medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

An observational study of the association between COVID-19 vaccination rates and entry into the 'Million Dollar Vax' competition

Dajung Jun, Anthony Scott (corresponding author: a.scott@unimelb.edu.au)
Melbourne Institute: Applied Economic and Social Research
The University of Melbourne

Abstract

Objectives

Are financial incentives from entry in a vaccine competition associated with a higher probability of vaccination for COVID-19?

Design

A cross-sectional study with adjustment for covariates using logistic regression

Setting

October and November 2021, Australia.

Participants

2,375 respondents of the Taking the Pulse of the Nation Survey

Interventions

Participation in the Million Dollar Vaccination competition

Primary and secondary outcome measures

The proportion of respondents who had any vaccination, a first dose only, or second dose after the competition opened compared to all other respondents

Results

Those who entered the competition were 2.27 times more likely to be vaccinated after the competition opened on October 1st than those who did not. This was driven by those receiving second doses. Participants were 1.38 times more likely to receive their first dose after September 30th but this was not statistically significant. They were 2.31 times more likely to receive their second dose after September 30th.

Conclusions

Entry into the Million Dollar Vax competition was associated with a higher vaccination rate, with this effect dominated by a higher rate of second doses. Financial incentives could 'nudge' people to get their second and subsequent doses more quickly.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- We use a nationally representative sample of individuals.
- We distinguish between the association between competition entry and first and second doses.
- We adjust for a rich set of individual characteristics associated with vaccination status
- The strong association for second dose vaccinations may reflect some individuals who had already had scheduled their second dose after the competition opened, potentially leading to an overestimate of the association.

Ethics statement

This study was approved by the University of Melbourne Faculty of Business and Economics & Melbourne Business School Human Ethics Advisory Group (Ref: 2056754.1).

Background

The effectiveness of using financial incentives to increase vaccination rates for the SARS-COV-2 virus is uncertain.[1-3] One form of financial incentive has been entry into vaccination competitions where participants are eligible for large randomly-drawn cash prizes. These have also been referred to as lotteries but unlike lotteries they do not require cash payment on entry and so are not a form of profit-driven gambling. Such competitions were established across at least 21 states in the United States in 2021. Most notable is the competition in Ohio run during May-June 2021 with 5 x $1 million prizes over five weeks. Four studies using state-level data on vaccination rates over time, and comparing states with vaccination competitions with those with none, found they were ineffective in increasing vaccination rates.[4-7] Four studies found an increase in vaccination rates[8-11], including one that found increases in vaccination rates in low-income counties in Ohio but not in high-income counties.[9] One study examined the use of financial incentives across 24 states across the U.S., mainly including vaccination competitions, and found no overall impact on vaccination rates.[12]

Our research uses individual-level data to examine the association between vaccination rates and financial incentives in Australia in October 2021. The Million Dollar Vaccination Campaign (M$V) was open to entries from 1st to 31st of October 2021 for those aged 18 years or over who were Australian residents. Unlike some U.S. lotteries where the whole population was automatically entered, in M$V, each person entered voluntarily by completing a short webform

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

providing their contact details. Proof of vaccination was not required at entry though individuals had to tick a box on the webpage stating that they had at least their first dose. If they were chosen to receive a prize (a provisional winner), they were required to show proof of full vaccination (interpreted at the time as two doses) in the form of a government-approved electronic vaccination certificate. To claim a prize full (two-dose) vaccination must have occurred before 13th December, or no later than 13th January, depending on the required interval between first and second doses, which may vary across States and be up to 12 weeks. Only one entry per person was allowed.

M$V was funded by an alliance of philanthropic organisations coordinated by the Summer Foundation. The competition was designed to increase the rate of full (two-dose) vaccinations against the context of meeting national 80% vaccination targets that would trigger the end of harsh lockdowns in the two most populous states, New South Wales and Victoria. The objective was to speed up the rate of vaccination amongst those who intended to get vaccinated but had not yet done so. This was intended to reduce hospitalisations and ongoing economic costs of lockdowns. Australia's vaccination program started in March 2021. On the 30th of September, just before the competition opened, vaccination rates had steadily increased to 77.8% percent of the population over 16 years old with a first dose and 54.2% with a second dose. New South Wales (NSW) and Victoria, the two most populous states, had experienced outbreaks since July 2021 and were under various forms of lockdown at the end of September, including night-time curfews in Victoria, closure of retail businesses and hospitality, and continuing bans on travel. Lockdowns in NSW were more targeted at specific LGAs with high case numbers.

All eight states and territories agreed to a national roadmap on 6August 2021, with states individually releasing precise targets of population vaccination rates that were linked to the lifting of restrictions throughout the last quarter of 2021, with some target dates at the time the competition was open. For example, in Victoria, the targets were 70% of the population aged 16 and over, (reached on 21st October), 80% (reached on 29th October), and 90% of 12+ years (reached on 18th November) with a second dose. These targets provided non-financial incentives to get a second dose (referred to as 'fully vaccinated' at the time) as restrictions were eased when targets were met, with restrictions largely non-existent after the 90% target was reached.

The competition had a AUD 1 million (USD 0.72 million) Grand Prize in cash and a total of 3,100 daily prizes of AUD 1,000, with a total prize pool of AUD 4.1 million. Each entrant was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

eligible for the Grand Prize draw and the daily draw on the entry date. The daily prizes were in the form of a gift card that could be used at a range of participating stores. The competition was supported by a AUD 3 million marketing campaign led by Sayers that included peak-time TV, radio, and full-page national and regional newspaper advertising, extensive social media advertising, and outdoor media (e.g., electronic posters at bus stops and shopping centres). The campaign targeted culturally and linguistically diverse audiences and included advertising in languages such as Mandarin, Arabic, Cantonese, and Vietnamese, and areas with high populations of Indigenous people. As the campaign progressed, the targeting became more granular and nuanced in response to the analysis of data regarding the reach of the campaign, competition entrants, and vaccination rates in specific geographic locations throughout Australia. In response to concerns raised on social media about M$V being a scam, the campaign pivoted to engage and profile daily draw winners and to provide social proof about the legitimacy of M$V. When the competition closed, 2,744,974 Australians had entered, representing 13.7% of the adult population.

The competition provided the potential to receive financial incentives to encourage receipt of the first dose for those not vaccinated and provided incentives to those with a first dose to schedule a second dose if they had not already done so. The interval between first and second doses at the time depended on the vaccine: 4-8 weeks for Astra Zeneca during an outbreak (up to 12 weeks with no outbreak) and 3-6 weeks for Pfizer from July 2021.[13] Those with a first dose may already have had their second dose scheduled during October given the recommended fixed interval between doses, and so the incentives would not influence this group unless they changed their scheduled appointment to receive their second dose earlier or were persuaded not to delay their appointment. Those who already had their second dose before the competition opened could still enter, but their vaccination status would not be affected by the competition.

Methods

Patient and public involvement statement. There was no patient or public involvement in the research.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Data and participants. The Taking the Pulse of the Nation (TTPN) Survey was used to collect data. This is run by the Melbourne Institute and was administered every week from April 2020 and every two weeks from January 2021. Each wave includes 1,200 respondents, so it is a repeated cross-section. This paper uses data from 2,400 respondents in Waves 44 and 45 conducted in November 2021 after the competition was closed at the end of October.

Data were collected by a commercial provider using a mixed-mode procedure. For each wave, 400 respondents were interviewed by telephone, and 800 respondents completed a web survey. The survey provider constructed the sampling frame from a diverse set of continuously updated proprietary databases. The survey sampling procedure followed strict quotas for six states and the Australian Capital Territory (ACT). Each wave includes 600 men and 600 women, and the shares of respondents for each state and ACT are proportional to the population of that state or territory. Each survey wave takes up to six days until the gender/state quotas are reached. Waves 44 and 45 were in the field between 1st and 6th November and 15th to 20th November. The raw share of each state/location/gender/age-group strata in the survey sample is not necessarily the same as the share of this stratum in the population. For each survey wave, post-stratification inverse probability weights are calculated based on Greater Capital City Statistical Area (GCCSA) or 'Rest of State' for each state using respondents' postcode, age group (18-24, 24-35, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 64-75), and gender.

Study design and hypothesis. This is a cross-sectional observational study that examines the association between financial incentives and the probability of receiving a vaccination after the competition during and after October 2021. The study design exploits information on the month individuals received their first or second dose of a COVID vaccine which was asked in Waves 44 and 45 after the competition had closed.

Variables. Participants were asked the following questions during Waves 44 and 45 in November 2021 to determine their vaccination status. *"Are you willing to have the COVID-19 vaccine? (1) Yes, (2) No, (3) Don't Know (4), I have had the first dose of the vaccine only (5), I have had the first and second dose of the vaccine*." If they answered option (4) they were asked the month of their first vaccination. If they answered option (5), they were asked the month of their second

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

vaccination. They were separately asked, *"Did you enter the Million Dollar Vax Lottery? (1) Yes, 2) No*." The main outcome variable is binary and equal to one for those who reported receiving any vaccination (first or second dose) after the competition opened in October and is zero for the rest of respondents (including those who remained unvaccinated or those who received their first or second dose before October). In addition, we separately analysed those who had their first dose after the competition opened and those who had their second dose after the competition opened.

TTPN asks a range of questions known to be associated with vaccination status, so these were included as independent variables in the analysis. We include indicators for male, age categories (25-34; 35-44; 45-49; 50-54; 55-64; 65-74; 75+), having a child under 18, income categories (25-50; 50-75; 75 percentile+; refused), education categories (high school graduates; some college; university and above), and categories of the industry relative to those not in the labour force (agriculture; mining; manufacturing; electricity; construction and wholesale; retail; food services; transport; information media; insurance services; real estate services; professional, scientific and technical services; administrative services; public administration; education; healthcare assistance; arts and recreation services; other). Indicators for states (VIC, QLD, SA, WA, others (ACT, TAS, NT)) and living in a rural area are included. Indicators for financial stress, policy satisfaction (satisfied; not satisfied), voting preferences (liberal or national; labour; greens or democrats) are included, and an indicator for wave 45 (15 - 19, November).

The vaccination rates of individuals could be associated with the vaccination rates of others in their LGA through neighbourhood peer effects, the location of vaccination providers, and other LGA-specific factors. In addition, M$V targeted LGAs with low vaccination rates, and so LGA vaccination rates would be associated with competition entry. We therefore merge data on LGA-level vaccination rates using each respondent's postcode of residence.

Statistical analysis. Data are analysed using logistic regression using the outcome variable (vaccinated after September 30th, 2021) and the above covariates as independent variables to adjust for observed differences between those participating in the competition and those who did not. Separate regressions are conducted for those receiving their first vaccination after September

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

30th and those receiving their second vaccination after September 30th. Results are reported as odds ratios and marginal effects of the difference in the probability of being vaccinated. We exclude respondents who did not know the month they were vaccinated.

Results

Of 2,400 respondents, 2,375 responded to the vaccination question. A further 13 respondents did not know the month they received their first vaccination, leaving 2,362 for the analysis of receipt of the first dose. At the time the survey was completed in November, after entry had closed, 59.9% of all respondents had received two doses, 6.1% had only their first, and 22.3% were willing to be vaccinated but had not yet received their first dose, 7% were unwilling to be vaccinated, and 4.7% were unsure.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	Full Sample		Entrant		Non-entrant	
	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.
Proportion receiving any dose after September 30th (n=2,362)	0.252	0.434	0.393	0.489	0.224	0.417
Proportion receiving first dose after September 30th (n=2,362)	0.089	0.285	0.118	0.323	0.083	0.276
Proportion receiving second dose after September 30th (2,375)	0.208	0.406	0.337	0.473	0.181	0.385
Competition entrant	0.17	0.376	1	0	0	0
Male	0.485	0.5	0.415	0.493	0.5	0.5
Age 18 - 24	0.116	0.32	0.098	0.298	0.12	0.325
Age 25 - 34	0.192	0.394	0.184	0.388	0.194	0.396
Age 35 - 44	0.173	0.378	0.188	0.391	0.17	0.375
Age 45 - 49	0.084	0.278	0.105	0.307	0.08	0.271
Age 50 - 54	0.081	0.273	0.127	0.334	0.071	0.258
Age 55 - 64	0.152	0.359	0.192	0.395	0.144	0.351
Age 65 - 74	0.119	0.324	0.085	0.28	0.126	0.332
Age 75 above	0.082	0.275	0.02	0.139	0.095	0.294
Having a child below 18	0.31	0.463	0.321	0.467	0.308	0.462
Not graduated high school/NA	0.162	0.368	0.141	0.348	0.166	0.372
Highschool graduated	0.175	0.38	0.152	0.359	0.179	0.384
Some college	0.307	0.461	0.325	0.469	0.303	0.46
University and above	0.357	0.479	0.383	0.487	0.351	0.478
Income: below 25 percentile	0.188	0.391	0.131	0.338	0.199	0.4
Income: 25 - 50 percentile	0.288	0.453	0.279	0.449	0.29	0.454
Income: 50 - 75 percentile	0.251	0.433	0.252	0.435	0.25	0.433

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Income: 75 and above percentile	0.198	0.399	0.233	0.423	0.191	0.393
Income: refused	0.075	0.263	0.105	0.307	0.069	0.253
Industry: agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.014	0.119	0.011	0.105	0.015	0.122
Industry: mining	0.008	0.089	0.011	0.105	0.007	0.085
Industry: manufacturing	0.026	0.159	0.021	0.143	0.027	0.162
Industry: electricity, gas, water and waste service	0.013	0.114	0.003	0.052	0.015	0.123
Industry: construction and wholesale trade	0.043	0.204	0.051	0.22	0.042	0.2
Industry: retail trade	0.071	0.257	0.092	0.289	0.067	0.25
Industry: accommodation and food services	0.021	0.143	0.014	0.119	0.022	0.147
Industry: transport, postal and warehousing	0.028	0.166	0.009	0.096	0.032	0.177
Industry: media and telecommunication	0.025	0.158	0.026	0.158	0.025	0.158
Industry: financial and insurance services	0.044	0.205	0.028	0.164	0.047	0.212
Industry: rental, hiring and real estate services	0.009	0.093	0.006	0.08	0.009	0.095
Industry: professional, scientific and technical	0.043	0.203	0.045	0.208	0.043	0.202
Industry: administrative and support services	0.019	0.138	0.02	0.142	0.019	0.137
Industry: public administration and safety	0.022	0.146	0.033	0.178	0.019	0.138
Industry: education and training	0.039	0.194	0.053	0.223	0.036	0.187
Industry: health care and social assistance	0.061	0.24	0.082	0.275	0.057	0.232
Industry: arts and recreation services	0.011	0.104	0.016	0.126	0.01	0.099
Industry: other services	0.059	0.236	0.054	0.226	0.06	0.238
Industry: don't know, refused, not in the labour force	0.443	0.497	0.426	0.495	0.446	0.497
Living in rural	0.316	0.465	0.303	0.46	0.318	0.466
NSW	0.328	0.47	0.269	0.444	0.34	0.474
VIC	0.265	0.442	0.327	0.47	0.253	0.435
QLD	0.203	0.402	0.194	0.396	0.205	0.404
SA	0.071	0.257	0.059	0.235	0.073	0.261
WA	0.102	0.303	0.126	0.333	0.097	0.296
ACT, TAS, NT	0.031	0.174	0.025	0.156	0.033	0.178
Fully Vaccinated rate by LGA	78.45	13.979	79.774	11.593	78.178	14.407
With Financial Stress	0.436	0.496	0.448	0.498	0.433	0.496
Satisfied with policy	0.428	0.495	0.437	0.497	0.426	0.495
Not satisfied with policy	0.251	0.434	0.212	0.409	0.259	0.438
Indifferent with policy	0.321	0.467	0.351	0.478	0.314	0.464
Voting liberal or national	0.342	0.475	0.328	0.47	0.345	0.476
Voting labour	0.324	0.468	0.35	0.477	0.319	0.466
Voting greens or democrats	0.114	0.318	0.089	0.285	0.119	0.324
Voting others/no preference	0.219	0.414	0.233	0.423	0.217	0.412
Wave 44 (1 - 6, Nov 2021)	0.5	0.5	0.466	0.499	0.507	0.5
Wave 45 (15 – 19, Nov 2021)	0.5	0.5	0.534	0.499	0.493	0.5
Number of observations	2,375		439		1,936	

Notes: Numbers are weighted.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1 shows the weighted descriptive statistics of the sample used in the analysis and compares those who entered the competition with those who did not. Seventeen percent of respondents entered the competition. After entries opened on October 1st, 25.2% of respondents received a vaccination (either first or second dose). For those who entered, 39.3% received a vaccination after entries opened on October 1st, compared to 22.4% of those who did not enter. After entries opened, 8.9% of respondents received their first dose. The percentage of those who entered and who received their first dose after it opened was 11.8%, compared to 8.3% for those who did not enter the competition. The proportion who received their second dose after entries opened was higher at 20.8%. For those who entered the competition, 33.7% received their second dose after entries opened compared to 18.1% of respondents who did not enter.

Those who chose to enter the competition were more likely to be female, slightly more likely to be under 35, more likely to be between 50 and 64 years old, and less likely to be over 65. Those who entered were likely to have a higher income. There was also a higher proportion of entrants in Victoria.

Table 2: Adjusted and Unadjusted Regressions

	Any dose after September 30th	**First dose after September 30th**	**Second dose after September 30th**
Adjusted analysis			
Entrant vs. non-entrant	2.274***	1.376	2.314***
(Odds Ratio, 95% CI)	(1.727 to 2.994)	(0.911 to 2.080)	(1.742 to 3.073)
Change in probability	0.155***	0.025	0.146***
(95% CI)	(0.100 to 0.210)	(-0.009 to 0.059)	(0.092 to 0.200)
Unadjusted analysis			
Entrant vs. non-entrant	2.249***	1.472*	2.300***
(Odds Ratio, 95% CI)	(1.732 to 2.919)	(0.990 to 2.190)	(1.756 to 3.012)
Change in probability	0.169***	0.035	0.156
(95% CI)	(0.111 to 0.228)	(-0.004 to 0.074)	(0.100 to 0.212)
Number of observations	2,362	2,362	2,375

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Notes: Results are based on logistic regressions and are all weighted. Respondents who serve as a baseline for categorical variables are in the youngest age group (18 - 24), income below 25 percentile, education below high school, being out of labour force or do not know the industry that they are in, living in NSW, without voting preference, and indifferent policy satisfaction. * = p value<0.10; ** = p value<0.05; *** = p value<0.01.

Table 2 presents the results from the unadjusted logistic regressions that include only the dummy variable (entrants vs non-entrants) as an independent variable, and from the adjusted logistic regressions that include all covariates in Table 1 as independent variables (full results in Appendix 1). The differences between the adjusted and unadjusted models are small. Competition entry is associated with a higher proportion of respondents having any dose after September 30th. Those who entered were 2.27 times more likely to have a vaccination after September 30th compared to everyone else. This is equivalent to an increase in the probability of having any dose after September 30th of 0.155 (95% CI 0.100 to 0.210: 15.5 percentage points) compared to everyone else. Entry was associated with a 0.025 (95% CI -0.009 to 0.059) increase in the probability of getting the first dose after September 30th, but this was not statistically significant in the adjusted analysis, with the association driven by people getting their second dose. Those who entered were 2.3 times more likely to have a second dose after September 30th compared to everyone else. This is equivalent to an increase in the probability of a second dose after September 30th of 0.146 (95% CI 0.100 to 0.210: 14.6 percentage points) compared to everyone else.

The full results (Appendix 1) show that males, those in older age groups, those with children under 18, those working in accommodation and food services, public admin and safety, and other services were less likely to receive any vaccine after September 30th: that is they were more likely to have been vaccinated earlier. There is a strong age gradient suggesting that older people were more likely to get vaccinated before October 1st. Those in rental, hiring, and real estate services were more likely to get vaccinated after September 30th compared to those who were out of the labour force.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3: Association with entry into M$V

	Odds ratio	95% CI	
Male	0.778*	0.592	1.023
Age 25 – 34	1.044	0.646	1.686
Age 35 – 44	1.228	0.748	2.015
Age 45 – 49	1.336	0.764	2.337
Age 50 – 54	1.877**	1.081	3.261
Age 55 – 64	1.333	0.808	2.198
Age 65 – 74	0.542*	0.288	1.018
Age 75 above	0.168***	0.067	0.42
Having a child under 18	0.903	0.663	1.23
HS graduated	0.83	0.52	1.324
Some college	1.057	0.692	1.615
University and above	1.221	0.783	1.905
Income: 25 - 50 percentile	1.344	0.873	2.069
Income: 50 - 75 percentile	1.353	0.851	2.152
Income: 75 percentile and above	1.563*	0.933	2.619
Income: refused	2.133***	1.212	3.753
Industry: agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.632	0.232	1.719
Industry: mining	0.906	0.182	4.505
Industry: manufacturing	0.524	0.225	1.218
Industry: electricity, gas, water and waste services	0.147*	0.019	1.122
Industry: construction and wholesale	0.837	0.44	1.59
Industry: retail trade	1.078	0.67	1.734
Industry: accommodation and food services	0.451*	0.188	1.082
Industry: transport, postal and warehousing	0.209***	0.065	0.671
Industry: media and telecommunication	0.696	0.318	1.525
Industry: financial and insurance services	0.430**	0.185	1.001
Industry: rental, hiring, and real estate services	0.489	0.099	2.426
Industry: professional, scientific and technical	0.701	0.357	1.375
Industry: administrative and support services	0.736	0.328	1.65
Industry: public administration and safety	0.986	0.457	2.128
Industry: education and training	0.848	0.439	1.638
Industry: health care and social assistance	0.886	0.528	1.486
Industry: arts and recreation services	1.404	0.47	4.196
Industry: other services	0.618*	0.355	1.077
Living in rural	1.076	0.817	1.419
VIC	1.728***	1.227	2.433
QLD	1.645**	1.026	2.635
SA	1.395	0.821	2.371
WA	2.134***	1.261	3.612
ACT, TAS, NT	1.174	0.612	2.252

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Fully vaccinated rate by LGA	1.017**	1.004	1.03
With financial stress	1.105	0.84	1.452
Satisfied with policy	0.999	0.734	1.361
Not satisfied with policy	0.759	0.54	1.069
Voting liberal or national	1.031	0.719	1.479
Voting labour	1.117	0.794	1.571
Voting greens or democrats	0.754	0.469	1.211
Wave 45 (15 - 19 Nov, 2021)	1.06	0.816	1.375
Constant	0.034***	0.01	0.114

Notes: n=2375. Results are based on logistic regressions and are all weighted. Respondents who serve as a baseline for categorical variables are in the youngest age group (18 - 24), income below 25 percentile, education below high school, being out of labour force or do not know the industry that they are in, living in NSW, without voting preference, and indifferent policy satisfaction.

Table 3 examines who is more likely to enter the competition. Males were less likely to do so compared to females. Relative to those aged 18-24, respondents aged 50-54 were more likely to enter, while those older than 65 were less likely to enter. Compared to those in the lowest income quartile, people in the highest income quartile were more likely to enter. Those working in manufacturing, electricity, gas, water services, accommodation and food services, transport, postal and warehousing, and financial and insurance services were less likely to enter than those who were not in the labour force. Respondents in LGAs with higher vaccination rates were more likely to enter. Compared to those living in NSW, respondents living in Victoria, Queensland, and Western Australia were more likely to enter M$V.

Discussion

This study finds evidence of a statistically significant association between entry into the M$V competition and receipt of vaccination after the competition opened on October 1st. The association was driven by those who had received a second dose after September 30th. Those who received their second dose after the competition opened included those who had previously received a first dose sometime before October 1st and decided to schedule their second dose in response to the financial incentives. This group also included those who had already made an appointment before October 1st to receive a second dose after September 30th. Some in this group could have brought their appointment forward or were persuaded not to delay their appointment any further. However, others in this group would not have been influenced by financial incentives given their second appointment was already booked. This could lead to an overestimate of the effect of competition entry participation on vaccination rates. We cannot

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

distinguish between these groups in our data as we did not capture the month of the first dose for those who had a second dose, and so could not measure the interval between first and second doses. The mandated interval between the first and second dose varied across states, which we adjust for in the analysis. In addition, there may be unobserved characteristics of individuals that drive both the timing of vaccination (whether they were vaccinated before or after October) and entry into the competition. Our results therefore represent an association not a causal effect.

Distinguishing between the effect of financial incentives on first and second doses is important for policy as they imply different objectives and the targeting of policy towards different groups of the population. The aim of M$V was to encourage the population to achieve second-dose vaccination targets more quickly than would otherwise have happened. M$V was focused on individuals who are already motivated. It is not surprising that the competition was not associated with an increase in first doses given the more complex range of factors influencing vaccine hesitancy.

Our research adds to the literature using a unique and representative sample of individuals from Australia during the time when the M$V competition was open. Previous evidence from the U.S., including several evaluations of the Ohio vaccine incentives, shows mixed results using difference-in-difference study designs. Of five studies that examined first doses[4 7-9 11], three found evidence of an effect of incentives.[8 9 11] Of two studies that examined second doses[4 5], only one found an effect.[5] Two studies[6 10] used the total rate of vaccinations combining first and second doses and one of these found an effect[10].

The Ohio incentives and M$V were designed differently, implemented at different times during the pandemic, and may have had different marketing campaigns and this may influence the results. The whole population of Ohio was eligible to win whereas the M$V competition required individuals to enter. In the U.S. at that time the rate of vaccination was slowing, suggesting a lack of motivation in the population. In Australia, October 2021 was a time when vaccination rates were steadily increasing and when vaccination targets focusing on second doses ('fully' vaccinated) had been set by some states that were linked to the lifting of harsh lockdowns. Generally, the Australian population was more motivated to get vaccinated and the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

M$V competition was designed to add to this motivation. People who were already fully vaccinated may have interpreted the competition as a reward for their patience during lockdowns and for their earlier decision to get vaccinated, and for this group therefore the competition did not influence their decision to get vaccinated.

There was also a higher proportion of competition entrants from Victoria where lockdowns were harshest and motivation to hit vaccination targets was arguably higher than in other states. Our results found that those with higher incomes were more likely to participate in the M$V competition. Though the literature on lotteries suggests those on lower incomes are more likely to enter, recall that vaccination competitions are not lotteries as they do not involve gambling.[14] [15]. The financial incentives offered through entry into M$V were likely to have been perceived as a reward for getting vaccinated and that this perception may have been more widely held by those with higher incomes. This may also be because those who were more informed about the benefits of vaccination were more likely to enter the competition, and this is correlated with income. Though we control for education level, this independent effect of income may be capturing other types of access to unbiased information on vaccination. The results also showed that those in LGAs with higher vaccination rates were more likely to enter the competition compared to LGAs with lower vaccination rates, suggesting that those who might have already been vaccinated before October 1st were more likely to enter.

We do not examine the overall vaccination rate but the timing of when people received their first and second vaccination, so our numerical results are not comparable to those from other studies that use changes over time in population vaccination rates or the number of vaccines administered. Our data are self-reported and there is a risk of over-reporting of vaccination rates due to social desirability bias. However, this is unlikely as our self-reported rate of second vaccinations of 59.9% in the sample is lower than official data at the time it was collected (77.5% on November 1st and 87% on November 30th). This also raises concerns about the representativeness of our sample. Though our sample is representative of states and territories and uses weights based on location, gender, and age, it is from a commercial panel where respondents might be different from the general population who do not participate in commercial panel surveys in ways we do not observe, and this might be correlated with entry into

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

competitions. For example, 17% of our sample participated in the M$V compared to the national estimate of 13.7%.

The role of financial incentives to increase vaccination rates remains unclear.[3 14 17 18] Their use as nudges to speed up vaccination decisions could be effective. Policies to increase vaccination rates depend on the context and the stage of the pandemic and may interact with other strategies to increase vaccination rates, particularly in vaccine-hesitant populations where other factors are likely to matter more than financial incentives. Speeding up third (booster) vaccinations is a key policy challenge, and in the absence of hitting targets so that harsh lockdowns are lifted, the role of financial incentives needs to be considered.

Funding and acknowledgments
This research was funded by the Summer Foundation (grant number: N/A) and used data from The Taking the Pulse of the Nation (TTPN) Survey run by the Melbourne Institute: Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne. We thank Di Winkler from the Summer Foundation for comments on an earlier draft.

Authors contributions
AS conceived of the study, secured funding, designed the survey questions, contributed to the analysis, wrote and revised the manuscript, and interpreted results. DJ prepared the data and conducted all statistical analyses, contributed to writing and revising the manuscript, and interpreting results.

Competing Interests
None declared.

Data availability statement
Statistical code for the analysis s available from the Dryad repository, DOI: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.rv15dv495. TTPN Survey is a proprietary data set and researchers interested in replication need to seek access to the TTPN survey by contacting the Melbourne Institute.

References.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

1. Jarrett C, Wilson R, O'Leary M, et al. Strategies for addressing vaccine hesitancy – A systematic review. *Vaccine* 2015;33(34):4180-90. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.040
2. Kim HB. Financial Incentives for COVID-19 Vaccination. *Epidemiology and Health* 2021:e2021088. doi: 10.4178/epih.e2021088
3. Volpp KG, Cannuscio CC. Incentives for Immunity — Strategies for Increasing Covid-19 Vaccine Uptake. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2021;385(1):e1. doi: 10.1056/nejmp2107719
4. Dave D, Friedson AI, Hansen B, et al. Association Between Statewide COVID-19 Lottery Announcements and Vaccinations. *JAMA Health Forum* 2021;2(10) doi: 10.1001/jamahealthforum.2021.3117
5. Lang D, Esbenshade L, Willer R. Did Ohio's vaccine lottery increase vaccination rates? A pre-registered, synthetic control study: Mimeo, 2021.
6. Walkey AJ, Law A, Bosch NA. Lottery-Based Incentive in Ohio and COVID-19 Vaccination Rates. *JAMA* 2021;326(8):766-67. doi: 10.1001/jama.2021.11048
7. Sehgal NKR. Impact of Vax-a-Million Lottery on COVID-19 Vaccination Rates in Ohio. *Am J Med* 2021;134(11):1424-26. doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2021.06.032 [published Online First: 20210730]
8. Barber A WJ. Conditional Cash Lotteries Increase COVID-19 Vaccination Rates. 2021 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3894034
9. Mallow PJ, Enis A, Wackler M, et al. COVID-19 financial lottery effect on vaccine hesitant areas: Results from Ohio's Vax-a-million program. *Am J Emerg Med* 2021 doi: 10.1016/j.ajem.2021.08.053 [published Online First: 20210826]
10. Acharya B, Dhakal C. Implementation of State Vaccine Incentive Lottery Programs and Uptake of COVID-19 Vaccinations in the United States. *JAMA Network Open* 2021;4(12):e2138238. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.38238
11. Brehm M, Brehm P, Saavedra M. The Ohio Vaccine Lottery and Starting Vaccination Rates. *American Journal of Health Economics* 2021 doi: 10.1086/718512
12. Thirumurthy H, Milkman K, Volpp K, et al. Association Between Statewide Financial Incentive Programs and COVID-19 Vaccination Rates. *Social Science Research Network* 2021 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3912786
13. Australian Technical Advisory Group on Immunisaton. ATAGI statement on use of COVID-19 vaccines in an outbreak setting Canberra: Australian Government; 2021 [Available from: https://www.health.gov.au/news/atagi-statement-on-use-of-covid-19-vaccines-in-an-outbreak-setting accessed March 2022 2022.
14. Herring M, Bledsoe T. A Model of Lottery Participation. Demographics, Context, and Attitudes. *Policy Studies Journal* 1994;22(2):245-57. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-0072.1994.tb01466.x

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.02.22271734; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

15. Fu HN, Monson E, Otto AR. Relationships between socio□economic status and lottery gambling across lottery types: neighborhood□level evidence from a large city. *Addiction* 2021;116(5):1256-61. doi: 10.1111/add.15252
16. Leask J, Carlson SJ, Attwell K, et al. Communicating with patients and the public about COVID□19 vaccine safety: recommendations from the Collaboration on Social Science and Immunisation. *Medical Journal of Australia* 2021;215(1):9. doi: 10.5694/mja2.51136
17. Razai MS, Chaudhry UAR, Doerholt K, et al. Covid-19 vaccination hesitancy. *BMJ* 2021:n1138. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n1138
18. Wong CA, Pilkington W, Doherty IA, et al. Guaranteed Financial Incentives for COVID-19 Vaccination: A Pilot Program in North Carolina. *JAMA Intern Med* 2021 doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2021.6170 [published Online First: 20211025]