

1 **Understanding COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in Pakistan: The paradigm of**
2 **Confidence, Convenience, and Complacency; A Cross-sectional study.**

3

4

5 Naveen Siddique Sheikh^{1*}, Mumtaz Touseef¹, Riddah Sultan¹, Kanwal Hassan Cheema¹, Sidra
6 Shafiq Cheema¹, Afia Sarwar¹, Haniya Zainab Siddique².

7

8

9 ¹Department of Pathology, CMH Lahore Medical College and Institute of Dentistry (NUMS),
10 Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

11 ²Institute of Environmental Engineering and Sciences (IESE), National University Of Sciences
12 and Technology (NUST), Islamabad, Islamabad Capital Territory, Pakistan.

13

14 ***Corresponding Author:**

15 naveen.s.sheikh@gmail.com (NSS)

16

17 **Role of Authors:**

18 Conceptualization: NSS, KHC.

19 Data curation: NSS, MT, RS, KHC, SSC, AS, HZS.

20 Formal analysis: NSS.

21 Methodology: NSS, MT, RS, KHC, HZS.

22 Project administration: KHC

23 Visualization: NSS

24 Writing - original draft: NSS

25 Writing - review & editing: NSS, MT, RS, KHC, SSC, AS, HZS.

26

27 **Acknowledgments:** We would like to thank Dr. Ahmed Waqas, Ph.D. fellow, Institute of
28 Population Health, University of Liverpool, for his critical evaluation of research methodology,
29 results, and manuscript revision. Our gratitude also goes to the study participants.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37 **Abstract:**

38 **Background and objectives:** Vaccine hesitancy is a big obstacle for vaccination
39 programs, as is anticipated for the COVID-19 vaccination program, resulting in low uptake of
40 vaccines thereby hindering the process of reaching herd immunity. Bearing this in mind the
41 current study was aimed to explore the determinants of vaccine hesitancy amongst the Pakistani
42 population.

43 **Methodology:** A cross-sectional study was carried out from November 2020 to March
44 2021. The conceptual framework of the study was based on the 3Cs (Confidence, Convenience,
45 Complacency) model. The google-forms-based questionnaire was disseminated amongst the
46 general population. Data collected were entered into SPSS version 26 and analyzed.

47 **Results:** Of the 421 participants, 68.4% were women. Non-healthcare workers were 55.8% of
48 respondents. Of vaccine-hesitant individuals, 26.13% reported they were very unlikely to get
49 vaccinated. The vaccine was not safe as it came out too fast was agreed upon by 12.6% of
50 individuals, 50.6% were worried about experiencing side-effects, 18% believed the vaccine will
51 not offer protection and 5.9% believed the vaccine would cause death. Low Practice of SOP in
52 non-Healthcare workers was the strongest contributor to vaccine hesitancy (OR: 5.338, p=0.040,
53 95% CI: 1.082-26.330) followed by High complacency (p=0.026) and Moderate Complacency
54 (OR: 0.212, p=0.007, 95% CI: 0.069-0.654) towards COVID-19 vaccination. In Healthcare
55 workers the strongest contributor to vaccine hesitancy was having a Moderate Confidence (OR:
56 0.323, p=0.042, 95% CI: 0.109-0.958) in the vaccine followed by Moderate Convenience (OR:
57 0.304, p=0.049, 95% CI: 0.093-0.993) for vaccination

58 **Conclusion:** Campaigning and communication strategies to reaffirm confidence in the
59 COVID-19 vaccine and educating the general population about the vaccine could lead to
60 increased perception of vaccine safety and effectiveness thereby restoring confidence in vaccine
61 and decreasing vaccine hesitancy. Likewise, working to increase vaccine convenience and
62 decreasing complacency towards the COVID-19 vaccine would translate into high vaccine
63 uptake.

64 **MeSH words:** Vaccine hesitancy; vaccination intention, COVID-19 vaccine, vaccine
65 confidence, complacency, convenience

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75 **Introduction:**

76 ‘Vaccine hesitancy refers to delayed acceptance or refusal of vaccination, despite resource
77 availability(1)¹. This well-known phenomenon endorsed into the present day is as old as the
78 vaccine themselves(2), dating back to resistance programs against the mandated smallpox
79 vaccination initiative in the mid-1800s(3). Consequently, over the years due to this phenomenon,
80 vaccine-preventable diseases (VPD) the likes of measles, pneumococcal disease, pertussis, and
81 poliomyelitis have resurfaced(4). The most serious instance of this was cited in the 2003-04
82 Northern Nigeria boycott of the polio vaccine, which led to the incidence of newer cases in the
83 country(5).

84 A year has elapsed since the index case of the novel severe acute respiratory syndrome
85 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was reported(6). On 31st January 2020, World Health Organisation
86 (WHO) declared a global health emergency and the coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) was
87 labeled a pandemic on 11th March 2020(7). Since then, as of 26th January 2021, there have been
88 99 million cases of infection(8), 2.1 million deaths(9), and an economic loss of \$3.7 trillion in
89 earnings to workers around the world due to COVID-19(10).

90 The ongoing pandemic can be mitigated by an essential tool, an efficacious vaccine(s), which
91 can reduce disease incidence, prevalence, new hospitalizations, and intensive care demand(11).
92 The Pfizer-BioNTech’s (BNT162b2) and Moderna (mRNA-1273) mRNA vaccines were
93 approved for emergency use by WHO in December 2020, giving hope for the resumption of
94 normalcy(12). Experts estimated that herd immunity would be achieved if 70% of the population
95 is immune to COVID-19(13). However, vaccine hesitancy amongst the general public can be a
96 significant roadblock towards ensuring adequate vaccination uptake and achieving herd

97 immunity. Vaccine hesitancy is becoming an impediment towards VPD prevention strategies,
98 similar is anticipated for the forthcoming SARS-CoV-2 vaccine(14), consequently curbing the
99 pandemic would become difficult with resistance to a prospective vaccine program.

100 Vaccine hesitancy is attributable to the ‘3Cs’ model which comprises confidence, complacency,
101 and convenience(15). A lack of confidence in the vaccine safety, efficacy, or its delivery system;
102 complacency due to a perceived low risk from VPD and vaccine inconvenience due to an
103 inability to afford, hampers the success of vaccination campaigns(16). Further evaluation of the
104 vaccine hesitancy reveals that public approval of vaccination is not motivated by empirical
105 evidence-based medicine or economic data alone, but is rather driven by a combination of
106 complex variables like political, psychological, technical, and sociocultural, all of which must be
107 recognized and taken into consideration by policymakers and decision-makers(17). In addition,
108 conspiracy beliefs result in vaccine hesitancy by undermining the trust in government bodies,
109 healthcare workers, and pharmaceutical industries despite knowing their negative implications
110 on human health behavior(18,19). Skepticism around the vaccines being adequately tested for
111 safety, coming out too fast, and being registered in less than a year perpetuated the social media,
112 thereby mediating low acceptance of the potential vaccine(20). Beliefs like vaccine causes
113 infertility and is a means to stop population growth, is designed for electronic tattooing or
114 microchipping individuals to achieve global surveillance and falsely asserting that vaccine
115 causes autism, eventually lead to low vaccine uptake by the general population by undermining
116 public confidence in vaccines and negatively impacting their attitude towards vaccination(21).
117 Public confidence and trust in vaccinations are highly variable. Building a group’s trust in
118 vaccines requires that one understands their perception of vaccine and vaccine-associated risks or
119 side effects, their socioeconomic standing, political stance, and religious affiliation. Although

120 providing factually precise, accurate, scientifically sound evidence on the risk-benefit ratios of
121 vaccines is of paramount importance, it is not sufficient to bridge the gap between present levels
122 of confidence afforded by the public to vaccines and levels of trust required to ensure sufficient
123 and continued vaccine coverage(4). In light of all this, the present study was planned to evaluate
124 the determinants of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy amongst the general Pakistani population. To
125 also gauge their Willingness-to-pay (WTP)(22), thereby, ascertaining the amount they are
126 inclined to allocate to vaccine technology.

127 **Methodology:**

128 A cross-sectional study was conducted from November 2020 to March 2021. Participants for the
129 study were recruited from 23rd January to 31st January 2021 through the convenience sampling
130 technique. Research questionnaire **S1 Appendix** constructed on google-forms was disseminated
131 via online social media platforms (Facebook, WhatsApp, and Gmail) amongst the general
132 population. Inclusion criteria were individuals above the age of 18 and residents of Pakistan.
133 Exclusion criteria were minors and individuals residing outside of Pakistan. Items in the
134 questionnaire were based on previous literature(23); some were modified taking into account the
135 general population of the country. Informed electronic consent was the first part of the
136 questionnaire. Participants were explained the voluntary nature of their participation, thereafter
137 their consent was sought prior to filling out the questionnaire and collecting data
138 (<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.14814882>). The research was approved by the Institutional
139 Review Board of CMH Lahore Medical College and Institute of Dentistry
140 (Case#539/ERC/CMH/LMC).

141 Sample Size: Sample size was calculated to be 385 using the formula:

142 $n = N * X / (X + N - 1),$

143 where,

144 $X = Z_{\alpha/2}^2 * p * (1-p) / MOE^2$

145 $Z_{\alpha/2}$ = critical value of the Normal distribution at $\alpha/2$ (confidence level 95%, $\alpha= 0.05$ and the
146 critical value is 1.96)

147 MOE= margin of error= 5%

148 p= sample proportion= 50%

149 N= population size= 220 million for Pakistan.

150 Questionnaire instrument: The questionnaire comprised of four parts; demographics, a
151 knowledge scale, and 2 sections exploring the beliefs, myths, and attitudes towards the COVID-
152 19 vaccine and alternate preventive measures.

153 Measures: Socio-demographic section recorded their gender, age group, education status, marital
154 status, employment status, healthcare worker status, chronic disease status, and disease type.

155 The Knowledge scale comprised of 10 questions. This tool had yes/no/I am not sure and
156 multiple-choice questions. ‘Yes’ was scored as 1 point, ‘No’ and ‘I am not sure’ were scored 0
157 points. Those with multiple choice answers had a correct answer scored at 1 and incorrect
158 answers scored at 0. Two Likert scale items (5 point Likert scale) were also employed. The tool
159 included questions, about knowledge of vaccine existence, government’s initial plan of
160 vaccination, re-infection, vaccination helping decrease spread of coronavirus infection, the
161 demographic to which it could be given (children, pregnant and breastfeeding women), dose
162 count, vaccine effectivity, and route of administration, framed in an approach similar to previous

163 studies (23)(24)(25)(26). The score was measured by calculating the mean score of the 10 items.
164 The lowest possible score was 2 and the highest possible score was 18.

165 A separate scale to explore the perceptions of respondents, on a series of items about COVID-19
166 infection (n = 4), a potential COVID-19 vaccination (n = 30), and COVID-19 vaccination cost
167 (n=2) to establish the Willingness-To-pay, was used. Respondents rated the perception
168 statements on a five-point Likert scale (1–5) from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”.

169 Statements employed in the tool measured the theoretical constructs such as imagining
170 themselves as being in a high-risk group, advantages of a potential COVID-19 vaccine,
171 subjective norms, factors influencing their decision to vaccinate, behavioral control, myths, and
172 beliefs about the vaccine, confidence in the Government and religious heads(23). These
173 statements also probed respondents' views on the vaccine enabling life to return to "normal," and
174 them being expected to adhere to the protocol for social distancing and other limitations for
175 COVID-19 once vaccinated, along with items gauging their acknowledgment and practice of
176 other preventive measures. Respondents were also inquired if they would vaccinate if their
177 employer seeks proof of vaccination or they needed the proof for travel(23). These questionnaire
178 items were computed to form 4 scales of Confidence, Convenience, Complacency (i.e 3C
179 indicator), and SOP Practice as shown in **Table 2**. Mean scores were calculated and categorized
180 on basis of the three percentiles i.e 33rd, 66th, 100th percentile. The three groups were Low (below
181 the 33rd percentile), Moderate (between the 34th and 66th percentile), and High (above the 67th
182 percentile). A few items were calculated in the inverted sense to remain consistent with the
183 direction of the indicator.

184 Finally, vaccination intention was also inquired (‘Yes’-intends to get vaccinated and ‘No’-does
185 not intend to get vaccinated). The dichotomized response was used in the binary logistic

186 regression model as the dependent variable with the demographics and the scales to find
 187 predictors of vaccine hesitancy. The data collected was analyzed using Statistical Package for the
 188 Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26. Data were analyzed for descriptive statistic analysis (means,
 189 standard deviations, frequency, and percentages) and inferential analysis (Independent sample *t*-
 190 test & Binary logistic regression). p -value ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant

191 **Results:**

192 The questionnaire was disseminated to 427 participants, out of which 421 completed it (98.5%
 193 response rate) by agreeing to the informed consent at the start of the questionnaire. Form for six
 194 participants was closed and submitted without being filled as they clicked disagree to the consent
 195 to fill. Women were 68.4% and men were 31.6%. The age group 20-30 years had the highest
 196 amount of respondents 70.3%. Of the 421 participants, 55.8% were not health care workers
 197 (HCW; doctors, nurses, technicians, paramedics, etc) while 44.2% were HCW. **Table 1** reflects
 198 the socio-demographic features of the respondents.

199 **Table 1: Socio-Demographic Details of Participants (N=421)**

Demographic Variables	Frequency		Percentage %
Gender	Males	133	31.6
	Females	288	68.4
Age (years)	Less than 20	34	8.1
	20-30	296	70.3
	30-40	39	9.3
	More than 40	52	12.4
Education Status	Less than matric	7	1.7
	Matric or equivalent	8	1.9
	Intermediate or equivalent	15	12.1
	Bachelor's	256	60.8
	Master's	91	21.6
	PhD	8	1.9
Chronic disease status	No	358	85

	Yes	One Disease	51	15
		Multiple Diseases	12	
Disease type	Diabetes Mellitus	18		4.3
	Hypertension	27		6.4
	Ischemic heart disease	4		1.0
	Asthma	17		4.0
	Disease other than mentioned	12		2.9
Health care worker	No	235		55.8
	Yes	186		44.2
Marital Status	Single	301		71.5
	Married	112		26.6
	Divorced	3		0.7
	Widow	5		1.2
Employment Status	Student	222		52.7
	Full-time Job	108		25.7
	Part-time Job	12		2.9
	Self-employed	22		5.2
	Unemployed	19		4.5
	Stay at home parent	26		6.2
	Do not want to say	12		2.9

200 Descriptive statistics for the items on the questionnaire are mentioned in **Table 2**. It also
201 highlights how the 3C indicator was constructed. Statements other than the ones mentioned in
202 the table used in the construction of the 3C indicator were the government’s initial plan for
203 vaccination and vaccine effectivity in Confidence indicator; the existence of a vaccine, the
204 vaccination being an almost pain-free procedure, the vaccine being able to decrease the spread of
205 infection and whether a person could be re-infected with COVID-19 in Complacency indicator;
206 and route of administration along with vaccine being dose-based in the Convenience indicator.
207 Statements gauging the beliefs of people regarding the vaccine revealed that 14% agreed that if
208 they were healthy or previously infected then they do not need the vaccination, 20% agreed that
209 there is no need for social distancing once vaccinated, 18% agreed that the vaccine will not offer

210 them protection, 28.8% agreed that vaccination will cause allergic reactions, 12.6% believed that
211 the vaccine is not safe as it came out too fast and 45% disagreed that the vaccine could be given
212 to pregnant/breastfeeding women. Fear of experiencing side-effects had 50.6% agree to the
213 statement. What was worrisome was that a staggering 24% disagreed that they would not
214 vaccinate if they were in a high-risk group and 20% disagreed to vaccinate even if they lived
215 with someone in a high-risk group. Even if they were a care provider, 21.7% chose to disagree
216 with vaccinating. Despite all this, 73% did however agree that the decision to vaccinate will
217 benefit the community. When asked if they were aware that the state had an initial vaccination
218 strategy for the population at high risk, healthcare workers, public health workers, and people
219 with chronic diseases, only 58.7% of the non-healthcare workers (non-HCW) responded with a
220 ‘Yes’ while 81.7% of the healthcare workers (HCW) responded with a ‘Yes’ (p-value 0.00).
221 When asked about the dose count of the vaccine only 49.5% of the HCW responded correctly
222 with 2 doses while only 34.0% of the non-HCW were aware of the correct response (p-value
223 0.001).

224 Two items in the questionnaire evaluated the Willingness-to-pay of the respondents. The first
225 was who should cover the cost of the vaccine, and the second being that if you were to pay from
226 pocket then how much are you willing to pay. The vaccine should be provided free of cost had
227 61.3% of the respondents choosing it, 28.7% chose that the vaccine be provided at a subsidized
228 rate by the government while only 10% were willing to pay from pocket for the vaccine. On the
229 amount of money that they were willing to pay, 27.3% chose less than 500 Pak rupees
230 (PKR)(\$3.16), 31.8% chose 500-1000 PKR(\$3.16-6.32), 23% chose 1000-2000 PKR(\$6.32-
231 12.64) while 17.8% were willing to pay more than 2000 PKR(>\$12.64) for the COVID-19

232 vaccine. Inquiry about vaccination intention revealed, 73.87% reported they were likely to get
 233 vaccinated, 26.13% were unlikely to get vaccinated.

234 **Table 2: Descriptive statistics of continuous items evaluating Confidence, Complacency,**
 235 **Convenience, Practice of SOPS, and vaccination intention for COVID-19. Data are mean**
 236 **(standard deviation) on a 1–5 numerical rating scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly**
 237 **agree).**

	Item	Mean (SD)
Confidence	I would be worried about experiencing the side effects from a coronavirus vaccination	3.49 (1.26)
	The vaccine will protect me from the coronavirus infection	3.59 (1.16)
	The vaccine can be given to pregnant and breastfeeding women	2.59 (1.19)
	The vaccine will allow us to return to normal	3.35 (1.20)
	The vaccine will cause infertility	1.94 (0.98)
	The vaccine will cause autism	1.88 (0.91)
	The vaccine will cause autoimmune diseases	2.03 (1.00)
	The vaccine will cause allergic reactions	2.90 (1.07)
	The vaccine will give me a coronavirus infection if I vaccinate	1.85 (1.00)

	The vaccine will cause death		1.73 (0.97)
	The vaccine is more dangerous than the virus		1.61 (0.97)
	The vaccine is not safe as it came out too fast		2.10 (1.10)
	The vaccine is only for old and vulnerable people		1.89 (1.10)
	The vaccine can be given to children		3.19 (1.23)
	I feel I know enough about the vaccine to make an informed decision about getting vaccinated		3.60 (1.17)
Convenience	My decision to vaccinate against COVID-19 increase only if:	If it is recommended by government officials	3.12 (1.31)
		If my family vaccinates and expresses support for the benefit of the vaccine	3.18 (1.28)
		If government officials vaccinate themselves	3.09 (1.27)
		If it is recommended by a healthcare professional	3.72 (1.25)
		If it is recommended to me by a religious head of my faith	2.32 (1.25)
		If my friends vaccinate and express support for the benefit of the vaccine	2.96 (1.31)
	I will vaccinate if:	I have to show proof of vaccination to my employer	3.04 (1.36)
		I have to show proof of vaccination for travel	3.44 (1.33)

		I am in a high-risk group	3.56 (1.39)	
		I live with someone who is in a high-risk group	3.66 (1.33)	
		I am a care provider	3.66 (1.39)	
		My decision to vaccinate benefits the community	4.03 (1.11)	
Complacency	I do not consider coronavirus to be a serious issue/ It is just like any other common cold		1.66 (1.05)	
	The coronavirus infection is just a media hype		1.58 (0.99)	
	If I already had the infection or I am healthy then I do not need the vaccination		2.08 (1.26)	
	If I were vaccinated, then I do not need to follow social distancing and other coronavirus restrictions		2.25 (1.26)	
	Even if I vaccinate, I can still get infected with the coronavirus infection		2.99 (1.13)	
	Practice and acknowledgment of other preventive measures (SOPs)	Been wearing a mask regularly		4.17 (1.05)
		Taken measures such as avoiding going to crowded places		3.91 (1.10)
		Avoided handshakes and physical contact in this pandemic		3.76 (1.15)
		Isolated yourself if you or someone in your family developed fever and cough in the past few months		3.92 (1.16)
		Avoided social gathering if you had flu-		3.99

		like symptoms	(1.15)
		Followed guidelines issued by WHO and health authorities	3.99 (1.04)
Vaccination Intention	When the coronavirus vaccine is made available in the country will you vaccinate?		4.12 (1.07)

238 Scores were calculated for each scale and were then categorized into Low, Moderate, and High
 239 on a percentile basis. High scores on the Confidence and Convenience indicator translate into
 240 low vaccine hesitancy while high scores on the Complacency indicator translate into a high
 241 vaccine hesitancy. Mean scores of the respondents for each scale were calculated along with
 242 standard deviations highlighted in the **S1 Table**. An independent sample t-test was performed to
 243 see if the difference in means between healthcare workers and non-healthcare workers was true
 244 or due to chance. Results are tabulated in **Table 3** (also highlighting the percentage of
 245 respondents who scored in each category). The difference was significant in Knowledge and
 246 Confidence while non-significant for the remainder indicators.

247 **Table 3: Independent Sample t-test for Knowledge, Confidence, Convenience,**
 248 **Complacency, and SOP Practice between Healthcare Workers (HCW) and Non-Healthcare**
 249 **Workers along with Score categorization for respective scales.**

Category		Knowledge		Confidence		Convenience		Complacency		SOP Practice		
HCW Status		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Score categories	Low	37.1	44.3	26.3	39.1	34.4	37.4	31.7	36.2	33.3	34.0	%
	Moderate	38.2	34.5	35.5	34.9	29.0	31.9	37.1	40.0	37.6	36.2	%
	High	24.7	21.3	38.2	26.0	36.6	30.6	31.2	23.8	29.0	29.8	%
t value		3.049		2.806		0.627		1.382		0.249		
p- value		0.002*		0.005*		0.531		0.168		0.804		

HCW= Healthcare worker
 %= percentage of individuals who got the respective score category
 SOP= standard operating procedures for infection prevention
 t= Student's T-Test value (Independent sample T-Test)
 *p-value ≤ 0.05 is considered statistically significant

250 A binary logistic regression analysis was performed to assess the relationship between
 251 Demographics, Knowledge, 3Cs indicator, SOP practice, and HCW status as predictors for
 252 vaccine hesitancy among the two groups. The model explained between 19.0% (Cox & Snell R
 253 square) and 28.2% (Nagelkerke R square) of the variance in Vaccine Hesitancy among HCW
 254 and between 16.3% (Cox & Snell R square) and 23.7% (Nagelkerke R square) for non-HCW. It
 255 correctly classified 76.3% of cases for HCW and 75.3% of cases for non-HCW. **Table 4** shows
 256 how each item made a statistically significant contribution to the model. Predicted probabilities
 257 were for membership of 'not vaccinating'. Low Practice of SOP in non-HCW was the strongest
 258 contributor to vaccine hesitancy (OR: 5.338, p=0.040, 95% CI: 1.082-26.330) followed by High
 259 complacency (p=0.026) and Moderate Complacency (OR: 0.212, p=0.007, 95% CI: 0.069-0.654)
 260 towards COVID-19 vaccination. In HCW the strongest contributor to vaccine hesitancy was
 261 having a Moderate Confidence (OR: 0.323, p=0.042, 95% CI: 0.109-0.958) in the vaccine
 262 followed by Moderate Convenience (OR: 0.304, p=0.049, 95% CI: 0.093-0.993) for vaccination.
 263 **Table 4: Binary logistic regression analysis predicting the likelihood of vaccine hesitancy**
 264 **amongst the respondents.**

Predictors	Healthcare workers (n=189)					Non-healthcare workers (n=232)					
	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig.	OR(95% CI)	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig.	OR(95% CI)	
Gender (Reference male)	0.298	0.528	0.319	0.572	1.348 (0.479-3.795)	-0.296	0.431	0.471	0.492	0.744 (0.319-1.732)	
Age group 20-30 years (Reference age >40 years)	1.153	1.306	0.780	0.377	3.168 (0.245-40.975)	-0.532	0.912	0.340	0.560	0.588 (0.098-3.511)	
Knowledge	Low	-0.571	0.646	0.780	0.377	0.565 (0.159-2.006)	-0.697	0.506	1.896	1.669	0.498 (0.185-1.343)
	Moderate	0.453	0.577	0.618	0.432	1.573 (0.508-4.872)	-0.470	0.473	0.986	0.321	0.625 (0.248-1.580)
	High (Reference)	-	-	4.307	0.116	-	-	-	1.921	0.383	-
Confidence	Low	-0.225	0.582	0.150	0.699	0.798 (0.255-	0.350	0.519	0.455	0.500	1.420 (0.513-

						2.497)					3.930)
	Moderate	-1.132	0.555	4.150	0.042*	0.323 (0.109-0.958)	0.003	0.490	0.000	0.994	1.004 (0.384-2.623)
	High (Reference)	-	-	4.352	0.114	-	-	-	0.759	0.684	-
Convenience	Low	-0.310	0.544	0.325	0.569	0.733 (0.253-2.128)	0.030	0.447	0.004	0.947	1.030 (0.429-2.475)
	Moderate	-1.190	0.604	3.889	0.049*	0.304 (0.093-0.993)	-0.186	0.481	0.150	0.699	0.830 (0.324-2.130)
	High (Reference)	-	-	3.997	0.136	-	-	-	0.244	0.885	-
Complacency	Low	0.327	0.983	0.110	0.740	1.386 (0.202-9.509)	-1.313	0.856	2.350	0.125	0.269 (0.050-1.441)
	Moderate	-0.335	0.620	0.292	0.589	0.715 (0.212-2.413)	-1.553	0.575	7.279	0.007*	0.212 (0.069-0.654)
	High (Reference)	-	-	0.911	0.634	-	-	-	7.303	0.026*	-
SOP Practice	Low	0.179	0.923	0.038	0.846	1.196 (0.196-7.298)	1.675	0.814	4.231	0.040*	5.338 (1.082-26.330)
	Moderate	0.198	0.597	0.109	0.741	1.218 (0.378-3.925)	0.498	0.569	0.765	0.382	1.645 (0.539-5.020)
	High (Reference)	-	-	0.110	0.947	-	-	-	4.362	0.113	-

B, coefficient for the constant; **S.E.**, standard error around the coefficient for the constant; **Wald**, Wald chi-square test; **Sig**, significance (*significant if $p < 0.05$); **OR**, Odds Ratio; **CI**, Confidence interval (95%).

265 Discussion:

266 Vaccine hesitancy has a great role to play in the success of a vaccination program(27).
 267 Identifying the reasons for hesitancy and addressing them properly can help curb vaccine
 268 hesitancy thereby leading to the high uptake of vaccines and consequently reaching herd
 269 immunity faster. Our study resolved to find the determinants of vaccine hesitancy amongst the
 270 Pakistani population. The study revealed that 50.6% of respondents were worried about
 271 experiencing side-effects from the vaccine, a contributor to vaccine hesitancy, these findings are
 272 in resonance with a study published by the Centre for Economic Research in Pakistan (CERP)
 273 which reported that 54% of respondents to their study from Pakistan were worried about the
 274 safety of the vaccine(28). When compared to the study conducted in the United States of
 275 America which reported the count of individuals worried about the safety of the vaccine to be at
 276 63.47%, our figures of 50.6% from Pakistan are significantly lower than theirs(29). Beliefs like
 277 vaccine will cause infertility (5.8% agreed), autism (3.1% agreed), autoimmune diseases (6.9%
 278 agreed), allergic reactions (28.8% agreed), death (5.9% agreed), is not safe as it came out too fast

279 (12.6% agreed) and the vaccine is more dangerous than the virus (5% agreed) are unsurprising,
280 they contributed to vaccine hesitancy and have been documented in previous literature(30). Such
281 concerns need to be addressed by the health officials (physicians, public health workers) by
282 having a healthy dialogue with the vaccine-hesitant people.

283 Of the respondents, 45% believed that the vaccine can not be given to pregnant/breastfeeding
284 women, highlighting a lack of knowledge about the vaccine as The American College of
285 Obstetricians and Gynaecologists(ACOG) recommends the vaccine for this group in guidelines
286 with the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP)(31). Similarly, the finding that
287 43% agreed with administering the vaccine to children reflects a knowledge gap too, as CDC
288 strictly prohibits the administration of the vaccine to individuals under the age of 16 years in the
289 case of Pfizer and, 18 years in the case of the Moderna vaccine(32). Our research found that
290 61.7% of respondents agreed that they would vaccinate on the recommendation of a healthcare
291 worker so having better physician recommendations is a good intervention to accentuate the
292 success of an immunization program as also cited in previous literature(33).

293 Our findings revealed that Confidence, Convenience, and Complacency were statistically
294 significant contributors to vaccine hesitancy, a finding documented in previous literature(34).
295 Bearing this in mind, if policymakers work towards increasing confidence and convenience for
296 the vaccine while decreasing complacency towards vaccine amongst the general population, they
297 can subsequently variate the community's intention to vaccinate significantly, this can be done
298 by adopting tailored interventions for the context at hand concerning the different groups in the
299 country, an approach supported in previous literature(35). Less adherence to COVID-19 health
300 behaviors i.e low practice of SOPs was established as a contributor to vaccine hesitancy in our
301 study, this finding is consistent with a previous study done in Australia which determined the

302 same for COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy amongst the Australian population(36), similar was also
303 reported in a study done in the US which cited that those who reported negative COVID-19
304 vaccination intentions had reduced odds of more frequent adherence to social distancing and
305 wearing masks(37).

306 This research is not without its limitations and warrants enhancements. The data is cross-
307 sectional making it difficult to disentangle causality of whether vaccine hesitancy is due to a lack
308 of knowledge of vaccine and health information or due to the propensity to believe in conspiracy
309 theories. The sample size is adequate, but it may not be truly representative of the entire
310 Pakistani population, respondents were approached via convenience sampling through social
311 networks of the data collectors, and considering that the authors belonged to only two provinces
312 of the country, they were unable to collect equal responses from all the provinces. Furthermore,
313 only 35% of the 224 million population of the country is urban and the country's literacy rate is
314 60% with a mean of 5.2 years of schooling. While cellphone access is more than 50%, among
315 youth, access to the internet is still however low (15%)(38). So the generalization of the results
316 for the entire country should be done with caution. Vaccine hesitancy is a multifaceted problem,
317 for which a better evaluation could be done via having a larger sample size with a longitudinal
318 sampling approach and open-ended questions.

319 **Conclusion:**

320 Our study revealed that there was a significant knowledge gap regarding the vaccine. The belief
321 in myths, like vaccine causes death, allergic reactions, and is more dangerous than the virus
322 itself, was rampant. A lack of confidence in the vaccine, lack of convenience for the vaccine, and
323 increased complacency were significant contributors to vaccine hesitancy. In light of the scale

324 and scope of this major issue, all government and non-governmental health care departments
325 must work together to restore trust in vaccines. The risk of vaccine-preventable disease(VPD),
326 benefits of a vaccine for that VPD, and the risk-benefit ratio of the vaccine need to be discussed,
327 supported by evidence-based medicine, with the hesitant people in a longitudinal,
328 comprehensive, coherent, and in an unbiased transparent fashion to increase vaccination
329 uptake(33). It is important to educate the public through mass outreach initiatives, awareness
330 campaigns, and conferences to alleviate fear and uncertainty about the safety and efficacy of all
331 vaccines and bridge the knowledge gap(39). Efforts to increase vaccine convenience and
332 decrease complacency towards the COVID-19 vaccine would result in high vaccine uptake and a
333 consequential faster herd immunity thereby decreasing the spread of infection and help in
334 curbing the pandemic.

335 **References:**

- 336 1. Shapiro GK, Tatar O, Dube E, Amsel R, Knauper B, Naz A, et al. The vaccine hesitancy scale:
337 Psychometric properties and validation. *Vaccine* [Internet]. 2018;36(5):660–7. Available from:
338 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.12.043>
- 339 2. Poland GA, Jacobson RM. The Age-Old Struggle against the Antivaccinationists. *New England*
340 *Journal of Medicine*. 2011;364(2):97–9.
- 341 3. Larson HJ, Cooper LZ, Eskola J, Katz SL, Ratzan S. Addressing the vaccine confidence gap. *The*
342 *Lancet*. 2011;378(9790):526–35.
- 343 4. Phadke VK, Bednarczyk RA, Salmon DA, Omer SB. Association between vaccine refusal and
344 vaccine-preventable diseases in the United States A review of measles and pertussis. *JAMA -*
345 *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2016;315(11):1149–58.
- 346 5. Kabamba Nzaji M, Kabamba Ngombe L, Ngoie Mwamba G, Banza Ndala DB, Mbidi Miema J,
347 Luhata Lungoyo C, et al. <p>Acceptability of Vaccination Against COVID-19 Among Healthcare
348 Workers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo</p>. *Pragmatic and Observational Research*.
349 2020;Volume 11:103–9.
- 350 6. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019
351 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):497–506.

- 352 7. (No Title) [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jan 26]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/docs/default-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audio-emergencies-coronavirus-press-conference-full-and-final-11mar2020.pdf?sfvrsn=cb432bb3_2)
353 [source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audio-emergencies-coronavirus-press-conference-full-and-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audio-emergencies-coronavirus-press-conference-full-and-final-11mar2020.pdf?sfvrsn=cb432bb3_2)
354 [final-11mar2020.pdf?sfvrsn=cb432bb3_2](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audio-emergencies-coronavirus-press-conference-full-and-final-11mar2020.pdf?sfvrsn=cb432bb3_2)
- 355 8. • COVID-19 cases worldwide by day | Statista [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jan 26]. Available from:
356 [https://www.statista.com/statistics/1103040/cumulative-coronavirus-covid19-cases-number-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1103040/cumulative-coronavirus-covid19-cases-number-worldwide-by-day/)
357 [worldwide-by-day/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1103040/cumulative-coronavirus-covid19-cases-number-worldwide-by-day/)
- 358 9. • Coronavirus deaths worldwide by country | Statista [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jan 26]. Available
359 from: [https://www.statista.com/statistics/1093256/novel-coronavirus-2019ncov-deaths-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1093256/novel-coronavirus-2019ncov-deaths-worldwide-by-country/)
360 [worldwide-by-country/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1093256/novel-coronavirus-2019ncov-deaths-worldwide-by-country/)
- 361 10. Covid-19 has cost global workers \$3.7tn in lost earnings, says ILO | Economics | The Guardian
362 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jan 26]. Available from:
363 [https://www.theguardian.com/business/2021/jan/25/covid-19-workers-lost-earnings-ilo-job-](https://www.theguardian.com/business/2021/jan/25/covid-19-workers-lost-earnings-ilo-job-losses)
364 [losses](https://www.theguardian.com/business/2021/jan/25/covid-19-workers-lost-earnings-ilo-job-losses)
- 365 11. Haynes BF, Corey L, Fernandes P, Gilbert PB, Hotez PJ, Rao S, et al. Prospects for a safe COVID-19
366 vaccine. *Science Translational Medicine*. 2020;12(568):1–13.
- 367 12. Abualsamen M. Acceptance and Attitudes Toward COVID-19 Vaccines: A Cross-Sectional Study
368 from Department of Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacognosy , Faculty of Pharmacy , Jordan
369 University of Science and Technology , Irbid 22110 , Jordan Department of Family and Commun.
370 2020;1–18.
- 371 13. Shen AK, Hughes Iv R, DeWald E, Rosenbaum S, Pisani A, Orenstein W. Ensuring Equitable Access
372 To COVID-19 Vaccines In The US: Current System Challenges And Opportunities. *Health affairs*
373 (Project Hope). 2021;40(1):62–9.
- 374 14. Sallam M, Dababseh D, Eid H, Al-Mahzoum K, Al-Haidar A, Taim D, et al. High rates of covid-19
375 vaccine hesitancy and its association with conspiracy beliefs: A study in jordan and kuwait among
376 other arab countries. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(1):1–16.
- 377 15. MacDonald NE, Eskola J, Liang X, Chaudhuri M, Dube E, Gellin B, et al. Vaccine hesitancy:
378 Definition, scope and determinants. *Vaccine*. 2015;33(34):4161–4.
- 379 16. González-Block MÁ, Gutiérrez-Calderón E, Pelcastre-Villafuerte BE, Arroyo-Laguna J, Comes Y,
380 Crocco P, et al. Influenza vaccination hesitancy in five countries of South America. Confidence,
381 complacency and convenience as determinants of immunization rates. *PLoS ONE*. 2020;15(12
382 December):1–12.
- 383 17. Dubé E, Laberge C, Guay M, Bramadat P, Roy R, Bettinger JA. Vaccine hesitancy. *Human Vaccines*
384 *& Immunotherapeutics*. 2013;9(8):1763–73.
- 385 18. Thomson A, Watson M. Vaccine hesitancy: A vade mecum v1.0. *Vaccine* [Internet].
386 2016;34(17):1989–92. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.12.049>
- 387 19. Jolley D, Douglas KM. The effects of anti-vaccine conspiracy theories on vaccination intentions.
388 *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9(2).

- 389 20. Mannan KA, Farhana KM. Knowledge, Attitude and Acceptance of a COVID-19 Vaccine: A Global
390 Cross-Sectional Study. SSRN Electronic Journal. 2021;6(4):1–23.
- 391 21. COVID19 meets the antivaccine movement. 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 27]; Available from:
392 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micinf.2020.05.010>
- 393 22. Wong LP, Alias H, Wong PF, Lee HY, AbuBakar S. The use of the health belief model to assess
394 predictors of intent to receive the COVID-19 vaccine and willingness to pay. *Human Vaccines and*
395 *Immunotherapeutics* [Internet]. 2020;16(9):2204–14. Available from:
396 <https://doi.org/10.1080/21645515.2020.1790279>
- 397 23. COVID-19 vaccination intention in the UK_ results from the COVID-19 vaccination acceptability
398 study _ Enhanced Reader.pdf.
- 399 24. Lin Y, Huang L, Nie S, Liu Z, Yu H, Yan W, et al. Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) related
400 to the Pandemic (H1N1) 2009 among Chinese General Population: a Telephone Survey [Internet].
401 2011 [cited 2021 Mar 28]. Available from: <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2334/11/128>
- 402 25. Ahmed SI, Siddiqui MI, Jafery SIA. Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices of General Practitioners in
403 Karachi District Central about Tetanus Immunization in Adults.
- 404 26. González-Block MÁ, Arroyo-Laguna J, Rodríguez-Zea B, Pelcastre-Villafuerte BE, Gutiérrez-
405 Calderón E, Díaz-Portillo SP, et al. The importance of confidence, complacency, and convenience
406 for influenza vaccination among key risk groups in large urban areas of Peru. *Human Vaccines*
407 *and Immunotherapeutics*. 2020;
- 408 27. van der Linden S. Why doctors should convey the medical consensus on vaccine safety. *Evidence-*
409 *Based Medicine*. 2016;21(3):119.
- 410 28. Asad S, Qureshi J, Shah T, Zafar B. Economic Vulnerability Assessment Round 3 Findings.
- 411 29. Pogue K, Jensen JL, Stancil CK, Ferguson DG, Hughes SJ, Mello EJ, et al. Influences on attitudes
412 regarding potential covid-19 vaccination in the united states. *Vaccines*. 2020;8(4):1–14.
- 413 30. Nuzhath T, Tasnim S, Sanjwal RK, Trisha NF, Rahman M, Mahmud SMF, et al. COVID-19
414 vaccination hesitancy, misinformation and conspiracy theories on social media: A content
415 analysis of Twitter data. *Osf Preprints*. 2020;(December).
- 416 31. Vaccinating Pregnant and Lactating Patients Against COVID-19 | ACOG [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb
417 25]. Available from: [https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/practice-](https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/practice-advisory/articles/2020/12/vaccinating-pregnant-and-lactating-patients-against-covid-19)
418 [advisory/articles/2020/12/vaccinating-pregnant-and-lactating-patients-against-covid-19](https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/practice-advisory/articles/2020/12/vaccinating-pregnant-and-lactating-patients-against-covid-19)
- 419 32. Interim Clinical Considerations for Use of mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines | CDC [Internet]. [cited 2021
420 Feb 25]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/info-by-product/clinical-](https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/info-by-product/clinical-considerations.html)
421 [considerations.html](https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/info-by-product/clinical-considerations.html)
- 422 33. Kerrigan AR, Aitnouri I, Mar J, Altman W. What barriers exist in the minds of vaccine-hesitant
423 parents, and how can we address them? *Family Medicine*. 2020;52(9):626–30.

- 424 34. Hou Z, Tong Y, Du F, Lu L, Zhao S, Yu K, et al. Assessing COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy, Confidence
 425 and Public Engagement: A Global Social Listening Study. SSRN Electronic Journal [Internet]. 2021
 426 Feb 11 [cited 2021 Mar 29]; Available from: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3775544>
- 427 35. Verger P, Dubé E. Restoring confidence in vaccines in the COVID-19 era. Vol. 19, Expert Review of
 428 Vaccines. 2020. p. 991–3.
- 429 36. Edwards B, Biddle N, Gray M, Sollis K. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and resistance: Correlates in a
 430 nationally representative longitudinal survey of the Australian population. di Gennaro F, editor.
 431 PLOS ONE [Internet]. 2021 Mar 24 [cited 2021 Mar 29];16(3):e0248892. Available from:
 432 <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248892>
- 433 37. Latkin CA, Dayton L, Yi G, Colon B, Kong X. Mask usage, social distancing, racial, and gender
 434 correlates of COVID-19 vaccine intentions among adults in the US. PloS one [Internet]. 2021
 435 [cited 2021 Mar 29];16(2):e0246970. Available from:
 436 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/33592035>
- 437 38. EF EPI 2020 – EF English Proficiency Index – Pakistan [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jun 21]. Available
 438 from: <https://www.ef.com/wwen/epi/regions/asia/pakistan/>
- 439 39. Fatima K, Syed NI. Dengvaxia controversy: Impact on vaccine hesitancy. Journal of Global Health.
 440 2018;8(2):8–10.

441 Supplemental Information:

442 S1 Table: Independent Sample t-test for Knowledge, Confidence, Convenience, 443 Complacency and SOP Practice between Healthcare Workers (HCW) and Non-Healthcare 444 Workers

Category	Knowledge		Confidence		Convenience		Complacency		SOP Practice	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Score Mean (SD)	10.23 (1.97)	9.58 (2.38)	63.52 (6.85)	61.60 (7.11)	41.31 (9.78)	40.71 (9.64)	50.41 (8.33)	49.31 (7.97)	23.84 (5.75)	23.70 (5.86)
t value	3.049		2.806		0.627		1.382		0.249	
p- value	0.002*		0.005*		0.531		0.168		0.804	

HCW= Healthcare worker
 SOP= standard operating procedures for infection prevention
 t= Student's T-Test value (Independent sample T-Test)
 *p-value ≤ 0.05 is considered statistically significant
SD=standard deviation

445