MMR vaccination coverage in the U.S. before and after the COVID-19 pandemic: A modelling study

Ensheng Dong[1,2,3], Andreas Nearchou[1,2], Yamato Okura[2], Samee Saiyed[1,2], Lauren M. Gardner[1,2,4,*]

[1]Department of Civil and Systems Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA.
[2]Center for Systems Science and Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA.
[3]RAND Corporation, Arlington, VA 22202, USA
[4]Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA.

Background: Childhood vaccination rates have been declining in the United States since the COVID-19 pandemic began. While COVID-19 exacerbated the decline in routine vaccination through disruption of healthcare services and the diversion of resources, factors including vaccine hesitancy, socioeconomic disparities and vaccine policy also contribute to changes in vaccination behavior. Understanding the factors that influence vaccination choice is necessary to develop effective public health policy.

Methods: We collect county-level MMR vaccination rates for kindergarten children from 2017 – 2024 for 2,266 U.S. counties, evaluate coverage patterns and trends before and after the COVID-19 pandemic, and implement multivariable weighted logistic regression models to identify factors associated with low and declining MMR vaccination rates in U.S. counties.

Findings: We reveal a nationwide decline in MMR rates following the COVID-19 pandemic, with declines observed in 1,688 of the counties evaluated. We find state-level non-medical exemption (NME) policies to be strongly associated with low and declining MMR rates. We identify a positive association in vaccination rates across vaccine types. We find higher MMR rates are positively associated with Republican-aligned counties and declines in MMR rates to be positively associated with COVID-19 death rates.

Interpretation: The significant association between NMEs and low and declining MMR rates suggest these state level policies are harmful and reduce vaccination coverage. The positive associations among vaccine types suggest spillover effects in vaccine seeking behavior. The association between MMR rates and Republican-aligned counties contrast COVID-19

vaccination patterns, highlighting the complex nature of political polarization on vaccine-related behavior, while the association between MMR declines and COVID-19 death rate reveals an additional burden posed by the pandemic.

Funding: This work was supported by a grant from Bloomberg Philanthropies awarded to the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg Center for Government Excellence, City Analytics Initiative.

Introduction

It is widely accepted in the scientific communities that childhood vaccination is an effective and efficient public health intervention, which has substantially reduced the incidence of vaccine-preventable diseases and has saved countless children's lives worldwide.[1] In the United States (U.S.), the Advisory Committee on Vaccination Practices (ACIP) recommends a series of vaccinations for children and adolescents to protect against various infectious diseases.[2] Researchers estimated that the childhood vaccination program has prevented over 24 million cases of vaccine-preventable diseases for the U.S. in 2019.[3] Nonetheless, in the U.S. there is evidence of a national-level decline in the measles-mumps-rubella (MMR) vaccination rate among children between 2019 and 2024. Furthermore, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has reported a resurgence of measles outbreaks,[4] which has typically served as a sentinel indicator of childhood vaccine interruptions.[5] According to the CDC, the national median MMR vaccination rate dropped from 94.3% to 92.0% between the 2019-20 and 2023-24 school years (Figure 1), indicating a growing risk of measles resurgence and emphasizing the urgent need to reinvigorate childhood vaccination campaigns.

Various factors have been shown to impact childhood vaccination rates in the U.S, including parental vaccine hesitancy, socioeconomic disparities, policy differences across states, and online misinformation.[5–8] The COVID-19 pandemic further exacerbated the decline in routine childhood vaccination coverage, potentially due to the disruption of healthcare services and the diversion of public health resources.[9,10] Furthermore, the widespread vaccine hesitancy observed during the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S. - characterized by significant regional disparities in vaccination uptake and strong influences of political and social factors - has raised concerns about potential spillover effects on routine childhood vaccination acceptance and coverage.[11–15] Several studies have examined childhood vaccination during the pandemic period, reporting decreases in pediatric vaccine ordering, childhood vaccination coverage, and up-to-date vaccination status,[9,16,17] however, the first

two studies only focus on the acute early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic while the latter only examines specific U.S. regions. Additionally, previous research has raised significant concerns about the impact of state-level vaccination policies on declining MMR vaccination coverage.[18,19] In particular, non-medical exemptions (NMEs), which are classified as religious or philosophical exemptions from vaccination requirements, have been strongly associated with declining MMR coverage and identified as a contributing factor to measles outbreaks in the U.S.[8,20–22]

While the national and state level declines in MMR coverage over the last five years are well documented,[4] outbreaks occur within communities, which may differ in their vaccination coverage substantially, even within a state. However, there are no comprehensive datasets or studies evaluating nationwide MMR coverage at a county-level in the post-COVID era.
In this study we build on the existing literature, addressing previous limitations in scale and resolution to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the geographical heterogeneity in MMR vaccine uptake and its underlying determinants. Specifically, the main contributions of our study are as follows:

1. We conducted a comprehensive data collection effort, developing a standardized protocol to compile county-level MMR vaccination data for all publicly reporting states in the U.S. from 2017 to 2024.
2. We mapped trends in MMR coverage over time and identified the U.S. counties with low MMR vaccination rates or significant declines during the pandemic period.
3. We employed multivariable weighted logistic regression models to reveal the demographic, socioeconomic, political, policy (NMEs), and pandemic- and health-related factors associated with low and declining MMR vaccination rates post-pandemic.

This study is unique in its population-based approach, high spatial resolution (county-level) and inclusion of a comprehensive set of explanatory factors, enabling a deeper understanding of nationwide childhood vaccination rates before and after the COVID-19 pandemic. It offers critical insights for policymakers to address local-level declines in vaccination rates, inform policies that enhance the resilience of the childhood vaccination program, and implement effective strategies to help children catch up on missed vaccinations where necessary.



Figure 1. Reported MMR cases from 2011 to 2024 and national MMR vaccination rates in the United States from school year 2011-12 to 2023-24. (Source: CDC,[4] as of December 8, 2024)

Methods

In this section, we describe our extensive data collection efforts to compile county-level MMR vaccination data from 2017 to 2024. Additionally, we collected data on demographics, socioeconomics, political affiliation, vaccine policy (NMEs), COVID-19 metrics and other health-related factors to uncover significant associations with MMR vaccination behavior. We also detail our methodology for identifying counties with significant changes in MMR vaccination rates and the multivariable logistic regression models implemented to examine factors linked to low and declining MMR vaccination rates pre-and-post pandemic.

Data collection and standardization of county-level MMR vaccination rates for the U.S.

The primary variable of this study is county-level MMR vaccination rates for school aged children, specifically the 2-dose MMR vaccination rates for kindergarteners. This metric represents completion of the full MMR vaccination series, where the first dose is typically administered at age one and the booster at age five, presumably right before entering kindergarten. We collected county-level 2-dose MMR vaccination rate for kindergarten children from each state's Department of Health website for the school years 2017-18 to 2023-24 for states that made the data publicly available. Our study includes 37 states covering 2,266 counties. To ensure consistency across states, we developed a standardized data collection procedure that accounted for discrepancies such as variations in reported

years, differences between private and public-school reporting, reporting at the school or city level, and other specifications, all of which are detailed in the Supplementary Section A. The data collected enables a high-resolution analysis of MMR vaccine coverage patterns across the U.S., and trends in MMR rates before and after the pandemic.

Data collection for modeling associations with MMR vaccination rates

In addition to collecting and analyzing MMR rates and trends, we seek to determine the factors associated with low and declining MMR vaccination rates in U.S. counties. To identify potential determinants of MMR vaccination rates and their changes during the pandemic, we collect a series of county- and state-level variables previously found to be associated with MMR rates in the literature.[7,12,23] The set of variables is classified into four main categories, as listed in Table 1: 1) demographic and socioeconomic factors, 2) political affiliation, 3) health-related factors including vaccine uptake behavior for other vaccine types, COVID-19 health outcomes, and a proxy for healthcare accessibility, and 4) vaccine policy, specifically state-level non-medical exemption (NME) policies. A detailed explanation of each variable is provided in Supplementary Section A.

Table 1. Summary statistics and corresponding data sources of the target and explanatory variables.

Factors	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max	Source
MMR Vaccination Rates							
Pre-pandemic MMR vaccination rates	2266	0.94	0.06	0.95	0.30	1.00	CDC and local health departments
Post-pandemic MMR vaccination rates	2266	0.92	0.07	0.93	0.32	1.00	CDC and local health departments
Health Related Factors							
COVID-19 case rate	2266	25956.43	5397.28	25861.08	9046.75	68110.44	JHU CSSE COVID-19 dashboard
COVID-19 death rate	2266	386.95	163.97	381.83	0.00	1222.95	JHU CSSE COVID-19 dashboard
COVID-19 booster rate	2266	23.38	8.43	22.04	5.25	56.85	COVID-19 vaccination tracking project
Pre-pandemic FFS Flu vaccinated (%)	2266	42.87	9.80	44.30	6.30	67.00	County Health Rankings & Roadmaps (CHR&R)
Post-pandemic FFS Flu vaccinated (%)	2266	44.94	10.65	46.00	5.00	71.00	County Health Rankings & Roadmaps (CHR&R)
Hospitals and pharmacies per 1000 people	2266	0.29	0.19	0.25	0.00	2.17	County Health Rankings & Roadmaps (CHR&R)
Demographic and Socioeconomic Factors							
Black people (%)	2266	8.88	14.14	2.48	0.00	87.46	U.S. Census Bureau
Latinx people (%)	2266	11.21	15.29	5.11	0.34	97.68	U.S. Census Bureau
Age 5-9 years old (%)	2266	6.09	1.20	6.10	1.20	13.40	U.S. Census Bureau
Higher education (%)	2266	54.00	10.72	54.00	7.40	90.30	U.S. Census Bureau
Relative median household income	2266	1.00	0.22	0.96	0.49	2.63	U.S. Census Bureau
Rural population (%)	2266	57.79	32.00	59.00	0.00	100.00	U.S. Census Bureau
Social vulnerability index (SVI)	2266	0.52	0.29	0.52	0.00	1.00	CDC Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)
Religious diversity index (RDI)	2266	0.63	0.13	0.65	0.23	0.90	Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI)
Political Affiliation							
Republican (%)	2266	63.75	16.62	66.34	8.73	96.18	MIT Election Data and Science Lab
Non-Medical Exemption Policy							
NME1 (Only religious NME allowed)	1144	/	/	/	/	/	National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)
NME2 (Both relig and philos NME allowed)	921	/	/	/	/	/	National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)

Spatial-temporal trend analysis of MMR vaccination rates

We use our comprehensive county-level MMR coverage dataset to identify trends and significant changes in MMR vaccination rates at the state- and county-levels pre-and post-pandemic. This spatial-temporal trend analysis aims to identify counties with low coverage

both before and after the pandemic, as well as counties with significant declines in MMR vaccination rates during the pandemic.

Statistical analysis to reveal factors associated with low and declining MMR vaccination rates

To identify the potential factors that are associated with low or declining MMR vaccination rates we employed three multivariable weighted logistic regression models. The objective of each model and their baseline reference groups are specified below.

1. **MMR Pre-Pandemic Model:** Identifies factors associated with counties reporting low MMR vaccination rates (i.e., less than or equal to 95%) before the pandemic; counties with MMR rates below 95% coverage pre-pandemic serve as the baseline reference group.
2. **MMR Post-Pandemic Model:** Identifies factors associated with counties reporting low MMR vaccination rates (i.e., less than or equal to 95%) after the pandemic; counties with MMR rates below 95% coverage post-pandemic serve as the baseline reference group.
3. **MMR Declining Model:** Identifies factors associated with counties reporting significant declines in MMR vaccination rates over the course of the pandemic; counties with a decrease in the MMR vaccination rate that is greater than or equal to 0.5 standard deviations above the mean of all declines serves as the baseline reference group.

We chose 95% as the threshold, as it is widely used in academic publications and government policies to refer to the minimum MMR vaccine target for herd immunity.[24] We use averages of annual MMR vaccination rates over specified time windows to define the static pre-and post-pandemic MMR rates used in the model. Specifically for each county, the pre-pandemic MMR vaccination rate is the average of the rates for the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 school years, while the post-pandemic MMR rate is the average of the rates for the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years for each county. Figure 2 depicts the spatial distribution of the baseline reference groups for each model. The number of counties included in each of the baseline groups for the Pre-Pandemic, Post-Pandemic and Declining Models are 1057, 1515 and 425, respectively, while the total number of counties included in each model is 2266. A comprehensive overview of each model and relevant limitations can be found in Supplementary Section B. All three models incorporate a wide range of explanatory variables (summarized in Table 1, with the correlation matrix shown in Figure S1).

MMR Pre-Pandemic Model



MMR Post-Pandemic Model





Figure 2. The baseline reference groups (colored in blue) for the binary target variables of each multivariable weighted logistic regression model. Counties selected as the baseline reference group for MMR Pre-Pandemic Model are those with pre-pandemic MMR vaccination rates lower than 95%. Counties selected as the baseline reference group for MMR Post-Pandemic Model are those with post-pandemic MMR vaccination rates lower than 95%. Counties selected as the baseline reference group for MMR Declining Model are those with a decline in MMR vaccination rates more than 0.5 standard deviation above the mean of all declines. Counties in grey are those with missing MMR data. Maps are created by Data wrapper.[25]

Role of the funding source

The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data visualization, model interpretation, or writing of the article. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Results

County-level MMR vaccination rates before and after the COVID-19 pandemic

Figure 4A illustrates the county-level MMR vaccination rates before and after the pandemic, respectively, while Figure 4B illustrates the distribution of MMR vaccination rates for all counties in each reporting state. Our findings reveal a trending nationwide decline in MMR vaccination rates in the U.S. over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic, with significant heterogeneity within and across states. Specifically, 1,688 counties out of 2,266 studied counties report a decline in coverage after the pandemic, with 425 reporting significant declines (as defined by the MMR Declining baseline). Further, 458 additional counties fell below the 95% threshold post-pandemic compared to the pre-pandemic period, increasing the total from 1,057 pre-pandemic to 1,515 post-pandemic. Notably, only four of the 37 states in our study, namely Maine, New York, Connecticut, and New Mexico, reported an increase in the median MMR rate (Figure 3). These county-level results reinforce the trends from state and national level reporting by the CDC, with 43 states out of 49 states reporting drops in rates (Montana has no post-pandemic data).

(A)





(B)



Figure 3. (A) Maps plotting the county-level MMR vaccination rates before and after the COVID-19 pandemic. Counties in grey are those with missing MMR data. Please refer to Supplementary A for a detailed description of the data collection procedure. Maps are created by Data wrapper.[25] (B) This boxplot shows the county-level MMR vaccination coverages for each state before (green) and after (orange) the pandemic. Each boxplot shows

the distribution of the MMR vaccination rates for all counties in a state. Boxplots are ranked from the states with the highest to the lowest median MMR vaccination rates. The national average of 2-dose kindergarten MMR vaccination rate is 95% (green-line) and 93% (orange-line) before and after the pandemic respectively,[4] delineated by two horizonal dashed lines.

Factors associated with low MMR vaccination rates before and after the pandemic

To improve our understanding of the factors associated with low MMR vaccination rates (i.e., rates below the critical 95% threshold), and how the factors might differ pre-and post-pandemic in U.S. counties, we developed two models: 1) MMR Pre-Pandemic Model, and 2) MMR Post-Pandemic Model. The modeled associations are represented as odds ratios in Figure 4 and Table S2.

The MMR Pre-Pandemic Model indicates that counties with higher postsecondary education rates are more likely to have MMR vaccination rates below 95%. In contrast, higher percentages of Black and Latinx populations, a higher relative median household income, a greater percentage of flu-vaccinated fee-for-service Medicare enrollees (FFS flu vaccinated percentage), a higher healthcare accessibility (measured by hospitals and pharmacies per 1,000 people), and a larger percentage of voters supporting Donald Trump in the 2020 presidential election are associated with counties having MMR vaccination rates above 95%.

The MMR Post-Pandemic Model yields similar results to the MMR Pre-Pandemic Model, with a few key differences from the previously observed associations, as well as some additional associations with pandemic-related variables. After the COVID-19 pandemic, the associations with percentages of Black and Latinx populations, postsecondary education rates, FFS flu vaccinated percentage, and percentage of voters supporting Donald Trump in the 2020 presidential election remain consistent with those prior to the pandemic. However, certain factors significant in the pre-pandemic model, such as relative median household income and healthcare accessibility, become insignificant. Critically, state-level NME policies, which are insignificant in the pre-pandemic model, become the most significantly associated factor with low MMR rates post-pandemic, with the dual religious and philosophical NMEs slightly more significant than religious NMEs alone. Additionally, COVID-19 booster and death rates are positively associated with county-level MMR vaccination rates above 95% post-pandemic.



Figure 4. Results for the MMR Pre-Pandemic Model and MMR Post-Pandemic Model. The relationship between each explanatory factor and MMR vaccination rates is presented as odds ratios. The red triangles and blue circles represent the odds ratios, while the corresponding lines indicate the 95% confidence intervals. An OR > 1 suggests that higher values of the factor are associated with counties maintaining MMR vaccination rates above 95%, whereas an OR < 1 suggests higher values are associated with counties having rates below 95%.

Factors associated with declining MMR vaccination rates during the pandemic

In addition to revealing the factors associated with low MMR rates in counties before and after the pandemic, we seek to understand the factors associated with counties where the MMR rates dropped during the pandemic. To achieve this objective, we developed an additional model to reveal the set of factors associated with statistically significant declines (MMR Declining Model) in MMR rates between the pre- and post-pandemic periods. Figure 5 and Table S2 present the associations determined by this model.

The results reveal both consistencies and key differences between factors associated with declines in MMR rates and those linked to low rates pre- and post-pandemic. Consistent with the results of the MMR Post-Pandemic Model, the MMR Declining Model indicates that counties permitting non-medical exemptions (religious only or both philosophical and religious) are more likely to have declines in MMR vaccination rates during the pandemic. Counties more affected by COVID-19, as indicated by higher COVID-19 death rate, were also more likely to experience declines in MMR vaccination rates during the pandemic. Additionally, counties with a higher rural population percentage and a larger percentage of 5-to-9-year-olds were linked to declines. Conversely, counties with a higher relative median household income, a greater percentage of Latinx population, and higher SVI scores were less likely to experience declines in MMR rates. Both the MMR Pre-Pandemic Model and the MMR Declining Model suggest that counties with a higher relative median household income are less likely to have low or declining rates. However, this association is insignificant in the MMR Post-Pandemic Model.



Figure 5. Results for the MMR Declining Model are presented as odds ratios, illustrating the relationship between each explanatory factor and declining MMR vaccination rates. Green triangles represent the odds ratio, while the corresponding lines indicate the 95% confidence intervals. An OR > 1 suggests that counties with higher values of the factor are less likely to experience declining vaccination rates. Conversely, an OR < 1 suggests that counties with higher values of the factor are more likely to experience declining vaccination rates.

Discussion

Observed nationwide decline in MMR vaccination rates after the COVID-19 pandemic

Our county-level dataset complements the state and national-level CDC data,[4] confirming a widespread decline in MMR vaccination rates in the U.S. following the COVID-19 pandemic, while critically revealing the significant heterogeneity in vaccination patterns both within and across states. By creating an open, centralized, high-resolution dataset, we offer a valuable resource to further explore the evolving vaccination landscape in the U.S., identify regions vulnerable to vaccine hesitancy and measles outbreaks, conduct more accurate risk assessments, and inform targeted policies to improve childhood vaccination coverage.

Demographic disparities reflected in MMR vaccination patterns

We found that counties with higher percentages of Black or Latinx populations were less likely to have low MMR vaccination rates both before and after the pandemic. Our findings may be attributed to mandatory childhood vaccination requirements in most U.S. schools, which has likely influenced MMR vaccination across diverse demographic groups,[26] and helped maintain high vaccination rates in counties with large Black and Latinx populations, despite a historical tendency for these groups to exhibit stronger opposition to vaccinations and other healthcare interventions.[27,28] While research from pre-pandemic periods lacks consensus on these associations,[7] likely due to the spatial clustering of low MMR rates in various distinct communities, our findings align with a 2011 CDC reports indicating that, since 2007, disparities in MMR vaccination coverage between non-Hispanic white children and racial or ethnic minorities have been virtually nonexistent.[29]

Furthermore, a higher percentage of Latinx population was less likely to be associated with MMR vaccination rate declines, while the Black population percentage showed no significant association, reinforcing the CDC's reporting and suggesting these populations did not alter their MMR vaccination seeking behavior during the pandemic. Our results also reveal counties with a larger percentage of young children (ages 5-9) were more likely to experience declines in MMR rates, possibly due to a larger number of children in these counties missing their routine vaccinations during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Socioeconomic heterogeneity reflected in MMR vaccination patterns

Our analysis found that counties with a higher percentage of individuals with postsecondary education were more likely to have low MMR vaccination rates both before and after the pandemic, aligning with previous literature suggesting that highly educated parents may be more skeptical about vaccines or have stronger personal beliefs influencing their vaccination decisions for their children.[30]

Additionally, we observe that counties with a higher rural population percentage were more likely to experience significant declines during the pandemic. Several factors may contribute to this association. First, the current vaccine distribution system may not have adequately ensured sufficient vaccine availability in rural areas, especially amid the disruption of healthcare services caused by COVID-19. Second, differences in how rural residents perceived the politicized pandemic may have led to a stronger distrust in vaccine safety, influencing parents MMR vaccination decisions.[31] Further research is needed to better understand the factors driving post-pandemic declines in MMR vaccination rates in counties with higher rural population percentages and to develop effective interventions to reverse these trends.

Conversely, counties with higher relative median household incomes were less likely to have low MMR rates before the pandemic and less likely to have significant declines in MMR rates during the pandemic. This aligns with published findings linking lower-income households to lower vaccination rates,[32] though, this association is not universally observed.[7] Additionally, counties with higher healthcare accessibility – measured by number of hospitals and pharmacies per 1000 people - were less likely to have low MMR rates pre-pandemic, suggesting that limited access to public health facilities may impede childhood vaccination. However, this association was not significant in the MMR Post-Pandemic or MMR Declining Model, suggesting that low or declining MMR rates post-pandemic are better explained by other variables. [7,14] We also observed that counties with higher SVI scores were less likely to have declining MMR vaccination rates during the pandemic. While existing literature associates highly vulnerable counties with lower pediatric vaccination rates, particularly for the COVID-19 vaccine, our findings are specific to the relationship between SVI and changes in MMR vaccination behavior during the pandemic, suggesting the more vulnerable counties remained consistent in their routine vaccination behavior during this period.[33] Given the limited research on the relationship between MMR vaccination rates and the SVI, further studies are needed to clarify the role of social vulnerability in shaping vaccine hesitancy and the relative influence of the pandemic.

COVID-19 intensity linked to declining MMR vaccination rates post pandemic

Result from our study indicate a positive association between the impact of COVID-19, measured by the cumulative death rate in a county, and the likelihood of significant MMR declines during the pandemic. This relationship is possibly due to the extensive reallocation of public health resources towards COVID-19 responses in the counties with more COVID-19 prevalence, which further restricted access to routine healthcare services, including childhood vaccinations. These results highlight an additional dimension of the disparate, and long-term impact of COVID-19 across the U.S.

Interestingly, the MMR Post-Pandemic Model reveals an inverse relationship in which counties with higher COVID-19 death rates are less likely to have MMR rates below 95%. While it is possible that overall declines in vaccination rate due to the COVID-19 pandemic could still allow counties to maintain MMR rates above the 95% threshold, supported by robust vaccination policies and programs, further research is needed to explore the causal impact of COVID-19 on routine vaccination disruptions.

Evidence for vaccine acceptance spillover

Our analysis reveals positive associations between acceptance of different types of vaccines, namely Flu, COVID-19, and MMR vaccines, contributing to the growing literature on general vaccine confidence patterns. Counties with a higher FFS flu vaccinated percentage are less likely to have low MMR vaccination rates in the pre-pandemic period, and counties demonstrating higher COVID-19 booster rate and higher FFS flu vaccinated percentage are less likely to have low MMR vaccination rates in the post-pandemic period. The positive association between MMR vaccination rates and COVID-19 booster rates is unsurprising, suggesting that individuals who proactively seek non-mandatory vaccinations, i.e., COVID-19 booster, have greater overall trust in vaccine efficacy and safety, and are thus more likely to complete the recommended childhood vaccination series. The additional association of MMR rates with flu vaccine rates reflects the more general spillover effects in vaccine acceptance across different routine vaccination types. These findings align with existing literature,[34] and imply that increasing public trust in one vaccine type might increase trust in vaccinations more broadly.

Contrasting role of political affiliation on MMR and COVID-19 vaccination behavior

Our results highlight a divergence in the relationship between population-level political affiliation and MMR vaccination rates compared to COVID-19 vaccination rates in the U. S.

Previous research revealed a significant association between the percentage of Republican voters in a county with anti-vaccine attitudes and lower COVID-19 vaccination uptake.[11,35] However, in this study, we observe that counties with a higher proportion of Republican voters in the 2020 presidential election were less likely to have low MMR vaccination rates both before and after the pandemic. These comprehensive population-level findings contrast with post-pandemic survey data from Zhou et al, which suggests that Republican parents exhibit greater childhood vaccine hesitancy than Democrats and that county-level political affiliation does not show significant association with MMR vaccine hesitancy.[36]

In general, the relationship in literature between political affiliation and childhood vaccination hesitancy remains inconclusive, with some studies linking higher hesitancy to Republicans,[37] others point to data indicating greater hesitancy for Democrats,[38] and some finding no meaningful association at all.[7] These inconsistent findings are likely due to the complexity of vaccination hesitancy, and differences across vaccine-related decisions. For example, MMR is part of a long-established immunization program reinforced by mandatory school requirements,[8,39] whereas the COVID-19 vaccine was a newly introduced vaccine (for all age groups), utilized novel technology, and was closely tied to a highly politicized pandemic – factors that likely contributed to the disproportionate vaccine hesitancy.[11,35] Thus, the associations between vaccine types and political affiliation can be inconsistent due to the influence of policies that create a "belief-behavior gap" in vaccination uptake, which occurs when individuals who express anti-vaccine beliefs still comply with childhood vaccination mandates for school entry. Given the discrepancies in literature in combination of our study results, we argue that, unlike COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy, political affiliation may not be a primary driver of childhood vaccine hesitancy. We conclude that addressing MMR vaccine hesitancy requires a bipartisan approach, focusing on strategies and policies that transcend political divisions to ensure equitable efforts in maintaining and improving childhood vaccination rates across various communities.

Non-medical exemption policies reduce MMR vaccination rates

Our findings demonstrate the critical influence of state-level non-medical exemption policies on MMR vaccination coverage at the county-level in the post-pandemic period. States permitting non-medical exemptions were significantly more likely to have low MMR rates post-pandemic as well as declines in coverage over the pandemic period. The phenomena are even more impactful in states with both religious and philosophical exemptions than those with only religious exemption. These findings point to a notable shift in the association of NME policies and declining vaccination rates during the pandemic, as this relationship was previously insignificant at the county-level in the pre-pandemic period

– likely due to the small number of states that prohibited non-medical exemptions at that time. The strong post-pandemic association between low and declining MMR rates and NME policies reinforce concerns about declining vaccine coverage under current vaccine exemption policies,[19,40] especially in communities with high exemption rates.

Notably, three of the four states that removed religious, philosophical, or both types of non-medical exemption options during the study period - Connecticut, Maine, and New York - experienced an increase in median county-level MMR rates, further underscoring the impact of NMEs and suggesting that the removal of these exemption options is linked to improved vaccination coverage, and therefore reduced risk of measles infections, including imported measles cases, which can lead to large outbreaks and adverse health outcomes.[8,22,39,41]

These findings underscore the urgent need for evidence-based policy reform to protect public health while balancing religious and individual beliefs. This approach is exemplified by Whittington et al.,[42] which demonstrates that more stringent exemption policies could decrease the likelihood of measles outbreaks, and advocates for measures such as requiring attendance at educational sessions or written statements of objection to approve vaccine exemptions. Additionally, further research merging policy and health data is necessary to effectively evaluate and address the spatial clustering of NMEs, and thus maintain adequate vaccination rates in communities to prevent large-scale outbreaks.[41]

Limitations

While this study provides valuable insights into the current vaccination landscape and factors influencing MMR vaccination patterns in the U.S., it is subject to limitations. Firstly, the data is incomplete, as some states do not publicly report county-level MMR vaccination data, limiting our nationwide analysis to 37 states. Second, the lack of standardized reporting for childhood vaccinations results in inconsistencies in reporting across states and thus affects the quality of the data available. Third, the 2-dose MMR vaccination rate, which reflects the rate of kindergartners with complete measles vaccine records, may be low not only due to high vaccine refusal rates but also because of missing student records or delays in receiving the booster due to pandemic-related disruptions, among other factors. These factors introduce bias into the dataset; for example, counties with high immigrant populations may have a higher number of students with missing records, resulting in MMR rates that are lower than the actual rates. Fourth, the county-level percentage of flu-vaccinated FFS Medicare enrollees (65+) represent a subgroup of the population, and not likely to be the same group making the parental vaccination choices modeled in this study. Fifth, we represent the active state-level NME policies from 2017 (pre-pandemic) and 2022

(post-pandemic), which do not account for the delayed effect any policy changes may have on local vaccine behavior. Additionally, this analysis is purely statistical and does not reveal causal associations between the set of factors considered and MMR rates. Finally, this study is designed to improve our understanding of MMR vaccination uptake behavior; while MMR vaccination rates are directly related to the risk of measles, mumps and rubella outbreaks, we do not directly evaluate the risks or harms posed by these diseases.

Conclusion

We provide a novel, high-resolution and comprehensive data set on MMR vaccination coverage in the U.S, spanning the entirety of the COVID-19 pandemic. The study revealed a significant nationwide decline in MMR vaccination rates following the pandemic and uncovers new associations between MMR coverage and critical driving factors, in particular the role of non-medical exemption (NME) policies in reducing vaccination coverage. Our findings highlight the need for evidence-based vaccine policy, targeted vaccination interventions, implementing culturally sensitive outreach programs, and improving healthcare access.

Contributors

ED and LG designed and planned the study. ED, AN, and YO collected the data. ED cleaned and analyzed the data. All authors interpreted the data and modeling results and wrote the manuscript. LG supervised the study. All authors revised and approved the final manuscript.

Data sharing statement

All data collected for this analysis and their sources are available on GitHub: https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/MMR_COVID_modeling.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgment

This work was partially supported by a grant from Bloomberg Philanthropies awarded to the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg Center for Government Excellence, City Analytics Initiative.

References

1. United States Government Department of Health & Human Services. Five Important Reasons to Vaccinate Your Child. *Policy (OIDP) Office of Infectious Disease and HIV/AIDS* https://www.hhs.gov/immunization/get-vaccinated/for-parents/five-reasons/index.html (2021).
2. ACIP Vaccine Recommendations | CDC. https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/hcp/acip-recs/index.html (2023).
3. Talbird, S. E. *et al.* Impact of Routine Childhood Immunization in Reducing Vaccine-Preventable Diseases in the United States. *Pediatrics* **150**, e2021056013 (2022).
4. CDC. Measles Cases and Outbreaks. *Measles (Rubeola)* https://www.cdc.gov/measles/data-research/index.html (2024).
5. Hotez, P. J., Nuzhath, T. & Colwell, B. Combating vaccine hesitancy and other 21st century social determinants in the global fight against measles. *Current Opinion in Virology* **41**, 1–7 (2020).
6. Glatman-Freedman, A. & Nichols, K. The effect of social determinants on immunization programs. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* **8**, 293–301 (2012).
7. Novilla, M. L. B. *et al.* Why Parents Say No to Having Their Children Vaccinated against Measles: A Systematic Review of the Social Determinants of Parental Perceptions on MMR Vaccine Hesitancy. *Vaccines* **11**, 926 (2023).
8. Sugerman, D. E. *et al.* Measles Outbreak in a Highly Vaccinated Population, San Diego, 2008: Role of the Intentionally Undervaccinated. *Pediatrics* **125**, 747–755 (2010).

9. Santoli, J. M. Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Routine Pediatric Vaccine Ordering and Administration — United States, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **69**, (2020).
10. Carias, C. *et al.* Potential impact of COVID-19 pandemic on vaccination coverage in children: A case study of measles-containing vaccine administration in the United States (US). *Vaccine* **39**, 1201–1204 (2021).
11. Dong, E., Nixon, K. & Gardner, L. M. A population level study on the determinants of COVID-19 vaccination rates at the U.S. county level. *Sci Rep* **14**, 4277 (2024).
12. Motta, M. Is partisan conflict over COVID-19 vaccination eroding support for childhood vaccine mandates? *npj Vaccines* **8**, 1–4 (2023).
13. Callaghan, T., Lueck, J. A., Trujillo, K. L. & Ferdinand, A. O. Rural and Urban Differences in COVID-19 Prevention Behaviors. *The Journal of Rural Health* **37**, 287–295 (2021).
14. Kirzinger, A., Muñana, C. & Published, M. B. Vaccine Hesitancy in Rural America. *KFF* https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/poll-finding/vaccine-hesitancy-in-rural-america/ (2021).
15. Dhawan, D., Bekalu, M., Pinnamaneni, R., McCloud, R. & Viswanath, K. COVID-19 News and Misinformation: Do They Matter for Public Health Prevention? *J Health Commun* **26**, 799–808 (2021).
16. Bramer, C. A. *et al.* Decline in Child Vaccination Coverage During the COVID-19 Pandemic - Michigan Care Improvement Registry, May 2016-May 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **69**, 630–631 (2020).
17. Treharne, A. *et al.* Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on routine childhood vaccination in 9 U.S. jurisdictions. *Vaccine* **42**, 125997 (2024).

18. Hotez, P. J. Texas and Its Measles Epidemics. *PLoS Med* **13**, e1002153 (2016).

19. Bednarczyk, R. A., King, A. R., Lahijani, A. & Omer, S. B. Current landscape of nonmedical vaccination exemptions in the United States: impact of policy changes. *Expert Review of Vaccines* **18**, 175–190 (2019).

20. Phadke, V. K., Bednarczyk, R. A., Salmon, D. A. & Omer, S. B. Association Between Vaccine Refusal and Vaccine-Preventable Diseases in the United States: A Review of Measles and Pertussis. *JAMA* **315**, 1149–1158 (2016).

21. Feikin, D. R. *et al.* Individual and community risks of measles and pertussis associated with personal exemptions to immunization. *JAMA* **284**, 3145–3150 (2000).

22. Patel, M. National Update on Measles Cases and Outbreaks — United States, January 1–October 1, 2019. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **68**, (2019).

23. Flynn, M. & Ogden, J. Predicting uptake of MMR vaccination: a prospective questionnaire study. *Br J Gen Pract* **54**, 526–530 (2004).

24. Cockman, P., Dawson, L., Mathur, R. & Hull, S. Improving MMR vaccination rates: herd immunity is a realistic goal. *BMJ* **343**, d5703 (2011).

25. Datawrapper: Create charts, maps, and tables. https://www.datawrapper.de.

26. Hutchins, S. S., Jiles, R. & Bernier, R. Elimination of Measles and of Disparities in Measles Childhood Vaccine Coverage among Racial and Ethnic Minority Populations in the United States. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* **189**, S146–S152 (2004).

27. Khan, M. S., Ali, S. A. M., Adelaine, A. & Karan, A. Rethinking vaccine hesitancy among minority groups. *The Lancet* **397**, 1863–1865 (2021).

28. Fisher, M. Understanding the history of vaccine hesitancy and current mistrust in healthcare. *BMJ* **384**, q539 (2024).
29. CDC. Reduction of Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Vaccination Coverage, 1995–2011. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/su6301a3.htm?s_cid%3Dsu6301a3_x .
30. Gupta, K., Chen, M. & Rocker, J. Measles: taking steps forward to prevent going backwards. *Current Opinion in Pediatrics* **32**, 436 (2020).
31. Santibanez, T. A., Santoli, J. M. & Barker, L. E. Differential Effects of the DTaP and MMR Vaccine Shortages on Timeliness of Childhood Vaccination Coverage. *Am J Public Health* **96**, 691–696 (2006).
32. Bardenheier, B. *et al.* Are Parental Vaccine Safety Concerns Associated With Receipt of Measles-Mumps-Rubella, Diphtheria and Tetanus Toxoids With Acellular Pertussis, or Hepatitis B Vaccines by Children? *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine* **158**, 569–575 (2004).
33. Bruckhaus, A. A. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccination dynamics in the US: coverage velocity and carrying capacity based on socio-demographic vulnerability indices in California's pediatric population. *Front. Public Health* **11**, (2023).
34. Soveri, A. *et al.* Spillover effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on attitudes to influenza and childhood vaccines. *BMC Public Health* **23**, 764 (2023).
35. Fridman, A., Gershon, R. & Gneezy, A. COVID-19 and vaccine hesitancy: A longitudinal study. *PLOS ONE* **16**, e0250123 (2021).

36. Zhou, E. G. *et al.* Parental Factors Associated With Measles–Mumps–Rubella Vaccination in US Children Younger Than 5 Years. *Am J Public Health* e1–e5 (2025) doi:10.2105/AJPH.2024.307912.

37. Motta, M. Republicans, Not Democrats, Are More Likely to Endorse Anti-Vaccine Misinformation. *American Politics Research* **49**, 428–438 (2021).

38. Bricker, B. & Justice, J. The Postmodern Medical Paradigm: A Case Study of Anti-MMR Vaccine Arguments. *Western Journal of Communication* **83**, 172–189 (2019).

39. Omer, S. B., Salmon, D. A., Orenstein, W. A., deHart, M. P. & Halsey, N. Vaccine Refusal, Mandatory Immunization, and the Risks of Vaccine-Preventable Diseases. *New England Journal of Medicine* **360**, 1981–1988 (2009).

40. Zipfel, C. M., Garnier, R., Kuney, M. C. & Bansal, S. The landscape of childhood vaccine exemptions in the United States. *Sci Data* **7**, 401 (2020).

41. Gromis, A. & Liu, K.-Y. Spatial Clustering of Vaccine Exemptions on the Risk of a Measles Outbreak. *Pediatrics* **149**, e2021050971 (2022).

42. Whittington, M. D., Kempe, A., Dempsey, A., Herlihy, R. & Campbell, J. D. Impact of Nonmedical Vaccine Exemption Policies on the Health and Economic Burden of Measles. *Academic Pediatrics* **17**, 571–576 (2017).

Supplementary materials for

MMR vaccination coverage in the U.S. before and after the COVID-19 pandemic: A modelling study

Ensheng Dong[1,2,3], Andreas Nearchou[1,2], Yamato Okura[2], Samee Saiyed[1,2], Lauren M. Gardner[1,2,4,*]

[1]Department of Civil and Systems Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA.
[2]Center for Systems Science and Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA.
[3]RAND Corporation, Arlington, VA 22202, USA
[4]Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA.

Contents:

Section A: Data Collection and Preparation
Section B: Detailed Model Description
Section C: Data Visualization and Model Outputs

Data and Code Availability

All data and code used in this study are available in the GitHub repository: https://github.com/CSSEGISandData/MMR_COVID_modeling.

Section A: Data Collection and Processing

County-Level MMR Vaccination Rates

The focus of this study is to evaluate MMR vaccination coverage before and after the COVID-19 pandemic, thus we collected historical county-level MMR vaccination data from 2017-2024 to robustly represent pre-pandemic and post-pandemic periods. This section provides a detailed overview of the comprehensive MMR data collection process.

In most cases, states released county-level data by school year; however, when data was reported by calendar year, we assigned it to the closest school year based on state regulations. For states that provided data for both private and public schools, we merged the data to obtain a complete county-level rate for both private and public kindergarten students. In instances where states reported school or city-level data, we collected both the student enrollment statistics and the vaccinated count for each location, aggregated them to county-level, and then used the county-level vaccinated count over the county-level kindergarten enrollment to calculate the corresponding county-level MMR vaccination rate. For New York state, where not all school enrollments were available, we used the average MMR vaccination rate of all schools in a county as a proxy for the county-level rate.

To evaluate the change in MMR vaccination rates before and after the pandemic, we define the pre-pandemic MMR vaccination rate as the average of the rates for the 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 school years, while the post-pandemic MMR rate is defined as the average of the rates for the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years. If any county-level data is missing for a particular school year in this time period, data for that particular school year is omitted from the calculation of pre- or post-pandemic average MMR rates.

Our final dataset included county-level 2-dose MMR vaccination rates with both pre- and post-pandemic data for 37 states. These states include Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. In total, the MMR vaccination rates were collected in these 37 states.

Several states are excluded from our analysis due to MMR data limitations. Specifically, Washington D.C. is excluded because pre-pandemic MMR data is unavailable, and Montana is excluded because post-pandemic MMR data is unavailable. Alaska, Arkansas, Delaware,

Idaho, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, and West Virginia are excluded because only state-level data is publicly available. Georgia, Indiana, and Nevada are excluded because they only report 1-dose MMR vaccination rates for children aged 19-35 months, which does not align with our focus on 2-dose MMR rates for kindergarten children. Illinois was excluded as it only reported 1-dose MMR vaccination rates for Pre K-12 children, rather than the 2-dose rates for kindergarten children required for our analysis. These exclusions are necessary to reduce potential biases in the data and subsequent analysis. However, we chose to include data from South Carolina, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, despite their reporting of 2-dose MMR data for age groups slightly different from kindergarten. We believe the inclusion of these states adds valuable information to our study without compromising the overall integrity of the analysis.

Explanatory Factors

We collected publicly available data on demographics and socioeconomics, political affiliation, vaccine policy (NMEs), COVID-19 metrics and other health-related variables to uncover significant associations with MMR vaccination behavior. The datasets, including their sources and other key details, are described below. If data on any variable is missing for a county that county is excluded from the analysis. Counties with missing values in the explanatory factors were dropped from the model. In total, we have 2,266 counties in the study.

Demographic and socioeconomic factors are collected at the county-level and include the percentage of Black and Latinx populations, the percentage of children aged 5-9 years; the percentage of rural population; the percentage of people with postsecondary degrees or higher; relative household median income (ratio of county-level household median income to the state-level average); social vulnerability index (SVI); and religious diversity index (RDI). These variables were obtained from multiple sources including the U.S. Census Bureau,[1] American Community Survey (ACS),[2] CDC and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR),[3] and Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI).[4] Demographic and socioeconomic factors were selected based on their relevance to childhood vaccinations or their links to vaccine hesitancy or low vaccination rates in past research.[5,6] (Table 1)

Political affiliation was measured by the percentage of voters supporting the Republican candidate in the 2020 presidential election for each U.S. county. This variable is included because political beliefs have been shown to influence attitudes towards vaccinations.[7,8] The data is available from the MIT Election Data and Science Lab.[9]

Health-related factors that may influence MMR vaccination rates include COVID-19 metrics (health outcomes and vaccinations), healthcare accessibility, and vaccine uptake behavior for other diseases. We included various COVID-19 metrics, including COVID-19 cumulative case and death rates per 100,000 people as of June 30th, 2022,[10] and cumulative COVID-19 booster rate as of March 3, 2022.[11,12] We included COVID-19 case and death rates as a proxy for the severity of the pandemic in each county leading up to the study period (the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 school years). We included booster rates to understand the relationship between optional COVID-19 vaccination behavior and MMR coverage, amid concerns that attitudes towards the COVID-19 vaccine may have influenced childhood vaccination rates.

We used the number of hospitals and pharmacies per 1000 people as a proxy for healthcare accessibility.[13] We included this variable as low healthcare accessibility was historically tied to lower MMR rates, particularly before measles was declared eliminated in the U.S. in 2000.[5]

Additionally, we used the county-level percentage of fee-for-service Medicare enrollees receiving annual flu vaccinations (FFS flu vaccinated percentage) as a proxy for flu-vaccination levels.[14] Flu vaccination data was included to further explore county-level differences in uptake across various vaccine types. The pre-pandemic FFS flu vaccinated percentage was averaged from 2017, 2018 and 2019 data, while the post-pandemic percentage was based on the most recent 2021 data. While FFS Medicare flu vaccination data reflects a different population (65+) than childhood vaccinations, we believe it serves as a reasonable proxy for overall flu vaccination rates.

Non-medical exemption (NME) policies at the state level, which have been identified as potential facilitators of vaccine hesitancy,[5] were included as a categorical explanatory variable. States are classified based on whether they allowed only medical exemptions, only religious exemptions, or both religious and philosophical exemptions. Original data was obtained from the CDC[15] and updated based on reports from the National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL).[16] We used NMEs from 2017 for the pre-pandemic period (2017-2019) and NMEs from 2022 for the post-pandemic period (2022-2024). In the pre-pandemic period, 35 out of 37 states permitted religious exemptions, while 14 allowed personal exemptions. In the post-pandemic period, these numbers decreased to 32 states and 12 states, respectively. Key policy changes that occurred during our study period included New York removing its religious exemption option in 2019, Washington removing its personal exemption option in 2019, Maine removing both religious and personal exemption options in 2019, and Connecticut removing its religious exemption option in 2021.[16] Although Mississippi introduced a religious exemption option in April 2023, this change was not

included in our analysis as it occurred after the start of the post-pandemic study period and was therefore not reflective of the trends in our model.

Table S1. State-Level Non-Medical Exemption Policies in 2017 and 2022. The data was obtained from the CDC and updated using the NCSL data. The 2017 data represent pre-pandemic NME policies, while the 2022 data represent post-pandemic NME policies. All 51 state-level NME policies (including D.C.) are present in the table. States included in our study are highlighted grey.

State	Pre-Pandemic Religious Exemption	Personal Exemption	Post-Pandemic Religious Exemption	Personal Exemption
Alabama	√		√	
Alaska	√		√	
Arizona	√	√	√	√
Arkansas	√	√	√	√
California				
Colorado	√	√	√	√
Connecticut	√			
Delaware	√		√	
District of Columbia				
Florida	√		√	
Georgia	√		√	
Hawaii	√		√	
Idaho	√	√	√	√
Illinois	√		√	
Indiana	√		√	
Iowa	√		√	
Kansas	√		√	
Kentucky	√		√	
Louisiana	√	√	√	√
Maine	√	√		
Maryland	√		√	
Massachusetts	√		√	
Michigan	√	√	√	√
Minnesota	√	√	√	√
Mississippi				
Missouri	√		√	
Montana	√		√	

Nebraska	√		√	
Nevada	√		√	
New Hampshire	√		√	
New Jersey	√		√	
New Mexico	√		√	
New York	√			
North Carolina	√		√	
North Dakota	√	√	√	√
Ohio	√	√	√	√
Oklahoma	√	√	√	√
Oregon	√	√	√	√
Pennsylvania	√	√	√	√
Rhode Island	√		√	
South Carolina	√		√	
South Dakota	√		√	
Tennessee	√		√	
Texas	√	√	√	√
Utah	√	√	√	√
Vermont	√		√	
Virginia	√		√	
Washington	√	√	√	
West Virginia				
Wisconsin	√	√	√	√
Wyoming	√		√	

Section B: Detailed model descriptions

Identifying Factors Associated with Low MMR Vaccination Rates

We employed multivariable weighted logistic regression to identify factors associated with low MMR vaccination rates before and after the pandemic. We chose 95% as the threshold, as it is widely used in academic publications and government policies to refer to the minimum MMR vaccine target for herd immunity.[17] To examine low MMR vaccination coverage, we dichotomized the target variables (pre- and post-pandemic MMR vaccination rates) into counties with MMR vaccination rates ⩾ 95% and those with rates < 95%. We then fit two separate logistic regression models, one for pre-pandemic (MMR Pre-Pandemic Model) and one for post-pandemic (MMR Post-Pandemic Model) MMR vaccination rates, using counties with rates < 95% as the reference baseline. Two separate logistic regression models were fitted:

1) MMR Pre-Pandemic Model (counties with low MMR rates pre-pandemic as the binary target variable):

$$\begin{aligned}\log\left[\frac{\pi(x)}{1-\pi(x)}\right] &= \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{percentage of Black people}) + \beta_2(\text{percentage of Hispanic people}) \\ &+ \beta_3(\text{percentage of children aged 5 to 9 years old}) \\ &+ \beta_4(\text{percentage of rural population}) \\ &+ \beta_5(\text{postsecondary education percentage}) \\ &+ \beta_6(\text{relative household median income}) + \beta_7(\text{SVI}) + \beta_8(\text{RDI}) \\ &+ \beta_9(\text{Republican presidential vote percentage}) \\ &+ \beta_{10}(\text{Pre-pandemic FFS flu vaccinated percentage}) \\ &+ \beta_{11}(\text{hospitals and pharmacies per 1000 people}) + \beta_{12}(\text{NME})\end{aligned}$$

2) MMR Post-Pandemic Model (counties with low MMR rates post-pandemic as the binary target variable):

$$\log\left[\frac{\pi(x)}{1-\pi(x)}\right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{percentage of Black people}) + \beta_2(\text{percentage of Hispanic people}) + \beta_3(\text{percentage of children aged 5 to 9 years old}) + \beta_4(\text{percentage of rural population}) + \beta_5(\text{postsecondary education percentage}) + \beta_6(\text{relative household median income}) + \beta_7(\text{SVI}) + \beta_8(\text{RDI}) + \beta_9(\text{Republican presidential vote percentage}) + \beta_{10}(\text{Post-pandemic FFS flu vaccinated percentage}) + \beta_{11}(\text{hospitals and pharmacies per 1000 people}) + \beta_{12}(\text{NME}) + \beta_{13}(\text{COVID-19 case rate}) + \beta_{14}(\text{COVID-19 death rate}) + \beta_{15}(\text{COVID-19 booster rate})$$

Where $\pi(x)$ represents the probability of a county having an MMR vaccination rate more than 95% before or after the pandemic, and $1-\pi(x)$ represents the probability of a county having an MMR vaccination rate less than or equal to 95% before or after the pandemic. Counties with an MMR vaccination rate below 95% pre- or post-pandemic serve as the baseline reference group for the MMR Pre-Pandemic Model and MMR Post-Pandemic Model, respectively. Both models are weighted by county population to account for differences in population size across counties: $w_i = \frac{\log(pop_i)}{mean(\sum_i \log(pop_i))}$.

Each model presents the relationship between explanatory variables and the outcome as odds ratios, along with their corresponding 95% confidence intervals. The odds ratio (OR) is represented by $\frac{\pi(x)}{1-\pi(x)}$, where an OR < 1 indicates counties are more likely to have vaccination rates less than or equal to 95%, an OR > 1 indicates counties are less likely to have vaccination rates below 95%, and OR = 1 suggests no association.

The MMR Pre-Pandemic Model does not include variables for COVID-19 health outcomes or COVID-19 booster rate. However, because the MMR Post-Pandemic Model aims to identify factors associated with low MMR vaccination rates after the pandemic, we included additional COVID-19 related factors into the model. All independent variables are continuous, except for the non-medical exemption (NME) policy, which has three categories: no non-medical exemption policies permitted (NME 0), counties permitting only religious exemptions (NME 1), and counties permitting both religious and philosophical exemptions

(NME 2). This allows for an examination of the impact of different exemption policies on MMR vaccination rates. Furthermore, we note that the inclusion of NMEs makes this a multi-scale model, with all variables implemented at the county-level except for NMEs, which are applied at the state level.

Identifying Factors Associated with Declining MMR Vaccination Rates

To investigate factors associated with the declining county-level MMR vaccination rates during the pandemic, we fit an additional model, the MMR Declining Model. This model used the same set of explanatory variables as the MMR Post-Pandemic Model, with the dependent variable adjusted to compare counties with significant declines in MMR vaccination rates during the pandemic. A county was classified as "declining" if the decrease in the MMR vaccination rate greater than or equal to more than 0.5 standard deviations above the mean of all declines; we conducted sensitivity analysis to this threshold and found the results are robust between 0.1 and 0.5. We chose 0.5 as the threshold to reduce noise. The number of counties classified as "declining" based on this threshold is 425 (where the total number of counties with any reported decline is 1,688). The MMR Declining Model is described below:

MMR Declining Model (with declining counties as the binary target variable):

$$\log\left[\frac{\pi(x)}{1-\pi(x)}\right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{percentage of Black people}) + \beta_2(\text{percentage of Hispanic people}) + \beta_3(\text{percentage of children aged 5 to 9 years old}) + \beta_4(\text{percentage of rural population}) + \beta_5(\text{postsecondary education percentage}) + \beta_6(\text{relative household median income}) + \beta_7(\text{SVI}) + \beta_8(\text{RDI}) + \beta_9(\text{Republican presidential vote percentage}) + \beta_{10}(\text{Post-pandemic FFS flu vaccinated percentage}) + \beta_{11}(\text{hospitals and pharmacies per 1000 people}) + \beta_{12}(\text{NME}) + \beta_{13}(\text{COVID-19 case rate}) + \beta_{14}(\text{COVID-19 death rate}) + \beta_{15}(\text{COVID-19 booster rate})$$

Counties with declining MMR vaccination rates during the pandemic represent the baseline reference group for the MMR Declining Model, where $1-\pi(x)$ represents the probability of a county with declining MMR vaccination rates and $\pi(x)$ represents the probability of a county with non-significant declining MMR vaccination rates. The model is weighted by county population to account for differences in population size across counties: $w_i = \frac{\log(pop_i)}{mean(\sum_i \log(pop_i))}$.

The MMR Declining Model presents the relationship between explanatory variables and the outcome as odds ratios, along with their corresponding 95% confidence intervals. For statistically significant factors, an odds ratio greater than 1 (OR > 1) indicates that counties are less likely to have declining MMR vaccination rates. Conversely, an odds ratio less than 1 (OR < 1) suggests that counties are more likely to have declining MMR rates. An OR = 1 suggests no association. All variables in this model, except for the target variable, are identical to those in the MMR Post-Pandemic Model.

Section C: Data Visualization and Model Outputs



Figure S1. Correlation matrix of the studied variables. A Pearson correlation matrix of all variables used in the logistic regression models.

Table S2. Results for logistic regression models. Table S2 details the outputs of the 3 logistic regression models, the MMR Pre-Pandemic, MMR Post-Pandemic, and MMR Declining models. This table presents all variables included in the logistic regression model, along their odds ratios (ORs), 95% confidence intervals (CI), and statistical significance.

Models	**MMR Pre-Pandemic Model**		**MMR Post-Pandemic Model**		**MMR Declining Model**	
Factors	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**95% CI**
Health Related Factors						
COVID-19 case rate			0.947	(0.843,1.064)	0.889	(0.779,1.014)
COVID-19 death rate			1.169*	(1.013,1.349)	0.837*	(0.717,0.978)
COVID-19 booster rate			1.754***	(1.427,2.162)	0.850	(0.680,1.062)
Flu vaccinated (%)	1.312***	(1.161,1.485)	1.297***	(1.127,1.495)	1.131	(0.973,1.313)
Hospital and pharmacy count per 1000 people	1.122*	(1.006,1.254)	1.089	(0.961,1.231)	1.034	(0.912,1.176)
Demographic and Socioeconomic Factors						
Black people (%)	2.049***	(1.732,2.433)	2.059***	(1.690,2.515)	0.911	(0.730,1.139)
Latinx people (%)	1.525***	(1.339,1.741)	1.695***	(1.478,1.947)	1.235*	(1.040,1.482)
Age 5-9 years old (%)	0.924	(0.829,1.030)	1.032	(0.916,1.163)	0.784***	(0.687,0.894)
Postsecondary education (%)	0.657***	(0.556,0.774)	0.794*	(0.662,0.951)	0.962	(0.782,1.181)
Relative median household income	1.242**	(1.091,1.414)	1.075	(0.928,1.244)	1.513***	(1.247,1.845)
Rural population (%)	0.867	(0.750,1.002)	0.981	(0.836,1.151)	0.701***	(0.588,0.835)
Social vulnerability index (SVI)	0.886	(0.755,1.039)	1.108	(0.925,1.327)	1.525***	(1.241,1.876)
Religious diversity index (RDI)	0.864	(0.733,1.019)	0.930	(0.779,1.109)	0.859	(0.692,1.066)
Political Affiliation						
Republican (%)	1.465***	(1.232,1.746)	2.286***	(1.750,3.001)	1.033	(0.777,1.372)
Non-Medical Exemption Policy						
NME1 (Only religious NME allowed)	1.290	(0.834,1.987)	0.158***	(0.110,0.225)	0.139***	(0.056,0.292)
NME2 (Religious and personal NME allowed)	0.836	(0.534,1.306)	0.108***	(0.073,0.157)	0.141***	(0.056,0.298)

*Significance label: <0.001: '***'; <0.01: '**'; <0.05: '*'.*

References

1. US Census Bureau. 2020 Census. *Census.gov* https://www.census.gov/2020census.
2. US Census Bureau. American Community Survey (ACS). *Census.gov* https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs.
3. CDC/ATSDR Social Vulnerability Index (CDC/ATSDR SVI). https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/index.html (2024).
4. PRRI. 2020 PRRI Census of American Religion: County-Level Data on Religious Identity and Diversity. https://www.prri.org/research/2020-census-of-american-religion/.
5. Novilla, M. L. B. *et al*. Why Parents Say No to Having Their Children Vaccinated against Measles: A Systematic Review of the Social Determinants of Parental Perceptions on MMR Vaccine Hesitancy. *Vaccines* **11**, 926 (2023).
6. Dalton, A. F. *et al*. Relationships Between Social Vulnerability and Coronavirus Disease 2019 Vaccination Coverage and Vaccine Effectiveness. *Clin. Infect. Dis. Off. Publ. Infect. Dis. Soc. Am.* **76**, 1615–1625 (2023).
7. Dong, E., Nixon, K. & Gardner, L. M. A population level study on the determinants of COVID-19 vaccination rates at the U.S. county level. *Sci. Rep.* **14**, 4277 (2024).
8. Motta, M. Republicans, Not Democrats, Are More Likely to Endorse Anti-Vaccine Misinformation. *Am. Polit. Res.* **49**, 428–438 (2021).
9. MIT Election Data and Science Lab. County Presidential Election Returns 2000-2020. Harvard Dataverse https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/VOQCHQ (2022).
10. Dong, E., Du, H. & Gardner, L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **20**, 533–534 (2020).

11. Tiu, A, Bansal, S. COVID-19 Vaccination Tracking. *Github Repository*. https://github.com/bansallab/vaccinetracking.
12. Tiu, A., Susswein, Z., Merritt, A. & Bansal, S. Characterizing the Spatiotemporal Heterogeneity of the COVID-19 Vaccination Landscape. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **191**, 1792–1802 (2022).
13. United States Government Department of Health & Human Services. *HealthData.gov* https://healthdata.gov/.
14. Flu Vaccinations | County Health Rankings & Roadmaps. https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/health-data/health-factors/clinical-care/quality-of-care/flu-vaccinations.
15. CDC. Public Health Law. *State School Immunization Requirements and Vaccine Exemption Laws* https://www.cdc.gov/phlp/docs/school-vaccinations.pdf.
16. State Non-Medical Exemptions from School Immunization Requirements. https://www.ncsl.org/health/state-non-medical-exemptions-from-school-immunization-requirements.
17. Cockman, P., Dawson, L., Mathur, R. & Hull, S. Improving MMR vaccination rates: herd immunity is a realistic goal. *BMJ* **343**, d5703 (2011).