

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 Abdullah¹, Taimoor Ahmad¹, Twangar Kazmi¹, Faisal Sultan^{2,3}, Sabeen
6 Afzal², Rana Muhammad Safdar², Adnan Ahmad Khan*^{2,4}

7
8 ¹Akhter Hameed Khan Foundation, Islamabad, Pakistan

9 ²Ministry of National Health Services, Regulation and Coordination, Islamabad,
10 Pakistan

11 ³Shaukat Khanum Memorial Cancer Hospital & Research Centre, Lahore, Pakistan

12 ⁴Research and Development Solutions, Islamabad, Pakistan

13

14 *Corresponding author:

15 Email: adnan@resdev.org (AAK)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 **Abstract**

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

41

42

43

44

45

46 Introduction

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

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

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

69 rollout and the intent to cover the entire population required addressing several
70 complex situations.

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

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

88 **Theoretical framework for the study**

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

93 risk towards oneself and a personal or family's history of COVID-19 infections [11,17–
94 26]. In addition, information and communication about COVID-19 vaccination act as
95 signals to influence individual behavior [24,25].

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

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

112 Engaging communities thus aid to disseminate information in the local language and
113 channels which can have a greater outreach [30]. As found in an earlier study of rural
114 Bangladesh [33], collaboration with NGOs to increase immunization rates also results
115 in better service delivery and increases vaccination acceptance as people exhibit more
116 trust in local NGOs. Mobile vaccination camps (MVCs) can help increase access to

117 vaccinations in such underserved communities. The current study explored the roles
118 of community mobilization and vaccination camps in marginalized, low-trust
119 communities to promote awareness and uptake of COVID-19 vaccination and the
120 effects of such interventions in sub-populations of these communities.

121 **Methodology**

122 **Study overview, location and sampling**

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

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

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

141 income, long stand informal locality) was included from Rawalpindi. Each community
142 is located sufficiently away from each other to make any cross over contamination of
143 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
146 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

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

153 A two-stage clustered sampling design was applied using GIS mapping, with
154 randomization being done first by selecting random sample of clusters in each locality
155 of the sampling frame and then at selecting households from each cluster. Pins
156 identifying clusters were dropped at random points on map. Out of those, we randomly
157 selected a total of 110 clusters, 30 each in Dhok Hassu, Bhara Kahu and I-10, and 10
158 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

161 in that cluster using the left-hand rule, skipping one household after every successful
162 interview. Each pair surveyed 8 male and 8 female respondents in every cluster, for a
163 total of 16 interviews per cluster. Males and females were surveyed from different
164 households, with no upper age limit restriction.

165 **Interventions**

166 **Awareness campaign via local mobilizers**

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

176 **Mobile vaccination camps (MVCs)**

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

185 and on the day of the visit, they helped improve access of community members to the
186 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),
189 assuming that households remained in the same treatment groups to which they were
190 originally assigned, whether they received the treatments or not. We estimated ATEs
191 on two primary outcomes: willingness to vaccinate and vaccine uptake. Given both the
192 dependent variables were binary, we estimated non-linear ITT parameters using multi-
193 level mixed effects logistic regressions [35] through difference-in-differences method.
194 Here, level 2 indicates clusters and level 1 indicates households within those clusters.
195 As suggested by Bruhn and McKenzie [36], we did not report statistical differences
196 between groups at baseline covariates.

197 The control variables in our analyses were taken based on the theoretical framework
198 explained above as well as their predictive powers to explain the outcome variables
199 [36], which were calculated as having strong correlations with the outcome variables.
200 Controlling for these variables that could be imbalanced at the baseline also controlled
201 for imbalance in the unobservable characteristics [36], and therefore the difference-in-
202 differences analysis was applicable. We ran all our analyses on statistical software
203 STATA 17.

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

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

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

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

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

222 The coefficient (β_3) on $Treat_{ijz} * Time_{ijt}$ captures the effect of interventions on the
223 treated areas as compared to the control area. Since our model is non-linear in nature,
224 ATEs are calculated by cross derivatives with respect to time and treat variables [37]:

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

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

228 **Results**

229 At the baseline, the respondents had a median age of 35 (range: 18-86) years. They
230 were predominantly of Punjabi ethnicity, with the exception of Dhok Hassu, where 42%
231 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).

246 **Table 2. Descriptive baseline characteristics in percentages across groups**

Variables	Categories	Control Group		Treatment Groups					
		I-10		G-7/F-7		Bhara Kahu		Dhok Hassu	
		Baselin e	Endlin e	Baselin e	Endlin e	Baselin e	Endlin e	Baselin e	Endlin e
Age Group	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
	40-49	19.0	18.7	19.1	19.3	22.9	22.7	22.8	20.9
	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
Education level	None	8.8	6.3	19.5	24.6	15.8	15.9	34.5	34.6
	Up to 12 years	44.0	42.3	57.9	60.1	63.0	64.5	58.5	58.1
	University degree	47.3	51.4	22.6	15.3	21.2	19.6	7.1	7.2
Ethnicity	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
	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

	Employed	23.1	22.8	39.8	38.6	26.9	22.1	22.4	21.4
	Unemployed	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 from CVC	Up to 2 kms	5.0	23.3	45.3	20.6	43.9	49.6	8.2	55.5
	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 perception of COVID-19	Worried	65.8	68.5	63.6	61.7	59.0	77.9	71.4	74.1
	Uncertain	17.2	10.9	4.8	6.2	14.8	9.3	10.7	9.1
	Unworried	17.0	20.6	31.7	32.1	26.2	12.8	17.9	16.8
Sources of information:									
Television	Yes	26.6	35.0	33.2	24.6	25.4	14.2	23.4	28.3
Government Call/SMS	Yes	26.8	17.8	16.3	19.9	37.6	41.0	27.6	32.4
Family/Friends	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

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

248 Willingness to receive vaccines increased substantially from baseline (67%) to endline
 249 (80%), more for men than women. The control area (I-10) had the highest willingness
 250 for both men and women across both time periods, with an exception that G7/F7 had
 251 the highest willingness for men at the endline (94%).

252 Correspondingly, refusal to receive vaccine dropped sharply in the endline. For men,
 253 the highest dip in refusals occurred in Dhok Hassu (18%), while Bhara Kahu had the
 254 highest decrease for women (20%). Registrations and vaccinations mirror willingness.

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

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

		Willingness to vaccinate						Vaccine uptake					
		Willing		Uncertain		Unwilling		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%
Female	T1: G-7/F-7	71%	72%	8%	8%	21%	20%	58%	43%	13%	6%	29%	51%
	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%

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

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

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

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

Comparison	(1)		(2)	
	Willingness to vaccinate	Vaccine Uptake	Unadjusted	Adjusted
	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

270 Robust standard errors were used, CI in parentheses
271 *** 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

277 captured by the independent variables. Both models show good fits to predict the
278 relevant outcomes.

279 **Determinants of willingness and vaccine uptake**

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

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

296 Having received an SMS or call from the government was a major motivator that led
297 to increased willingness (AOR: 2.414, CI: 1.420, 4.103) and uptake (AOR: 1.310, CI:
298 1.004, 1.708) in the endline. Advice from friends, family, medical professionals and
299 religious leaders did not sway opinions about willingness or uptake of vaccination.
300 Living near a CVC was correlated with higher willingness and closer distances were

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

304 **Table 5. Odds ratios of factors influencing willingness to vaccinate and**
305 **vaccine uptake**

VARIABLES	Willingness to Vaccinate		Vaccine Uptake	
	(1) Baseline	(2) Endline	(3) Baseline	(4) Endline
Group (Control: I-10)				
T1: G-7/F-7	0.501** (0.275, 0.911)	0.766 (0.365, 1.608)	0.883 (0.513, 1.520)	1.975** (1.079, 3.617)
T2: Bhara Kahu	0.567** (0.354, 0.908)	0.670 (0.328, 1.368)	0.669 (0.405, 1.104)	0.741 (0.422, 1.301)
T3: Dhok Hassu	0.718 (0.435, 1.187)	1.091 (0.492, 2.418)	0.483*** (0.294, 0.792)	0.639 (0.373, 1.095)
Female	0.546*** (0.349, 0.853)	0.477*** (0.278, 0.818)	1.049 (0.656, 1.676)	0.766 (0.520, 1.129)
Age Group (18-29)				
30-39	1.332 (0.924, 1.920)	2.072*** (1.347, 3.187)	2.215*** (1.407, 3.489)	1.631*** (1.136, 2.342)
40-49	1.699*** (1.153, 2.502)	2.413*** (1.424, 4.087)	6.775*** (4.255, 10.79)	3.154*** (2.135, 4.659)
50-59	1.761** (1.010, 3.070)	2.502** (1.225, 5.111)	12.32*** (7.350, 20.65)	4.595*** (3.022, 6.988)
60-69	2.913*** (1.498, 5.661)	2.391** (1.061, 5.386)	31.23*** (17.22, 56.64)	4.890*** (3.002, 7.966)
Education level (None)				
Up to 12 years	1.237 (0.863, 1.771)	0.920 (0.580, 1.459)	1.122 (0.695, 1.810)	0.728* (0.530, 1.001)
University degree	1.941** (1.167, 3.227)	0.614 (0.324, 1.163)	1.735* (0.955, 3.153)	0.918 (0.576, 1.460)
Ethnicity (Others)				
Punjabi	0.935 (0.583, 1.501)	0.996 (0.483, 2.055)	1.042 (0.665, 1.635)	1.054 (0.654, 1.698)
Pashtun	1.154 (0.667, 1.995)	0.618 (0.274, 1.393)	1.003 (0.615, 1.636)	0.605* (0.337, 1.087)
Urdu Speaking	0.820 (0.352, 1.908)	1.153 (0.361, 3.680)	1.630 (0.808, 3.288)	2.033** (1.026, 4.027)
Hindko	0.832 (0.357, 1.938)	1.100 (0.283, 4.269)	0.595 (0.207, 1.716)	1.202 (0.530, 2.727)
Employment status (Unemployed)				
Self-employed	1.339 (0.827, 2.166)	2.296** (1.167, 4.520)	1.009 (0.598, 1.702)	1.272 (0.834, 1.941)
Employed	2.279*** (1.412, 3.681)	2.396*** (1.322, 4.339)	3.390*** (2.190, 5.248)	2.332*** (1.545, 3.522)
Self-infection of COVID-19				
	1.079 (0.507, 2.299)	0.699 (0.265, 1.847)	1.095 (0.606, 1.980)	2.286** (1.142, 4.576)
Family infection of COVID-19				
	3.005*** (1.416, 6.376)	3.607*** (1.591, 8.176)	1.877** (1.075, 3.278)	1.443 (0.840, 2.477)
Family vaccination (No)				
Yes	2.816*** (1.951, 4.064)	4.679*** (2.905, 7.537)	8.181*** (5.175, 12.93)	5.766*** (4.070, 8.169)
Not applicable	0.296***	1.308	1.347	1.121

	(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*** (1.765, 3.523)	5.627*** (3.609, 8.772)	1.295 (0.833, 2.014)	1.427** (1.020, 1.995)
Uncertain	0.938 (0.572, 1.540)	4.021*** (1.687, 9.583)	1.279 (0.716, 2.284)	2.308*** (1.247, 4.274)
Source of information on COVID-19 vaccine				
Television	1.107 (0.774, 1.585)	1.279 (0.849, 1.927)	0.823 (0.566, 1.194)	1.012 (0.752, 1.361)
Government Call/SMS	1.159 (0.807, 1.664)	2.414*** (1.420, 4.103)	0.931 (0.637, 1.361)	1.310** (1.004, 1.708)
Family/friends	1.211 (0.894, 1.641)	0.889 (0.559, 1.413)	0.657** (0.472, 0.916)	0.774* (0.589, 1.016)
Medical professionals	2.057* (0.931, 4.549)	1.046 (0.544, 2.012)	1.360 (0.827, 2.236)	1.187 (0.849, 1.659)
Religious leaders	0.0437*** (0.007, 0.265)	2.177 (0.672, 7.053)	0.131 (0.0112, 1.531)	1.752* (0.959, 3.203)
Distance from CVC (Do not know)				
Less than 2 kms	1.591** (1.029, 2.460)	1.474 (0.913, 2.379)	4.140*** (2.370, 7.233)	2.273*** (1.528, 3.381)
2+ kms	2.163*** (1.511, 3.096)	2.320*** (1.334, 4.035)	3.969*** (2.452, 6.423)	1.765*** (1.171, 2.661)
Any NGO/CBO working in area	1.384* (0.988, 1.938)	1.165 (0.791, 1.717)	1.657** (1.093, 2.514)	1.334* (1.000, 1.780)
Sought treatment for last illness	1.758*** (1.236, 2.499)	1.470 (0.882, 2.451)	0.772 (0.500, 1.192)	1.471** (1.078, 2.009)
Constant	0.365** (0.144, 0.924)	0.293* (0.0852, 1.005)	0.00392*** (0.001, 0.0141)	0.0306*** (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 parentheses

307 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

308

309 Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

377 **Limitations**

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

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

394 Conclusion

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

405 References

- 406 1. John Hopkins University. Coronavirus Resource Center. 2022 [cited 15 Jul
407 2022]. Available: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/>
- 408 2. Schneiders ML, Naemiratch B, Cheah PK, Cuman G, Poomchaichote T,
409 Ruangajorn S, et al. The impact of COVID-19 non-pharmaceutical
410 interventions on the lived experiences of people living in Thailand, Malaysia,
411 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

- 417 solid organ transplantation. *Pediatr Transplant*. 2022; e14243.
418 doi:10.1111/petr.14243
- 419 5. Buckley RM. Targeting the World's Slums as Fat Tails in the Distribution of
420 COVID-19 Cases. *Journal of Urban Health*. 2020. pp.
421 358–364. doi:10.1007/s11524-020-00450-w
- 422 6. Armand A, Augsburg B, Bancalari A, Augsburg B. Coping with COVID-19 in
423 Slums Evidence from India. 2020 [cited 17 Dec 2021]. Available:
424 [https://www.theigc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Armand-et-al-2020-Final-](https://www.theigc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Armand-et-al-2020-Final-report.pdf)
425 [report.pdf](https://www.theigc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Armand-et-al-2020-Final-report.pdf)
- 426 7. Christie A, Brooks JT, Hicks LA, Sauber-Schatz EK, Yoder JS, Honein MA.
427 Guidance for Implementing COVID-19 Prevention Strategies in the Context of
428 Varying Community Transmission Levels and Vaccination Coverage. *MMWR*
429 *Recomm Reports*. 2021;70: 1044–1047. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7030e2
- 430 8. WHO. Status of COVID-19 Vaccines within WHO EUL / PQ evaluation
431 process. WHO. World Health Organization; 2021. Available:
432 [https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/sites/default/files/documents/Status_of_COVID-](https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/sites/default/files/documents/Status_of_COVID-19_Vaccines_within_WHO_EUL-PQ_evaluation_process-16June2021_Final.pdf)
433 [19_Vaccines_within_WHO_EUL-PQ_evaluation_process-](https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/sites/default/files/documents/Status_of_COVID-19_Vaccines_within_WHO_EUL-PQ_evaluation_process-16June2021_Final.pdf)
434 [16June2021_Final.pdf](https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/sites/default/files/documents/Status_of_COVID-19_Vaccines_within_WHO_EUL-PQ_evaluation_process-16June2021_Final.pdf)
- 435 9. Haque N. Pakistan Urbanization: Achieving Progress and Development
436 through Urban Renewal. Policy Br Ser Pakistan's Urban. New York, USA.: The
437 Woodrow Wilson Center; 2013.
- 438 10. Haider M. Urban Transport Planning: Moving People and the Economy. Policy
439 Br Ser Pakistan's Urban. New York, USA.: The Woodrow Wilson Center; 2014.
- 440 11. Razai MS, Chaudhry UAR, Doerholt K, Bauld L, Majeed A. Covid-19
441 vaccination hesitancy. *BMJ*. 2021;373: 1136–1139. doi:10.1136/bmj.n1138
- 442 12. Clouston S, Kidman R, Palermo T. Social inequalities in vaccination uptake
443 among children aged 0-59 months living in Madagascar: An analysis of
444 Demographic and Health Survey data from 2008 to 2009. *Vaccine*. 2014;32:
445 3533–3539. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.04.030
- 446 13. Opel DJ, Lo B, Peek ME. Addressing mistrust about COVID-19 vaccines
447 among patients of color. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021;174: 698–700.
448 doi:10.7326/M21-0055
- 449 14. Opel DJ, Salmon DA, Marcuse EK. Building Trust to Achieve Confidence in
450 COVID-19 Vaccines. *JAMA Netw open*. 2020;3: e2025672.

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

- 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, Agle 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-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-vaccination-community-engagement-2021.1)
513 [community-engagement-2021.1](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-vaccination-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-](https://www.3ieimpact.org/sites/default/files/2019-01/3ie_immunisation_scoping_report_3.pdf)
523 [01/3ie_immunisation_scoping_report_3.pdf](https://www.3ieimpact.org/sites/default/files/2019-01/3ie_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=W1siZiIsIjIwMTUvMDQvMDIvMDYvMzcvMDYvMTE5L011bHRpcGxIX0luZGJjYXRvcl9DbHVzdGVyX1N1cnZleV9NYW51YWxfMjAwNS5wZGYiXV0&sha=dd2e54d1ddd61cdb>
- 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.sozioologie.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**