1	Community engagement to increase vaccine uptake: Quasi-
2	experimental evidence from Islamabad and Rawalpindi, Pakistan
3	Short title: Community engagement to increase vaccine uptake
4	
5	Mujahid Abdullah <sup>1</sup> , Taimoor Ahmad <sup>1</sup> , Twangar Kazmi <sup>1</sup> , Faisal Sultan <sup>2,3</sup> , Sabeen
6	Afzal <sup>2</sup> , Rana Muhammad Safdar <sup>2</sup> , Adnan Ahmad Khan* <sup>2,4</sup>
7	
8	<sup>1</sup> Akhter Hameed Khan Foundation, Islamabad, Pakistan
9	<sup>2</sup> Ministry of National Health Services, Regulation and Coordination, Islamabad,
10	Pakistan
11	<sup>3</sup> Shaukat Khanum Memorial Cancer Hospital & Research Centre, Lahore, Pakistan
12	<sup>4</sup> Research and Development Solutions, Islamabad, Pakistan
13	
14	*Corresponding author:
15	Email: adnan@resdev.org (AAK)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice
22	

## 23 Abstract

Developing countries have been facing difficulties in reaching out to low-income and 24 underserved communities for COVID-19 vaccination coverage. The rapidity of vaccine 25 development caused a mistrust among certain subgroups of the population, and hence 26 innovative approaches were taken to reach out to such populations. Using a sample 27 of 1760 respondents in five low-income, informal localities of Islamabad and 28 29 Rawalpindi, Pakistan, we evaluated a set of interventions involving community engagement by addressing demand and access barriers. We used multi-level mixed 30 effects models to estimate average treatment effects across treatment areas. We 31 found that our interventions increased COVID-19 vaccine willingness in two treatment 32 areas that are furthest from city centers by 7.6% and 6.6% respectively, while vaccine 33 uptake increased in one of the treatment areas by 17.1%, compared to the control 34 area. Our results suggest that personalized information campaigns such as community 35 mobilization help to increase COVID-19 vaccine willingness. Increasing uptake 36 however, requires improving access to the vaccination services. Both information and 37 access may be different for various communities and therefore a "one-size-fits-all" 38 approach may need to be better localized. Such underserved and marginalized 39 40 communities are better served if vaccination efforts are contextualized.

41

- 42
- 43

44

45

### 46 Introduction

The SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) outbreak has been one of the largest infectious disease 47 challenges in the past century with 559 million cases and 6.36 million deaths [1]. In 48 the initial phase, the only means to curb transmission were measures that limited 49 contact between individuals, such as lockdowns, closures of schools, work and public 50 places. These, in turn resulted in tremendous social costs and loss of wellbeing of 51 individuals and societies [2]. However, the availability of effective vaccines from the 52 first half of 2021 changed how countries and societies approached the contagion and 53 how effective they were in doing so. 54

The rapidity of the vaccine development process has been unprecedented, as has been the intended scope of its coverage. Until now it took 5-10 years to develop and navigate most vaccines through regulatory approvals, which for most parts were administered to sub-sets of population such as children, women giving birth etc. COVID-19 vaccines went from the first identification of the virus to a public rollout of vaccines in under one year and were aimed at nearly all of the world's population.

This swiftness raised issues of mistrust among potential recipients, who questioned 61 both the efficacy and safety of the vaccine. This in turn led to some reluctance and 62 affected the rollout of the vaccine. Several means were attempted to promote 63 vaccination widely, including mandates (e.g., for healthcare workers, other 64 government personnel or certain patients) [3,4], tying vaccination to access to public 65 transport or to enter stadiums, or by giving incentives to vaccinate (e.g., discounts on 66 certain purchases). As anticipated, much of the initial vaccinations were in cities, and 67 among well-documented and vaccine seeking populations. However, the large-scale 68

rollout and the intent to cover the entire population required addressing severalcomplex situations.

71 For one, globally, about 1 billion people reside in densely populated low-income informal settlements (urban slums) [5] where access and availability to public health 72 facilities is limited [6-8]. These barriers are further accentuated by a mutual lack of 73 74 trust between these residents and public authorities that are supposed to serve them, but often do not have a full sense of their numbers, nor have systems in place to reach 75 and meet their needs, and often consider them illegal occupants of government lands 76 [9,10]. This in turn creates social exclusions and aggravates intra-societal iniquity 77 where the most marginalized individuals are also suspicious of the government and 78 its initiatives to reach them with life-saving services [11–15]. 79

80 Pakistan started a multi-staged rollout of COVID-19 vaccination in March 2021 that initially prioritized the oldest population, frontline workers, and those with certain risk 81 82 factors, and then progressively included younger citizens, till vaccinations were opened to everyone aged 18 years or older from July 2021. When the original, 83 voluntary uptake of vaccines slowed down, several strategies were attempted, 84 including reaching out to poor urban communities [16]. The present study explores the 85 effectiveness of interventions aimed at addressing demand and access barriers in 86 such communities. 87

#### 88 Theoretical framework for the study

Several socio-demographic factors, communication about COVID-19 and vaccines, perceptions regarding COVID-19 vaccination, and prior experience of COVID-19 infection affect vaccine acceptance. Being male, older in age, highly educated, and employed are associated with higher acceptance; as is the perception of COVID-19

risk towards oneself and a personal or family's history of COVID-19 infections [11,17–
26]. In addition, information and communication about COVID-19 vaccination act as
signals to influence individual behavior [24,25].

These factors were included in the context of the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) to develop a theoretical framework of vaccine willingness and uptake. The theory suggests that people's behavioral intentions are motivated by their attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control [27]. These behavioral intentions in turn can directly affect an individual's health behavior [18,27,28], which we hypothesized in our study as willingness translating to increased vaccine uptake among the targeted population.

103 Through our community engagement interventions, we aimed to change behavioral intentions (i.e., COVID-19 vaccine willingness) of residents in the treatment areas. 104 Behavior change communication was carried out in context of social mobilization to 105 engage the communities [29–31]. Interventions aimed at mobilizing communities for 106 vaccination can help strengthen weak links in the causal chain, as this can enable to 107 take into account the local characteristics and implement the interventions in a more 108 effective way [32]. When information is spread through local prominent members 109 (community and religious leaders) of the community, people become more willing to 110 accept it and in turn, implement it. 111

Engaging communities thus aid to disseminate information in the local language and channels which can have a greater outreach [30]. As found in an earlier study of rural Bangladesh [33], collaboration with NGOs to increase immunization rates also results in better service delivery and increases vaccination acceptance as people exhibit more trust in local NGOs. Mobile vaccination camps (MVCs) can help increase access to vaccinations in such underserved communities. The current study explored the roles of community mobilization and vaccination camps in marginalized, low-trust communities to promote awareness and uptake of COVID-19 vaccination and the effects of such interventions in sub-populations of these communities.

## 121 Methodology

### 122 Study overview, location and sampling

The study used a cross-sectional research design. Residents of five urban poor communities from Rawalpindi-Islamabad twin cities were included. A baseline survey of 1760 respondents with equal representations of males and females was conducted from June 16 to 26, 2021, followed by an intervention (explained below). An endline survey was conducted from August 24 to September 03, 2021, with the same sampling technique, but not the same respondents. The response rate for baseline was 98% while it was 96% for the endline.

The study was limited to COVID-19 vaccine-eligible respondents of 18 years of age that were residents of selected communities. The final survey instrument comprised of 38 questions divided into multiple sections. Only a few questions were open-ended and the survey was administered in Urdu (local) language for accurate responses. Data collection was carried out in field on electronic tablets using SurveyCTO.

Five densely populated, low-income, and underserved areas were selected in consultation with the Ministry of National Health Services, Regulations and Coordination (MoNHSRC) for their low participation in the ongoing vaccination efforts. From Islamabad, we included I-10 (a middle-class locality), G-7 (Low-income but formal locality), F-7 (France Colony) (informal settlement), and Bhara Kahu (low- to middle-income, completely informal and recent settlement), while Dhok Hassu (low-

- income, long stand informal locality) was included from Rawalpindi. Each community
  is located sufficiently away from each other to make any cross over contamination of
  the intervention (information and eased access to local camps through social
- 144 mobilization) unlikely.
- 145 Population and average household sizes were based on the census 2017 by Pakistan
- Bureau of Statistics and on-site visits (Table 1).

#### 147 Table 1. Location characteristics of study areas

Locality	Actual Population	Actual Households	Average Household Size
I-10	44,580	7,984	5.6
G-7 (Low-income quarters)	29,609	4,707	6.3
F-7 (France Colony)	9,113	1429	6.4
Bhara Kahu	125,048	21,123	5.9
Dhok Hassu	201,212	30,032	6.7

The sample size was calculated using MICS methodology with a 95% confidence interval [34]. We assumed a 50% acceptance rate for vaccination uptake, a design effect of 1.5, a relative margin of error of 0.12 and a 95% response rate. The sample size included 480 respondents from each of the larger communities (population greater than 30,000), while 160 each from smaller communities.

A two-stage clustered sampling design was applied using GIS mapping, with randomization being done first by selecting random sample of clusters in each locality of the sampling frame and then at selecting households from each cluster. Pins identifying clusters were dropped at random points on map. Out of those, we randomly selected a total of 110 clusters, 30 each in Dhok Hassu, Bhara Kahu and I-10, and 10 each in F-7 (France Colony) and G-7 (Low-income quarters) for each round of surveys.

159 Working in pairs, enumerators reached the pins and started with the nearest 160 household to the left within the cluster. The pair then surveyed fifteen more households in that cluster using the left-hand rule, skipping one household after every successful
 interview. Each pair surveyed 8 male and 8 female respondents in every cluster, for a
 total of 16 interviews per cluster. Males and females were surveyed from different
 households, with no upper age limit restriction.

#### 165 Interventions

#### 166 Awareness campaign via local mobilizers

The primary intervention focused on building awareness among residents of treatment 167 areas through social mobilization techniques geared towards improving vaccine 168 willingness and uptake. The campaign targeted public places such as shops, markets, 169 mosques and churches. Within the communities, active members of the community 170 including religious and political leaders were engaged to spread awareness on 171 COVID-19. Printed information pamphlets (S1 Fig) were also distributed in Urdu 172 173 language to explain the process of registering and getting vaccinated, while also debunking common myths surrounding vaccines, and identifying COVID-19 174 vaccination camps (CVCs) nearby. 175

#### 176 Mobile vaccination camps (MVCs)

Since there were no CVCs in the vicinity of the selected communities, MVCs were 177 arranged to provide access to COVID-19 vaccination. These camps were organized 178 in treatment areas in collaboration with local community-based organizations, NGOs 179 and local leaders through a team of volunteers (usually local activists) to facilitate the 180 community vaccination process encompassing assembling, counselling and 181 registering community members for the vaccination. The venue of the vaccination site 182 was chosen by the community as a locally well-known and accessible location, such 183 as a school or other landmarks. Local volunteers also advertised for these in advance 184

and on the day of the visit, they helped improve access of community members to the
 camps and facilitated them while they were at the camp.

#### **187** Empirical measurement strategy

188 We used intent-to-treat (ITT) analysis to measure average treatment effects (ATEs), assuming that households remained in the same treatment groups to which they were 189 originally assigned, whether they received the treatments or not. We estimated ATEs 190 on two primary outcomes: willingness to vaccinate and vaccine uptake. Given both the 191 dependent variables were binary, we estimated non-linear ITT parameters using multi-192 level mixed effects logistic regressions [35] through difference-in-differences method. 193 194 Here, level 2 indicates clusters and level 1 indicates households within those clusters. As suggested by Bruhn and McKenzie [36], we did not report statistical differences 195 between groups at baseline covariates. 196

The control variables in our analyses were taken based on the theoretical framework explained above as well as their predictive powers to explain the outcome variables [36], which were calculated as having strong correlations with the outcome variables. Controlling for these variables that could be imbalanced at the baseline also controlled for imbalance in the unobservable characteristics [36], and therefore the difference-indifferences analysis was applicable. We ran all our analyses on statistical software STATA 17.

204 The difference-in-differences model in regression form is then specified as follows:

$$205 \quad logit(Y_{ij}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Treat_{ijz} + \beta_2 Time_{ijt} + \beta_3 Treat_{ijz} * Time_{ijt} + \sum_{k=4}^{20} \delta X_{ijk} + \mu_j + \varepsilon_{ij}$$
(1)

In equation 1, *i* refers to each household, *j* refers to each cluster, z represents each treatment group, *t* represents pre- and post- time periods and  $Y_{ij}$  is the relevant outcome. Since we estimated two models,  $Y_{vu}$  was vaccine uptake and  $Y_{wv}$  was

willingness to vaccinate. We also accounted for several control variables  $(\sum_{k=4}^{20} X_{ijk})$  in our models to explain variation in our outcome variables (S1 Table). The fixed part of the model consists of  $\beta_0 + \beta_1 Treat_{ijz} + \beta_2 Time_{ijt} + \beta_3 Treat_{ijz} * Time_{ijt} + \sum_{k=4}^{20} \delta X_{ijk}$ ,  $\mu_j$ represents the random part of the model, and  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  is the household-level specific error term.

Vaccine uptake  $(Y_{yu})$  is given a value of 1 if the respondent has received at least one 214 dose of COVID-19 vaccination and 0 otherwise, and willingness to vaccinate ( $Y_{\mu\nu}$ ) is 215 assigned a value of 1 if the respondent is willing to get vaccinated if a free of cost 216 government-administered COVID-19 vaccine is provided, and 0 otherwise. Treat<sub>ijz</sub> 217 indicates the localities which we took in treatment and control areas. We define three 218 treatment areas (T1: G-7/F-7, T2: Bhara Kahu and T3: Dhok Hassu) and one control 219 area (C: I-10). *Time<sub>iit</sub>* is a binary variable indicating a value of 1 for post-intervention 220 and 0 for pre-intervention time periods. 221

The coefficient ( $\beta_3$ ) on  $Treat_{ijz} * Time_{ijt}$  captures the effect of interventions on the treated areas as compared to the control area. Since our model is non-linear in nature, ATEs are calculated by cross derivatives with respect to time and treat variables [37]:

225 
$$\frac{\partial^2 Y}{\partial \text{Time } \partial \text{Treat}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 + X\beta)}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_1 + X\beta)}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_2 + X\beta)}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(X\beta)}}$$

The R-square for our models were calculated using a community-distributed STATA program written by Dr Wolfgang Langer [38].

## 228 **Results**

At the baseline, the respondents had a median age of 35 (range: 18-86) years. They were predominantly of Punjabi ethnicity, with the exception of Dhok Hassu, where 42% respondents were Pashtun (Table 2). The control area (I-10) had more respondents

232	that were Urdu speakers (10%), were better off than any of the treatment areas, and
233	more educated – fewest uneducated (9%) and the most university degree holders
234	(47%). Unemployment rates ranged from 61% in I-10 to 48% in Dhok Hassu.
235	Few respondents (1% to 17%) reported any prior COVID-19 infection for themselves
236	or among their families from any location. The highest rates were reported from the
237	control area (I-10). However, 59-71% of all respondents reported being worried about
238	COVID-19. The history of at least one member of the family having received the
239	COVID-19 vaccine was the highest in G7/F7 (67%), followed by I-10 (57%), and the
240	lowest in Dhok Hassu (19%). Distance from a CVC was the least for residents of G7/F7
241	and Bhara Kahu and the most for I-10 residents. Respondents from all areas reported
242	similar proportions of sources of COVID-19 vaccination information and similar rates
243	of treatment seeking during a prior illness. 89% of respondents from I-10 were aware
244	of NGOs and CBOs working in the area, compared with 56% in G-7/F-7 and 74% in
245	Bhara Kahu and Dhok Hassu (Table 2).

		Control	Group			Troatmon	t Groups		
Variables	Categories	 I-1	0	G-7	G-7/F-7		Kahu	Dhok	Hassu
		Baselin	Endlin	Baselin	Endlin	Baselin	Endlin	Baselin	Endlin
		e	e	e	e	e	e	e	e
	18-29	32.2	28.3	31.7	36.0	29.2	26.6	30.8	29.2
	30-39	24.5	24.0	27.3	21.9	31.9	33.2	31.0	28.0
Age Group	40-49	19.0	18.7	19.1	19.3	22.9	22.7	22.8	20.9
0 1	50-59	11.2	14.8	13.2	12.8	9.7	12.6	9.4	12.9
	60+	12.6	14.3	8.8	10.0	6.3	5.0	6.1	9.1
	None	8.8	6.3	19.5	24.6	15.8	15.9	34.5	34.6
Education	Up to 12 years	44.0	42.3	57.9	60.1	63.0	64.5	58.5	58.1
level	University degree	47.3	51.4	22.6	15.3	21.2	19.6	7.1	7.2
	Punjabi	58.0	59.1	84.0	90.7	50.6	63.9	45.1	48.7
	Pashtun	16.74	15.2	5.6	4.7	16.2	13.6	42.4	39.0
Ethnicity	Urdu Speaking	10.3	16.1	2.2	0.6	3.4	5.0	0.4	0.62
	Hindko	3.6	2.7	1.3	0	4.4	3.1	6.9	7.2
	Others	11.5	7.0	6.9	4.1	25.4	14.4	5.2	4.5
Employment	Self Employed	15.7	11.9	6.9	10.3	19.3	21.3	29.4	25.0

Table 2. Descriptive baseline characteristics in percentages across groups 246

	Employed	23.1	22.8	39.8	38.6	26.9	22.1	22.4	21.4
	Unemploye d	61.2	65.3	53.3	51.1	53.8	56.6	48.2	53.6
Self-infection of COVID-19	Yes	13.5	13.7	7.3	4.4	4.3	3.5	1.5	2.7
Family infection of COVID-19	Yes	16.9	19.7	11.6	6.0	7.0	6.4	2.3	3.3
Sought treatment for last illness	Yes	79.3	72.2	79.6	70.0	80.6	74.8	83.3	81.4
Family vaccination	Yes	57.4	85.5	66.9	89.3	36.4	69.0	18.9	57.0
Distance	Up to 2 kms	5.0	23.3	45.3	20.6	43.9	49.6	8.2	55.5
from CVC	More than 2 kms	49.4	40.3	42.8	67.6	29.4	28.1	37.1	22.3
	Don't Know	45.6	36.4	12.0	11.8	26.7	22.3	54.6	22.3
Risk	Worried	65.8	68.5	63.6	61.7	59.0	77.9	71.4	74.1
perception of	Uncertain	17.2	10.9	4.8	6.2	14.8	9.3	10.7	9.1
COVID-19	Unworried	17.0	20.6	31.7	32.1	26.2	12.8	17.9	16.8
Sources of information:	Vec	26.6	35.0	33.0	24.6	25 4	14.2	23.4	28.3
Government	163	20.0	55.0	JJ.2	24.0	20.4	17.2	20.4	20.5
Call/SMS	Yes	26.8	17.8	16.3	19.9	37.6	41.0	27.6	32.4
Family/Friend S	Yes	46.2	24.2	49.2	53.0	46.0	65.2	44.1	63.1
Medical professionals	Yes	8.6	8.4	9.1	18.1	6.1	11.6	4.2	15.9
Religious leaders	Yes	0	0	0.3	7.5	1.5	2.7	0.4	6.2
Any NGO/CBO working in area	Yes	88.7	66.6	56.1	48.3	74.4	71.6	74.1	73.4

#### Willingness to vaccinate and COVID-19 vaccine uptake 247

Willingness to receive vaccines increased substantially from baseline (67%) to endline 248 (80%), more for men than women. The control area (I-10) had the highest willingness 249 for both men and women across both time periods, with an exception that G7/F7 had 250

the highest willingness for men at the endline (94%). 251

Correspondingly, refusal to receive vaccine dropped sharply in the endline. For men, 252

- the highest dip in refusals occurred in Dhok Hassu (18%), while Bhara Kahu had the 253
- highest decrease for women (20%). Registrations and vaccinations mirror willingness. 254

- Vaccine uptake increased from 22% to 47%, with men receiving more vaccination than
- women (Table 3).

		Willingness to vaccinate							Vaccine uptake					
		Will	ing	ug Uncertain		Unwilling U		Unvaco	Unvaccinated		Only registered		At least partially vaccinated	
		Baseline	Endline	Baseline	Endline	Baseline	Endline	Baseline	Endline	Baseline	Endline	Baseline	Endline	
	TOTAL	67%	80%	12%	9%	21%	10%	65%	39%	13%	14%	22%	47%	
	C: I-10	82%	88%	9%	2%	9%	10%	59%	20%	12%	31%	29%	49%	
	T1: G-7/F-7	81%	94%	2%	4%	17%	2%	43%	16%	16%	6%	40%	78%	
Male	T2: Bhara Kahu	64%	77%	25%	18%	12%	5%	64%	35%	12%	14%	24%	51%	
	T3: Dhok Hassu	64%	85%	13%	10%	23%	5%	76%	38%	14%	22%	10%	40%	
	Total	72%	85%	13%	9%	15%	6%	62%	28%	13%	19%	24%	52%	
	C: I-10	73%	83%	9%	9%	18%	9%	49%	32%	18%	11%	33%	57%	
	T1: G-7/F-7	71%	72%	8%	8%	21%	20%	58%	43%	13%	6%	29%	51%	
Female	T2: Bhara Kahu	51%	80%	13%	4%	36%	16%	79%	60%	8%	7%	12%	32%	
	T3: Dhok Hassu	55%	67%	17%	18%	28%	15%	83%	59%	11%	12%	7%	28%	
	Total	62%	76%	12%	10%	26%	14%	68%	49%	12%	9%	20%	41%	

## Table 3. Willingness to vaccinate and vaccine uptake segregated by gender and location

258

### **Intent-To-Treat (ITT) and Average Treatment Effects (ATEs)**

Average marginal treatment effects from multi-level mixed effects logistic regressions show that, compared to the control area (I-10), willingness to receive vaccination increased by 7.6% in Bhara Kahu (Coef: 0.0764, CI: 0.0121, 0.1406) and 6.6% in Dhok Hassu (Coef: 0.0661, CI: 0.00498, 0.1272) respectively. However, the change in G7/F7 was not significant.

Whereas, this willingness did not translate into an increase in vaccination rates in either of the areas. Vaccine uptake increased by 17.1% (Coef: 0.1709, CI: 0.0417, 0.3) in G-7/F-7 only (Table 4). Our adjusted models with all controls showing odds ratios are provided in S2 Table.

0	(	1)	(2)			
Comparison	Willingness	to vaccinate	Vaccine	e Uptake		
	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted		
Difference-in-differences						
T1: G-7/F-7 vs C: I-10	0.0312 (-0.0578, 0.1203)	0.0611 (-0.0197, 0.1419)	0.077 (-0.0354, 0.1894)	0.1709** (0.0417, 0.3)		
T2: Bhara Kahu vs C: I-10	0.1189*** (0.0424, 0.1954)	0.0764** (0.0121, 0.1406)	0.0078 (-0.0994, 0.115)	0.0418 (-0.0817, 0.1652)		
T3: Dhok Hassu vs C: I-10	0.1314*** (0.0566, 0.2063)	0.0661** (0.00498, 0.1272)	0.0385 (-0.066, 0.143)	0.0398 (-0.0767, 0.1563)		
Observations	3107	2,904	3448	3216		
Number of clusters	220	220	220	220		
Intra-class correlation	0.044	0.046	0.042	0.048		
McKelvey & Zavoina R2 (FE and RE)	0.083	0.395	0.198	0.533		

#### **Table 4. Pairwise comparisons of average marginal treatment effects**

270 271 Robust standard errors were used, Cl in parentheses \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

272	The Intra class correlation (ICC) is the correlation among observations within the same
273	cluster. In our models, ICC indicates that only around 4.2-4.8% of the total variance in
274	willingness to vaccinate and uptake is explained by between-cluster differences (i.e.,
275	due to clustering). The Mckelvey & Zavoina Pseudo R-squares of adjusted models
276	show that 40% and 53% of the variations in willingness and uptake respectively are

captured by the independent variables. Both models show good fits to predict therelevant outcomes.

#### 279 Determinants of willingness and vaccine uptake

Willingness to vaccinate was twice as likely in the control area at baseline but this 280 effect disappeared at the endline. On the other hand, the likelihood of vaccine uptake 281 increased in G-7/F-7 compared to the control locality (AOR: 1.975, CI: 1.079, 3.617) 282 but not anywhere else. Women were half as likely to express willingness to vaccinate 283 but were not any different from men in terms of vaccine uptake. Increasing age, higher 284 education and employment were important determinants of willingness and uptake of 285 286 vaccination at the baseline. While these factors remained important at the endline as well, their significance decreased as seen by their lowered odds at the endline. 287 Pashtuns became less likely and Urdu speakers more likely to receive vaccination at 288 the endline. 289

A previous infection with COVID-19 for self was not a key determinant for willingness but a significant one for uptake of vaccination (AOR: 2.286, CI: 1.142, 4.576). Similarly, infection or vaccination of a family member and a high-risk perception were motivators for both willingness and uptake of vaccination. The effect of all these factors increased at endline. Having sought treatment for a recent illness was positively correlated with uptake (AOR: 1.471, CI: 1.078, 2.009).

Having received an SMS or call from the government was a major motivator that led
to increased willingness (AOR: 2.414, CI: 1.420, 4.103) and uptake (AOR: 1.310, CI:
1.004, 1.708) in the endline. Advice from friends, family, medical professionals and
religious leaders did not sway opinions about willingness or uptake of vaccination.
Living near a CVC was correlated with higher willingness and closer distances were

associated with higher uptake. The odds of vaccine uptake also increased if an 301 NGO/CBO was working in the area in the pre-intervention period (AOR: 1.657, CI: 302 1.093, 2.514) (Table 5). 303

#### Table 5. Odds ratios of factors influencing willingness to vaccinate and 304

vaccine uptake 305

	Willingness	to Vaccinate	Vaccine Uptake			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
VARIABLES	Baseline	Endline	Baseline	Endline		
Group (Control: I-10)						
T1: G-7/F-7	0.501**	0.766	0.883	1.975**		
	(0.275, 0.911)	(0.365, 1.608)	(0.513, 1.520)	(1.079, 3.617)		
T2: Bhara Kahu	0.567**	0.670	0.669	0.741		
	(0.354, 0.908)	(0.328, 1.368)	(0.405, 1.104)	(0.422, 1.301)		
T3: Dhok Hassu	0.718	1.091	0.483***	0.639		
	(0.435, 1.187)	(0.492, 2.418)	(0.294, 0.792)	(0.373, 1.095)		
Female	0.546***	0.477***	1.049	0.766		
	(0.349, 0.853)	(0.278, 0.818)	(0.656, 1.676)	(0.520, 1.129)		
Age Group (18-29)	(0.010, 0.000)	(0.210, 0.010)	(0.000, 1.010)	(0.020, 1.120)		
30-39	1 332	2 072***	2 215***	1 631***		
	$(0.924 \ 1.920)$	(1 347 3 187)	(1407 3489)	(1 136 2 342)		
40-49	1 699***	2 413***	6 775***	3 154***		
	(1 153 2 502)	(1 424 4 087)	(4 255 10 79)	(2 135 4 659)		
50-59	1 761**	2 502**	12 32***	4 595***		
	$(1\ 0\ 10\ 3\ 0\ 70)$	$(1\ 225\ 5\ 111)$	(7,350,20,65)	(3 022 6 988)		
60-69	2 913***	2 391**	31 23***	4 890***		
	(1 498 5 661)	(1 061 5 386)	(17 22 56 64)	(3 002 7 966)		
Education level (None)	(1.400, 0.001)	(1.001, 0.000)	(17.22,00.04)	(0.002, 7.000)		
Lin to 12 years	1 237	0 920	1 122	0 728*		
	(0.863 1.771)	(0 580 1 459)	(0.695 1.810)	(0.530, 1.001)		
Liniversity degree	1 941**	0.614	1 735*	0.000, 1.001)		
	(1 167 3 227)	(0.324 1.163)	(0.955, 3.153)	(0.576, 1.460)		
Ethnicity (Others)	(1.107, 0.227)	(0.024, 1.100)	(0.000, 0.100)	(0.070, 1.400)		
Puniahi	0.935	0 996	1 042	1 054		
	(0.583, 1.501)	(0 483 2 055)	(0.665, 1.635)	(0.654 1.698)		
Pashtun	1 154	0.618	1 003	0.605*		
1 dontari	(0.667 1.995)	(0 274 1 393)	(0.615, 1.636)	(0.337 1.087)		
Urdu Speaking	0.820	1 153	1 630	2 033**		
orde opeaking	(0.352 1.908)	(0.361_3.680)	(0.808 3.288)	(1 026 4 027)		
Hindko	0.832	1 100	0.595	1 202		
1 mildito	(0 357 1 938)	(0.283, 4.269)	(0 207 1 716)	(0 530 2 727)		
Employment status (Unemployed)	(0.007, 1.000)	(0.200, 4.200)	(0.207, 1.710)	(0.000, 2.121)		
Self-employed	1 330	2 296**	1 009	1 272		
Sell-employed	(0.827, 2.166)	(1 167 4 520)	(0.598 1.702)	(0.834 1.941)		
Employed	2 279***	2 396***	3 390***	2 332***		
Employed	(1 412 3 681)	(1 322 4 339)	(2 190 5 248)	(1 545 3 522)		
Self-infection of COVID-19	1 070	0 600	1 005	2 286**		
	(0 507 2 200)	(0.265 1.847)	(0.606, 1.980)	(1 142 4 576)		
Eamily infection of COVID-19	3 005***	3 607***	(0.000, 1.000)	1 1/13		
	(1 416 6 376)	(1 591 8 176)	(1 075 3 278)	(0 840 2 477)		
Family vaccination (No)	(1.710, 0.070)	(1.001, 0.170)	(1.070, 0.270)	(0.0+0, 2.+11)		
	2 816***	4 670***	8 181***	5 766***		
100	(1 951 4 064)	(2 905 7 537)	(5 175 12 03)	(4 070 8 160)		
Not applicable	0 206***	1 308	1 2/17	1 101		
	0.200	1.000	1.077	1.141		

	(0.168, 0.521)	(0.619, 2.767)	(0.377, 4.821)	(0.501, 2.510)
Risk perception of COVID-19				
(Unworried)				
Worried	2.494***	5.627***	1.295	1.427**
	(1.765, 3.523)	(3.609, 8.772)	(0.833, 2.014)	(1.020, 1.995)
Uncertain	0.938	4.021^^^	1.279	2.308^^^
	(0.572, 1.540)	(1.687, 9.583)	(0.716, 2.284)	(1.247, 4.274)
Source of information on COVID-19				
Vaccine	4 4 0 7	4.070	0.000	4 0 4 0
I elevision	1.107	1.279	0.823	1.012
	(0.774, 1.585)	(0.849, 1.927)	(0.566, 1.194)	(0.752, 1.361)
Government Call/SMS	1.159	2.414***	0.931	1.310**
	(0.807, 1.664)	(1.420, 4.103)	(0.637, 1.361)	(1.004, 1.708)
Family/friends	1.211	0.889	0.657**	0.774*
	(0.894, 1.641)	(0.559, 1.413)	(0.472, 0.916)	(0.589, 1.016)
Medical professionals	2.057*	1.046	1.360	1.187
	(0.931, 4.549)	(0.544, 2.012)	(0.827, 2.236)	(0.849, 1.659)
Religious leaders	0.0437***	2.177	0.131	1.752*
	(0.007, 0.265)	(0.672, 7.053)	(0.0112, 1.531)	(0.959, 3.203)
Distance from CVC (Do not know)				
Less than 2 kms	1.591**	1.474	4.140***	2.273***
	(1.029, 2.460)	(0.913, 2.379)	(2.370, 7.233)	(1.528, 3.381)
2+ kms	2.163***	2.320***	3.969***	1.765***
	(1.511, 3.096)	(1.334, 4.035)	(2.452, 6.423)	(1.171, 2.661)
Any NGO/CBO working in area	1.384*	1.165	1.657**	1.334*
	(0.988, 1.938)	(0.791, 1.717)	(1.093, 2.514)	(1.000, 1.780)
Sought treatment for last illness	1.758***	1.470	0.772	1.471**
	(1.236, 2.499)	(0.882, 2.451)	(0.500, 1.192)	(1.078, 2.009)
Constant	0.365**	0.293*	0.00392***	0.0306***
	(0.144, 0.924)	(0.0852, 1.005)	(0.001, 0.0141)	(0.012, 0.078)
Observations	1,417	1,487	1,613	1,603
Number of clusters	110	110	110	110
Intra-class correlation	0.038	0.084	0	0.087
McKelvey & Zavoina R2 (FE and RE)	0.401	0.434	0.584	0.423
306 Robust	standard errors, (	CI eform in parenth	eses	

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

#### **Discussion** 309

We found that interventions that raise awareness and remove access barriers helped 310 improve vaccine willingness by 7% and uptake by 17% in some low-income and 311 underserved communities. However, there is a two-stage process. In the first, 312 increased and hesitancy decreased, following awareness our awareness 313 interventions. In the second stage, some of those that became convinced took up the 314 vaccines. Uptake was dependent on access to vaccinations, which our interventions 315 addressed only in part. 316

<sup>307</sup> 308

Our findings suggest that raising awareness of COVID-19 vaccination through more 317 personalized means at community levels using printed material in local languages, 318 engaging with community leaders, and building partnerships with local organizations 319 can improve vaccine willingness by changing behavioral intentions of residents, which 320 is in line with previous literature on the topic [11,29,32]. By contrast, merely informing 321 the public through television, internet or local pamphlets etc., i.e., non-personalized 322 323 means, may be less effective, as was seen in the control area. However, benefits from this approach may saturate beyond a certain point. For example, our interventions 324 325 were successful in improving vaccine willingness in Bhara Kahu and Dhok Hassu by 7.6 and 6.6 percentage points compared to I-10, but to a lesser extent in G7/F7 where 326 there had already been high willingness at baseline. 327

While willingness improved, it did not always translate into increased uptake. A major 328 barrier towards achieving COVID-19 vaccination coverage in some settlements is the 329 difficulty that residents have in accessing CVCs, which were often several kilometers 330 away. While our set of interventions included some mobile vaccination centers (MVC), 331 these were insufficient to fulfill the extent of demand for vaccination. Thus, vaccine 332 uptake increased the most in G-7/F-7 by 17.1 percentage points compared to the 333 control area, possibly because these areas are located in the center of Islamabad with 334 easier access to multiple CVCs nearby - as compared to Bhara Kahu, a peri-urban 335 slum outside Islamabad, and Dhok Hassu, an urban slum of Rawalpindi. 336

Table 5 tracks changes in willingness and uptake before and after the intervention. Odds of willingness to receive vaccination which was lower in all urban slums at baseline when compared to the control area, became indistinguishable at the endline. Similarly, the odds of willingness for university educated respondents, which were initially twice as much as those with lesser education, became insignificant. On the

other hand, the odds of willingness rose for those that had experienced infection for self or family, if someone was already worried about infections or if a family member had received vaccination. It appears that the interventions may have helped mitigate the disadvantage of residence in an urban slum or from lower education and accentuated the willingness of those who had encountered infection or vaccines.

Similarly, odds of uptake of the vaccination rose by two-folds in G-7/F-7, which is located in city center and for the 18-39 years age groups compared to all older groups. On the other hand, there appeared to be little effect from education or employment and slight loss of advantage of those with a previous vaccination in the family. In short, in the endline period, there appears to be a homogenization effect in terms of who would take up vaccination, or a loss of disadvantage of the less educated, younger individuals, and residents of marginalized communities.

Our interventions also helped to increase vaccine willingness for people whose family members had a prior experience with COVID-19, but did not affect their uptake, which was more associated with a previous infection for self. Although our results are consistent with a prior study which uses a sample of Pakistan's adult population to the extent that an incidence of COVID-19 among family members influences perception about COVID-19 vaccination [39], the effect is not strong enough to translate this willingness into action.

Vaccine uptake was higher among those with a previous infection with COVID-19, those with risk-aversion (were worried about getting infected) and those who sought treatment for their illness. Previous research has shown a positive association between health concerns and vaccine willingness [40–42], therefore our interventions may have nudged them to seek vaccination [43]. This implies that raising awareness,

dispelling rumors, and communicating benefits of COVID-19 vaccines can change
 behavior of people who are more concerned about their health.

A prior study on routine immunizations in urban slums of Pakistan found that source 368 of information also plays an important role in shaping trust and risk perceptions of 369 vaccines [44]. Given the social norms and inaccurate information especially in low-370 371 income settlements, people might not get vaccinated due to social hesitancy regarding COVID-19 vaccination. We also found that government calls and SMS about COVID-372 19 vaccination in the endline were associated with both increased willingness and 373 uptake. Given the high tele-density of cellphone users in Pakistan - 85.3% penetration 374 as of October 2021 [45], cellphone campaigns communicating COVID-19 and benefits 375 of vaccination may be cost-effective. 376

## 377 Limitations

One limitation is that a group (set) of interventions – community outreach through local 378 leaders, local vaccination campaign and information - were implemented for all 379 treatment groups. Therefore, we cannot isolate the effect of each intervention to 380 analyze its relative effectiveness. Secondly, although MVCs were deployed in each 381 382 treatment area and each reached around 150-250 vaccinations a day compared to 30-50 when they merely showed up without our intervention, such MVC visits were too 383 few. Only 5% of the respondents out of total vaccinated reported that they had been 384 vaccinated through MVCs, suggesting that CVCs were the predominant source of 385 vaccinations and subject to the distance effect mentioned above. This may have 386 limited the impact on vaccination uptake in distant communities (Bara Kahu and Dhok 387 388 Hassu). Data for previous self and family infection of COVID-19 are self-reported and not actually verified through laboratory means which may have skewed our results to 389

some extent. Finally, the baseline and endline were separated by 2 months, during
which the national vaccination campaign had ramped up. Some of the homogenization
of uptake may be explained by this rather an intervention effect, although the
difference-in-differences analysis shows a significant change.

# 394 **Conclusion**

We show that personalized information campaigns such as community mobilization 395 and direct messaging are superior to general messaging in helping overcome COVID-396 19 vaccine hesitancy. However, increasing uptake of the vaccine requires an 397 additional step of improving access to the vaccination services. Both information and 398 access may be different for various communities and therefore a "one-size-fits-all" 399 approach may need to be better localized. These findings may apply to other 400 401 vaccinations and possibly to other health initiatives where the public may require motivation to uptake services such as diabetes or hypertension screening or testing. 402 A key lesson is that low-income or marginalized communities would be better served 403 if the services are brought to them locally. 404

## 405 **References**

4061.John Hopkins University. Coronavirus Resource Center. 2022 [cited 15 Jul

407 2022]. Available: https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/

- 2. Schneiders ML, Naemiratch B, Cheah PK, Cuman G, Poomchaichote T,
- 409 Ruangkajorn S, et al. The impact of COVID-19 non-pharmaceutical
- 410 interventions on the lived experiences of people living in Thailand, Malaysia,
- Italy and the United Kingdom: A cross-country qualitative study. PLoS One.
- 412 2022;17: e0262421. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0262421
- 413 3. Opel DJ, Diekema DS, Ross LF. Should We Mandate a COVID-19 Vaccine for
- 414 Children? JAMA Pediatr. 2021;175: 125–126.
- 415 doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.3019
- 416 4. Ross LF, Opel DJ. The case against COVID-19 vaccine mandates in pediatric

solid organ transplantation. Pediatr Transplant. 20220212th ed. 2022; e14243. 417 doi:10.1111/petr.14243 418 Buckley RM. Targeting the World's Slums as Fat Tails in the Distribution of 419 5. COVID-19 Cases. Journal of Urban Health. Journal of Urban Health; 2020. pp. 420 358-364. doi:10.1007/s11524-020-00450-w 421 Armand A, Augsburg B, Bancalari A, Augsburg B. Coping with COVID-19 in 6. 422 Slums Evidence from India. 2020 [cited 17 Dec 2021]. Available: 423 https://www.theigc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Armand-et-al-2020-Final-424 425 report.pdf Christie A, Brooks JT, Hicks LA, Sauber-Schatz EK, Yoder JS, Honein MA. 426 7. Guidance for Implementing COVID-19 Prevention Strategies in the Context of 427 Varying Community Transmission Levels and Vaccination Coverage. MMWR 428 Recomm Reports. 2021;70: 1044–1047. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7030e2 429 WHO. Status of COVID-19 Vaccines within WHO EUL / PQ evaluation 430 8. process. WHO. World Health Organization; 2021. Available: 431 https://extranet.who.int/pgweb/sites/default/files/documents/Status of COVID-432 19 Vaccines within WHO EUL-PQ evaluation process-433 434 16June2021 Final.pdf Hague N. Pakistan Urbanization: Achieving Progress and Development 435 9. through Urban Renewal. Policy Br Ser Pakistan's Urban. New York, USA.: The 436 Woodrow Wilson Center; 2013. 437 10. Haider M. Urban Transport Planning: Moving People and the Economy. Policy 438 Br Ser Pakistan's Urban. New York, USA.: The Woodrow Wilson Center; 2014. 439 11. Razai MS, Chaudhry UAR, Doerholt K, Bauld L, Majeed A. Covid-19 440 vaccination hesitancy. BMJ. 2021;373: 1136–1139. doi:10.1136/bmj.n1138 441 12. Clouston S, Kidman R, Palermo T. Social inequalities in vaccination uptake 442 among children aged 0-59 months living in Madagascar: An analysis of 443 Demographic and Health Survey data from 2008 to 2009. Vaccine. 2014;32: 444 3533–3539. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.04.030 445 13. Opel DJ, Lo B, Peek ME. Addressing mistrust about COVID-19 vaccines 446 among patients of color. Ann Intern Med. 20210209th ed. 2021;174: 698-700. 447 doi:10.7326/M21-0055 448 Opel DJ, Salmon DA, Marcuse EK. Building Trust to Achieve Confidence in 14. 449 COVID-19 Vaccines. JAMA Netw open. 20201001st ed. 2020;3: e2025672. 450

doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.25672 451 15. Simione L, Vagni M, Gnagnarella C, Bersani G, Pajardi D. Mistrust and Beliefs 452 in Conspiracy Theories Differently Mediate the Effects of Psychological 453 Factors on Propensity for COVID-19 Vaccine. Front Psychol. 20210707th ed. 454 2021;12: 683684. doi:10.3389/fpsvg.2021.683684 455 Omer SB, Benjamin RM, Brewer NT, Buttenheim AM, Callaghan T, Caplan A, 16. 456 et al. Promoting COVID-19 vaccine acceptance: recommendations from the 457 Lancet Commission on Vaccine Refusal, Acceptance, and Demand in the 458 459 USA. Lancet. 20211115th ed. 2021;398: 2186–2192. doi:10.1016/S0140-460 6736(21)02507-1 Solís Arce JS, Warren SS, Meriggi NF, Scacco A, McMurry N, Voors M, et al. 17. 461 COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy in low- and middle-income 462 countries. Nat Med. 20210716th ed. 2021;27: 1385-1394. 463 464 doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01454-y Hossain MB, Alam MZ, Islam MS, Sultan S, Faysal MM, Rima S, et al. Health 18. 465 Belief Model, Theory of Planned Behavior, or Psychological Antecedents: 466 What Predicts COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy Better Among the Bangladeshi 467 468 Adults? Front Public Heal. 20210816th ed. 2021;9: 1172. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.711066 469 19. Abedin M, Islam MA, Rahman FN, Reza HM, Hossain MZ, Hossain MA, et al. 470 Willingness to vaccinate against COVID-19 among Bangladeshi adults: 471 Understanding the strategies to optimize vaccination coverage. PLoS One. 472 2021;16: e0250495. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0250495 473 20. Guidry JPD, Laestadius LI, Vraga EK, Miller CA, Perrin PB, Burton CW, et al. 474 Willingness to get the COVID-19 vaccine with and without emergency use 475 authorization. Am J Infect Control. 20201120th ed. 2021;49: 137-142. 476 doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2020.11.018 477 Lin Y, Hu Z, Zhao Q, Alias H, Danaee M, Wong LP. Understanding COVID-19 21. 478 vaccine demand and hesitancy: A nationwide online survey in China. PLoS 479 Negl Trop Dis. 20201217th ed. 2020;14: e0008961. 480 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0008961 481 Walker AN, Zhang T, Peng XQ, Ge JJ, Gu H, You H. Vaccine acceptance and 22. 482 its influencing factors: An online cross-sectional study among international 483 college students studying in china. Vaccines. 20210602nd ed. 2021;9: 585. 484

485		doi:10.3390/vaccines9060585
486	23.	Joshi A, Kaur M, Kaur R, Grover A, Nash D, El-Mohandes A. Predictors of
487		COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance, Intention, and Hesitancy: A Scoping Review.
488		Front Public Heal. 20210813th ed. 2021;9: 1152.
489		doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.698111
490	24.	Loomba S, de Figueiredo A, Piatek SJ, de Graaf K, Larson HJ. Measuring the
491		impact of COVID-19 vaccine misinformation on vaccination intent in the UK
492		and USA. Nat Hum Behav. 20210205th ed. 2021;5: 337–348.
493		doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01056-1
494	25.	Cerda AA, García LY. Hesitation and Refusal Factors in Individuals' Decision-
495		Making Processes Regarding a Coronavirus Disease 2019 Vaccination. Front
496		Public Heal. 20210421st ed. 2021;9: 229. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.626852
497	26.	Zewude B, Habtegiorgis T. Willingness to Take COVID-19 Vaccine Among
498		People Most at Risk of Exposure in Southern Ethiopia. Pragmatic Obs Res.
499		2021;Volume 12: 37–47. doi:10.2147/por.s313991
500	27.	Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process.
501		1991;50: 179–211. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
502	28.	Ullah I, Lin CY, Malik NI, Wu TY, Araban M, Griffiths MD, et al. Factors
503		affecting Pakistani young adults' intentions to uptake COVID-19 vaccination:
504		An extension of the theory of planned behavior. Brain Behav. 20210920th ed.
505		2021;11: e2370. doi:10.1002/brb3.2370
506	29.	Dutta T, Agley J, Meyerson BE, Barnes PA, Sherwood-Laughlin C, Nicholson-
507		Crotty J. Perceived enablers and barriers of community engagement for
508		vaccination in India: Using socioecological analysis. PLoS One. 2021;16.
509		doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0253318
510	30.	World Health Organisation. Conducting community engagement for COVID-19
511		vaccines: interim guidance. Geneva; 2021. Available:
512		https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-vaccination-
513		community-engagement-2021.1
514	31.	Olufadewa II, Adesina MA, Ekpo MD, Akinloye SJ, Iyanda TO, Nwachukwu P,
515		et al. Lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic
516		response in China, Italy, and the U.S.: a guide for Africa and low- and middle-
517		income countries. Glob Heal J. 2021;5: 56–61.
518		doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glohj.2021.02.003

519	32.	Sabarwal S, Bhatia R, Dhody B, Perumal S, Howard W, Puri J. Engaging
520		communities for increasing immunisation coverage What do we know? July
521		2015 Scoping Paper 3. 2015 [cited 10 Dec 2021]. Available:
522		https://www.3ieimpact.org/sites/default/files/2019-
523		01/3ie_immunisation_scoping_report_3.pdf
524	33.	Amin R, Li Y. NGO-Promoted women's credit program, immunization
525		coverage, and child mortality in rural Bangladesh. Women Heal. 1997;25: 71–
526		87. doi:10.1300/J013v25n01_05
527	34.	UNICEF. MULTIPLE INDICATOR CLUSTER SURVEY MANUAL 2005. New
528		York, USA.: Division of Communication, UNICEF; 2005. Available:
529		https://mics.unicef.org/files?job=W1siZiIsIjIwMTUvMDQvMDIvMDYvMzcvMDY
530		vMTE5L011bHRpcGxlX0luZGljYXRvcl9DbHVzdGVyX1N1cnZleV9NYW51YW
531		xfMjAwNS5wZGYiXV0&sha=dd2e54d1ddd61cdb
532	35.	Banerjee AV, Duflo E, Glennerster R, Kothari D. Improving immunisation
533		coverage in rural India: Clustered randomised controlled evaluation of
534		immunisation campaigns with and without incentives. BMJ. 2010;340: 1291.
535		doi:10.1136/bmj.c2220
536	36.	Bruhn M, McKenzie D. In pursuit of balance: Randomization in practice in
537		development field experiments. Am Econ J Appl Econ. 2009;1: 200–232.
538		doi:10.1257/app.1.4.200
539	37.	Puhani PA. The treatment effect, the cross difference, and the interaction term
540		in nonlinear "difference-in-differences" models. Econ Lett. 2012;115: 85–87.
541		doi:10.1016/j.econlet.2011.11.025
542	38.	Langer W. Stata Page. 2019 [cited 6 Dec 2021]. Available:
543		https://langer.soziologie.uni-halle.de/stata/index.html
544	39.	Hawlader MDH, Rahman ML, Nazir A, Ara T, Haque MMA, Saha S, et al.
545		COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in South Asia: a multi-country study. Int J Infect
546		Dis. 2022;114: 1–10. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2021.09.056
547	40.	Qamar MA, Irfan O, Dhillon RA, Bhatti A, Sajid MI, Awan S, et al. Acceptance
548		of COVID-19 Vaccine in Pakistan: A Nationwide Cross-Sectional Study.
549		Cureus. 2021;13: e16603. doi:10.7759/cureus.16603
550	41.	Ahmed TF, Ahmed A, Ahmed S, Ahmed HU. Understanding COVID-19
551		vaccine acceptance in Pakistan: an echo of previous immunizations or
552		prospect of change? Expert Rev Vaccines. 2021;20: 1185–1193.

553		doi:10.1080/14760584.2021.1964963
554	42.	Zakar R, Momina A ul, Shahzad S, Hayee M, Shahzad R, Zakar MZ. COVID-
555		19 Vaccination Hesitancy or Acceptance and Its Associated Factors: Findings
556		from Post-Vaccination Cross-Sectional Survey from Punjab Pakistan. Int J
557		Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19. doi:10.3390/ijerph19031305
558	43.	Ledderer L, Kjær M, Madsen EK, Busch J, Fage-Butler A. Nudging in Public
559		Health Lifestyle Interventions: A Systematic Literature Review and
560		Metasynthesis. Heal Educ Behav Off Publ Soc Public Heal Educ. 2020;47:
561		749–764. doi:10.1177/1090198120931788
562	44.	Yazdani AT, Muhammad A, Nisar MI, Khan U, Shafiq Y. Unveiling and
563		addressing implementation barriers to routine immunization in the peri-urban
564		slums of Karachi, Pakistan: a mixed-methods study. Heal Res Policy Syst.
565		2021;19: 1–9. doi:10.1186/s12961-021-00691-4
566	45.	Pakistan Telecom Authorities. Telecom Indicators in Pakistan PTA. In: Pta
567		[Internet]. 2021 [cited 17 Dec 2021]. Available:
568		https://www.pta.gov.pk/en/telecom-indicators

569

# 570 List of Legends

- 571 Table 1. Location characteristics of study areas
- 572 **Table 2. Descriptive baseline characteristics in percentages across groups**
- 573 **Table 3. Willingness to vaccinate and vaccine uptake segregated by gender**
- 574 and location
- 575 **Table 4. Pairwise comparisons of average marginal treatment effects**
- 576 **Table 5. Odds ratios of factors influencing willingness to vaccinate and**
- 577 vaccine uptake
- 578 **S1 Fig. Pamphlet distributed for awareness campaign**
- 579 **S1 Table. Names, descriptions and coding of variables**
- 580 S2 Table. Adjusted odds ratios for willingness to vaccinate and vaccine uptake
- 581 S1 Data. The dataset used for the study