

1 **Effectiveness and acceptability of an opt-out nudge to promote influenza vaccination**
2 **among medical residents in Nice, France: a randomized controlled trial.**

3 Running head: OPT-OUT NUDGE: EFFECTIVENESS AND ACCEPTABILITY

4
5 Article Category: Health Service Research
6

7 Adriaan BARBAROUX ^a, Ilaria SERATI ^b.

8
9 ^a Université Côte d'Azur, Département d'enseignement et de recherche en médecine générale,
10 RETINES, LAPCOS, HEALTHY, France.

11 ^b Université Côte d'Azur, France.
12
13

14 Corresponding author:

15 Dr A. Barbaroux, Université Côte d'Azur, Département d'enseignement et de recherche en
16 médecine générale, RETINES, LAPCOS, HEALTHY, 28 Avenue de Valombrose, 06107 Nice,
17 France, adriaan.barbaroux@univ-cotedazur.fr - +33630852190
18

19 Key messages

20 Nudging is one of the most efficient techniques to improve vaccination coverage.

21 Changing defaults may be effective in promoting vaccination and well accepted.

22 Changing defaults does not lower the feeling of control over choices.

23 The sense of autonomy related to a nudge is correlated to its acceptability.

24 Behavior adoption increases the sense of autonomy related to a nudge.

25 Using defaults for nudge should take into account the ethical implications.

26 **ABSTRACT**

27 *Background:* Nudges have been proposed as an effective tool to promote influenza vaccination
28 of healthcare workers. To be successful, nudges must match the needs of the target healthcare
29 workers population and be acceptable.

30 *Objective:* To evaluate the effectiveness and the acceptability of an opt-out nudge promoting
31 influenza vaccination among medical residents.

32 *Methods:* The hypothesis were that an opt-out nudge would be effective, better accepted when
33 applied to patients than to residents, and that prior exposure to a nudge and being vaccinated
34 increase its acceptability and residents' sense of autonomy (the feeling of being in control of
35 their choice about whether to get vaccinated). Residents were randomly divided into two
36 parallel experimental arms: a nudge group and a control group. The nudge consisted in offering
37 participants an appointment for a flu shot, while leaving them the choice to refuse or to
38 reschedule it.

39 *Results:* The analysis included 260 residents. Residents in nudge group were more likely
40 to be vaccinated than residents in control group. There was a strong consensus among the
41 residents that it is very acceptable to nudge their peers and patients. Acceptability for residents
42 and patients did not differ. Acceptability was better among residents exposed to the nudge and
43 residents who were vaccinated. Residents considered that the nudge does not reduce their
44 control over whether to get a flu shot. The sense of autonomy was associated with nudge's
45 acceptability.

46 *Conclusion:* An opt-out nudge to promote influenza vaccination among medical
47 residents can be effective and very well accepted. These data suggest that this approach can
48 complement other vaccination promoting interventions and be eventually extended to other
49 healthcare workers' categories and to general population, but should consider its ethical
50 implications. More studies are needed to assess the nudge's effectiveness and acceptability on
51 other populations.

52

53 *Keywords:* Nudge, Default, Effectiveness, Social acceptability, Vaccination promotion,
54 Healthcare workers

55

56

57 **Background**

58 Influenza is a public health issue, with seasonal epidemics affecting 2 to 8 million people
59 in France each year, with recent figures estimating up to 15.000 influenza-associated deaths(1).

60 Healthcare workers are at risk of acquiring influenza and thus serve as an important
61 reservoir for patients under their care. Also, they are in contact with those who are most at risk
62 of severe influenza(2). Annual influenza vaccination of high-risk persons and their contacts,
63 including healthcare workers, is a primary means of preventing influenza, limiting the use of
64 care and reducing pneumonia deaths in health facilities(2).

65 Despite influenza vaccine effectiveness and safety, vaccination coverage among
66 healthcare workers in Europe rarely exceeds 30%(3–5) and remains far below recommended
67 levels of 75%(6).

68 Most public health policies use education programs to change healthcare workers’
69 attitude and increase influenza vaccine uptake(7). The effects of conventional educational
70 programs and campaigns are in general of modest impact only, suggesting that new strategies
71 to promote influenza vaccination among healthcare workers are needed(8).

72 Thaler and Sunstein suggested that nudges are an effective method to promote behavior
73 changes(9). A nudge refers to any alteration of the environmental context or “choice
74 architecture” people operate within, that aims to influence people's behavior in a predictable
75 way, without denying them any options or changing their attitudes(9). It consists of a gentle
76 incitement that respects freedom of choice and does not use financial incentives(9). Its
77 effectiveness has been demonstrated in the field of economics and earned Richard Thaler the
78 Nobel Prize in Economics in 2017.

79 Nudges’ effectiveness in medicine is poorly studied, but systematic reviews place
80 nudges among the most promising interventions to promote healthy behaviors(10,11). Some
81 studies have shown nudges’ effectiveness in increasing vaccination coverage(11–19).

82 There are different types of nudges, which change the choice architecture in different
83 ways(20). Patel et al.(18) showed that the most effective nudge consists in changing the default
84 (the outcome that results when no action is taken) by scheduling people for a vaccination
85 appointment, making the appointment the default option (opting-out), and thus avoiding the
86 risk of forgetting or procrastinating to schedule an appointment by oneself (opting-in).

87 According to Thaler and Sunstein, nudges must be transparent and publicly
88 defensible(9). Being often very subtle, nudges might be criticized as unethical(21). Also, the
89 operationalization of nudges is based on heuristics and cognitive bias(22). The analysis of the
90 decision process induced by nudges shows that their handling is ethically tricky(23). By not
91 being transparent about the intention to influence individual choice, they might be perceived as
92 limiting freedom of autonomous decisions(21,24) or as manipulation attempts(25,26). Previous
93 studies described a generally positive but variable acceptability, with 40 to 87% of participants
94 judging nudges as acceptable(27). A nudge's acceptability could also be modified by mere
95 exposure to nudge(28).

96 Although there are several types of nudges, few studies evaluated their respective
97 effectiveness, and it is difficult to predict a nudge's effectiveness(29). Systematic reviews
98 emphasize the need to develop better quality randomized trials(30). Also, there are few
99 randomized controlled studies evaluating the acceptability of nudges(12,31,32) or their
100 implementation among health professionals(11,30,33).

101 In a previous study on a medical residents' population, a reminder nudge proved
102 ineffective but well accepted(31). The aim of the present study was to evaluate the effectiveness
103 and the acceptability of an opt-out nudge to promote influenza vaccination among a very similar
104 residents' population. It was hypothesized that the vaccination rate would be higher among
105 nudge-exposed residents than in unexposed residents (nudge's effectiveness, H1). The
106 hypothesis about nudge's acceptability were: acceptability would be higher when the nudge is
107 applied to patients than to peers (H2), among nudged participants (H3) and those who were

108 vaccinated (H4); the sense of autonomy (participants' feeling of control over whether to get
109 vaccinated) would be greater among nudged participants (H5) and those who were vaccinated
110 (H6); the sense of autonomy would be positively correlated to the nudge's acceptability (H7).

111

112 **Methods**

113 *Setting, participants, design and procedure*

114 This paper is an extension of a previous work testing the same hypotheses on a different
115 nudge(31). Pre-recorded hypotheses are available on ClinicalTrials.com (ClinicalTrials.gov
116 Identifier: NCT03768596).

117 A monocentric, controlled, randomized, two arm trial was designed. The inclusion
118 criteria were to be a medical resident at the University Côte d'Azur and to be in an internship
119 in one of the followings: Antibes Hospital, Grasse Hospital, Fréjus Hospital, the University and
120 Teaching Hospital of Nice (Archet, Pasteur or Cimiez Hospital), or an ambulatory internship in
121 Nice or at most 10 km from Nice. These internship sites rely on vaccination centers whose
122 operators approved the implementation of the study. The exclusion criteria were the refuse to
123 participate, the impossibility to reach the resident by phone, and accidental cross-over between
124 the groups. An equal randomization (1:1) was used, stratified by internship site to avoid the
125 center-effect due to discrepancies in vaccination campaigns in different hospitals.

126 The study was conducted in two steps. Step 1 took place between November 14th and
127 27th, 2021. In step 1, residents assigned to the nudge group received a phone call from the main
128 investigator (IS) to offer them an appointment for an influenza vaccination at the vaccination
129 center on which they depended according to their internship site, while leaving them the choice
130 to refuse or to reschedule it. No reference to the study was made at this stage. The control group
131 was not solicited at that time and was included directly in step 2. Step 2 took place between
132 January 9th and February 28th, 2022. In step 2, both groups received a phone call from the
133 investigator. The call specified its scientific purpose and the legal context for collecting data

134 (anonymous, computerized processing, no obligation to reply, possibility of leaving the study
135 at any time). The participants who gave a verbal consent answered a questionnaire about their
136 vaccination status, their opinions on vaccination and their attitude towards the nudge (social
137 acceptability and feeling of control). The questionnaire included an explanation of the nudge
138 procedure and unveiled the study aim.

139 Participants self-reported their vaccination status by indicating whether they had
140 obtained an influenza vaccination by January 9th, corresponding to the beginning of step 2.
141 Social acceptability was assessed for the residents and for the patients via a series of seven-
142 point Likert scales already used in a previous work(31), formulated as follows: "What do you
143 think about the use of this type of method on you?" on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (absolutely)
144 and applied to the following eight adjectives: abusive, acceptable, inappropriate, ethical,
145 immoral, unfair, legitimate, relevant. Acceptability toward patients was assessed via the same
146 scales. Sense of autonomy was assessed via a seven-point Likert scale formulated as follows:
147 "Do you think this nudge lets you choose whether to get vaccinated?" on a scale from 1 (not at
148 all) to 7 (absolutely).

149 The telephone interview guide for step 1 and step 2 calls and the questionnaire are
150 available online (Annex 1 and 2).

151 In order to obtain a statistical power of 90% with a tolerated alpha risk of 5%, 108
152 residents per group were required for the effectiveness study, assuming 90% vaccinated
153 residents in the nudge group against 73% in the control group, the latter corresponding to the
154 influenza vaccination rate found in our previous study(31). To obtain the same power for the
155 acceptability study, 33 people were needed per group by providing an acceptability of 5 points
156 on a Likert scale of 7 in the nudge group versus 4 in the control group.

157 *Data analysis*

158 The effectiveness of the nudge on vaccination rates were evaluated by Chi2 tests.

159 The consistency of the nudge acceptability scales was tested using Cronbach's alpha.

160 The acceptability of the nudge for residents and for patients was compared using
161 Student's t.

162 The hypotheses on nudge's acceptability and sense of autonomy were tested by stepwise
163 linear regressions including the following independent variables: nudge exposure, age, gender,
164 vaccination status, and opinion of current vaccination recommendations.

165 The dependent variables were vaccination status in step 2 (for the nudge's effectiveness
166 assessment), nudge's acceptability for residents and patients, and sense of autonomy.

167 All statistical analyses were performed using JASP® software(34).

168 *Regulatory and ethical aspects*

169 The study was classified out of scope of the Jardé law by the Ethics Committee “CPP
170 Sud Ouest et Outre Mer III” (ID-RCB: 2021-A00975-36, Ref. SI CNRIPH: ID12087
171 N°21.03.31.68613). A favorable opinion was issued by the Ethics Committee of the French
172 National College of Generalist Teachers (N°020921306). This work has been the subject of a
173 declaration of compliance with the MR004 to the National Commission of Liberty and
174 Computing “CNIL” (N°2221800v0).

175

176 **Results**

177 *Descriptive statistics*

178 Step 1 (inclusion and nudge application) took place between November 14th and 27th,
179 2021 and step 2 (data collection) between January 9th and February 28th, 2022. Of the 329
180 eligible residents, 46 could not be reached, 22 refused to participate and 1 was excluded because
181 of accidental cross-over (missing data: 21%). Flow chart is available in Figure 1. The final
182 analysis included 260 participants distributed as follows: 138 participants in the nudged group
183 and 122 in the control group. Participants' age ranged from 21 to 43 years ($M = 26.8$, $SD = 2.8$);
184 140 were women (67.5%).

185 INSERT Figure 1

186 Of the 164 participants included in step 1, 11 (6.7%) were already vaccinated at the time
187 of inclusion. In step 2, 220 participants reported being vaccinated (84.6%). Table 1 presents the
188 number of vaccinated participants per group and percentages among 260 residents.

189 INSERT Table 1

190 *Nudge effectiveness*

191 The first hypothesis (H1: residents exposed to the nudge were more likely to be
192 vaccinated than unexposed residents) was verified, $\chi^2(1, N = 260) = 70, p < .001$.

193 *Nudge acceptability*

194 We observed a high level of acceptability regardless of the experimental condition the
195 residents were included in (see Table 2). Participants rated the nudging procedure acceptable
196 for both patients ($M = 6.14$; $SD = .56$) and residents ($M = 6.10$; $SD = .80$). Only one resident
197 considered the nudge procedure to be rather unacceptable when applied to residents or patients
198 (acceptability below the seven-point Likert-scale midpoint).

199 The second hypothesis (H2: better acceptability for patients than for residents) was not
200 verified: acceptability for residents and patients did not differ, $t(260) = -1.18, p = .24$.

201 The third (H3) and the fourth (H4) hypothesis were verified: residents were more accepting of
202 the nudge as applied to themselves or to patients after previous exposure to the same nudge (p
203 $< .001$) and when they were vaccinated ($p < .001$). See Figure 2 for a visual representation of
204 these data and Table 2.

205 INSERT Figure 2

206 INSERT Table 2

207 *Sense of autonomy*

208 We observed a high level of sense of autonomy regardless of the experimental condition
209 the residents were included in (see Table 3). No resident considered the nudge procedure to
210 lower their control (sense of autonomy below the seven-point Likert-scale midpoint). The fifth
211 (H5) and the sixth (H6) hypothesis were verified: residents felt more control over the nudge

212 after previous exposure to the same nudge ($p < .001$) and when they were vaccinated ($p < .001$).
213 The seventh hypothesis (H7) was verified: the sense of autonomy was associated with nudge
214 acceptability as applied to the residents ($p < .001$) and patients ($p < .001$).

215 INSERT Table 3

216 *Additional analyses*

217 Residents were more accepting of the nudge when they approved vaccination
218 recommendations or when they would recommend vaccination to patients or other healthcare
219 workers. Acceptability did not differ within age and sex of the participants.

220

221 **Discussion**

222 These data show that an opt-out nudge can increase medical residents' influenza
223 vaccination coverage. Also, it was perceived as a soft and acceptable incentive to target both
224 residents and patients and did not reduce participants' sense of autonomy (the feeling of control
225 over whether to get vaccinated). Prior exposure to the nudge increased its acceptability and
226 participants' sense of autonomy. Acceptability and sense of autonomy were stronger among
227 vaccinated participants.

228 *Effectiveness*

229 In this randomized, controlled experimental study, a nudge changing the default (opting-
230 out instead of opting-in for a flu shot) increased influenza vaccination coverage among medical
231 residents. This result is consistent with previous evidences, which place opt-out nudges among
232 the most effective interventions in promoting vaccination(14–18).

233 This result is even more remarkable when considering the high vaccination coverage of
234 the study population, which is close to the recommended levels(6). Previous works showed that
235 vaccination coverage is typically lower among medical residents(4).

236 The vaccination booths set up at the hospitals act like a nudge changing the option-
237 related efforts, by facilitating the access to vaccination. The present study shows that this opt-

238 out nudge can increase the expected benefits of other interventions aimed at increasing
239 influenza vaccination coverage of medical residents.

240 *Acceptability*

241 This study showed interesting results concerning the acceptability of this kind of nudge.
242 First, the nudge was widely accepted, to a greater extent than previous works suggested(27,35).
243 Second, there was a strong consensus among the residents that it is very acceptable to nudge
244 both their peers and patients. Third, nudge exposure had a positive impact on nudge's
245 acceptability, as previously shown(31). Fourth, vaccinated residents found the nudge more
246 acceptable than unvaccinated residents, according to recent evidences(32).

247 Both exposed and unexposed residents found the nudge very acceptable, with almost all
248 residents accepting the nudge despite the embedded deception in the experimental design.
249 Indeed, only at a later stage were participants informed of the experimental intent of the
250 proposed vaccination appointment, which was actually a nudge aimed at influencing their
251 vaccination behavior. This shift in the communication contract could have been perceived as a
252 manipulation attempt(25), but it was not interpreted this way by participants. These findings
253 suggest a wide acceptance supporting vaccination and interventions to promote it and are
254 consistent with recent evidences about acceptability of nudges to promote vaccination on
255 residents and healthcare workers(31,32). On the contrary, this massive acceptability was not
256 found in general, non-medical populations(27,35). This discrepancy confirms that the
257 population and behavior studied affect nudge's acceptability, as previously evocated(31).
258 Indeed, despite vaccine hesitancy among healthcare workers(36), most agree that vaccination
259 is one of the most important public health practices(37). Residents and healthcare workers may
260 be more inclined to accept a nudge about vaccination than general, non-medical population.

261 *Sense of autonomy*

262 Despite nudge's effectiveness, residents did not report any attempt to their sense of
263 autonomy. Participants' sense of autonomy was stronger in nudge-exposed and in vaccinated

264 residents, and it was associated with nudge's acceptability. Interestingly, residents for whom
265 the nudge was effective felt they had more control over their choice than the others.

266 Participants were offered a vaccination appointment without explaining them it was a
267 nudge. This lack of transparency could be experienced as a violation of freedom of
268 choice(21,24), but it was not interpreted that way. This inconsistency can be explained by
269 study's conditions. Indeed, the design of the nudge made it very easy to opt out. This was found
270 to be a relevant condition that needs to be considered when using defaults to influence health-
271 related behaviors(38). To our knowledge, no experimental study has focused before on
272 assessing people's sense of autonomy related to a nudge.

273 *Strengths and limitations*

274 One limitation concerns the method by which efficacy was assessed. To avoid
275 measurement bias related to the expected long duration of the data collection phase (51 days),
276 it was decided to collect the participants' vaccination status on January 9th, 2022, which
277 corresponds to the beginning of step 2. The influenza vaccination campaign lasted until
278 February 28th, 2022(39). We assume that this may have underestimated vaccination coverage.
279 However, the difference between the vaccination coverage of the two groups is so marked
280 (22%) that we believe it is unlikely that such a difference can be due only to late vaccinations,
281 taking into account that the vaccination campaigns began between late October and mid-
282 November 2021 in all the hospitals involved.

283 In addition, since vaccination status was defined on declarative data and most hospitals
284 did not kept track of employees' influenza vaccinations, it was not possible to verify statements
285 about vaccination status. Except for those who were already vaccinated at step 1, none of the
286 participants in the nudge group refused the vaccination appointment. Since they were
287 announced that they were free to accept or not, we have no reason to think that participants in
288 the nudge group might have given more misinformation about their vaccination status than

289 participants in the control group. While an overestimation of the vaccination coverages is
290 possible, we do not believe that this could affected the assessment of the nudge's effectiveness.

291 The strength of this study resides in its interventional, controlled and randomized design.
292 Indeed, systematic reviews showed that, despite the numerous publications on nudges, only a
293 few authors used the consort reporting guidelines as we did(29,30,33). Moreover, experimental
294 studies conducted on the effectiveness and acceptability of a nudge are scarce(31). To our
295 knowledge, this is the first attempt at studying participants' participants' sense of autonomy
296 related to a nudge in experimental conditions, showing that the sense of autonomy is associated
297 with nudge's acceptability and that prior exposure to a nudge influence people's sense of
298 autonomy.

299

300 **Conclusion**

301 This work shows that a nudge changing the default from opting-in to opting-out for a
302 flu shot appointment is effective to increase influenza vaccination coverage among medical
303 residents. Also, it was deemed a very acceptable intervention to promote vaccination of both
304 residents and patients. This procedure did not reduce people's feeling of control over their
305 choices. Assessment of sense of autonomy is innovative in this context and deserves further
306 investigations. Indeed, peoples' sense of autonomy is correlated with nudge's acceptability.

307 These data suggest that changing the default to promote influenza vaccination among
308 residents might be an easy and cost-effective method to complement other promoting
309 vaccination interventions. Also, this approach could be extended to other healthcare workers'
310 categories or even to general population. However, this study shows that a nontransparent
311 nudge may simultaneously be effective and make nudged people feel they can control their
312 choices. Therefore, we must be careful about the ethical implications when using defaults to
313 nudge, especially since the sense of autonomy was found to be stronger among people on whom
314 the nudge was effective.

315

316 **Acknowledgements**

317 We would like to thank the residents who participated, Pr. Michel Carles, Mme Aurore
318 Schneider, Mr. Jérôme Chauvet, Dr. Philippe Colombani, Dr. Serge Tempesta and Dr. Astrid
319 Sieber-Roth for allowing this study to be carried out, Pr. Michel Benoît, Pr. Michel Carles and
320 Pr. Isabelle Milhabet for proofreading.

321

322 **Declaration**

323 *Funding.* This study has no funding.

324 *Ethical approval.* As an interventional study in the human and social sciences applied to the
325 field of health, the study was classified out of scope of the Jardé law by the Ethics Committee
326 “CPP Sud Ouest et Outre Mer III” (ID-RCB: 2021-A00975-36, Ref. SI CNRIPH: ID 12087 N°
327 21.03.31.68613). A favorable opinion was issued by the Ethics Committee of the French
328 National College of Generalist Teachers (N° 020921306).

329 *Conflicts of interest.* The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest in relation to this
330 work.

331

332 **Data availability**

333 The data underlying this article will be shared upon request to the corresponding author.

334

335

336 **References**

- 337
- 338 1. Grippe [Internet]. Institut Pasteur. 2015 [cited 2022 Aug 5]. Available from:
339 <https://www.pasteur.fr/fr/centre-medical/fiches-maladies/grippe>
- 340 2. Cd S, Bm F, Kk H, Fg H. Influenza in the acute hospital setting. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2002
341 Mar 1;2(3):145–55.
- 342 3. Vaux S, Noël D, Fonteneau L, Guthmann JP, Lévy-Bruhl D. Influenza vaccination
343 coverage of healthcare workers and residents and their determinants in nursing homes for
344 elderly people in France: a cross-sectional survey. *BMC Public Health*. 2010 Mar
345 25;10(1):159.
- 346 4. Mir O, Adam J, Gaillard R, Gregory T, Veyrie N, Yordanov Y, et al. Vaccination
347 coverage among medical residents in Paris, France. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2012
348 May;18(5):E137-139.
- 349 5. Blank PR, Schwenkglenks M, Szucs TD. Vaccination coverage rates in eleven European
350 countries during two consecutive influenza seasons. *Journal of Infection*. 2009 Jun
351 1;58(6):446–58.
- 352 6. Seasonal influenza vaccination and antiviral use in EU/EEA Member States [Internet].
353 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. 2018 [cited 2022 Aug 11].
354 Available from: [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/seasonal-influenza-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/seasonal-influenza-vaccination-antiviral-use-eu-eea-member-states)
355 [vaccination-antiviral-use-eu-eea-member-states](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/seasonal-influenza-vaccination-antiviral-use-eu-eea-member-states)
- 356 7. Looijmans-van den Akker I, Hulscher ME, Verheij TJ, Riphagen-Dalhuisen J, van Delden
357 JJ, Hak E. How to develop a program to increase influenza vaccine uptake among
358 workers in health care settings? *Implement Sci*. 2011 May 19;6:47.
- 359 8. To KW, Lai A, Lee KCK, Koh D, Lee SS. Increasing the coverage of influenza
360 vaccination in healthcare workers: review of challenges and solutions. *J Hosp Infect*. 2016
361 Oct;94(2):133–42.
- 362 9. Thaler RH, Sunstein CR. *Nudge: improving decisions about health, wealth, and*
363 *happiness*. New Haven: Yale University Press; 2008. 293 p.
- 364 10. Li M, Chapman GB. Nudge to health: Harnessing decision research to promote health
365 behavior. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*. 2013;7(3):187–98.
- 366 11. Corace KM, Srigley JA, Hargadon DP, Yu D, MacDonald TK, Fabrigar LR, et al. Using
367 behavior change frameworks to improve healthcare worker influenza vaccination rates: A
368 systematic review. *Vaccine*. 2016 Jun 14;34(28):3235–42.
- 369 12. Reñosa MDC, Landicho J, Wachinger J, DalGLISH SL, Bärnighausen K, Bärnighausen T,
370 et al. Nudging toward vaccination: a systematic review. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2021
371 Sep;6(9):e006237.
- 372 13. Jacobson Vann JC, Jacobson RM, Coyne-Beasley T, Asafu-Adjei JK, Szilagyi PG.
373 Patient reminder and recall interventions to improve immunization rates. *Cochrane*
374 *Database Syst Rev*. 2018 18;1:CD003941.
- 375 14. Bonander C, Ekman M, Jakobsson N. Vaccination nudges: A study of pre-booked
376 COVID-19 vaccinations in Sweden. *Soc Sci Med*. 2022 Aug 5;115248.

- 377 15. Chapman GB, Li M, Colby H, Yoon H. Opting In vs Opting Out of Influenza
378 Vaccination. *JAMA*. 2010 Jul 7;304(1):43–4.
- 379 16. Lehmann BA, Chapman GB, Franssen FM, Kok G, Ruiter RA. Changing the default to
380 promote influenza vaccination among health care workers. *Vaccine*. 2016 Mar
381 8;34(11):1389–92.
- 382 17. Logue E, Dudley P, Imhoff T, Smucker W, Stapin J, DiSabato J, et al. An opt-out
383 influenza vaccination policy improves immunization rates in primary care. *J Health Care
384 Poor Underserved*. 2011 Feb;22(1):232–42.
- 385 18. Patel MS. Nudges for influenza vaccination. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2018 Oct;2(10):720–1.
- 386 19. Milkman KL, Patel MS, Gandhi L, Graci HN, Gromet DM, Ho H, et al. A megastudy of
387 text-based nudges encouraging patients to get vaccinated at an upcoming doctor’s
388 appointment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2021 May
389 18;118(20):e2101165118.
- 390 20. Münscher R, Vetter M, Scheuerle T. A Review and Taxonomy of Choice Architecture
391 Techniques. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*. 2016;29(5):511–24.
- 392 21. Bruns H, Kantorowicz-Reznichenko E, Klement K, Luistro Jonsson M, Rahali B. Can
393 Nudges Be Transparent and Yet Effective? [Internet]. Rochester, NY; 2018 [cited 2022
394 Aug 8]. Available from: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2816227>
- 395 22. Tversky A, Kahneman D. The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice.
396 *Science*. 1981 Jan 30;211(4481):453–8.
- 397 23. Huyard C. ["Nudges": relevance, limitations and ethical issues, specifically in health
398 policy]. *Med Sci (Paris)*. 2016 Dec;32(12):1130–4.
- 399 24. Selinger E, Whyte K. Is There a Right Way to Nudge? The Practice and Ethics of Choice
400 Architecture [Internet]. Rochester, NY; 2011 [cited 2022 Aug 8]. Available from:
401 <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1883243>
- 402 25. Courbet D. Jean-Léon Beauvois, Les influences sournoises. *Précis des manipulations
403 ordinaires. Questions de communication*. 2012 Sep 1;(21):312–4.
- 404 26. Bonell C, McKee M, Fletcher A, Haines A, Wilkinson P. Nudge smudge: UK
405 Government misrepresents “nudge.” *The Lancet*. 2011 Jun 25;377(9784):2158–9.
- 406 27. Hagman W, Andersson D, Västfjäll D, Tinghög G. Public Views on Policies Involving
407 Nudges. *RevPhilPsych*. 2015 Sep 1;6(3):439–53.
- 408 28. Zajonc RB. Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social
409 Psychology*. 1968;9(2, Pt.2):1–27.
- 410 29. Szaszi B, Palinkas A, Palfi B, Szollosi A, Aczel B. A Systematic Scoping Review of the
411 Choice Architecture Movement: Toward Understanding When and Why Nudges Work.
412 *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*. 2018;31(3):355–66.
- 413 30. Nagtegaal R, Tummers L, Noordegraaf M, Bekkers V. Nudging healthcare professionals
414 towards evidence-based medicine: A systematic scoping review. *JBPA [Internet]*. 2019
415 Oct 2 [cited 2022 Aug 8];2(2). Available from: <https://journal-bpa.org>

- 416 31. Barbaroux A, Benoit L, Raymondie RA, Milhabet I. Nudging health care workers towards
417 a flu shot: reminders are accepted but not necessarily effective. A randomized controlled
418 study among residents in general practice in France. *Fam Pract*. 2021 Jul 28;38(4):410–5.
- 419 32. Vries R de, den Hoven M van, Ridder D de, Verweij M, Vet E de. Healthcare workers’
420 acceptability of influenza vaccination nudges: Evaluation of a real-world intervention.
421 *Prev Med Rep*. 2022 Jul 20;29:101910.
- 422 33. Lamprell K, Tran Y, Arnolda G, Braithwaite J. Nudging clinicians: A systematic scoping
423 review of the literature. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2021 Feb;27(1):175–92.
- 424 34. Spaan M. JASP - A Fresh Way to Do Statistics [Internet]. JASP - Free and User-Friendly
425 Statistical Software. [cited 2022 Aug 2]. Available from: <https://jasp-stats.org/>
- 426 35. Felsen G, Castelo N, Reiner PB. Decisional enhancement and autonomy: Public attitudes
427 towards overt and covert nudges. *Judgment and Decision Making*. 2013;8(3):202–13.
- 428 36. Verger P, Fressard L, Collange F, Gautier A, Jestin C, Launay O, et al. Vaccine Hesitancy
429 Among General Practitioners and Its Determinants During Controversies: A National
430 Cross-sectional Survey in France. *EBioMedicine*. 2015 Aug;2(8):891–7.
- 431 37. Ehreth J. The global value of vaccination. *Vaccine*. 2003 Jan 30;21(7–8):596–600.
- 432 38. Blumenthal-Barby JS, Burroughs H. Seeking better health care outcomes: the ethics of
433 using the “nudge.” *Am J Bioeth*. 2012;12(2):1–10.
- 434 39. The flu vaccination campaign is extended until February 28, 2022 [Internet]. [cited 2022
435 Jul 28]. Available from: <https://www.service-public.fr/particuliers/actualites/A15259>
- 436

437 **Tables**

438

439 Table 1

440 *Number of vaccinated participants per group and percentages for residents from Nice,*
441 *France in 2022 (N = 260).*

	Nudge group (n = 138)	Control group (n = 122)	Total (N = 260)
Vaccinated at step 1 (%)	11 (6.7%)	-	11 (6.7%)
Vaccinated at step 2 (%)	131 (95%)	89 (73%)	220 (84.6%)

442

443

444 Table 2

445 *Acceptability of the nudge when applied to residents or patients per group and per*
 446 *vaccination status for residents from Nice, France in 2022 (N = 260).*

Acceptability	Nudge group	Control group	Total
For residents			
Vaccinated	6.46 (0.82)	5.87 (0.54)	6.22 (0.78) †
Not vaccinated	5.79 (0.23)	5.38 (0.56)	5.45 (0.54) †
Total	6.42 (0.82)*	5.73 (0.59)*	6.10 (0.80)
For patients			
Vaccinated	6.38 (0.44)	6.03 (0.53)	6.24 (0.50) ††
Not vaccinated	5.95 (0.22)	5.55 (0.63)	5.62 (0.59) ††
Total	6.47 (0.61)**	5.90 (0.59)**	6.14 (0.56)

Values in brackets correspond to the SD. Results marked with *, **, † and †† were significant ($p < .001$) and correspond to our pre-registered hypothesis.

447

448

449 Table 3

450 *Sense of autonomy related to an opt-out nudge for residents from Nice, France in 2022 (N =*
451 *260).*

	Nudge Group (n = 138)	Control Group (n = 122)	Total (n = 260)
Vaccinated	6.81 (0.41)	5.83 (0.93)	6.41 (0.83) [†]
Not vaccinated	6.86 (0.38)	4.88 (0.78)	5.22 (1.05) [†]
Total	6.81 (0.41) [*]	5.57 (0.99) [*]	6.23 (0.96)

Values in brackets correspond to the SD. Results marked with * and † were significant (p < .001) and correspond to our pre-registered hypothesis.

452

453

454 **Figure captions**

455

456 *Figure 1. Flow chart.*

457 *Figure 1. Mean acceptability of a nudge as applied to patients or to residents, among 260*

458 *residents from Nice, France in 2022 (error bars displays 95% CI).*



