Sub-national forecasts of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance across the UK: a large-scale cross-sectional spatial modelling study

A. de Figueiredo, PhD[1,2†]

[1] Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK
[2] Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London, UK

[†] alex.defigueiredo@lshtm.ac.uk

Introduction There is evidence of decreasing uptake of routine immunisations in the UK in recent years. As the United Kingdom begins a mass vaccination campaign with a novel COVID-19 vaccine, it is unclear whether refusal of the vaccine in some regions and among some socio-economic groups will pose challenges for achieving herd/community immunity against SARS-CoV-2.

Methods This study estimates uptake of a COVID-19 at unprecedented spatial resolution across the UK using a large-scale survey and state-of-the-art Bayesian statistical methods for estimating public opinion. Between 24 September and 14 October 2020, 17,684 individuals are surveyed in a cross-sectional online survey design. Regions and socio-economic groups who may be more resistant towards a new vaccine are identified using multilevel regression and poststratification. Gibbs sampling is used for Bayesian model inference, with uncertainty in parameter estimates captured via 95% highest posterior density intervals.

Findings This study predicts that clusters of non-vaccinators will likely emerge in many regions across the UK, most notably in London (which has 13 of the 20 lowest ranking regions) and the North West (which has four, including Greater Manchester and Liverpool). Males are much more likely to state intent to accept the vaccine than females (OR 1·59, 1·47 to 1·73); while Muslims are less likely than atheists / agnostics (0·75, 0·57 to 0·96), Black / Black British are less likely than Whites (0·47, 0·38 to 0·60), and Polish speakers (0·45, 0·31 to 0·63) are less likely than those who primarily speak English or Welsh. Across the UK, 8·7% (8·2 to 9·2%) state that they would "definitely not" accept a vaccine, but less than half (47·5%, 46·5 to 48·5%) say they would "definitely" accept a COVID-19 vaccine, with a substantial proportion unsure.

Interpretation The study findings are extremely important in the context of achieving herd/community immunity. Low predicted acceptance rates in parts of London and the North West are of particular concern as many of these regions have among the highest rates of COVID-19 infection across the UK: low vaccine uptake in these regions may result in disease "hotspots" that amplify the spread of the disease and require increases in vaccination levels in adjacent regions to provide nationwide herd/community immunity. It is therefore extremely important to identify such regions, and to engage with communities within them in advance of vaccination rollout to the population at large. Encouragingly, intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine is higher among older age-groups, who are among the first to receive a COVID-19 vaccine.

Declaration of Interests: The Author is involved in Vaccine Confidence Project collaborative grants with GlaxoSmithKline outside the submitted work.

Funding: This project was funded by the Imperial College COVID-19 Response Fund.

Ethical Approval: Approval for this study was obtained via the Imperial College Research Ethics Committee on 24 July 2020 with reference 20IC6133.

Introduction

A vaccine against the novel coronavirus 2019 disease (COVID-19) caused by the severe acute respiratory coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) will be a major step in reducing mortality, morbidity, economic, and societal burdens associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. The UK's National Health Service (NHS) is beginning rollout of the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine – recently approved by the UK's Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Authority (MHRA)[1].

A successful vaccination campaign of a safe and effective vaccine is contingent on three leading order factors: at-scale manufacture ensuring sufficient dosages to target populations; governments and health organisations ensuring fast and equitable distribution via existing and novel supply-chain networks with sufficient capacity for storage and delivery; and public acceptance. This latter factor is perhaps of particular concern in the UK, which has had notable hesitancy towards vaccinating in the past[2]. In recent years, there have been year-on-year decreases in uptake of routine immunisations[3] with corresponding outbreaks of vaccine-preventable diseases and, ultimately, a loss of the UK's measles-free status[4–7].

UK policymakers may therefore face public concerns over a novel vaccine and recent data bears this out: a cross-sectional survey of 1,500 respondents in July 2020 suggested that a majority of the UK public are unsure whether they would accept a COVID-19 vaccine[8]. A more recent study in September and October 2020 suggests that at least 36% of the UK public would not be "very likely" to accept the vaccine[9]. These existing fears may be worsened due to online misinformation surrounding a novel COVID-19 vaccine seeking to exploit these fears[10], which have been widely circulating[11,12].

Addressing attitudinal barriers to accepting a novel vaccine in advance of vaccine rollout is crucial to an effective immunisation campaign. Vaccine delays and refusals not only place individuals directly at risk but can contribute to lowering vaccination thresholds required for herd immunity. Geographic clustering of non-vaccinators can be particularly troublesome, as these "cold spots" can disproportionately increase required vaccination levels for herd immunity in adjacent settings, as they serve as infection hubs amplifying the spread of disease[13,14].

In this large-scale modelling study, intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine is estimated at the sub-national level across the UK using survey data from over 16,820 individuals. Multilevel regression and poststratification (MRP) – a robust statistical method recently used to successfully predict national general election results in the UK[15] – is used to obtain these sub-national estimates and to identify the socio-econo-demographic barriers to vaccine acceptance. This analysis aims to provide policymakers with estimates for COVID-19 uptake rates among the UK adult population and to highlight regions and socio-economic groups that may be disinclined to receive the vaccine and could pose challenges for reaching herd immunity across all UK regions.

Methods

Data collection

Between 24 September and 14 October 2020, a cross-sectional online survey probing acceptance of a novel COVID-19 vaccine was administered to 17,684 UK residents aged 18 and over. All respondents were recruited via an online panel by ORB (Gallup) International (www.orb-international.com). This sample size was chosen to maximise the number of observations within each of the sub-national regions; this study has approximately 100 observations for each of the 174 sub-national regions, which far exceeds sizes used in similar research[16]. During data collection, quality control procedures that included the detection of respondents with exceptionally high click-through rates or who "straight-lined" (providing the same response to each question) resulted in the removal of 864 respondents. Respondent quotas were set according to national demographic distributions for sex, age, and sub-national region (the third level of the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, or 'NUTS3'[*]) and which were re-adjusted based on the removal of respondents through the ongoing quality control checks during data collection. These quotas ensured a geographic spread of respondents across the UK, between the sexes, and across all age groups. Descriptions for all respondent data collected and recoding are provided in table 1. A breakdown of the number of individuals surveyed by socio-econo-demographic characteristic is found in appendix 1, figure A1.

Respondents' outer postcodes are mapped to the 174 sub-national NUTS3 units. The maximum number of surveys conducted in a NUTS3 region is 293 (Hertfordshire) and the minimum is 16 (Mid and East Antrim). The mean number of responses per NUTS3 unit is 96·7 (with standard deviation 52·1) and the median is 85. The survey counts for each NUTS3 region can be found in the supplementary data file.

Outcome variable

Respondents are asked whether they would accept a COVID-19 vaccine ("*If a new coronavirus (COVID-19) vaccine became available, would you accept the vaccine for yourself?*"). Respondents could provide one of four responses on an ordinal scale: "*yes, definitely*", "*unsure, but leaning towards yes*", "*unsure, but leaning towards no*", or "*no, definitely not*". The rationale behind this choice of responses is to elicit an explicit vaccination intent rather than provide a continuous or Likert scale, from which the intent to vaccinate may be less clear. This variable is modelled as a four-class ordinal response (see *Statistical analysis*).

Covariates

Socio-econo-demographic data was collected for each respondent to assess the relationship between these characteristics and vaccine intent and to allow for the reweighting of respondents' vaccination intent according to census data (both via multilevel regression and poststratification, see *Statistical analysis*). These covariate data were therefore chosen to align with the socio-econo-demographic data collected in the latest UK census. The covariate data collected for each individual was: sex, age, highest educational attainment, religious affiliation, ethnicity, employment status, primary language, and outer postcode (the first half of a UK postcode). Variables are recoded to avoid any missing data; for example, individuals who do not wish to provide their religious affiliation are recoded to religion "not given" (table 1). The recoding of covariate data preserved all data resulting in no missing data. Summary counts across all groups are provided in appendix 1, table A1.

Statistical analysis

Multilevel regression and poststratification (MRP)[15,17] is used to estimate intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine across the 174 sub-national NUTS across the UK and to identify the socio-econo-demographic barriers to

[*] See https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/ukgeographies/eurostat for further details (accessed 25 November 2020)

uptake. MRP comprises two stages[18]. In stage one, a multilevel regression model is fit (using response and covariate data described above and in table 1) to determine, for each possible stratum of socio-econo-demographic status and sub-national unit, the probability of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance for each of the four ordinal responses (see *Outcome variable*). In the second step, these probabilities are reweighted according to the frequency with which each stratum appears in the country (obtained via census records). In this study there are a total of $I = 30{,}870$ socio-econo-demographic strata: two sexes × seven age groups × three education levels × seven affiliations for religion × five ethnicity groupings × seven employment statuses × three languages, in addition to $J = 174$ sub-national regions – see table 1. Further MRP details and benefits are given in appendix 2.

A Bayesian multilevel proportional-odds logistic regression model[19] is used in the first step to yield the probability θ_{sj} that an individual belonging to a specific stratum $s = 1, \dots, S$ and sub-national region $j = 1, \dots, J$ would "definitely" accept a COVID-19 vaccine if it were available. The associated proportion $w_{sj} = \frac{N_{sj}}{\sum_s N_{sj}}$ of times this stratum appears in each UK region is calculated using the UK census microdata sample, which provides 5 million individual census records, representative of the whole UK population[†]. Sub-national estimates of the proportion of individuals who would "definitely" accept a COVID-19 vaccine are therefore given by $\sum_s \theta_{sj} p_{sj}$. (National estimates can be calculated similarly.) As the census microdata sample is assumed to be representative, no uncertainty in the weights is considered in the modelling process: this is a study limitation (see *Discussion*). The multilevel regression model's fixed- and random-effects describing the effect of each socio-econo-demographic characteristic on uptake intent at the national and sub-national levels (respectively) are also reported.

Model inference

Model inference is performed using Markov chain Monte Carlo: Gibbs sampling is used to estimate the posterior distribution of multilevel model parameters using 20,000 draws from the posterior distribution following successful model burn in. Relevant statistics for parameters of interest (percentages, odds-ratios and log odds-ratios) are reported as a mean estimate (the effect size) with a corresponding highest posterior density (HPD) credible interval. `R` version 4.0.3 is used for all statistical analyses. JAGS v 4.3.0 is used (via `rjags`) to implement Gibbs sampling. See appendix 3 for full model implementation and inference details.

Role of the funding source: The funders had no role in data collection, questionnaire design, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of this study. The author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Results

MRP Estimates of COVID-19 vaccination intent

Across the UK, just under half the population – 47·5% (95% highest posterior density interval (HPDI) 46·5 to 48·5%) – would "definitely" take a COVID-19 vaccine according to the MRP-based estimates of uptake intent. A further 32·6% (31·8 to 33·2%) are leaning towards vaccinating but are unsure. 8·7% (8·2 to 9·2%) would "definitely not" take a COVID-19 vaccine and 11·2% (10·7 to 11·8%) are unsure but leaning towards no (fig 1).

Sub-national MRP estimates of the proportion of each of the UK's 174 NUTS regions who would "definitely" accept a COVID-19 vaccine are mapped in figure 2. The values in figure 2 are repeated in figure 3 with their

[†] See https://census.ukdataservice.ac.uk/get-data/microdata.aspx (accessed 25 November 2020)

corresponding 70% and 95% HPDIs and are ranked from lowest to highest acceptance by broad UK region. (Raw values for the MRP estimates and HPDIs for each of the 174 sub-national regions and each of the four outcome variable options are provided in the supplementary data file).

Estimates across the 174 sub-national NUTS regions of the UK vary considerably. Estimates of the proportion of the public who would "definitely" accept a COVID-19 vaccine range from 28·3% (20·1 to 35·7%) in Haringey and Islington to 64·8% (54·2 to 76·6%) in East Cumbria (fig 2 and fig 3). The lowest proportions of the UK public who would "definitely" accept a COVID-19 vaccine are concentrated in London, which contains 13 of the 20 lowest proportions in the UK: Haringey and Islington (28·3%, 20·1 to 35·7%); Barking, and Dagenham and Havering (32·0%, 24·4 to 41·5%); Redbridge and Waltham Forest (32·4%, 26·0 to 39·1%); Lewisham and Southwark (32·6%, 26·4 to 39·9%); Bexley and Greenwich (34·1%, 26·1 to 42·4%); Ealing (34·3%, 23·2% to 42·7%); Lambeth (34·4%, 25·8 to 42·8%); Brent (34·7%, 25·7 to 43·7%); Tower Hamlets (36·5%, 27·4 to 46·8%); Wandsworth (38·1%, 28·0 to 47·9%); Westminster (38·4%, 31·6 to 45·7%); Enfield (38·5%, 30·0 to 47·2%); and Harrow and Hillingdon (39·1%, 29·0 to 48·3%). Four of the remaining seven regions in the lowest 20 are in North West England: Blackburn with Darwen (33·7%, 21·0 to 44·2%), Greater Manchester North East (Bury, Oldham, and Rochdale) (34·5%, 27·5 to 41·4%), Liverpool (36·8%, 27·4 to 46·6%), Blackpool (38·3%, 25·9 to 53·0%). The remaining three areas in the lowest 20 are West Essex (East of England, 38·8%, 29·1 to 49·6%), Sandwell (West Midlands, 37·9%, 27·6 to 48·6%), and the City of Kingston upon Hull (Yorkshire and the Humber, 36·9%, 27·0 to 46·6%).

The five regions with the highest proportions of the UK public who would "definitely" accept a COVID-19 vaccine are East Cumbria (64·8%, 54·2 to 76·6%), Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire (63·2%, 54·9 to 71·1%), West Cumbria (61·5%, 48·3 to 75·3%), Conwy and Denbighshire (61·3%, 50·3 to 73·7%), and the City of Edinburgh (59·6%, 51·0 to 67·1%). The top 20 regions disproportionately contain regions in Scotland (5 regions) and Northern Ireland (4) (fig 3 and the supplementary data file). (In fact, Scotland and NI have 13 of the highest-ranking regions in the top 26.)

Estimates for the proportions of respondents who would "definitely, not" or who are "unsure" about taking a COVID-19 vaccine are provided in the supplementary data file and mapped in the appendix, figures A2 and A3.

Determinants of vaccination intent

The fixed-effects in the ordinal multilevel regression (see *Statistical analysis* and appendix 2) – which represent an "average" impact of socio-econo-demographic characteristics on vaccination intent across the whole country – are shown in figure 4.

A number of factors are associated with COVID-19 vaccine intent. Males are more likely than females (odds ratio 1·59, 95% HPDI 1·47 to 1·73) to accept a COVID-19 vaccine. Older age groups are more likely to accept a COVID-19 vaccine than 18-24-year-olds, in particular 65-79 and 80+ year-olds (2·40, 2·01 to 2·80 and 2·67, 1·86 to 3·94, respectively). Interestingly, 25-34-year-olds are *less* likely than 18-24-year-olds to accept a vaccine (0·78, 0·68 to 0·89). Individuals with undergraduate or postgraduate qualifications (level 4) are more likely than those with GCSEs, A- or O-levels to accept a vaccine (1·38, 1·28 to 1·51) while those with no formal qualifications or other qualifications (see table 1) are less likely (0·80, 0·72 to 0·90).

There is no evidence to suggest those who identify as Christian are more or less likely than atheists or agnostics to accept a vaccine (1·03, 0·94 to 1·12), those reporting Hinduism or Judaism as their religion are more likely than atheists or agnostics to accept a vaccine (1·66, 1·11 to 2·43 and 1·56, 1·04 to 2·43, respectively). Those

identifying as Muslim (0·75, 0·57 to 0·96), not providing their religion (0·74, 0·64 to 0·86), or stating an "other" religious affiliation (0·72, 0·62 to 0·82) are less likely to accept a COVID-19 than atheists or agnostics. Ethnicity also plays a role in determining intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine, independently of religion, with those identifying as Black or Black British (0·47, 0·38 to 0·60) and those reporting an "other" ethnicity than those provided (0·72, 0·56 to 0·93) less likely to accept a COVID-19 vaccine than Whites.

Individuals' employment status appears to play less of a role than the other factors outlined above, with odds ratios closer to one. However, there is evidence to suggest that those in part-time work (0·87, 0·79 to 0·97) or who are unemployed (0·84, 0·71 to 1·00) are less likely than those in full-time in employment to accept a COVID-19 vaccine, while students (1·23, 1·02 to 1·47) are more likely.

Individuals who report a language other than English or Welsh as their primary language hold less intent to accept to accept a vaccine than those reporting English or Welsh (Polish 0·45, 0·31 to 0·63 and "other" language 0·70, 0·59 to 0·83).

The parameters that describe the relationship between each of the factors considered and vaccine uptake within each region (that is, the model's random effects) are provided in supplementary data file. There are a total of 4,698 odds ratios for these random effects (excluding intercept parameters), of which 319 (6.8%) have a 95% HPDI that excludes zero. These random effects are shown in figure A3, appendix 2 with some regions highlighted. For example, in Tower Hamlets (London), there are strong associations between a number of factors and uptake intent: sex (males more likely than females), age (65-79-year-olds more likely than 18-24-year-olds), and ethnicity (Black/Black British less likely than White). These random effects are not further remarked upon in this study, however, all region-specific random-effect parameters with corresponding HPD intervals are provided for national and local policymakers in the supplementary data file.

Discussion

Main findings

This study reports multiple findings of immediate relevance to clinicians and policymakers involved with the delivery of a COVID-19 vaccine. This study estimates that less than half the UK public would "definitely" accept a COVID-19 vaccine, with strong regional variation in estimates. Although a relatively small proportion (8·7%, 8·2 to 9·2%) state that they would "definitely, not" accept a vaccine, rates of rejection intent are much higher in London and the North West (figure A2 and the supplementary data file), where they reach as high as 18·0% (14·8 to 20·7%) in Haringey and Islington. Since February 2020, London and the North West have experienced high disease burdens. The North West is particularly notable in this regard as four of the five UK regions with the highest infection rate (correct of 20 November 2020) are all in the North West: Blackburn and Darwen (6,312 per 100,000), Oldham (6,157), Rochdale (5,585), and Manchester (5,539)[20]. Interestingly, Blackburn and Darwen has the fifth lowest intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine (ranking 170 out of 174), while Oldham and Rochdale rank ninth lowest (Greater Manchester North East – which contains both these towns – ranks 166 out of 174). Manchester fares a little better ranking 148 out of 174. These results point to an important possible interaction between high COVID-19 rates and low vaccine acceptance and the effect this may have on vaccination rates required for herd/community immunity in adjacent regions[13,14,21].
Socio-econo-demographic background is strongly associated with intent to accept the vaccine. This study finds strong evidence to suggest that males, and older age groups are substantially more likely to accept a COVID-19 vaccine than females and 18-24-year-olds (respectively). Highest level of education, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and primary language are also found to be strongly related to intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine. Most notably, individuals who identify as Black or Black British are much less likely than Whites to intend to receive the vaccine, as too are those reporting Polish as their primary language.

These associations have been found with regards to existing immunisation programmes[22–25], as well as – more recently – with respect to vaccine acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine specifically. A study of over 30,000 adults in the UK conducted between 7 September to 5 October, found similar rates of intent to reject a vaccine (14% of respondents unwilling to receive a vaccine compared to 8·7% -- comparison of intent to accept a vaccine is difficult due to differences in questionnaire wording and socio-economic drivers of intent[9]. Notably, that females and those with education levels below postgraduate degrees were less likely to accept a COVID-19 vaccine. A link between BAME groups and uptake was not found at a 95% significance testing interval, however[9] (this could be because of the aggregation of BAME groups and/or a different set of predictor variables used to explain variation in uptake intent). Two other recent studies examining COVID-19 vaccine intent in England and Scotland, however, do find that intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine is modulated by ethnicity, with non-Whites less likely to accept a COVID-19 vaccine[26,27]. As risk of severe COVID-19 is greater in BAME communities[28], achieving high vaccine acceptance may avert further burden within these communities. (The author refers policymakers to the supplementary data file which reveals regions in which there is a strong association between ethnicity and uptake intent.)

There are a number of study limitations to note. Firstly, this study maps intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine across the entire population and does not assess vaccine acceptance among at-risk groups or healthcare workers, who are likely to be the first groups offered a novel vaccine. Secondly, the most recent census data used for probability reweighting (see *Statistical analysis* and appendix 2) is from 2011. Large changes in the demographic structure of the 174 regional populations could, therefore, result in biased estimates of vaccine intent. Finally, the study was conducted online with a sample of panellists who registered to take part in research surveys. While efforts have been made to ensure representativeness via MRP, there may be a bias among respondents who have access to (and can use) mobile phones or computers, through which the questionnaire would be completed.

While this study provides a comprehensive snapshot of intent to accept a vaccine across the UK in September and October 2020, it predates both the Pfizer announcement that approval is being sought for use in the UK and the peak of the second wave of daily new coronavirus cases. Attitudes may change on short timescales. As the second wave passes, the UK public may have a decreased appreciation for the importance of the vaccine through either a decrease in the perception of the seriousness of disease or a belief that they have already been infected with SARS-CoV-2 (which is associated with willingness to vaccinate24. Fears relating to the safety of the vaccine could also grow due to the relative speed of vaccine development or because vaccinating is now a reality rather than a hypothetical. Online misinformation could also play a role in shaping vaccination beliefs. Despite these limitations, this study greatly extends existing research on both COVID-19 vaccine intentions and – more broadly – on the spatial resolution obtained for studies estimating nations' vaccination beliefs or intentions[30,31]. By virtue of a more granular sub-national modelling approach, estimates are derived at regional scales consistent with those relevant for local policymaking. Estimates in this study could, for instance, be integrated into epidemiological models of COVID-19 spread to forecast case counts and deaths under predicted coverage or used to estimate where future COVID-19 epidemics may occur.

As the UK rolls out a vaccine across the UK to at-risk groups, a lot is still unknown about the acceptance of the vaccine among both at-risk groups and the wider population. While evidence in this study suggests that older age groups will likely be more accepting of a new vaccine, this study provides no geographic estimates, nor does it probe factors that may lower barriers to vaccinating. Future research could explore best practices on how to deliver vaccines to at-risk groups in light of the socio-economic and regional variation in attitudes.

Policymakers will need to be prepared to address vaccine concerns. As this study reveals, intent to accept a COVID-19 is strongly dependent on socio-economic background and is thus also therefore highly heterogeneous across the UK. Designing effective communication materials, while emphasising the benefits of vaccinating for yourself and others, may also need to address group-specific concerns.

***Table 1*. Study data** Survey items are shown with the responses (including recodes, if any), and baselines used in the ordinal logistic regressions. COVID-19 vaccination intent is the study response variable. The explanatory variables are socio-economic and demographic factors.

Survey question	**Values** (recodes, including to align with UK census in parenthesis)	**Regression baseline**
Response: COVID-19 vaccination intent		
If a new coronavirus (COVID-19) vaccine became available, would you accept the vaccine for yourself?	yes, definitely; unsure, but leaning towards yes; unsure but leaning towards no no, definitely not	n/a (response variable)
Covariates: socio-econo-demographic factors		
sex	male and female	male
age	integer value mapped to 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65-79, 80+	18-24
highest educational attainment	No academic qualifications (none/other) 0-4 GCSE, O-levels, or equivalents (level 1-3) 5+ GCSE, O-levels, 1 A level, or equivalents (level 1-3) 2+ A levels or equivalents (level 1-3) Undergraduate or postgraduate degree or other professional qualification (level 4) Apprenticeship (none/other) Other (e.g., vocational, foreign qualifications) (none/other) Do not know (none/other) Do not wish to answer (none/other)	level 1-3
religious affiliation	atheist/agnostic Christian Buddhist (other religion) Hindu Muslim other religion do not wish to answer (not given)	atheist / agnostic
work status	working full-time (including self-employed) part-time (including self-employed) unemployed student looking after the home retired (retired / disabled) unable to work (e.g., short- or long-term disability) (retired / disabled) do not wish to answer (other work status)	full-time
ethnicity	White: English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British (White) White: Irish (White) White: Other white background (White) White and Black Caribbean (mixed) White and Black African (mixed) White and Asian or White and Asian British (mixed) Black, African, Caribbean or Black British (Black/Black British) Asian or Asian British: Indian (Asian/Asian British) Asian or Asian British: Pakistani (Asian/Asian British) Asian or Asian British: Chinese (Asian/Asian British) Asian or Asian British: Other (Asian/Asian British) other ethnicity (other ethnicity) do not wish to answer (other ethnicity)	White
language	English or Welsh Polish Punjabi (other language) Urdu (other language) Bengali (other language) Other (other language) do not wish to answer (other language)	English or Welsh



***Figure* 2 National-level estimates of COVID-19 vaccine uptake intent.** National-level estimates for the percentage of the UK that would: "definitely not" accept a COVID-19 vaccine, "definitely" accept a COVID-19 vaccine, or who are unsure. Uncertainty in estimates are 95% HPD intervals.



***Figure* 3. Intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine**. The estimated proportion of respondents in each of the UK's 174 NUTS3 region who would definitely accept a COVID-19 vaccine are shown. Regional boundaries are used under the Open Government License v3.0 (see https://data.gov.uk/dataset/b147a160-86b6-48e4-8dd0-f35b90981814/nuts-level-3-january-2015-super-generalised-clipped-boundaries-in-england-and-wales accessed 25 November 2020).



***Figure* 4. Ranked intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine**. The estimated proportion of respondents in each of the UK's 174 NUTS3 region who would definitely accept a COVID-19 vaccine are shown and ranked within the 12 first-level NUTS regions (NUTS1). 70% and 95% highest posterior density intervals (horizontal bars) are shown around the mean estimate (dot). Each region is suffixed by its rank (out of 174) according to the estimated proportion who would "definitely" accept a COVID-19 vaccine. East Cumbria (North West England) ranks first, while Haringey and Islington (London) is last.



Figure 5. **The socio-econo-demographic determinants of intent to accept a COVID-19 vaccine**. Multilevel regression fixed-effect parameter log odds ratios are plotted with corresponding 95% HPDIs. These log odds ratios are coloured by effect magnitude and direction, where blues (reds) signify that the group is more (less) likely than the baseline group to accept a COVID-19 vaccine. The darker the colour the stronger the association. For each factor, the baseline group is provided in parentheses on the left. Odds ratios with 95% HPDIs are shown on the right for each parameter.

References

1. UK Government. *UK authorises Pfizer/BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine*. (2020).
2. Brown, K. F. *et al.* UK parents' decision-making about measles-mumps-rubella (MMR) vaccine 10 years after the MMR-autism controversy: A qualitative analysis. *Vaccine* (2012) doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.12.127.
3. World Health Organization. WHO UNICEF estimates of national immunisation coverage. https://www.who.int/immunization/monitoring_surveillance/data/en/ (2019).
4. Edelstein, M. *et al.* Keep calm and carry on vaccinating: Is anti-vaccination sentiment contributing to declining vaccine coverage in England? *Vaccine* (2020) doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.05.082.
5. NHS. Childhood Vaccination Coverage Statistics - England 2018-19. (2019).
6. WHO. Measles reported cases. (2020).
7. Jacqui, W. MMR vaccine: Johnson urges new impetus to increase uptake as UK loses measles-free-status. *BMJ* **l5219**, (2019).
8. Sherman, S. M. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccination intention in the UK: results from the COVID-19 vaccination acceptability study (CoVAccS), a nationally representative cross-sectional survey. *Hum. Vaccin. Immunother.* 1–10 (2020) doi:10.1080/21645515.2020.1846397.
9. Paul, E., Steptoe, A. & Fancourt, D. Anti-vaccine attitudes and risk factors for not agreeing to vaccination against COVID-19 amongst 32,361 UK adults: Implications for public health communications. *medRxiv* 2020.10.21.20216218 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.10.21.20216218.
10. Loomba, S., de Figueiredo, A., Piatek, S. J., de Graaf, K. & Larson, H. J. Measuring the Impact of Exposure to COVID-19 Vaccine Misinformation on Vaccine Intent in the UK and US. *medRxiv* 2020.10.22.20217513 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.10.22.20217513.
11. Pennycook, G., McPhetres, J., Zhang, Y., Lu, J. G. & Rand, D. G. Fighting COVID-19 Misinformation on Social Media: Experimental Evidence for a Scalable Accuracy-Nudge Intervention. *Psychol. Sci.* (2020) doi:10.1177/0956797620939054.
12. Megget, K. Even covid-19 can't kill the anti-vaccination movement. *The BMJ* (2020) doi:10.1136/bmj.m2184.
13. Salathé, M. & Bonhoeffer, S. The effect of opinion clustering on disease outbreaks. *J. R. Soc. Interface* (2008) doi:10.1098/rsif.2008.0271.
14. Peeples, L. Rethinking herd immunity. *Nature medicine* (2019) doi:10.1038/s41591-019-0515-2.
15. Lauderdale, B. E., Bailey, D., Blumenau, J. & Rivers, D. Model-based pre-election polling for national and sub-national outcomes in the US and UK. *Int. J. Forecast.* (2020) doi:10.1016/j.ijforecast.2019.05.012.
16. Hanretty, C. An Introduction to Multilevel Regression and Post-Stratification for Estimating Constituency Opinion. *Polit. Stud. Rev.* (2020) doi:10.1177/1478929919864773.
17. Kastellec, J. P., Lax, J. R. & Phillips, J. *Estimating State Public Opinion With Multi-Level Regression and Poststratification using R. Unpublished manuscript* (2014).
18. Gao, Y., Kennedy, L., Simpson, D. & Gelman, A. Improving multilevel regression and poststratification with structured priors. *arXiv* (2019) doi:10.1214/20-ba1223.
19. Gelman, A. & Hill, J. *Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models*. *Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models* (2006). doi:10.1017/cbo9780511790942.
20. Government, U. Coronavirus (COVID-19) in the UK. https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk (2020).
21. Kwok, K. O., Lai, F., Wei, W. I., Wong, S. Y. S. & Tang, J. W. T. Herd immunity – estimating the level required to halt the COVID-19 epidemics in affected countries. *Journal of Infection* (2020) doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.03.027.
22. Forster, A. S. *et al.* Ethnicity-specific factors influencing childhood immunisation decisions among Black and Asian Minority Ethnic groups in the UK: A systematic review of qualitative research. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* (2017) doi:10.1136/jech-2016-207366.
23. Samad, L. *et al.* Differences in risk factors for partial and no immunisation in the first year of life: Prospective cohort study. *Br. Med. J.* (2006) doi:10.1136/bmj.332.7553.1312.
24. Tiley, K. S., White, J. M., Andrews, N., Ramsay, M. & Edelstein, M. Inequalities in childhood

vaccination timing and completion in London. *Vaccine* (2018) doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.09.032.
25. Ward, C. *et al.* Sociodemographic predictors of variation in coverage of the national shingles vaccination programme in England, 2014/15. *Vaccine* (2017) doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.03.042.
26. Bell, S., Clarke, R., Mounier-Jack, S., Walker, J. L. & Paterson, P. Parents' and guardians' views on the acceptability of a future COVID-19 vaccine: A multi-methods study in England. *Vaccine* (2020) doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.10.027.
27. Williams, L., Flowers, P., McLeod, J., Young, D. & Rollins, L. Social patterning and stability of COVID-19 vaccination acceptance in Scotland: Will those most at risk accept a vaccine? *medRxiv* 2020.11.19.20234682 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.11.19.20234682.
28. Raisi-Estabragh, Z. *et al.* Greater risk of severe COVID-19 in Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic populations is not explained by cardiometabolic, socioeconomic or behavioural factors, or by 25(OH)-vitamin D status: study of 1326 cases from the UK Biobank. *J. Public Health (Oxf).* (2020) doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdaa095.
29. Loomba, S., de Figueiredo, A., Piatek, S. J., de Graaf, K. & Larson, H. J. Measuring the Impact of Exposure to COVID-19 Vaccine Misinformation on Vaccine Intent in the UK and US. *medRxiv* 2020.10.22.20217513 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.10.22.20217513.
30. de Figueiredo, A., Simas, C., Karafillakis, E., Paterson, P. & Larson, H. J. Mapping global trends in vaccine confidence and investigating barriers to vaccine uptake: a large-scale retrospective temporal modelling study. *Lancet* (2020) doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)31558-0.
31. Lazarus, J. V. *et al.* A global survey of potential acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine. *Nat. Med.* (2020) doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1124-9.