Public sentiment towards vaccination: characterizing global patterns and drivers of scientific research

Duilio Balsamo [1,2], Vittoria Offeddu [1], Zhina Aghamohammadi [1], Chiara Chiavenna [1,2], Laura P. Leone [1,3,4], Elena D'Agnese [1,5,6], Deepak Sharma[7], Aleksandra Torbica[1,8], Soheil Shayegh[9,10], Javier Andreu-Perez[11], Alessia Melegaro [1,2*]

1. DONDENA Centre for Research on Social Dynamics and Public Policy, Bocconi University, Milan, Italy

2. BIDSA Bocconi Institute for Data Science and Analytics, Bocconi University, Milan, Italy

3. Nuffield College, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

4. Department of Sociology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

5. Department of Economics and Management, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy

6. Department of Statistics, Computer Science, Applications, University of Florence, Florence, Italy

7. Department of Computer Science, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Kiel, Germany

8. CERGAS Centre for Research on Health and Social Care Management, Bocconi University, Milan, Italy

9. RFF-CMCC European Institute on Economics and the Environment, Milan, Italy

10. CMCC Foundation - Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Change, Milan, Italy

11. Centre for Computational Intelligence, School of Computer Science and Electronic Engineering, University of Essex, Colchester, UK

* Corresponding author: Alessia Melegaro (alessia.melegaro@unibocconi.it, +39 347 6724239)

Abstract

Introduction: Global health research is profoundly influenced by economic factors, with high-income countries frequently setting research agendas that may not adequately address local public health needs. Childhood immunisation is an example of such misaligned allocation of research efforts. The success of vaccination campaigns is typically threatened by widespread hesitancy, calling for a better understanding of public sentiment towards vaccination (PSV). However, it is unclear to what extent research on PSV is shaped by local disease endemicity, vaccine sentiment, or economic factors. In this study, we characterised global patterns and drivers of PSV research for five selected vaccines, *i.e.* polio, measles, human papillomavirus, influenza, and SARS-CoV-2, and assessed the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the observed research dynamics.

Methods: We conducted a machine-assisted literature search on PSV without geographical or time constraints. Through scientometric, Natural Language Processing, network, and statistical methods we modelled the geographical, epidemiological, and economic factors driving research on PSV.

Results: The global patterns of PSV research are primarily influenced by country-specific economic factors, and to a lesser extent by local disease incidence. We found evident imbalances in the distribution and direction of research efforts and disproportionate foreign authorship in studies concerning low-income settings. We found that academic attention to PSV towards measles and polio vaccines was disrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic, with potentially negative consequences for current eradication efforts and future research.

Conclusion: Our work highlights persistent inequities in PSV research, whereby shifts in high-income countries' health research priorities may undermine ongoing efforts. Our findings underscore the importance of promoting equitable research opportunities and research agendas that align with both emerging threats and long-standing global health goals.

Key messages

What is already known on this topic

Public sentiment towards vaccination (PSV) significantly influences vaccination campaign outcomes. While bibliometric studies have explored PSV research patterns, economic and contextual drivers in this research field remain underexplored, and international collaboration dynamics lack in-depth analysis.

What this study adds

This study identifies significant economic disparities shaping PSV research, with high-income countries dominating the field and directing studies toward low-income settings with limited local author representation. It also highlights the COVID-19 pandemic's role in shifting research focus from critical childhood vaccines to SARS-CoV-2, exacerbating these imbalances.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy

By revealing inequities in PSV research, this work underscores the need for equitable and inclusive research initiatives, prioritizing public health needs while addressing systemic disparities in global health research and policy.

Introduction

The primary goal of global health research is to promote health equity and strengthen healthcare systems by bridging global knowledge with local interventions.[1] However, global health initiatives are heavily influenced by economic factors.[2] Researchers from lower-income settings face limited access to global health research grants,[3] and are underrepresented in peer-reviewed publications.[4] Furthermore, 90% of all health research funding targets health issues of industrialized countries,[5] marginalizing lower-income regions, where health burdens are typically greater. This perpetuates inequities, with researchers from high-income countries dominating research activities also in lower-income settings, resulting in inadequate research agendas that fail to meet local public health needs, such as ensuring full childhood immunization.[2]

Despite vaccines' efficacy, global uptake remains suboptimal in most countries, pockets of zero-dose individuals persist,[6] and public sentiment towards vaccination (PSV) is imbued with widespread hesitancy.[7] Over time, considerable research efforts have been directed towards investigating the intricate mechanisms shaping PSV, resulting in a heterogeneous, multi-disciplinary, and fast-growing body of literature.[8] Numerous reviews attempted to systematize and summarize the existing evidence on PSV.[9] However, due to the sheer amount and complexity of the published data, this task is proving increasingly difficult, especially without the aid of machine-assisted methods. Identifying the main drivers of PSV research might facilitate the definition of future research priorities and provide an evidence-based rationale to support a more appropriate allocation of resources.

To what extent PSV research is shaped by the interplay between economic factors, local disease endemicity, and the effective need to study PSV locally is not fully understood,[8,10–12] especially in light of disruptive events, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The exceptional circumstances in which the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine was licensed, together with the determining role it has played in curbing the pandemic, significantly intensified research efforts and public discussions on PSV.[13] However, the pandemic also diverted a significant portion of global academic efforts and funding from other research to COVID-19-related

contributions, which benefitted from fast publication tracks and great academic attention, putting research on other diseases and vaccines at considerable disadvantage.[14–16]

In this work, we investigated the global patterns and drivers of scientific research on PSV, including studies on public attitudes, beliefs, emotions, trust, and uptake. To enable a fine-grained yet broad perspective on the literature, we selected a set of vaccines *i.e.,* those against polio, measles, Human PapillomaVirus (HPV), influenza, and SARS-CoV-2, to be representative of different target populations, licensing and distribution histories, and viral pathogens with distinct transmission routes and epidemiology. Using a combination of scientometric, Natural Language Processing, network, and statistical tools, we analysed a database of peer-reviewed scientific PSV literature to model the geographical, epidemiological, and economic factors driving scientific focus and academic contribution in this research field. Moreover, we assessed to what extent the COVID-19 pandemic has altered pre-existing publication dynamics.

Methods

Database construction

To retrieve scientific publications on PSV, we developed a comprehensive search string according to validated guidelines,[17] incorporating keywords regarding public knowledge, attitudes, awareness, emotions and beliefs related to vaccination, vaccine hesitancy and refusal, trust, and uptake (Table S1). To optimize the specificity of our search, we limited vaccine-related keywords to the article title, and other search terms to the title and abstract. We refined our search string through subsequent search cycles and qualitative screening of the first n=100 delivered papers, iteratively removing 1) keywords retrieving irrelevant literature, *e.g.* "vaccinia", and 2) individual terms that were likely to occur together with a synonymous search term in true positive cases and retrieving irrelevant literature otherwise. The literature search was conducted in the MEDLINE and Web of Science Core Collection databases until December 2023, without geographical or other time constraints. We chose this database combination to cover a broad spectrum of scientific disciplines while obtaining the best possible balance between sensitivity and specificity.[18] We

removed duplicates using the article DOIs and titles and excluded papers not mentioning any of the vaccines of interest in their titles or abstracts.

Given the large number of retrieved articles, we used Machine Learning (ML) techniques to select articles directly related to PSV. Applying a supervised learning approach, we first manually annotated (n=1,000) titles and abstracts based on a set of predefined rules, retaining articles including at least one aspect related to vaccine sentiment *e.g.* studies on knowledge, attitudes, and practices related to vaccination, or articles assessing determinants of vaccine acceptance, uptake, and timeliness. We included quantitative and qualitative primary research, secondary data analyses, empirical studies and theoretical models, mathematical models analysing determinants of vaccination, editorials, and reviews. After the first round of screening, performed by two independent reviewers, we obtained an inter-rater agreement *Cohen's k = 0.8*, indicating substantial agreement. A third reviewer resolved the disagreements, resulting in *n=376* and *n=624* articles respectively labelled as directly related or unrelated to public sentiment towards vaccination. Next, using the annotated sample, we trained several ML classifiers, fine-tuning the pipelines' hyperparameters in a 5-fold cross-validation setting. We applied the best-performing model (*Random Forest Classifier* with *bag-of-words* and *tf-idf* preprocessing, *F1-score = 0.89*, *Matthews Correlation Coefficient = 0.82* on the test set) to screen the full dataset. The retained articles were then further annotated by identifying their *primary vaccine*, *i.e.* the most frequently mentioned vaccine in the title and/or abstract, and the other *mentioned vaccines*. In cases where multiple vaccines were mentioned equally, the first vaccine appearing was considered the *primary vaccine*.

Data pre-processing and enrichment

Using OpenAI's GPT (Supplement-Methodological details) we enriched our corpus by extracting from titles and abstracts of collected articles the *authors' countries*, *i.e.* the countries of the authors' institutions, and the *studied countries*, *i.e.,* the countries of the analysis. Each country was then assigned a list of categorical attributes, including income level as of 2021,[19] time-dependent vaccine-specific coverage,[20,21] and time-dependent disease incidence for each related disease,[22,23] all categorized into four groups (L=low;

LM=lower-middle; UM=upper-middle; H=high) based on the empirical quantiles (Supplement-Methodological details). Polio incidence was classified as either "No cases" or “Reported cases”. Due to incomplete data on disease incidence and vaccination coverage for HPV and influenza, we limited the analysis including all attributes to measles and polio.

Time trend analysis

To characterize the publication trends over time, we modelled the volume of published papers for each vaccine from 2010 to 2019 fitting an exponential function. The impact of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic on PSV-related research was assessed by comparing the predicted publication volumes for 2020-2023, based on the fitted exponential models, with the actual volume produced after 2020, calculating the *percentage difference* (Supplement-Methodological details).

Geographic network construction

We developed a custom network analysis pipeline to map the geographic direction of global research on PSV. For each 5-year time interval, we created vaccine-specific networks where each node represents a country, and each directed weighted edge, a connection between countries i and j, was formed proportionally to the number of papers authored or co-authored by institutions from country i focusing on country j. Articles with multiple authors’ countries and/or studied countries contributed to multiple edges in the network. We further characterized each node (country i) by counting the number of 1) *Domestic* studies, papers on country i authored by local researchers alone (the weighted self-loops of node i); 2) *Inbound* studies, papers on country i authored or co-authored by foreign institutions (the weighted in-degree minus the self-loops); 3) *Outbound* studies, papers on any foreign country authored or co-authored by institutions from country i (the out-degree minus the self-loops).

Statistical analysis on research drivers

We employed a regression framework to investigate the drivers of global PSV research. First, to investigate the probability of a country being *studied*, we fitted logistic regression models using a binary dependent

variable indicating whether a country had been the object of at least one research paper on a given vaccine (1 if studied, 0 if not) (Supplement-Methodological details). Second, for countries that were *studied*, we analysed which countries' factors influenced the proportion of papers authored or co-authored by foreign institutions (*i.e., Inbound* / (*Inbound* + *Domestic*)). We achieved that through a Beta regression model, suitable for modelling proportions (Supplement-Methodological details). Independent variables in both models included 1) time interval, classified as pre-pandemic (2010-2014; 2015-2019) and post-pandemic (2020-2023) periods, 2) country income level, 3) country time-varying vaccination coverage level, and 4) country time-varying disease incidence level. All models except the ones for polio (for which not enough data was available) included an interaction term between income and time to test whether the probability of being studied or the proportion of foreign authorship varied over time across income groups (Supplement-Methodological details).

Ethics approval

This study did not include human participants and is thus exempt from Institutional Review Board approval.

Results

The unfolding of PSV research over time

Our query across two databases yielded 154,552 articles in English from 1902 to 2023 (Figure 1). After removing duplicates (*43%*), and screening for references to any of the five selected vaccines, we used ML-assisted techniques to exclude non-relevant papers (*24%* of articles on the selected vaccines). We retained a total of *13,287* articles (*18%* of the initial yield) for analysis. Of these, 44% focused on SARS-CoV-2 as the *primary vaccine* (n= 5,818), 25% on influenza (n=3,328), 23% on HPV (n=3,078), 7% on measles (n=883), and 1% on polio (n=180).

The volume of PSV literature did not rise significantly until the late 1980s (Figure 1). We observed exponential growth across all vaccines, with vaccine-specific surges corresponding to the licensing of the HPV and SARS-CoV-2 vaccines, and a volume spike in influenza-related publications following the

development of the novel influenza vaccine against the 2009/H1N1 pandemic strain. Using the fitted exponential models (Figure S2), we predicted the volume of publications post-SARS-CoV-2 and compared them against the measured volumes, finding a higher-than-expected increase in the volume of influenza-related research (Perc. Diff. = *32%; 95%CI = 20%, 46%)*. In contrast, the volume of PSV research on the two routine childhood vaccinations, polio and measles, fell below expectation after the pandemic, with decreases of *Perc. Diff. = -56% (95%CI = -68%, -26%)* and *Perc. Diff. = -17% (95%CI = -33%, 9%)* respectively.

Notably, an increasing proportion of papers mentioned more than one vaccine in the text (7·3% before 2020 and 12·9% after 2020). In particular (Figure 2), vaccines sharing similar target populations, such as polio and measles, or those protecting against pathogens with similar characteristics, such as influenza and SARS-CoV-2, two respiratory viruses with pandemic potential, were more frequently studied together. Additionally, several studies on all *primary vaccines* began co-mentioning SARS-CoV-2 during the pandemic. This applied even to vaccines with relatively different characteristics, such as polio, measles, or HPV, suggesting a potential impact of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic on PSV research. Despite historical trends, the share of articles studying influenza alone also declined after the pandemic, with a large proportion (19·7%) of recent influenza-related articles also referencing the new coronavirus.

Geographic patterns in global health research

We mapped the geographic distribution of global PSV research from 2010 onwards (Figure 3). To reconstruct the direction of research we evaluated country-specific proportions of publications authored by local institutions alone (*Domestic),* authored by or with institutions from a foreign country (*Inbound*), or focused exclusively on foreign countries (*Outbound)*.

Overall, published PSV literature covered most countries worldwide, with high-income countries in North America and Europe authoring the majority of studies (72·2 %). However, notable differences emerged in the spatial distribution of published articles across the examined vaccines. PSV research on the polio vaccine was more geographically clustered compared to other vaccines, with hotspots of research in Sub-

Saharan Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia. Conversely, research efforts on the influenza vaccine were relatively frequent in Europe and North America but scarce on the African continent, with over 70%, over 40%, and less than 30% of countries in the respective continents involved, *i.e.* authoring or being studied in at least one paper (Figure S3, top row).

We also observed income-related global imbalances in terms of research direction (Figure S3, bottom row). Despite the high number of studies on polio and measles vaccines authored by institutions in North America, Europe, and Australia, the direction of these studies was predominantly *Outbound* for high-income countries *(Median proportion Outbound studies, High-income; Polio: 82%; Measles: 61%)*, and mostly *Inbound* for low-income countries *(Median proportion Inbound studies, Low-income: Polio: 100%; Measles: 78%)*. In the same time frame, little *Domestic* and even less *Outbound* research emerged from low- and lower-middle-income countries. Similar but reversed income-dependent trends were observed in the distribution of PSV research on the HPV and influenza vaccines, although in high-income countries the shares of *Domestic*, *Inbound*, and *Outbound* research efforts were more equally distributed for these two vaccines *(Median proportion Domestic, Inbound, Outbound studies, High-income; Influenza: 24%, 37%, 26%; HPV: 33%, 32%, 33%)*. Lastly, we measured comparable shares of *Outbound* research on SARS-CoV-2 across income levels *(Median proportion Outbound studies SARS-CoV-2: Low-income: 21%; Low-middle-income: 31%; Upper-middle-income: 33%; High-income: 40%)*, with the amount of *Inbound* research decreasing with increasing country income, mirroring patterns observed for other vaccines.

Drivers of global research flow

Through vaccine-specific logistic regression models, we assessed the potential factors influencing the probability of countries being the focus of global PSV research. The reconstructed marginal probabilities are shown in Figure 4 and Figure S4, upper panels, coefficients are reported in Table S2 and Table S3. We found that a significantly lower proportion of countries has been studied in polio research compared to all the other vaccines. For all vaccines, the probability of being studied was significantly associated with the country's income level, although this dependence followed opposite directions for different vaccines. In

the reference period (2010-2014), lower-income countries had a significantly higher probability of being the object of polio or measles PSV research compared to high-income countries. The disparity was greatest for the measles vaccine in the reference period, with high-income countries having 98% lower odds of being studied compared to the low-income group *(H vs L: OR=0·02; 95%CI = 0·00, 0·11)* (Table S2). This income disparity remained constant over time for polio and appeared to level up for measles, with increased interest in higher-income settings but a decrease in lower-income ones. In contrast, high-income countries had a significantly higher probability of serving as study locations for the HPV and influenza vaccines, perpetuating existing income disparities without significant time-and-income variation. Additionally, the probability of being studied for the influenza vaccine appeared to be significantly higher in the years following the COVID-19 pandemic *(2020-23 vs 2010-14: OR=7·57; 95%CI = 1·16, 149·71)* (Table S3).

For both measles and polio, local disease incidence affected the probability of countries to be studied (Figure S4, Table S2). Countries where clinical polio cases were reported had 2·7 times higher odds of being studied compared to countries where the disease was eliminated *(Reported cases vs No cases: OR=2·67; 95%CI= 0·95, 7·37)*. Analogously, the probability of being studied was significantly higher among countries experiencing comparatively high measles incidence *(H vs L: OR=10·11; 95% CI= 4·45, 24·76)*. Conversely, we did not detect a consistent effect of national vaccination coverage on the probability of being studied for either vaccine.

Determinants of foreign authorship

For countries that have been the object of PSV research, we modelled the proportion of articles (co-)authored by foreign countries using Beta regression models. The fitted values are shown in Figure 4 and Figure S4, bottom panels, the coefficients are reported in Table S2 and Table S3. Across all vaccines, during the reference period (2010-2014), the proportion of papers involving foreign research efforts increased as the income level of the *studied* country decreased. This income-related disparity appeared to diminish over time for the measles, HPV, and influenza vaccines. Conversely, we observed no significant time-dependent change for polio research.

For both polio and measles, countries reporting clinical disease cases had a smaller proportion of articles (co-)authored by foreign researchers. We found no consistent effect of national vaccination coverage on the proportion of foreign authorship.

Discussion

In this work, we integrated an extensive literature search, machine learning-assisted article screening and data enrichment, network analysis, and statistical methods to develop a novel database of research papers on PSV, which offers a valuable resource for addressing broad global health research questions. Going beyond traditional bibliometric methods,[8,10–12] and merging information on economic factors and direction of research, we investigated patterns and drivers shaping the global research efforts on PSV, exposing significant inequities that might compromise the achievement of longstanding global health research goals.

Our findings portrayed PSV research as a rather recent research field, shaped by vaccine-specific epidemiological factors and unforeseen global health challenges, such as pandemic threats, and significantly influenced by country-specific economic determinants.

Our study shows that, despite the known efficacy of the polio and measles vaccines against diseases for which eradication is considered within reach,[24] and in spite of the rise in public vaccine hesitancy in recent years,[25,26] the PSV research focus on these vaccines has not intensified as much as needed. Specifically, our analysis of historical and geographical publication trends revealed that while overall PSV publications have grown exponentially, the research output on the polio and measles vaccines remained relatively modest throughout the study period, with evident geographic and economic disparities. Moreover, PSV research on these vaccines proved vulnerable to the sudden disruptions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic.

By modelling the volumes of historical research data, we detected a strong post-pandemic shift in the publication patterns of research on PSV related to all the studied vaccines.

We observed higher-than-expected post-pandemic publication volumes for the influenza vaccine, likely due to its analogies with the SARS-CoV-2 vaccines. In contrast, we measured a marked decline in research

attention on the polio and measles vaccines. These findings align with abundant evidence of the negative impact of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic on routine childhood vaccinations, both in terms of vaccine uptake[27,28] and public trust,[29] and may be attributed to a temporary redirection of academic interest and research funding towards COVID-19-related research. The influence of SARS-CoV-2 on PSV research was further highlighted by a post-pandemic increase in articles on other *primary vaccines* mentioning the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. This is remarkable for vaccines that share few or no similarities with it. These results may be the reflection of the very peculiar situation of an ongoing pandemic threat and the expected momentary shift of the global health research agenda. However, they may also suggest that PSV research remains highly sensitive to time- and context-dependent opportunities that influence researchers' actions in pursuit of academic success,[16] underscoring the need to maintain sustained academic attention on long-standing research objectives, such as eradication goals for other vaccines.

Our statistical analyses of geographical, economic, and epidemiological factors consistently showed that country income levels critically shape the landscape of PSV research, inducing an economically driven imbalance in both the global distribution and direction of research efforts.

In agreement with previous literature,[8,10–12] we found that high-income countries produced the majority of global PSV research. In addition, these countries typically directed their research on polio and measles towards lower-income regions and were more likely to attract research efforts on the HPV and influenza vaccines.

Our regression analysis also suggested a gradual shift in academic attention from low- to high-income settings, particularly for measles, but also for HPV and influenza. We showed that such a trend may be partially explained by changes in the epidemiology of the related diseases, though other factors we were unable to measure accurately at a global scale likely played a significant role as well. These may include the inequitable global distribution of financial and academic research resources, a country's historical experience with the disease, local outbreaks, local vaccination recommendations and policies, political context, global publication bias,[30] and countries' involvement in international public health endeavours,

such as disease elimination initiatives. Overall, many of these disparities likely hinder lower-income countries' ability to fill the gap with *Domestic* research. The instability in ensuring steady academic attention to PSV research may render the establishment of long-standing research agendas more challenging, potentially compromising the efficacy of global efforts such as disease eradication for polio and measles.

Income-dependent disparities were also evident through the disproportionate amount of foreign authorship in studies concerning low-income settings, especially in PSV research on polio and measles. This suggests a worrisome need for external research efforts in low-income countries, even in cases concerning very local health challenges.

Except for polio research, where the historical imbalances persist, foreign research contributions became more evenly distributed across income groups for all vaccines, indicating an encouraging increase in academic collaborations across income groups. Combining this result with an overall increased attention to higher-income countries, however, our analyses also suggested that the levelling of foreign efforts might be driven by increased collaborations among high-income countries, likely at the expense of lower-income ones, where such research is often most needed.

Overall, our analyses showed that the global patterns of scientific research on PSV are significantly influenced by economic factors and global epidemiological events that steer academic focus and the opportunity for scientific collaborations. We uncovered that the COVID-19 pandemic profoundly altered pre-existing PSV research trends, favouring new research on influenza but slowing down the existing efforts on the polio and measles vaccines. Additionally, we provided strong evidence that a country's lower income significantly limits its capacity to perform *Domestic* research, even in areas with high disease incidence, resulting in an inequitable and likely inefficient reliance on external research activities to address critical local health challenges.

This study is limited because we were not able to measure additional factors that may shape global attention on PVS research, *e.g.* a country's academic spending, historical experience with the disease, the emergence

of local outbreaks, local vaccination recommendations and policies, politics, and countries' involvement in international public health endeavours, such as disease elimination initiatives. In addition, our data collection may have been biased by the systematic exclusion of articles in languages other than English.

Conclusion

The misalignment between those with the financial resources to conduct research and those most in need of its outcomes points to persistent inequities in the PSV research field. These circumstances, driven by funding availability, academic opportunities, and public opinion, are not unique to this domain but are rather a disquieting epitome of broader inequities affecting other global and public health areas. These factors influence research priorities worldwide, especially in high-income countries, potentially undermining the effectiveness of existing research agendas to achieve desired global health outcomes beyond increasing vaccine uptake in endemic countries.[31] Our findings suggest that such inequities are likely to be exacerbated by external disruptions, such as those imposed by the emergence of COVID-19, with potentially damaging impacts on current public health interventions and future research directions.

By providing a clearer view of the main drivers of PSV research and exposing the pitfalls of shifting international academic attention, our work emphasized the importance of promoting inclusive and equitable research opportunities. Such initiatives should foster research that addresses pressing public health needs without losing sight of existing global health goals.

Figures



Figure 1 Annual number of published scientific articles on public sentiment towards 5 selected vaccines from 1980 onwards. Dashed lines indicate the total number of articles mentioning each vaccine, reported in different colours, in their title and/or abstract. Solid lines indicate the total number of articles focusing on a specific vaccine as the *primary vaccine*. Vertical lines mark vaccine licensing dates. The licensing date for influenza corresponds to the vaccine against the 2009/H1N1 pandemic strain, while the licensing of the 1945 inactivated seasonal influenza vaccine is omitted. Polio (1955) and measles (1963) vaccine licensing dates precede the emergence of PSV research. For visualization purposes, the number of papers published on SARS-CoV-2 is evaluated and reported quarterly.



Figure 2 Co-occurrence of *primary vaccines* and *mentioned vaccines* from 2010 onwards. For each 5-year interval, the color-coded heatmap shows the percentage of articles focusing on a primary vaccine (y-axis)

and mentioning another vaccine (x-axis). Percentages on the diagonal represent the proportion of papers that focus exclusively on a *primary vaccine*. Articles mentioning more than one additional vaccine are included more than once in the matrices. The total number of articles focusing on each *primary vaccine* for a given period is reported under the y-axis labels.



Figure 3 Geographic distribution of *author countries* and *studied countries* by vaccine from 2010 onwards. Pie slices represent country-specific shares of *Domestic*, *Inbound,* or *Outbound* studies. *Domestic*: studies on country *i* authored by local researchers alone. *Inbound*: studies on country *i* authored or co-authored by foreign institutions. *Outbound:* studies on any foreign country authored or co-authored by institutions from country *i*. The size of each pie chart is proportional to the total number of studies involving a country. Background colour corresponds to countries' income levels. Panels *(f – j)* focus on European countries.



Figure 4 (Top row) Estimated probabilities, with 95% confidence intervals, of being the subject of PVS research on a given vaccine across time points and income groups. (Bottom row) Estimated proportion, with 95% confidence intervals, of PSV research articles on a given vaccine involving foreign researchers (*Inbound/(Inbound+Domestic)),* by income level of studied countries. L=low income; LM=lower-middle income; UM= upper-middle income; H= high income.

References

1 Koplan JP, Bond TC, Merson MH, Reddy KS, Rodriguez MH, Sewankambo NK *et al.* Towards a common definition of global health. *Lancet* 2009; **373**: 1993–1995.

2 Smeeth L, Kyobutungi C. Reclaiming global health. *Lancet* 2023; **401**: 625–627.

3 Charani E, Abimbola S, Pai M, Adeyi O, Mendelson M, Laxminarayan R *et al.* Funders: The missing link in equitable global health research? *PLOS Glob Public Heal* 2022; **2**: e0000583.

4 Cash-Gibson L, Rojas-Gualdrón DF, Pericàs JM, Benach J. Inequalities in global health inequalities research: A 50-year bibliometric analysis (1966-2015). *PLoS One* 2018; **13**: e0191901.

5 Global Forum for Health Research & World Health Organization. The 10/90 (ten ninety) report on health research 2003-2004. 2004.https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/44386 (accessed 16 Jul2024).

6 The WHO Global Health Observatory. IA2030 IG 2.1: Number of zero dose children. 2024.https://www.who.int/data/gho/indicator-metadata-registry/imr-details/7792 (accessed 19 Sep2024).

7 de Figueiredo A, Simas C, Karafillakis E, Paterson P, Larson HJ. Mapping global trends in vaccine confidence and investigating barriers to vaccine uptake: a large-scale retrospective temporal modelling study. *Lancet* 2020; **0**. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31558-0.

8 Sweileh WM. Bibliometric analysis of global scientific literature on vaccine hesitancy in peer-reviewed journals (1990-2019). *BMC Public Health* 2020; **20**: 1–15.

9 Fernandes S, Jit M, Bozzani F, Griffiths UK, Anthony JG. A bibliometric analysis of systematic reviews on vaccines and immunisation. 2020; **36**: 2254–2261.

10 Chen C, Yang Q, Tian H, Wu J, Chen L, Ji Z *et al.* Bibliometric and visual analysis of vaccination hesitancy research from 2013 to 2022. *Hum Vaccines Immunother* 2023; **19**. doi:10.1080/21645515.2023.2226584.

11 Sweileh WM. Bibliometric analysis of scientific research publications on COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy (2020 – 2021). *Electron J Gen Med* 2023; **20**: em500.

12 Jaca A, Iwu-Jaja CJ, Balakrishna Y, Pienaar E, Wiysonge CS. A global bibliometric analysis of

research productivity on vaccine hesitancy from 1974 to 2019. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 2021; **17**: 3016–3022.

13 Emery N, Dugerdil A, Flahault A. Vaccine Hesitancies Across the World in the Era of COVID-19. *Am J Public Health* 2022; **112**: 1579–1581.

14 He J, Liu X, Lu X, Zhong M, Jia C, Eliseo D *et al.* The impact of COVID-19 on global health journals: an analysis of impact factor and publication trends. *BMJ Glob Heal* 2023; **8**: 11514.

15 Riccaboni M, Verginer L. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on scientific research in the life sciences. *PLoS One* 2022; **17**: e0263001.

16 Aviv-Reuven S, Rosenfeld A. Publication patterns' changes due to the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal and short-term scientometric analysis. *Scientometrics* 2021; **126**: 6761–6784.

17 Bramer WM, de Jonge GB, Rethlefsen ML, Mast F, Kleijnen J. A systematic approach to searching: an efficient and complete method to develop literature searches. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2018; **106**. doi:10.5195/jmla.2018.283.

18 Bramer WM, Rethlefsen ML, Kleijnen J, Franco OH. Optimal database combinations for literature searches in systematic reviews: A prospective exploratory study. *Syst Rev* 2017; **6**: 1–12.

19 World Bank Group. World Bank Country and Lending Groups. 2024.

20 World Health Organization. Polio (Pol3) Immunization coverage estimates by country. 2024.https://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.A831 (accessed 15 Jul2024).

21 World Health Organization. Measles-containing-vaccine second-dose (MCV2) immunization coverage by the locally recommended age (%). 2024.https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/measles-containing-vaccine-second-dose-(mcv2)-immunization-coverage-by-the-nationally-recommended-age-(-) (accessed 15 Jul2024).

22 World Health Organization. Poliomyelitis - number of reported cases. 2024.https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/poliomyelitis---number-of-reported-cases (accessed 15 Jul2024).

23 WOrld Health Organization. Measles - number of reported cases. 2024.https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/measles---number-of-reported-cases (accessed 15 Jul2024).

24 Higgins DM, O'Leary ST. A World without Measles and Rubella: Addressing the Challenge of Vaccine Hesitancy. *Vaccines 2024, Vol 12, Page 694* 2024; **12**: 694.

25 Pandey A, Galvani AP. Exacerbation of measles mortality by vaccine hesitancy worldwide. 2023. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00063-3.

26 Harvard International Review. Polio in a post vaccine world the consequences of anti-vaccination sentiments. 2023.https://hir.harvard.edu/polio-in-a-post-vaccine-world-the-consequences-of-anti-vaccination-sentiments/.

27 Shet A, Carr K, Danovaro-Holliday MC, Sodha S V., Prosperi C, Wunderlich J *et al.* Impact of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic on routine immunisation services: evidence of disruption and recovery from 170 countries and territories. *Lancet Glob Heal* 2022; **10**: e186–e194.

28 Lassi ZS, Naseem R, Salam RA, Siddiqui F, Das JK. The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Immunization Campaigns and Programs: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021; **18**: 1–19.

29 Lazarus J V., White TM, Wyka K, Ratzan SC, Rabin K, Larson HJ *et al.* Influence of COVID-19 on trust in routine immunization, health information sources and pandemic preparedness in 23 countries in 2023. *Nat Med 2024 306* 2024; **30**: 1559–1563.

30 Chen H, Rider CI, Jurgens D, Teplitskiy M. Geographical Disparities in Navigating Rejection in Science Drive Disparities in its File Drawer. 2024. doi:10.2139/SSRN.4872023.

31 Agnandji ST, Tsassa V, Conzelmann C, Köhler C, Ehni HJ. Patterns of biomedical science production in a sub-Saharan research center. *BMC Med Ethics* 2012; **13**. doi:10.1186/1472-6939-13-3.

Data availability statement

The database containing all scientific publications included in this analysis will be made available on reasonable request for scientific research purposes. For further information or to request access, please contact the corresponding author.

Competing interests statement

None declared

Funding statement

Supported by the ERC Grant "IMMUNE" (ID: 101003183), PNRR Grant BEHAVE-MOD (ID: SA-02. P0001), and the Bocconi Covid Crisis Lab, supported by the "Fondazione Romeo ed Enrica Invernizzi".

Patient and Public Involvement statement

It was not appropriate or possible to involve patients or the public in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research

Author contributions

DB, VO, ZA, CC, LPL, AT, SS, JAP, and AM contributed to the conceptualization by formulating the research idea, objectives, and research questions. VO, LPL, ED, and AM developed the search string, screening strategy, and annotated the dataset for relevance. DS and JAP collected and curated the dataset, while DB, VO, ZA, and CC enriched it with relevant attributes and performed data cleaning. DB, VO, ZA, CC, and AM designed the study methods and performed technical analyses, including machine-assisted literature searches, enrichment via natural language processing, network analysis, and other formal analyses. CC and ZA conducted the regression analysis. DB, VO, ZA, CC, and AM produced the results and drafted the initial manuscript. All authors interpreted the results, reviewed, and edited the drafts. DB and VO led and coordinated the project, AM supervised and secured funding.