

1 COVID-19 vaccine access and attitudes among people experiencing
2 homelessness from pilot mobile phone survey in Los Angeles, CA

3

4

5 Randall Kuhn^{1*}, Benjamin Henwood², Alexander Lawton¹, Mary Kleva³, Karthik Murali³, Coley

6 King⁴, Lillian Gelberg⁵

7

8

9

10 ¹Department of Community Health Sciences, Jonathon and Karen Fielding School of Public
11 Health, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, United States of America

12

13 ²Suzanne Dworak-Peck School of Social Work, University of Southern California, Los Angeles,
14 California, United States of America

15

16 ³Akido Labs, Los Angeles, California, United States of America

17

18 ⁴Venice Family Clinic, Los Angeles, California, United States of America

19

20 ⁵Department of Family Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California,
21 United States of America

22

23

24 * kuhn@ucla.edu

25

26

27

28 Abbreviations: AOR, adjusted odds ratio; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; FQHC, federally

29 qualified health center; OR, odds ratio; PEH, people experiencing homelessness; PHQ-4,

30 patient health questionnaire-4

31 **Abstract**

32 **Background**

33 People experiencing homelessness (PEH) are at high risk for COVID-19 complications
34 and fatality, and have been prioritized for vaccination in many areas. Yet little is known about
35 vaccine acceptance in this population. The objective of this study was to determine the level of
36 vaccine hesitancy among PEH in Los Angeles, CA and to understand the covariates of
37 hesitancy in relation to COVID-19 risk, threat perception, self-protection and information
38 sources.

39 **Methods and findings**

40 A novel mobile survey platform was deployed to recruit PEH from a federally qualified
41 health center (FQHC) in Los Angeles to participate in a monthly rapid response study of COVID-
42 19 attitudes, behaviors, and risks. Of 90 PEH surveyed, 43 (48%) expressed some level of
43 vaccine hesitancy based either on actual vaccine offers (17/90 = 19%) or a hypothetical offer
44 (73/90 = 81%). In bivariate analysis, those with high COVID-19 threat perception were less
45 likely to be vaccine hesitant (OR=0.34, $P=.03$), while those who frequently practiced COVID-19
46 protective behaviors were more likely to be vaccine hesitant (OR=2.21, $P=.08$). In a multivariate
47 model, those with high threat perception (OR=0.25, $P=.02$) were less likely to be hesitant, while
48 those engaging in COVID-19 protective behaviors were more hesitant (OR=3.63, $P=.02$). Those
49 who trusted official sources were less hesitant (OR=0.37, $P=.08$) while those who trusted friends
50 and family for COVID-19 information (OR=2.70, $P=.07$) were more likely to be hesitant.

51 **Conclusions**

52 Findings suggest that targeted educational and social influence interventions are needed
53 to address high levels of vaccine hesitancy among PEH.

54

55 **Introduction**

56 People experiencing homelessness (PEH), who have high rates of comorbid conditions
57 more typical of individuals 15-20 years older than their chronological age [1–3], are extremely
58 susceptible to COVID-19 (coronavirus disease 2019), with higher risk of hospitalization and
59 death from infection.[4,5] Highly effective vaccines against SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes
60 COVID-19, may thus hold an outsized benefit for PEH, particularly those living in congregate
61 settings such as shelters or unsheltered encampments that had previously seen COVID-19
62 outbreaks.[6,7] Yet concerns persist about vaccine hesitancy among this population. Studies
63 have already documented that populations with elevated risks of current and lifetime
64 homelessness are hesitant to accept vaccines more generally, most notably African American,
65 low income and low schooling populations. [8–10] Behavioral models of vaccine hesitancy
66 highlight the complex role of threat perception, activation and trust in vaccine decisions.[11,12]
67 All of these concerns may be at play given the physical and mental health issues and social
68 isolation facing PEH.[13] Yet few studies have documented vaccine hesitancy for any condition
69 among PEH [14], and we know of no study that has addressed COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in
70 this population.

71 Using a unique, rapidly-deployed online survey of homeless patients of a Federally
72 Qualified Health Center (FQHC) in Los Angeles, we describe levels of vaccine uptake and
73 hesitancy, and address covariates of hesitancy in terms of COVID-19 vulnerability, threat
74 perception, protection and information sources, along with demographic covariates.

75 **Data and Methods**

76 This study was designed as a pilot for a larger platform to address the challenge of
77 gathering ongoing, longitudinal data from PEH through monthly online surveys. A university-

78 based research team worked closely with an FQHC partner with strong homeless outreach and
79 an active electronic health record system with messaging platform. The analysis met all
80 requirements of the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology
81 (STROBE) guidelines, as shown in S1 STROBE Checklist. Because the study was designed
82 prior to the development of a vaccine, analyses were not pre-specified in any protocols.

83 Potential patient participants were identified as homeless by the FQHC based on self-
84 report from a patient questionnaire and/or the presence of an ICD-10 diagnosis code for
85 homelessness at any point in their patient history (N=3,145). A total of 1,537/3,145 (48.9%)
86 clicked on the pre-screening survey. Respondents were screened as survey-eligible if they were
87 age 18+, living in LA County, and met the US Department of Housing and Urban Development
88 definition of homeless: "People who are living in a place not meant for human habitation, in
89 emergency shelter, in transitional housing, or are exiting an institution where they temporarily
90 resided." Of the 190 individuals meeting these criteria, 125 answered the survey (65.8%). The
91 Month 3 survey that incorporated vaccine questions was completed by 90 respondents, for a
92 73% retention rate (90/125). Age/sex/race composition of the study population was compared to
93 the source population of patients in the EHR system.

94 Once enrolled in the study, surveys were delivered through a HIPAA-compliant, cloud-
95 based data collection platform that was designed to suit the capabilities of the study population,
96 with extensive consultation with a lived experience advisory group and testing with unhoused
97 clients. Informed consent was conducted via the survey questionnaire, requiring affirmative
98 consent before proceeding with the survey and providing complete informed consent
99 documentation at the start of each survey. A 5-minute baseline demographic and risk factor
100 survey was conducted December 2020 through January 2021. Monthly surveys lasted 15
101 minutes on average and included questions on COVID-19 risk perception, protective behaviors
102 and information sources along with physical and mental well-being. The third monthly survey

103 conducted February 15-26, 2021 added questions on vaccine uptake and acceptability.

104 Participants received financial incentives of \$5 for the baseline and for each monthly survey.

105 The study protocols were approved by the 1st author's university IRB.

106 **Dependent variables:** Vaccine uptake was measured with a two-part question that first asked
107 whether a respondent had been offered a vaccine, followed by a hesitancy question based on
108 actual or hypothetical behavior. For those who had been offered a vaccine, individuals who did
109 not accept the vaccine were coded as vaccine hesitant. Among those who had not been offered
110 the vaccine, respondents were asked if they would take the vaccine if they were offered it, with
111 possible responses of "yes," "no" or "prefer not to answer." Those who responded "no" or "prefer
112 not to answer" were coded as vaccine hesitant.

113 **Independent variables:** The initial baseline survey included self-reports of age (18-34, 35-44,
114 45-54, 55-64, 65+), sex/gender (male/female) and race/ethnicity (White non-Hispanic, any
115 Hispanic/Latino, Black non-Hispanic, other). Vulnerability to severe COVID-19 complications
116 was assessed at baseline using self-reports of the CDC's list of underlying medical conditions
117 (CDC). Sheltered/unsheltered status was measured in the monthly survey based on where the
118 respondent slept the previous night. COVID-19 threat perception was measured using a
119 modified 4-item adaptation of the Fear of COVID-19 scale[15], with "high threat perception"
120 classified as responding "agree/strongly agree" to at least 3/4 questions. COVID-19 self-
121 protective behavior was measured using a four-item index of how frequently the respondent
122 wore a mask, washed their hands, stayed 6 feet from others, and avoided touching their face.
123 Anxiety/depression was measured using the Patient Health Questionnaire-4 (PHQ-4), with
124 moderate-severe psychological distress classified using the documented scoring system.[16]

125 **Statistical analysis:** After describing the univariate distribution for all dependent and
126 independent variables, we conduct bivariate analysis of vaccine hesitancy in terms of all

127 independent variables using two-tailed chi-square tests of differences in proportions and two-
128 tailed t-tests of differences in means. We then estimated a multivariate model including all
129 factors shown to be significant in bivariate analysis. All statistical analyses were performed in
130 Stata 16. Due to the relatively small sample size, we report significance at both the 5% and 10%
131 levels.

132 **Results:**

133 The mean age of the sample was 48.7 and 59% of respondents were female (Table 1).
134 The sample was predominantly White (49%), followed by Hispanic/Latino (18%), other (18%),
135 and Black/African American (9%). Most respondents were unsheltered (44%). More than half
136 (52%) of respondents were coded as having moderate/severe psychological distress according
137 to the PHQ-4 screening. Thirty three percent of respondents perceived COVID-19 as a high
138 threat, and 42% reported high COVID-19 protective behavior. More than half reported trust in
139 some official source (62%) or mass media (56%), while 42% reporting trusting personal
140 information sources such as friends, family or social media.

141

142 **Table 1. Summary statistics by COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy**

143

	<u>No hesitancy (n=47)</u>		<u>Hesitancy (n=43)</u>		<u>Total (n=90)</u>		<i>P</i> value ^a
	mean	(95% CI)	mean	(95% CI)	mean	(95% CI)	
Age	49.8	(45.9-53.7)	47.6	(43.4-51.7)	48.7	(45.9-51.5)	.43
Sex (female)	0.60	(0.45-0.73)	0.58	(0.43-0.72)	0.59	(0.48-0.69)	.89
Race							
White	0.47	(0.33-0.61)	0.51	(0.36-0.66)	0.49	(0.39-0.59)	.83
Black/African American	0.11	(0.04-0.23)	0.07	(0.02-0.20)	0.09	(0.04-0.17)	
Hispanic/Latino	0.15	(0.07-0.28)	0.21	(0.11-0.36)	0.18	(0.11-0.27)	
Other	0.19	(0.10-0.33)	0.16	(0.08-0.31)	0.18	(0.11-0.27)	
Unreported	0.09	(0.03-0.21)	0.05	(0.01-0.17)	0.07	(0.03-0.14)	
Housing status							
Unsheltered	0.47	(0.33-0.61)	0.42	(0.28-0.57)	0.44	(0.34-0.55)	.57
Sheltered	0.32	(0.20-0.47)	0.30	(0.18-0.46)	0.31	(0.22-0.42)	
Doubled up/hotel	0.13	(0.06-0.26)	0.23	(0.13-0.38)	0.18	(0.11-0.27)	
Other	0.09	(0.03-0.21)	0.05	(0.01-0.17)	0.07	(0.03-0.14)	
PHQ-4 Score	6.62	(5.67-7.57)	4.95	(3.86-6.04)	5.84	(5.11-6.57)	.02
PHQ-4 Moderate/Severe	0.62	(0.47-0.75)	0.41	(0.27-0.57)	0.52	(0.42-0.63)	.06
COVID-19 Threat Index (out of 4)^b	2.11	(1.64-2.57)	1.24	(0.82-1.67)	1.70	(1.38-2.03)	.008
I fear COVID more than anything else	0.51	(0.37-0.65)	0.32	(0.19-0.48)	0.42	(0.32-0.53)	.07
I feel anxious when hearing about COVID	0.55	(0.41-0.69)	0.37	(0.23-0.52)	0.47	(0.36-0.57)	.08
I'm more likely to get COVID than most	0.49	(0.35-0.63)	0.17	(0.08-0.32)	0.34	(0.25-0.45)	.002
I'm more likely to get very sick from COVID than most	0.55	(0.41-0.69)	0.39	(0.25-0.55)	0.48	(0.37-0.58)	.13
COVID-19 Threat - High (≥ 3)	0.45	(0.31-0.59)	0.20	(0.10-0.35)	0.33	(0.24-0.44)	.01
COVID-19 Protective Behavior Index (out of 4)^c	1.66	(1.27-2.05)	2.15	(1.66-2.63)	1.89	(1.58-2.19)	.12
Always wash hands after bathroom, before eating	0.47	(0.33-0.61)	0.55	(0.39-0.69)	0.51	(0.40-0.61)	.45
Always stay 6 feet apart from people I didn't live with	0.45	(0.31-0.59)	0.50	(0.35-0.65)	0.47	(0.37-0.58)	.62
Always wear a mask	0.51	(0.37-0.65)	0.60	(0.44-0.74)	0.55	(0.44-0.66)	.41
Always try not to touch mouth, nose, eyes, face	0.19	(0.10-0.33)	0.46	(0.32-0.62)	0.32	(0.23-0.42)	.006
COVID-19 Protective Behavior - High (≥3)	0.34	(0.22-0.49)	0.51	(0.36-0.66)	0.42	(0.32-0.53)	.10
COVID-19 info from official sources	0.71	(0.56-0.83)	0.51	(0.36-0.66)	0.62	(0.51-0.71)	.06
COVID-19 info from media	0.64	(0.49-0.77)	0.46	(0.32-0.62)	0.56	(0.45-0.66)	.09
COVID-19 info from personal sources	0.36	(0.23-0.51)	0.49	(0.34-0.64)	0.42	(0.32-0.53)	.21

144

145 ^aTests for significance by vaccine acceptance. Reported *P* values correspond to chi-square tests for

146 categorical variables and 2-tail t-tests for continuous variables

147 ^bIndividual COVID-19 Threat Index items refer to those who responded "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to


148 each statement, with high threat perception coded as responding "Always" or "Almost Always" to at least

149 3/4 items


150

151

152 Figure 1 shows that, of the 90 respondents in the sample, 17 (19%) have been offered
153 the vaccine, 10 of whom accepted. Among the 73 not offered the vaccine, 37 (51%) said they
154 would take it if offered, 23 said they would not (32%), and 13 declined to answer (17%). Given
155 these results, 43 (48%) expressed vaccine hesitancy, as defined above. Among those who
156 rejected an offer of the vaccine or stated that they would not get the vaccine if offered (n=30),
157 the most common reasons cited for vaccine hesitancy or refusal were fear of side effects (37%),
158 wanting to have more information (30%), and rejection of all vaccines (27%) (Figure 2).



159 **Fig 1. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy by prior vaccine access.** Respondents who were offered
160 a vaccine (n=17) were asked whether or not they received the vaccine; those who received the
161 vaccine (n=10) were classified as not vaccine hesitant and those who did not receive the
162 vaccine were classified as vaccine hesitant (n=7). Respondents who had not been offered the
163 vaccine (n=73) were asked if they would take the vaccine. Those who said they would take the
164 vaccine (n=37) were classified as not hesitant and those who said they wouldn't (n=23) or
165 declined to answer (n=13) were classified as hesitant.
166



167
168 **Fig 2. Reasons for vaccine hesitancy among those who refused an actual or hypothetical**
169 **offer of COVID-19 vaccine.** Respondents who refused an actual or hypothetical offer of the
170 COVID-19 vaccine were asked their reason(s) for refusal (n=30). Other possible reasons for
171 vaccine hesitancy that were not selected by any participants included “I am not at risk for
172 COVID-19” and “I could not afford the vaccine.”
173

174 Bivariate analysis (Table 1) revealed no significant differences in vaccine hesitancy
175 across any key demographic variables, including age, sex, race, and last-night housing status.
176 Hesitant respondents scored as having lower PHQ-4 scores (4.95 vs. 6.62, $P=.02$) and were
177 less likely to have moderate/severe psychological distress (41% vs 62% $P=.06$). Respondents
178 classified as vaccine-hesitant scored lower on the COVID-19 threat index (1.24, compared to
179 2.11, $P=.008$) and were less likely to report high threat perception based on 3 out of 4 perceived
180 threats (20% vs. 45%, $P=0.01$). Hesitant respondents were not significantly more likely to
181 engage in ≥ 3 of 4 reported COVID-19 protective behaviors (51% vs. 34%, $P=.10$), but were
182 significantly more likely to avoid touching their faces (46% vs. 19%, $P=.006$). They were less
183 likely to trust COVID-19 protection information from official sources (51% vs. 71%, $P=.06$) or
184 mass media (46% vs. 64%, $P=.09$) and no more likely to trust information from friends or social
185 media (49% vs. 36%, $P=.21$).

186 A multivariate model showed that respondents with high COVID-19 threat perception
 187 were significantly less likely to be vaccine-hesitant (OR=0.25, $P=.02$) (Table 2). Those engaging
 188 in highly protective behavior were more likely to be vaccine-hesitant (OR=3.63, $P=0.02$). Those
 189 trusting official sources were significantly less likely to be hesitant (OR=0.37, $P=.08$) and those
 190 trusting personal contacts more likely to be hesitant (OR=2.70, $P=.07$). A two-tailed t-test of
 191 equality in the coefficients for COVID-19 information sources revealed significantly higher levels
 192 of hesitancy for personal contacts vs. official sources (chi-square=4.84, $P=.09$) and personal
 193 contacts vs. mass media (chi-square = 4.88, $P=0.09$), with no significant difference between
 194 official sources vs. mass media.

195 **Table 2. Model of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy**
 196

Factor	OR	(95% CI)	P value	AOR	(95% CI)	P value
COVID-19 Threat Index - High	0.34	(0.13, 0.91)	.03	0.25	(0.08, 0.80)	.02
COVID-19 Protective Behavior - High	2.21	(0.92, 5.31)	.08	3.63	(1.26, 10.47)	.02
PHQ-4 - Moderate/Severe	0.49	(0.21, 1.17)	.11	0.64	(0.24, 1.71)	.38
COVID-19 info from official sources	0.41	(0.17, 0.99)	.05	0.37	(0.12, 1.11)	.08
COVID-19 info from media	0.50	(0.21, 1.19)	.12	0.52	(0.19, 1.41)	.20
COVID-19 info from personal sources	1.81	(0.76, 4.32)	.18	2.70	(0.93, 7.81)	.07
n	85			85		
Pseudo R ²						0.172

197
 198 **Discussion**
 199 Our findings provide initial evidence of high levels of hesitancy towards the COVID-19
 200 vaccine among unhoused individuals. Based on a combination of actual and hypothetical
 201 behavior, 48% showed hesitancy toward the vaccine, considerably higher than the 31-35%
 202 observed in the general population over a similar period [9,10]. The share who had been offered
 203 the vaccine was comparable to the general population of LA County at the time, and rates of
 204 hesitancy were nearly identical in actual and hypothetical responses.

205 Our findings point to the complex role of threat perception, activation and information in
206 vaccine hesitancy among PEH. In adjusted models, respondents reporting higher COVID-19
207 fear were one-third as likely to express vaccine hesitancy. At the same time, however,
208 individuals who fully engaged in protective behaviors (e.g. mask-wearing) had nearly 4 times
209 greater odds of vaccine hesitancy. Indeed, those who were hesitant towards the vaccine were
210 more likely to engage in each of the four reported protective behaviors. This suggests that
211 individuals who have actively engaged in COVID-19 protective measures over the past year
212 may now be less accepting of the vaccine. Those who trusted COVID-19 information from
213 official sources and news media were less hesitant, while those trusting personal sources (i.e.
214 friends/family and social media) were relatively more hesitant. While we did not have sufficient
215 power to test significance in reasons for hesitancy, we note that a higher proportion of those
216 with high protective behavior reported reasons such as “I am part of a risk group and want more
217 info,” “I fear it will have unpleasant side effects,” and “I do not believe the vaccine will protect
218 me.” Given that vaccine-hesitant individuals are often more vocal in their beliefs, this points to
219 the opportunity to leverage interpersonal networks as pathways of influence by focusing on
220 individuals who may be especially activated or vocal about risks ascribed to both the disease
221 itself and the vaccine. [17]

222 This rapid-reaction pilot study has a number of limitations. First, the sample size was
223 small and addressed patients only in one portion of West Los Angeles. Nevertheless, the results
224 have been received as valuable to public health officials who are supporting additional
225 enrollments across all service areas to increase the sample. Second, while all homeless-flagged
226 patients with phones had the opportunity to answer the survey and response rates were
227 considerably higher than most online or phone-based polls, we know that those who answered
228 the survey were more likely to be female (59% vs. 35%) and less likely to be African-American
229 (9% vs. 24%) than that clinic’s homeless patient base as a whole. Given the lack of differences

230 in hesitancy across any demographic groups and the small sample size, we did not report
231 weighted results. Finally, we note that these interviews were conducted prior to PEH receiving
232 universal vaccine eligibility on March 15, 2021, and that some hesitancy may more accurately
233 reflect indifference or frustration at the difficulty of obtaining the vaccine.

234 In spite of these limitations, our findings point to challenges in widespread vaccine
235 scaleup that are not so different than those faced in the general population. It is important to
236 know that those people who need the vaccine most - those who fear COVID-19 but are less
237 likely to protect themselves through social distancing measures - are those most highly willing to
238 be vaccinated. But achieving widespread vaccine acceptance may be far more challenging
239 among individuals who are more proactive with protective behaviors but who may be more
240 skeptical of the COVID-19 vaccine and who may have low trust in official information sources.

241 **Conclusion**

242 Preliminary results from a small survey of PEH in Los Angeles reveal a high rate of
243 vaccine hesitancy in this population, with higher levels of hesitancy observed among those with
244 low threat perception, those engaging in self-protective behaviors, and those with higher trust in
245 personal sources of information versus official sources. Our data suggest the need for targeted
246 educational and social influence interventions to increase vaccine uptake among PEH, who are
247 at greater risk of suffering from severe COVID-19 than the general population. Additional data
248 collected on a larger, more representative sample is necessary to determine differences in
249 vaccine attitudes across demographic variables like race.

250 **Author contributions:** Dr. Kuhn had full access to all of the data in the study and takes
251 responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. *Concept and*
252 *design:* Kuhn, Henwood, Gelberg, King. *Acquisition of data:* Kuhn, Henwood, Lawton, Murali,

253 Kleva. *Analysis and interpretation of data*: Kuhn, Henwood, Lawton. *Drafting of the manuscript*.
254 Lawton, Kuhn. *Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content*: Kuhn,
255 Henwood, Lawton, Kleva, Murali, Gelberg, King. *Statistical analysis*: Lawton, Kuhn. *Obtained*
256 *funding*: Kuhn, Henwood. *Administrative, technical, or material support*: Kuhn, Henwood,
257 Lawton, Kleva, Murali, King, Gelberg. *Supervision*: Kuhn, Henwood.

258 **Funding/Support:** Funding for this study was provided by University of California Office of the
259 President Emergency COVID-19 Research Seed Funding Grant #R00RG2888 “A data-driven
260 response to coronavirus among homeless clients in LA County” and the USC Homeless Policy
261 Research Institute.

262 **Acknowledgements:** The authors wish to thank the entire team at Venice Family Clinic for their
263 partnerships, for reviewing the questionnaire, distributing the survey to their patients, and
264 providing data support, specifically Karen C. Lamp, MD; Jenny O’Brien; Meghan Powers;
265 Matthew Ware; and Carrie Kowalski. We would also like to thank the staff at Akido Labs who
266 played an instrumental role in designing the survey and rapidly adding new questions,
267 specifically Aishwarya Badanidiyoor. Finally, we are tremendously grateful to the support
268 provided by our lived expertise group, a panel of individuals with past or current homelessness
269 experience, for informing design of our study and research platform.

270 **References**

- 271 1. Brown RT, Hemati K, Riley ED, Lee CT, Ponath C, Tieu L, et al. Geriatric Conditions in a
272 Population-Based Sample of Older Homeless Adults. *The Gerontologist*. 2016;57: 757–
273 766. doi:10.1093/geront/gnw011
- 274 2. Adams J, Rosenheck R, Gee L, Seibyl CL, Kushel M. Hospitalized younger: a comparison
275 of a national sample of homeless and housed inpatient veterans. *J Health Care Poor*
276 *Underserved*. 2007;18: 173–184.
- 277 3. Culhane D, Treglia D, Steif K, Kuhn R, Byrne T. Estimated Emergency and
278 Observational/Quarantine Capacity Need for the US Homeless Population Related to
279 COVID-19 Exposure by County; Projected Hospitalizations, Intensive Care Units and
280 Mortality. 2020.
- 281 4. Leifheit KM, Chaisson LH, Medina JA, Wahbi R, Shover CL. Elevated mortality among
282 people experiencing homelessness with COVID-19. *Epidemiology*; 2021 Mar.
283 doi:10.1101/2021.03.05.21253019
- 284 5. Baggett TP, Lewis E, Gaeta JM. Epidemiology of COVID-19 among people experiencing
285 homelessness: early evidence from Boston. 2020.
- 286 6. Mosites E, Parker EM, Clarke KEN, Gaeta JM, Baggett TP, Imbert E, et al. Assessment of
287 SARS-CoV-2 Infection Prevalence in Homeless Shelters — Four U.S. Cities, March 27–
288 April 15, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69: 521–522.
289 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6917e1
- 290 7. Baggett TP, Keyes H, Sporn N, Gaeta JM. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in
291 residents of a large homeless shelter in Boston. *Jama*. 2020;323: 2191–2192.
- 292 8. Momplaisir F, Haynes N, Nkwihoreze H, Nelson M, Werner RM, Jemmott J. Understanding
293 Drivers of COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy Among Blacks. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021.
- 294 9. Inc G. U.S. Readiness to Get COVID-19 Vaccine Steadies at 65%. In: Gallup.com
295 [Internet]. 12 Jan 2021 [cited 25 Feb 2021]. Available:
296 <https://news.gallup.com/poll/328415/readiness-covid-vaccine-steadies.aspx>
- 297 10. Callaghan T, Moghtaderi A, Lueck JA, Hotez P, Strych U, Dor A, et al. Correlates and
298 disparities of intention to vaccinate against COVID-19. *Soc Sci Med*. 2021;272: 113638.
299 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113638
- 300 11. Peretti-Watel P, Larson HJ, Ward JK, Schulz WS, Verger P. Vaccine Hesitancy: Clarifying
301 a Theoretical Framework for an Ambiguous Notion. *PLoS Curr*. 2015;7.
302 doi:10.1371/currents.outbreaks.6844c80ff9f5b273f34c91f71b7fc289
- 303 12. Reich JA. Of natural bodies and antibodies: Parents' vaccine refusal and the dichotomies
304 of natural and artificial. *Soc Sci Med*. 2016;157: 103–110.

- 305 13. Fazel S, Geddes JR, Kushel M. The health of homeless people in high-income countries:
306 Descriptive epidemiology, health consequences, and clinical and policy recommendations.
307 *The Lancet*. 2014;384: 1529–1540. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61132-6
- 308 14. Buechler CR, Ukani A, Elsharawi R, Gable J, Petersen A, Franklin M, et al. Barriers,
309 beliefs, and practices regarding hygiene and vaccination among the homeless during a
310 hepatitis A outbreak in Detroit, MI. *Heliyon*. 2020;6: e03474.
- 311 15. Ahorsu DK, Lin C-Y, Imani V, Saffari M, Griffiths MD, Pakpour AH. The Fear of COVID-19
312 Scale: Development and Initial Validation. *Int J Ment Health Addict*. 2020 [cited 12 Mar
313 2021]. doi:10.1007/s11469-020-00270-8
- 314 16. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB, Löwe B. An ultra-brief screening scale for anxiety and
315 depression: the PHQ–4. *Psychosomatics*. 2009;50: 613–621.
- 316 17. Rice E, Yoshioka-Maxwell A, Petering R, Onasch-Vera L, Craddock J, Tambe M, et al.
317 Piloting the Use of Artificial Intelligence to Enhance HIV Prevention Interventions for Youth
318 Experiencing Homelessness. *J Soc Soc Work Res*. 2018;9: 551–573. doi:10.1086/701439
- 319