Intention of health care workers to accept COVID-19 vaccination and related factors: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Abstract

Background: Considering medical and economic burden of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), a high COVID-19 vaccination coverage among health care workers (HCWs) is an urgent need.

Objective: To estimate the intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination and to find out related factors.

Design: We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis guidelines for this study.

Data sources: We searched PubMed, Medline, Scopus, Web of Science, ProQuest, CINAHL and medRxiv from January 1, 2020 to December 02, 2020.

Methods: The heterogeneity between results was very high and thus we applied a random effect model to estimate pooled effects. We performed subgroup and meta-regression analysis to identify possible resources of heterogeneity.

Results: Eleven studies, including 8847 HCWs met the inclusion criteria. The overall proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was 55.9% (95% CI: 43.6-67.9%) with a wide range among studies from 27.7% to 81.5%. Intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination was higher in studies with moderate quality and in studies that were conducted in Europe. The following factors were associated with increased HCWs’ willingness to get vaccinated against COVID-19: male gender, older age, physician profession, fewer work experience, comorbidity among HCWs, seasonal influenza vaccination, stronger vaccine confidence, positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine, fear about COVID-19, individual perceived risk about COVID-19, and contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients.

Conclusions: HCWs represent a high-risk group for SARS-CoV-2 infection. The reluctance or refusal of HCWs to vaccinate against COVID-19 could diminish the trust of individuals and trigger a ripple effect in the general public. Since vaccination
is a complex behavior, understanding the way that HCWs take the decision to accept or not COVID-19 vaccination will give us the opportunity to develop the appropriate interventions to increase COVID-19 vaccination uptake. Knowledge of the factors that affect intention of HWCs to accept COVID-19 vaccination is limited and there is an urgent need for further and more valid studies.
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Background

A second wave of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic is hitting worldwide threatening societies, with an immense number of deaths and a catastrophic economic impact [1,2]. Indicative, as of December 8, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) reported more than 66 million cases globally and more than 1.5 million deaths due to COVID-19 [3].

Seasonal influenza vaccination among health care workers (HCWs) is an effective infection control measure in health care settings [4,5]. Also, the importance of HCWs vaccination against H1N1 during the 2009/2010 influenza pandemic has already noticed [6,7]. Seasonal influenza immunization is a priority in countries where the proportion of elderly is high [8–10]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the WHO and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has identified HCWs as a population with significant elevated risk of being infected from the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and has recommended the rapid and prioritized vaccination of HCWs against COVID-19 to protect the HCWs and the public health [11–13].

HCWs’ vaccination against infectious diseases is of utmost importance to prevent the spread of viruses, especially in health care settings with patients. There are plenty of research studying factors influence vaccines’ acceptance by HCWs [14–19]. Several factors are identified in systematic reviews and meta-analyses, e.g. desire for self-protection, desire to prevent illness in family or friends, perceived severity and risk of the disease, perceived safety and effectiveness of vaccination, more favorable attitudes toward vaccination, seasonal influenza vaccination, and physician profession [14–19].

The positive attitude of HCWs towards the COVID-19 vaccination is imperative since they should accept the vaccination and promote vaccine acceptance in general public to achieve herd immunity as soon as possible. To date, no systematic review and meta-analysis has investigated the willingness of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination. Thus, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis to estimate the intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination and to find out related factors.
Methods

Data sources and strategy

We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines [20] for this systematic review and meta-analysis and the respective checklist is presented in Web Table 1. We searched PubMed, Medline, Scopus, Web of Science, ProQuest, CINAHL and pre-print services (medRxiv) from January 1, 2020 to December 02, 2020. We used the following strategy in all fields: ((("health care worker*" OR "healthcare worker*" OR "healthcare personnel" OR "health care personnel" OR "health care professional*" OR "healthcare professional*" OR HCWS OR HCW OR HCPS OR HCP OR staff OR "nursing staff" OR employee* OR professional* OR personnel OR worker* OR doctor* OR physician* OR clinician* OR nurs* OR midwives OR midwife* OR paramedic* OR hospital* OR practitioner*)) AND (vaccin*)) AND (intent* OR willing* OR hesitancy)) AND (COVID-19 OR COVID19 OR COVID OR SARS-CoV* OR "Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus*" OR coronavirus*). Also, we examined reference lists of all relevant articles and we removed duplicates.

Selection and eligibility criteria

Study selection was performed by two independent reviewers, while a third, senior reviewer resolved the discrepancies. Firstly, we screened title and abstract of the records and then full-text. We included studies examining HCWs’ intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination and related factors. Also, we included all studies that were written in English, except qualitative studies, reviews, case reports, protocols, editorials, and letters to the Editor. All types of HCWs working in clinical settings were accepted for inclusion, while we excluded studies that included students of health sciences, retired HCWs, patients, and general population.

Data extraction and quality assessment

We extracted the following data from each study: authors, location, sample size, age, gender, study design, sampling method, assessment of intention to accept COVID-19
vaccination, response rate, data collection time, type of publication (journal or pre-print service), number of HCWs with intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination, type of occupation (physicians, nurses, assistant nurses, paramedical staff, etc), factors related with intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination, and the level of analysis (univariate or multivariable).

Two independent reviewers used the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tools to assess quality of studies (poor, moderate or good quality). An 8-point scale is used for cross-sectional studies with a score of ≤3 indicates poor quality, a score of 4-6 points indicates moderate quality, and a score of 7-8 points indicates good quality [21].

**Statistical analysis**

For each study we divided the number of HCWs with intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination with the sample size to calculate the proportion of HCWs with intention to accept vaccination and the relative 95% confidence interval (CI). Then, we transformed the proportions with the Freeman-Tukey Double Arcsine method before pooling [22]. We used the I² and Hedges Q statistics to assess between-studies heterogeneity. I² values higher than 75% indicate high heterogeneity and a p-value<0.1 for the Hedges Q statistic indicates statistically significant heterogeneity [23]. The heterogeneity between results was very high and thus we applied a random effect model to estimate pooled effects [23]. We considered sample size, age, gender, response rate, data collection time, publication type (journal or pre-print service), type of occupation, studies quality, and the continent that studies were conducted as pre-specified sources of heterogeneity. Due to the limited variability of data in some variables, we decided to perform subgroup analysis for publication type, studies quality, and the continent that studies were conducted and meta-regression analysis for sample size, gender distribution, and data collection time as the independent variables. We conducted a leave-one-out sensitivity analysis to determine the influence of each study on the overall effect. A funnel plot and the Egger’s test were used to assess the publication bias with a P-value<0.05 indicating publication bias [24]. We did not perform meta-analysis for the factors related with intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination since the data were highly heterogeneous and limited. We used OpenMeta[Analyst] for the meta-analysis [25].
Results

Identification and selection of studies

Flowchart of the literature search according to PRISMA guidelines is presented in Figure 1. Initially, we identified 1442 potential records through electronic databases and 545 duplicates were removed. After the screening of the titles and abstracts, we removed 850 records and we added one more record found by the reference lists scanning. We included 11 studies [26–36] in this systematic review and meta-analysis that met our inclusion criteria.

Characteristics of the studies

Main characteristics of the 11 studies included in this review are presented in Table 1. A total of 8847 HCWs were included in this systematic review with a minimum of 123 HCWs [29] and a maximum of 2047 HCWs [26] among studies. Five studies were conducted in Europe (France, Malta and Greece) [26,27,29,30,32], three studies in Asia (China and Hong Kong) [31,33,34], two studies in Africa (Democratic Republic of the Congo and Zambia) [28,35], and one study in North America (USA) [36]. Females were more in six studies [26,30,31,33,34,36], while males were more in two studies [28,35]. All studies were cross-sectional using a convenience sample. Seven studies were published in journals [26–32] and four studies in pre-print services [33–36]. Three studies did not report data regarding age [27,29,32], three regarding gender distribution [27,29,32], and four regarding response rate [26,28,32,35]. Five studies used Likert-type scales to assess intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination [27,29,30,32,34], three studies used a yes/no/uncertain answer [31,33,35], and three studies used a yes/no answer [26,28,36].

Intention of HCWs to accept vaccination and study population in the studies included in this systematic review are presented in Table 2. Intention ranged from 27.7% [28] to 81.5% [32]. Percentage of physicians that participated in studies ranged from 20.4% [27] to 100% [29], while percentage of nurses ranged from 18.1% [26] to 100% [31,34]. Two studies did not report data regarding study population [32,33].
Quality assessment

Quality assessment of cross-sectional studies included in this review is shown in Table 3. Quality was moderate in six studies [27,29,30,32,33,35] and good in five studies [26,28,31,34,36].

Meta-analysis

The overall proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was 55.9% (95% CI: 43.6-67.9%) (Figure 2). The heterogeneity between results was very high ($\hat{\tau}^2=99.25\%$, p-value for the Hedges Q statistic<0.001). A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis showed that no single study had a disproportional effect on the pooled proportion, which varied between 53.1% (95% CI: 40.8-65.2%), with Fu et al. [33] excluded, and 58.8% (95% CI: 46.9-70.2%), with Nzaji et al. [28] excluded (Web Figure 1).

According to subgroup analysis, the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was almost the same for the studies that were published in journals (56.5% [95% CI: 39.8-72.5%], $\hat{\tau}^2=99.43$) and those in pre-print services (54.9% [95% CI: 35.7-73.4%], $\hat{\tau}^2=98.75$). Moreover, the proportion was much higher for the studies with moderate quality (62.4% [95% CI: 46.6-77.0%], $\hat{\tau}^2=98.78$) compared to those with good quality (48.1% [95% CI: 28.4-68.2%], $\hat{\tau}^2=99.54$). The proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was higher in studies that were conducted in Europe (65.6% [95% CI: 50.6-79.1%], $\hat{\tau}^2=99.06$) compared to those in Asia (60.1% [95% CI: 40.5-78.2%], $\hat{\tau}^2=98.85$) and Africa (36.7% [95% CI: 19.6-55.9%], $\hat{\tau}^2=95.86$). Meta-regression showed that the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was independent of the sample size (p=0.13), gender distribution (p=0.56), and data collection time (p=0.66).

P-value<0.05 for Egger’s test and the asymmetrical shape of the funnel plot (Web Figure 2) implied potential publication bias.

Factors related with intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination
Eight studies [26–31,34,36] investigated factors related with intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination, while five studies used multivariable analysis to control confounding [26,28,31,34,36] (Table 4).

We found that several demographic characteristics were associated with COVID-19 vaccination acceptance. Profession was the most frequent predictor since five studies [26–28,30,36] found that physicians were more prone to get vaccinated against COVID-19 than other HCWs and especially nurses and paramedical staff (odds ratios [ORs] ranged from 1.59 to 7.76). Male HCWs were more likely to be vaccinated than females with ORs ranged from 1.17 to 1.88 [26–28,30]. Three studies [26,27,29] found that older age was associated with an increase in COVID-19 vaccine acceptance, while Kwok et al. [34] found the opposite. Papagiannis et al. [30] found that fewer work experience increase the intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccine. Also, HCWs with chronic conditions were more likely to be vaccinated against COVID-19 [31]. Flu vaccination during previous season was associated with intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination with ORs ranged from 2.03 to 4.69 [26,31].

Stronger vaccine confidence [34] and positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine [28] increased HCWs’ willingness to get vaccinated against COVID-19. Fear about COVID-19, individual perceived risk about COVID-19, and weaker complacency about the COVID-19 were related with increased COVID-19 vaccination acceptance [26,34]. Wang et al. [31] found that HCWs exposed and in contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients were more likely to accept COVID-19 vaccine.

**Discussion**

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis that assesses the intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination and related factors. We found that the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was moderate (55.9%) with a wide range among studies from 27.7% to 81.5%. This moderate level of acceptance may be attributable to several reasons, e.g. inadequate knowledge among HCWs regarding COVID-19 [37,38], negative attitude towards the disease [37,39], and feelings of fear and anxiety during the COVID-19 pandemic [40–
Also, concerns raised for COVID-19 vaccination are related with inadequate knowledge about such new vaccines regarding the long term side effects, effectiveness, efficacy etc. [27,29]. Better knowledge of COVID-19 among HCWs affects their attitude, increases their confidence, and promotes preventive measures such as the vaccination [44–46].

Although the positive effects of influenza vaccine in health outcomes and in financial terms are well known [9,47–49], the vaccination rate is low even among HCWs. In particular, low vaccination coverage was found in a meta-analysis [18] with 45 studies in mainland China where the influenza vaccination rate was 17.7%, 9.4%, 7.8%, and 3.5% for HCWs, general population, pregnant women, and people with chronic conditions respectively. Also, a systematic review [16] found that the median vaccination rate against seasonal influenza and H1N1 among HCWs in Asia is low (37.4%) although is higher than high-risk groups, students/military, and general population (37.3%, 35.5% and 14.3% respectively). Similar findings are found in studies in Europe (United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Spain) where HCWs receive influenza vaccination more often than the general population but in low levels, ranging from 15% to 29% [50]. A meta-analysis included studies in Italy found that the proportion of influenza vaccination among nurses and ancillary workers was 13.47% and 12.52% respectively [51]. Influenza vaccination coverage is higher in Canada, ranging from 35.5% to 51% [52,53] and much higher in USA approaching 80.6% during the 2019-2020 season among 2454 HCWs [54] but still lower than the national Healthy People 2020 target of 90% [55].

According to our subgroup analysis, the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination was higher in studies in Europe than those in Asia and Africa. This finding is in accordance with a study [56] in 10 countries in Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe, Asia Pacific, and the Middle East where the influenza vaccination coverage rate in general population was much higher in Europe than in Asia and Africa. This difference may be attributable mainly to the fact that a national influenza vaccination policy and recommendations for seasonal influenza vaccination are standard in developed countries but this is not the case in many developing countries in Asia and Africa. Also, the availability of influenza vaccines is low in Africa [57], while the number of influenza vaccines per capita is much higher in high-
income countries compared to lower and middle-income countries (median number; 139.2 vs. 6.1 per 1000 population) [58].

We found a difference in intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination between the professions, with physicians most inclined to get vaccinated compared to other HCWs and especially nurses and paramedical staff. This finding is confirmed by two meta-analyses [51,59] including studies in Italy, where the prevalence of influenza vaccination among physicians was 23.18% [59], among nurses was 13.47%, and among ancillary workers was 12.52% [51]. Several other studies worldwide confirm the fact that the influenza vaccination coverage among physicians is the highest [54,60,61]. Also, a systematic review [62] with regards to pandemic influenza A vaccine (H1N1) 2009 found that physicians were more likely to accept influenza vaccine and to have a positive attitude toward vaccination. In general, physicians are more prone to accept vaccination than other HCWs, e.g. the full hepatitis B vaccination coverage among physicians is 2.6 times higher than nurses [19]. Several reasons could be behind this observation such as greater misconceptions about vaccines among nurses and other HCWs, less fear and care about infectious diseases, less knowledge and more doubt about vaccine efficacy. This finding is a major concern in health care settings especially during the COVID-19 pandemic since nurses and assistant nurses have more and longer direct contact with patients than other HCWs [63]. Also, the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies is higher among frontline health care workers and health care assistants [64] indicating that nurses and assistant nurses represent a high-risk group for SARS-CoV-2 infection.

We found that older age was related with an increase in willingness to get vaccinated against COVID-19. This finding is unsurprising since HCWs are quite familiar with the fact that older age is one of the strongest risk factors for COVID-19 mortality [65–67]. Therefore, it is more probable for older HCWs to take the COVID-19 vaccine due to their own self-interest. In a similar way, we found that HCWs with chronic conditions were more prone to get vaccinated against COVID-19. This finding makes sense since HCWs with comorbidity is a high-risk group for complications and death from COVID-19 as this is the case for the general population also according to several meta-analyses [66–70]. Older HCWs with comorbidity confront COVID-19 with fear and anxiety affecting critically their decision to accept a COVID-19 vaccine. An interesting result in our review is that male gender was associated with greater likelihood of taking COVID-19 vaccine. Two reviews regarding influenza vaccination
and hepatitis B vaccination did not find any relation between gender and vaccination coverage. A possible explanation for our observation could be that the individual perceived risk about COVID-19 is higher among male HCWs. According to our study, being vaccinated against flu during previous season was associated with COVID-19 vaccine acceptance. Similarly, HCWs with vaccine confidence and positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine were more likely to be vaccinated against COVID-19. These findings are of utmost importance since the WHO named vaccine hesitancy as one of the top ten threats to global health in 2019. Health care workers especially at primary care should communicate in a clear way the message that vaccines are safe and effective to improve vaccination coverage in communities. Since a safe and effective COVID-19 vaccine seems to be the only solution for this pandemic, the positive attitude of HCWs towards vaccination is imperative. Vaccine hesitancy among HCWs with regard to other vaccines, such as seasonal influenza vaccine already exists. In case of the COVID-19 vaccine the situation can be worse since vaccine hesitancy is fuelled by fake news and conspiracy theories. The reluctance or refusal of HCWs to vaccinate against COVID-19 could diminish the trust of individuals and trigger a ripple effect in the general public. There is a need to build confidence and trust in communities to roll out successfully a COVID-19 vaccine.

Additionally, we found that individual perceived risk about COVID-19 was related with increased COVID-19 vaccination acceptance among HCWs. HCWs may be reluctant to receive a novel COVID-19 vaccine when they believe that it is not protect against a significant personal threat. On the other hand, the self-perceived susceptibility to and seriousness of a vaccine infectious disease such as COVID-19 may increase vaccine acceptance. This association has already observed in case of COVID-19 not only in the general public but also in HCWs. A warning sign to public health safety is that vaccine hesitancy is greater among nurses than among physicians.

Our study is subject to several limitations. In particular, more than the half of studies was of moderate quality, while four out of eleven studies were published in pre-print services which do not apply peer-review process. We performed subgroup analysis according to studies quality and publication type to overcome this limitation. The statistical heterogeneity in results was very high due probably to variability in study designs and populations. In that case, we applied a random effects model and we
performed subgroup and meta-regression analysis. Data with regards to the factors related with intention of HCWs to accept COVID-19 vaccination were limited, while five studies used multivariable models to eliminate confounding. We consider this as a potential area for future study. Moreover, all the studies included in this review were cross-sectional studies making causal inferences impossible. Finally, the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination may be an overestimation since studies evaluated self-reported answers that could be subject to social desirability bias, with HCWs knowing that the general public expects a high COVID-19 vaccination coverage among them.

Conclusions

HCWs are identified worldwide as priority recipients of the novel COVID-19 vaccine since they represent a high-risk group for SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission risk of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical settings between patients and HCWs is high. Also, HCWs serve as trusted community workers on public health topics and their role in promoting COVID-19 vaccine acceptance is critical. Thus, COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among HCWs should be eliminated to inspire the general public towards a positive attitude regarding a novel COVID-19 vaccine. Knowledge of the factors that affect intention of HWCs to accept COVID-19 vaccination is limited and there is an urgent need for further studies to make more valid inferences. Since vaccination is a complex behavior, understanding the way that HCWs take the decision to accept or not COVID-19 vaccination will give us the opportunity to develop the appropriate interventions to increase COVID-19 vaccination uptake.
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**Figure 1.** Flowchart of the literature search according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis.

**Figure 2.** Forest plot of the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination.

**Web Figure 1.** A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis of the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination.

**Web Figure 2.** Funnel plot of the prevalence of the proportion of HCWs that intent to accept COVID-19 vaccination.

**Web Table 1.** PRISMA Checklist
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Table 1. Main characteristics of the studies included in this systematic review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sample size (n)</th>
<th>Age, mean (SD)</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Sampling method</th>
<th>Assessment of intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
<th>Data collection time</th>
<th>Publication in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gagneux-Brunon et al. 2020 [26]</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2047</td>
<td>&lt;30 years: 22.7%; 30-49: 47.3%; 50-64: 26.8%; &gt;64: 3.1%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Yes/no answer</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>March 26 to July 2</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grech et al. 2020 [27]</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Five point Likert-type scale (unlikely to likely)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>September 11-16</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nzaji et al. 2020 [28]</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>40.3 (11.7)</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Yes/no answer</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>March 01 to April 30</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grech et al. 2020 [29]</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Five point Likert-type scale (unlikely to likely)</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>September 25-29</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papagiannis et al. 2020 [30]</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>44.2 (10.8)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Five point Likert-type scale (fully disagree to fully agree)</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>February 10-25</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age Distribution</td>
<td>Likert Scale Type</td>
<td>Likert Range</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Method of Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detoc et al. 2020 [32]</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Five point Likert-type scale (definitely no to certainly yes)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>March 26 to April 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu et al. 2020 [33]</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Yes/no/uncertain answer</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>March 17-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwok et al. 2020 [34]</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Eleven-point Likert-type scale (0=definitely no, 10=definitely yes)</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>March 16 to April 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chawe et al. 2020 [35]</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Yes/no/uncertain answer</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>June 10-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadoth et al. 2020 [36]</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Yes/no answer</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>September 24 to October 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR: not reported
Table 2. Intention of health care workers to accept vaccination and study population in the studies included in this systematic review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Intention to accept vaccination, n/N (%)</th>
<th>Physicians (%)</th>
<th>Nurses (%)</th>
<th>Assistant nurses (%)</th>
<th>Paramedical staff (%)</th>
<th>Pharmacists (%)</th>
<th>Others (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gagneux-Brunon et al. 2020</td>
<td>1574/2047 (76.9)</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grech et al. 2020 [27]</td>
<td>521/1002 (52.0)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nzaji et al. 2020 [28]</td>
<td>170/613 (27.7)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grech et al. 2020 [29]</td>
<td>87/123 (70.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papagiannis et al. 2020 [30]</td>
<td>200/461 (43.4)</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. 2020 [31]</td>
<td>322/806 (40.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detoc et al. 2020 [32]</td>
<td>1158/1421 (81.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu et al. 2020 [33]</td>
<td>269/352 (76.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwok et al. 2020 [34]</td>
<td>759/1205 (63.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chawe et al. 2020 [35]</td>
<td>97/208 (46.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadoth et al. 2020 [36]</td>
<td>197/609 (32.3)</td>
<td>39.9d</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* midwives, physiotherapists, administrative staff, laboratories staff, research staff; † nurses and others; ‡ laboratories staff; § physicians, nurse practitioners, physician, assistants, certified registered nurse anesthetists; ‡ personnel with or without patient contact
Table 3. Quality of cross-sectional studies included in this systematic review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[26]</th>
<th>[27]</th>
<th>[28]</th>
<th>[29]</th>
<th>[30]</th>
<th>[31]</th>
<th>[32]</th>
<th>[33]</th>
<th>[34]</th>
<th>[35]</th>
<th>[36]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Were confounding factors identified?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total quality</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Factors related with intention of health care workers to accept COVID-19 vaccination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>COVID-19 vaccination acceptance</th>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gagneux-Brunon et al. 2020[26] | - Male gender (OR:1.88; 95% CI:1.38-2.56, p<0.001)  
- Older age (≥30 vs. <30 years, OR:1.66; 95% CI:1.32-2.09, p<0.001)  
- Physicians vs. nurses (OR:6.37; 95% CI:4.23-9.60, p<0.001) and assistant nurses (OR:7.76; 95% CI:4.98-12.08, p<0.001)  
- Flu vaccination during previous season (OR:4.69; 95% CI:3.59-6.11, p<0.001)  
- Fear about COVID-19 (OR:2.03; 95% CI:1.58-2.61, p<0.001)  
- Individual perceived risk (OR:2.48; 95% CI:1.93-3.2, p<0.001) | Multivariable   |
| Grech et al. 2020 [27]     | - Male gender (p=0.0003)  
- Physicians vs. others (p<0.001)  
- Older age (p<0.05) | Univariate       |
| Nzaji et al. 2020 [28]     | - Male gender (OR:1.17; 95% CI:1.15-2.6, p=0.008)  
- Physicians vs. others (OR:1.59; 95% CI:1.03-2.44, p=0.035)  
- Positive attitude towards a COVID-19 vaccine (OR:11.49; 95% CI:5.88-22.46, p<0.001) | Multivariable   |
| Grech et al. 2020 [29]     | - Older age (p=0.003) | Univariate       |
| Papagiannis et al. 2020 [30]| - Male gender (p=0.001)  
- Fewer work experience (p=0.019)  
- Physicians vs. nurses (p<0.001) and paramedical staff (p<0.001) | Univariate       |
| Wang et al. 2020 [31]      | - HCWs with chronic conditions (OR:1.83; 95% CI:1.22-2.77)  
- HCWs exposed and in contact with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 patients (OR:1.63; 95% CI:1.14-2.33)  
- Flu vaccination during previous season (OR:2.03; 95% CI:1.47-2.81) | Multivariable   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kwok et al. 2020 [34]</th>
<th>Gadoth et al. 2020 [36]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Younger age (b=-0.07; 95% CI: -0.12 to -0.01; p=0.02)</td>
<td>- Physicians vs. nurses (p&lt;0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stronger vaccine confidence (b=0.29; 95% CI: 0.22-0.35; p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>- Collective responsibility (b=0.12; 95% CI: 0.06-0.19; p&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Weaker complacency (b=-0.11; 95% CI: -0.17 to -0.05; p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>- Physicians vs. nurses (p&lt;0.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*b: coefficient beta regression; CI: confidence interval; HCW: health care worker; OR: odds ratio*
Records identified through PubMed searching (n=25), Medline (n=52), Scopus (n=443), Web of Science (n=21), ProQuest (n=680), CINAHL (n=8), and medRxiv (n=213)

Records after duplicates removed (n=897)

Records screened (n=897)

Records excluded at first screening (title/abstract) (n=850)

Additional records through reference lists scanning (n=1)

Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n=48)

Full-text articles excluded, for not meeting inclusion criteria (n=37)

Studies included in the qualitative analysis (n=11)

Studies included in the quantitative analysis (n=11)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Estimate (95% C.I.)</th>
<th>n/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gagneux-Brunon et al. 2020</td>
<td>0.769 (0.750, 0.787)</td>
<td>1574/2047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grech et al. (a) 2020</td>
<td>0.520 (0.489, 0.551)</td>
<td>521/1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nzaj et al. 2020</td>
<td>0.277 (0.243, 0.313)</td>
<td>170/613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grech et al. (b) 2020</td>
<td>0.707 (0.624, 0.784)</td>
<td>87/123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papagiannis et al. 2020</td>
<td>0.434 (0.389, 0.479)</td>
<td>200/461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. 2020</td>
<td>0.400 (0.366, 0.434)</td>
<td>322/806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detoc et al. 2020</td>
<td>0.815 (0.794, 0.835)</td>
<td>1158/1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu et al. 2020</td>
<td>0.764 (0.718, 0.807)</td>
<td>269/352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwok et al. 2020</td>
<td>0.630 (0.602, 0.657)</td>
<td>759/1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chawe et al. 2020</td>
<td>0.466 (0.399, 0.534)</td>
<td>97/208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadoth et al. 2020</td>
<td>0.323 (0.287, 0.361)</td>
<td>197/609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall (I^2=99.25 % , P&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>0.559 (0.436, 0.679)</td>
<td>5354/8847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arcsine of Square Root Proportion
Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Estimate (95% C.I.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.559 (0.436, 0.679)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gagneux-Brunon et al.</td>
<td>0.537 (0.407, 0.663)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grech et al. (a)</td>
<td>0.563 (0.426, 0.696)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nzaji et al.</td>
<td>0.588 (0.469, 0.702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grech et al. (b)</td>
<td>0.544 (0.414, 0.672)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Papagiannis et al.</td>
<td>0.572 (0.441, 0.698)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wang et al.</td>
<td>0.575 (0.447, 0.699)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detoc et al.</td>
<td>0.531 (0.408, 0.652)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fu et al.</td>
<td>0.538 (0.407, 0.666)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Kwok et al.</td>
<td>0.552 (0.411, 0.689)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chawe et al.</td>
<td>0.568 (0.438, 0.694)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gadoth et al.</td>
<td>0.583 (0.460, 0.701)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>