

24 vaccine acceptors would prefer to be vaccinated.

25 **Design**

26 43-question cross-sectional survey conducted November 17-18, 2020, distributed on Amazon
27 Mechanical Turk, an online labor marketplace where individuals receive a nominal fee (here,
28 \$1.80) for anonymously completing tasks.

29 **Eligible Participants**

30 United States residents 18-88 years of age, excluding healthcare workers. A total 1,756 volunteer
31 respondents completed the survey (median age 38 years, 53% female).

32 **Main Outcome Measure**

33 Multivariable logistic regression modeled the primary outcome of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy
34 (defined as non-acceptance or being unsure about acceptance of the COVID-19 vaccine) with
35 respondent characteristics.

36 **Results**

37 A total 663 respondents (37.8%) were COVID-19 vaccine hesitant (374 [21.3%] non-acceptors
38 and 289 [16.5%] unsure about accepting). Vaccine hesitancy was associated with not receiving
39 influenza vaccination in the past 5 years (odds ratio [OR] 4.07, 95% confidence interval [CI]
40 3.26-5.07, $p < 0.01$), female gender (OR 2.12, 95%CI 1.70-2.65, $p < 0.01$), Black race (OR 1.54,
41 95%CI 1.05-2.26, $p = 0.03$), having a high school education or less (OR 1.46, 95%CI 1.03-2.07,
42 $p = 0.03$), and Republican party affiliation (OR 2.41, 95%CI 1.88-3.10, $p < 0.01$). Primary reasons
43 for hesitancy were concerns about side effects, need for more information, and doubts about
44 vaccine efficacy. Preferred sites for vaccination for acceptors were primary doctors'
45 offices/clinics, pharmacies, and dedicated vaccination locations.

46 **Conclusions**

- 47 In this recent national survey, over one-third of respondents were COVID-19 vaccine hesitant.
- 48 To increase vaccine acceptance, public health interventions should target vaccine hesitant
- 49 populations with messaging that addresses their concerns about safety and efficacy.

50 INTRODUCTION

51 The greatest public health crisis of the past century, the COVID-19 pandemic has led to
52 over 1.8 million deaths globally as of January 3, 2021 (1). The three tenets of the public health
53 response to the pandemic remain social distancing, mask wearing, and vaccination (2,3).
54 However, these mitigation measures are only as effective as their broad acceptance and
55 implementation.

56 Along with research and development of therapeutics, the most anticipated control
57 measures are a series of COVID-19 vaccines, two of which - as of this writing - have received
58 United States (U.S.) Food and Drug Administration emergency use authorizations (4). As
59 COVID-19 vaccination is implemented across the U.S., a critical question remains as to how
60 much of the population will accept it. For COVID-19 vaccination to effectively confer herd
61 immunity, experts agree that at least 60-70% of the population will need to be vaccinated (5).
62 Vaccine hesitancy, a phenomenon which predates the pandemic, has been well studied with other
63 vaccinations, including the influenza and Measles/Mumps/Rubella vaccines. Recent influenza
64 vaccine vaccination hesitancy rates have hovered at approximately 40% (6–9). The traditionally
65 low rates of influenza vaccination in Black, Latinx, and Native American populations are of
66 particular concern since these groups have had disproportionately poor outcomes during the
67 COVID-19 pandemic (9–11). While a recent study found that COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy rates
68 have varied between 26-44% (with rates increasing throughout 2020), the reasons for vaccine
69 refusal in late 2020 have yet to be fully described (12). These reasons are especially relevant as
70 we begin public vaccination programs in early 2021.

71 With the need for widespread acceptance of COVID-19 vaccination in mind, the
72 objectives of this survey study were to determine: 1) the US population rate of COVID-19

73 vaccine hesitancy (defined as either non-acceptance or unsure about acceptance of the COVID-
74 19 vaccine), 2) characteristics associated with hesitancy, 3) reasons for hesitancy, and 4) health
75 care sites where respondents would prefer to receive the vaccine.

76

77 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

78 *Study Setting and Population*

79 We distributed this cross-sectional survey from November 17 to November 18, 2020 on
80 Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk, <https://www.mturk.com>), an online labor marketplace in
81 which individuals anonymously complete tasks, including surveys, and in return receive a
82 nominal fee (in this case, \$1.80). MTurk is well-validated for behavioral experiments and
83 increasingly used to study healthcare questions, and data from MTurk are considered reliable
84 (13,14). This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at <redacted for review>.

85 We recruited U.S. residents between 18 and 88 years of age from MTurk to complete a
86 43-question survey. Because our goal was to assess vaccine hesitancy in a more medically naïve
87 population, we excluded respondents self-identifying as healthcare workers.

88 *Survey Instrument*

89 The survey (Supplement) included questions regarding demographic characteristics,
90 health insurance status, healthcare utilization, employment and housing status, and political
91 affiliation. Survey respondents were then asked a series of questions regarding self-reported
92 adherence to different COVID-19 mitigation measures and previous influenza vaccinations.
93 After a short descriptor about the COVID-19 vaccine including the statement that it would likely
94 be provided free of charge, participants were asked, “Would you accept the COVID-19 vaccine
95 when it becomes available?” Respondents who responded that they would accept it were then

96 asked their preferred location to receive a COVID-19 vaccine. The survey also contained quality
97 assurance questions to ensure meaningful responses. Respondents not appropriately responding
98 to these questions were excluded from analyses.

99 *Primary and Secondary Outcome Measures*

100 The primary outcome measure was COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy - defined as either non-
101 acceptance or being unsure about acceptance of the COVID-19 vaccine. Other outcomes
102 included patient characteristics associated with vaccine hesitancy, reasons for hesitancy, and
103 health care sites where vaccine acceptors would prefer to be vaccinated.

104 *Statistical Analysis*

105 We coded survey items as continuous, ordinal, or categorical variables in accordance
106 with their survey presentation and report respondent demographics using standard descriptive
107 statistics, e.g., medians and interquartile ranges (IQRs). We transformed the primary outcome of
108 COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy from a nominal to a dichotomized (no/yes) categorical variable for
109 primary analysis and used the Chi-squared test with Bonferroni correction for multiple
110 comparisons to assess association of this outcome with characteristics of age, gender, race,
111 political affiliation, and receipt of influenza in previous years. We then used a multivariable
112 logistic regression to model the primary outcome variable with these same predictor
113 characteristics.

114 To more intuitively depict COVID-19 vaccine acceptance (the converse of vaccine
115 hesitancy), we chose the regression modelling technique of classification tree analysis and
116 plotted results in a personograph. To prevent overfitting, we pruned the full tree to a smaller
117 subtree using minimum-error pruning.

118 In terms of sample size calculation, we sought to power the primary outcome to 95% in

119 assessment of its association with four characteristics - gender, race, age, and political affiliation.
120 To adjust for multiple comparisons, we used an alpha level of 0.0125 (0.05/4) for statistical
121 significance. Given the above information, the sample size needed to detect a small effect size
122 (w) of 0.1 for a Chi-squared test with 1 degree of freedom $[(2-1)*(2-1)]$ was 1,716.

123 We conformed our study reporting to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational
124 Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines. We used JAMOVI v1.2.14.0 (Sydney,
125 Australia) for statistical analyses.

126

127 **RESULTS**

128 *Population Characteristics*

129 Of 1,786 adult respondents, we excluded 30 for poor quality responses. Characteristics of
130 the 1,756 respondents comprising the final study cohort are shown in Table 1. Most respondents
131 self-identified as female (53%, $n=931$) and White (77%, $n=1,356$); their median age was 38
132 years (IQR 31-48). Approximately 85% ($n=1,491$) of the respondents had health insurance, and
133 78% ($n=1,362$) reported regular access to medical care. Most respondents lived with other people
134 (84%, $n=1474$), including a significant other (71%, $n=1,047$), children <18 years of age (48%,
135 $n=706$), and parents (21%, $n=316$). Approximately 8% ($n=149$) of respondents reported a
136 previous diagnosis of COVID-19, and 20% ($n=349$) reported that one or more family members
137 were previously diagnosed with COVID-19.

138 **Table 1. Characteristics of U.S. Survey Respondents on Amazon Mechanical Turk**
139 **($n=1,756$).**

Characteristic	N (%)
Gender	
Male	810 (46)

Characteristic	N (%)
Female	931 (53)
Non-binary	15 (1)
Age (median, IQR)	38 (31-48)
Race/Ethnicity	
Non-Hispanic White	1,356 (77)
Non-Hispanic Black	152 (9)
Hispanic/Latinx	100 (6)
Asian	97 (6)
Other	51 (3)
<u>Covid-19 Diagnosis</u>	
Yes	149 (8)
No / Unsure	1,607 (91)
Flu Vaccine Acceptance	
Yes	1051 (60)
No	675 (38)
Unsure	30 (2)
Education	
No High School	3 (0)
Grades 9-11	15 (1)
Grade 12 or GED	180 (10)
College 1-3 years	448 (26)
College 4 years or more	799 (46)
Graduate or Professional degree	311 (18)
Region of Residence	
Northeast	316 (18)
Midwest	373 (21)
South	681 (39)
West	385 (21.9)
Unknown	1 (0)
Health Insurance	
Yes	1,491 (85)
No	219 (12)

Characteristic	N (%)
Currently Applying for Insurance	38 (2)
Unsure	10 (1)
Regular Access to Medical Care	
Yes	1,361 (78)
No	394 (22)
Annual Income	
<u>Less than \$15k</u>	<u>90 (5)</u>
\$15k-25k	178 (10)
\$26k-40k	338 (19)
\$41k-59k	381 (22)
\$60k-89k	414 (24)
Greater than \$90k	355 (20)
<u>Living with Others</u>	
Yes	1,474 (84)
No	282 (16)
If yes, how many? (median, IQR)	2 (1-3)
Political Affiliation	
Conservative Republican	252 (15)
Moderate Republican	155 (9)
Liberal Republican	115 (7)
Conservative Democrat	127 (7)
Moderate Democrat	236 (14)
Liberal Democrat	458 (27)
Conservative Independent	95 (6)
Moderate Independent	109 (6)
Liberal Independent	145 (8)
Unsure	24 (1)

140 IQR = interquartile range; k = 1000

141 ***COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy***

142 When asked about acceptance of the COVID-19 vaccine, 37.8% (663) were COVID-19
 143 vaccine hesitant: 374 (21.3%) non-acceptors and 289 (16.5%) unsure about accepting. A similar

144 proportion (40.1%, n=705) reported not receiving the influenza vaccine within the last five years.

145 In the multivariable logistic regression model (Table 2), respondents were more likely to
 146 be vaccine hesitant if they had not previously had an influenza vaccine (odds ratio [OR] 4.07,
 147 95% confidence interval [CI] 3.26-5.07, p<0.01), identified as female (vs. male, OR 2.12, 95% CI
 148 1.70-2.65, p<0.01), were Black (vs. White, OR 1.54, 95%CI 1.05-2.26, p=0.03), had a high
 149 school education or less (vs. college or more, OR 1.46, 95%CI 1.03-2.07, p=0.03), and were
 150 Republican (vs. Democrat, OR 2.41, 95%CI 1.88-3.10, p<0.01).

151 **Table 2. Predictors of Hesitancy of a Free Covid-19 Vaccine**

Predictor Variables	adjusted OR	95% Confidence Interval	
		Lower	Upper
Previous Influenza Vaccine Refusal	4.07	3.26	5.07
Gender			
Male	Reference	?	?
Female	2.12	1.70	2.65
Other	0.19	0.02	1.58
Income			
< \$41k	1.06	0.77	1.45
\$41k - \$89k	1.19	0.89	1.60
≥ \$90k	Reference	?	?
Education			
High School or Less	1.46	1.03	2.07
College or More	Reference	?	?
Race			
Black	1.54	1.05	2.26
Other	1.18	0.86	1.62
White	Reference	?	?
Political Affiliation			
Republican	2.44	1.90	3.13

Independent or Other	2.42	1.83	3.20
Democrat	Reference	?	?

152 OR = odds ratio; k = 1000. Adjusted analyses represent the full multivariable logistic regression
153 model. Odds ratios represent the log odds of unwillingness to receive a Covid-19 vaccine for
154 free, Unlikely vs. Likely.

155

156 On classification tree analysis, previous receipt of an influenza vaccine and Democratic
157 party political affiliation were significant predictors of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance (Fig 1).

158

159 **Fig 1. Main Predictors of Covid-19 Vaccine Hesitancy**

160 Personograph plot of the classification tree analysis, which identified previous influenza vaccine
161 coverage and political affiliation as significant predictors of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy.

162 The main reasons given for vaccine were concerns about side effects and safety of the
163 vaccine (75%, n=497), the need for more information about the vaccine (53%, n=351), and
164 doubts regarding the efficacy of the vaccine (17%, n=110).

165 ***Location of Receipt of COVID-19 Vaccination***

166 Most vaccine acceptors (53%, n=576) preferred to receive it in their primary doctors'
167 offices or clinic. Pharmacies (32%, n=353) and dedicated vaccination locations (14%, n=154)
168 were the next most preferred locations.

169

170 **DISCUSSION**

171 Optimal health policy deliberations for COVID-19 vaccine distribution require
172 consideration of vaccine hesitancy and reasons for refusal. We found significant vaccine
173 hesitancy in the U.S. population that was more common in women, Blacks, and people with

174 lower education levels or who identified as Republicans. Vaccine safety and side effects were the
175 primary concerns, and over half of vaccine non-acceptors wanted more information before
176 rendering a decision. Prior non-receipt of the influenza vaccine was the most powerful predictor
177 of unwillingness to receive the COVID-19 vaccine. For those respondents willing to receive the
178 COVID-19 vaccine, most indicated that they would prefer to receive it at their primary
179 physician's office/clinic.

180 Our data adds to the growing body of literature regarding vaccine hesitancy. A number of
181 patient characteristics (socioeconomic status, level of education, health literacy, political
182 affiliation, and race/ethnicity, among others), have historically played a role in attitudes toward
183 vaccines (6,15,16). Beyond these patient level predictors, vaccine hesitancy also varies by
184 vaccine type with childhood vaccines, such as MMR (measles, mumps, and rubella) and DTaP
185 (diphtheria, tetanus, and pertussis), having much higher acceptance rates than adult vaccines
186 (e.g., DTaP boosters, Pneumococcus, yearly influenza) (17).

187 Other unique characteristics of COVID-19 vaccine development may further complicate
188 issues of vaccine acceptance. The unprecedented "warp" speed of research, development, and
189 approval of the COVID-19 vaccines with significant public/governmental involvement and
190 investment, has led some to speculate about their safety and efficacy (15). Disinformation and
191 conspiracy theories about masks, transmission, therapeutics, and vaccines - amplified through
192 social media and other venues - are also particularly vexing (18).

193 Driven in part by popular perception of poor efficacy and fear of side effects, influenza
194 vaccine hesitancy is common (8–11,19). Given that influenza vaccine refusal appears to be
195 predictive of hesitancy of COVID-19 vaccination, public health campaigns should emphasize the
196 much higher efficacy of the COVID-19 vaccine (>90%) (20,21).

197 The racial/ethnic differences in vaccine hesitancy which we encountered in our study are
198 highly concerning, but not unexpected given prior literature. Black and Hispanic/Latinx
199 individuals have consistently lower influenza vaccination rates than their White counterparts (9–
200 11). Possible reasons for this historical difference include differences in racial consciousness
201 leading to differential trust in the vaccine process and safety, general disparate trust in health
202 care institutions, and limited knowledge of the specific vaccines (10,11). Unfortunately, vaccine
203 hesitancy may further exacerbate the disproportionate effects of the pandemic on Latinx,
204 African-American and Native American populations (22). Strategies to engage communities of
205 color, including trusted messenger programs about safety of COVID-19 vaccines, will be
206 essential to address this critical health disparity.

207 Previous research has shown associations between political affiliation and various health
208 metrics and behaviors, including vaccination acceptance. Republican voters have been found to
209 have lower self-reported influenza vaccination rates and an increased propensity for anti-
210 vaccination beliefs when compared to Democrats (23,24). Our study corroborates these findings
211 and suggests a need for political leaders of all parties to promote COVID-19 vaccination broadly
212 among their constituencies.

213 Regarding our finding of association of lower education levels with vaccine hesitancy,
214 prior literature has shown mixed results; some studies have found similar associations and others
215 the opposite (6,11). Our results reaffirm the concept that information regarding vaccine safety
216 and efficacy should be in language that is understandable by those with all levels of education.

217 One of the potential ways to address vaccine hesitancy is to ensure that vaccines are
218 dispensed at locations where patients are most comfortable receiving them. Our results indicate
219 that patients are most willing to go to their own clinics or physicians for vaccinations. Given that

220 community pharmacies are embedded within neighborhoods and are seen as trusted sources for
221 health information, they should also be prioritized for vaccine distribution (25,26).

222 Prior large studies have shown that the most effective efforts at reducing vaccine
223 hesitancy are both multi-faceted and targeted at specific populations (7). A one-size-fits-all
224 model is unlikely to work. Instead, a framework of engaging community and religious leaders,
225 active messaging in various digital and non-digital media, education campaigns, targeted and
226 incentivized vaccine drives, and wide distribution of vaccine at trusted sites will likely be
227 required in order to decrease vaccine hesitancy.

228 The study has limitations. Responses were provided by interested survey respondents
229 who had self-selected themselves into the Amazon Turk population (“Turkers”) who all had
230 internet access, limiting the generalizability of our findings to other underserved populations. In
231 this regard, Latinx respondents in this study were under-represented (6%) in comparison to their
232 percentage in the general U.S. population (16.7%). Because the study platform does not allow for
233 determination of how many people saw the invitation and did not participate, we could not
234 calculate a true survey response rate.

235 In conclusion, COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy is common in the U.S. population and more
236 prevalent in women, Blacks, people with lower education levels and Republicans. To improve
237 efficient and equitable vaccine distribution, educational messaging campaigns should seek to
238 address non-acceptors’ primary concerns of safety and side effects of the vaccine.

239

240 **References**

- 241 1. COVID-19 Map [Internet]. Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. [cited 2020 Dec
242 24]. Available from: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>
- 243 2. Ngonghala CN, Iboi E, Eikenberry S, Scotch M, MacIntyre CR, Bonds MH, et al.
244 Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on curtailing
245 the 2019 novel Coronavirus. *Math Biosci.* 2020;325:108364.
- 246 3. Lyu W, Wehby GL. Community Use Of Face Masks And COVID-19: Evidence From A
247 Natural Experiment Of State Mandates In The US. *Health Aff (Millwood).*
248 2020;39(8):1419–25.
- 249 4. Office of the Commissioner. COVID-19 Vaccines. FDA [Internet]. 2020 Dec 23 [cited
250 2020 Dec 24]; Available from: [https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-](https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines)
251 [response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines](https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines)
- 252 5. Ashwanden C. The false promise of herd immunity for COVID-19. *Nature.* 2020 Oct
253 21;587(7832):26–8.
- 254 6. Larson HJ, Jarrett C, Eckersberger E, Smith DMD, Paterson P. Understanding vaccine
255 hesitancy around vaccines and vaccination from a global perspective: A systematic review
256 of published literature, 2007–2012. *Vaccine.* 2014 Apr 17;32(19):2150–9.
- 257 7. Jarrett C, Wilson R, O’Leary M, Eckersberger E, Larson HJ. Strategies for addressing
258 vaccine hesitancy – A systematic review. *Vaccine.* 2015 Aug 14;33(34):4180–90.
- 259 8. Schmid P, Rauber D, Betsch C, Lidolt G, Denker M-L. Barriers of Influenza Vaccination
260 Intention and Behavior - A Systematic Review of Influenza Vaccine Hesitancy, 2005 -
261 2016. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(1):e0170550.

- 262 9. Flu Vaccination Coverage, United States, 2019–20 Influenza Season | FluVaxView |
263 Seasonal Influenza (Flu) | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Dec 7]. Available from:
264 <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluvoxview/coverage-1920estimates.htm>
- 265 10. Crouse Quinn S, Jamison AM, Freimuth VS, An J, Hancock GR. Determinants of influenza
266 vaccination among high-risk Black and White adults. *Vaccine*. 2017 18;35(51):7154–9.
- 267 11. Quinn SC, Jamison A, Freimuth VS, An J, Hancock GR, Musa D. Exploring racial
268 influences on flu vaccine attitudes and behavior: Results of a national survey of White and
269 African American adults. *Vaccine*. 2017 22;35(8):1167–74.
- 270 12. Szilagyi PG, Thomas K, Shah MD, Vizueta N, Cui Y, Vangala S, et al. National Trends in
271 the US Public’s Likelihood of Getting a COVID-19 Vaccine—April 1 to December 8,
272 2020. *JAMA* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 29 [cited 2020 Dec 29]; Available from:
273 <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2774711>
- 274 13. Strickland JC, Stoops WW. The use of crowdsourcing in addiction science research:
275 Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2019 Feb;27(1):1–18.
- 276 14. Mortensen K, Hughes TL. Comparing Amazon’s Mechanical Turk Platform to
277 Conventional Data Collection Methods in the Health and Medical Research Literature. *J*
278 *Gen Intern Med*. 2018 Apr;33(4):533–8.
- 279 15. McAteer J, Yildirim I, Chahroudi A. The VACCINES Act, Deciphering Vaccine Hesitancy
280 in the Time of COVID19. *Clin Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2020 Apr 13 [cited 2020 Dec 11];
281 Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7184475/>
- 282 16. Siddiqui M, Salmon DA, Omer SB. Epidemiology of vaccine hesitancy in the United
283 States. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*. 2013 Dec 24;9(12):2643–8.

- 284 17. FastStats [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Dec 11]. Available from:
285 <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/immunize.htm>
- 286 18. Tasnim S, Hossain MM, Mazumder H. Impact of Rumors and Misinformation on COVID-
287 19 in Social Media. *J Prev Med Public Health*. 2020 May;53(3):171–4.
- 288 19. Williams WW. Surveillance of Vaccination Coverage Among Adult Populations — United
289 States, 2014. *MMWR Surveill Summ* [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2020 Dec 11];65. Available
290 from: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/65/ss/ss6501a1.htm>
- 291 20. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, Lockhart S, et al. Safety and
292 Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *New England Journal of Medicine*.
293 2020 Dec 10;0(0):null.
- 294 21. Promising Interim Results from Clinical Trial of NIH-Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine
295 [Internet]. National Institutes of Health (NIH). 2020 [cited 2020 Dec 24]. Available from:
296 [https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/promising-interim-results-clinical-trial-](https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/promising-interim-results-clinical-trial-nih-moderna-covid-19-vaccine)
297 [nih-moderna-covid-19-vaccine](https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/promising-interim-results-clinical-trial-nih-moderna-covid-19-vaccine)
- 298 22. CDC. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and
299 Prevention. 2020 [cited 2020 Dec 11]. Available from:
300 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/investigations-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/investigations-discovery/hospitalization-death-by-race-ethnicity.html)
301 [discovery/hospitalization-death-by-race-ethnicity.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/investigations-discovery/hospitalization-death-by-race-ethnicity.html)
- 302 23. Kannan VD, Veazie PJ. Political orientation, political environment, and health behaviors in
303 the United States. *Preventive Medicine*. 2018 Sep 1;114:95–101.
- 304 24. Pabayo R, Kawachi I, Muennig P. Political party affiliation, political ideology and
305 mortality. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2015 May 1;69(5):423–31.



- 306 25. Ecartot F, Crepaldi G, Juvin P, Grabenstein J, Del Giudice G, Tan L, et al. Pharmacy-based
307 interventions to increase vaccine uptake: report of a multidisciplinary stakeholders meeting.
308 BMC Public Health. 2019 Dec 18;19(1):1698.
- 309 26. Mercer K, Neiterman E, Guirguis L, Burns C, Grindrod K. “My pharmacist”: Creating and
310 maintaining relationship between physicians and pharmacists in primary care settings. Res
311 Social Adm Pharm. 2020 Jan;16(1):102–7.
- 312

313
314

Will Get COVID-19 Vaccine

Unlikely to Get COVID-19 Vaccine

Political Affiliation



Previous Influenza Vaccine Coverage

