A EUCIC survey prior to COVID-19 pandemic. Vaccine 2020;38:8357–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.11.003.

[83] Pless A, McLennan SR, Nicca D, Shaw DM, Elger BS. Reasons why nurses decline influenza vaccination: a qualitative study. BMC Nurs 2017;16:20. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-017-0215-5.

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 [26]	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	Journal
Grech et al. 2020 [27]	Malta	1002	NR	NR	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Five point Likert-type scale (unlikely to likely)	10.4	September 11-16	Journal
Nzaji et al. 2020 [28]	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	Journal
Grech et al. 2020 [29]	Malta	123	NR	NR	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Five point Likert-type scale (unlikely to likely)	42.7	September 25-29	Journal
Papagiannis et al. 2020 [30]	Greece	461	44.2 (10.8)	74	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Five point Likert-type scale (fully disagree to fully agree)	92.2	February 10-25	Journal
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	Journal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 .

Detoc et al. 2020 [32]	France	1421	NR	NR	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Five point Likert-type scale (definitely no to certainly yes)	NR	March 26 to April 20	Journal
Fu et al. 2020 [33]	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	Pre-print service
Kwok et al. 2020 [34]	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	Pre-print service
Chawe et al. 2020 [35]	Zambia	208	<30 years: 50%; 30-39: 38%; >39: 12%	41.8	Cross-sectional	Convenience sampling	Yes/no/uncertain answer	NR	June 10-29	Pre-print service
Gadoth et al. 2020 [36]	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	Pre-print service

NR: not reported

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 [26]	1574/2047 (76.9)	21.1	18.1	10.7		24.5	25.6[a]
Grech et al. 2020 [27]	521/1002 (52.0)	20.4	31.7	27.4	20.5		
Nzaji et al. 2020 [28]	170/613 (27.7)	27.2					72.8[b]
Grech et al. 2020 [29]	87/123 (70.7)	100					
Papagiannis et al. 2020 [30]	200/461 (43.4)	30.5	47.5		19		
Wang et al. 2020 [31]	322/806 (40.0)		100				
Detoc et al. 2020 [32]	1158/1421 (81.5)						
Fu et al. 2020 [33]	269/352 (76.4)						
Kwok et al. 2020 [34]	759/1205 (63.0)		100				
Chawe et al. 2020 [35]	97/208 (46.6)						100[c]
Gadoth et al. 2020 [36]	197/609 (32.3)	39.9[d]	33.8				26.3[e]

[a] midwives, physiotherapists, administrative staff, laboratories staff, research staff; [b] nurses and others; [c] laboratories staff; [d] physicians, nurse practitioners, physician, assistants, certified registered nurse anesthetists; [e] personnel with or without patient contact

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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.

	[26]	[27]	[28]	[29]	[30]	[31]	[32]	[33]	[34]	[35]	[36]
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	X		X		X	X			X	X	X
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5. Were confounding factors identified?	X		X			X			X		X
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	X		X			X			X		X
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Total quality	Good	Moderate	Good	Moderate	Moderate	Good	Moderate	Moderate	Good	Moderate	Good

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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. 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 [26]	- 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
Grech et al. 2020 [27]	- Male gender (p=0.0003) - Physicians vs. others (p<0.001) - Older age (p<0.05)	Univariate
Nzaji et al. 2020 [28]	- 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
Grech et al. 2020 [29]	- Older age (p=0.003)	Univariate
Papagiannis et al. 2020 [30]	- Male gender (p=0.001) - Fewer work experience (p=0.019) - Physicians vs. nurses (p<0.001) and paramedical staff (p<0.001)	Univariate
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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041; this version posted December 11, 2020. 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 [34]	- 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 [36]	- Physicians vs. nurses (p<0.05)	Multivariable

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 December 11, 2020. 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=25), Medline (n=52), Scopus (n=443), Web of Science (n=21), ProQuest (n=680), CINAHL (n=8), and medRxiv (n=213)
Records after duplicates removed (n=897)
Records screened (n=897)
Records excluded at first screening (title/abstract) (n=850)
Additional records through reference lists scanning (n=1)
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n=48)
Full-text articles excluded, for not meeting inclusion criteria (n=37)
Studies included in the qualitative analysis (n=11)
Studies included in the quantitative analysis (n=11)

Studies	Estimate (95% C.I.)	n/N
Gagneux-Brunon et al. 2020	0.769 (0.750, 0.787)	1574/2047
Grech et al. (a) 2020	0.520 (0.489, 0.551)	521/1002
Nzaji et al. 2020	0.277 (0.243, 0.313)	170/613
Grech et al. (b) 2020	0.707 (0.624, 0.784)	87/123
Papagiannis et al. 2020	0.434 (0.389, 0.479)	200/461
Wang et al. 2020	0.400 (0.366, 0.434)	322/806
Detoc et al. 2020	0.815 (0.794, 0.835)	1158/1421
Fu et al. 2020	0.764 (0.718, 0.807)	269/352
Kwok et al. 2020	0.630 (0.602, 0.657)	759/1205
Chawe et al. 2020	0.466 (0.399, 0.534)	97/208
Gadoth et al. 2020	0.323 (0.287, 0.361)	197/609
Overall (I^2=99.25 % , P< 0.001)	**0.559 (0.436, 0.679)**	**5354/8847**




Studies
Estimate (95% C.I.)
Overall 0.559 (0.436, 0.679)
- Gagneux-Brunon et al. 0.537 (0.407, 0.663)
- Grech et al. (a) 0.563 (0.426, 0.696)
- Nzaji et al. 0.588 (0.469, 0.702)
- Grech et al. (b) 0.544 (0.414, 0.672)
- Papagiannis et al. 0.572 (0.441, 0.698)
- Wang et al. 0.575 (0.447, 0.699)
- Detoc et al. 0.531 (0.408, 0.652)
- Fu et al. 0.538 (0.407, 0.666)
- Kwok et al. 0.552 (0.411, 0.689)
- Chawe et al. 0.568 (0.438, 0.694)
- Gadoth et al. 0.583 (0.460, 0.701)
0.42
0.49
0.56
0.63
0.7
Arcsine of Square Root Proportion


0,02
0,025
0,03
0,035
0,04
0,045
0,05
0,055
0,06
0,065
0,07
0,075
0,08
0,085
0,09
0,095
Standard error
2
Double Arcsin Prevalence