

# 1 Uptake of COVID-19 vaccines among healthcare workers 2 within primary healthcare facilities, Entebbe municipality

## 3 Uganda

4 N Kyakuwa<sup>1</sup>, C Atuhairwe<sup>2</sup>, H Kalute<sup>1</sup>, S Mpooya<sup>1</sup>, F Nakanjako<sup>1</sup>, L Perez<sup>3</sup>, B Kikaire<sup>4</sup>

5 1 Uganda Virus Research institute, 2 Uganda Martyrs University, 3 University of Lausanne, 4 Makerere University college of  
6 Health Sciences

## 7 Abstract

8 **Background:** Routine vaccination is an essential highly successfully public health  
9 intervention in the prevention of infectious diseases that greatly depends on high coverage, and  
10 health care workers (HCWs) who play a pivotal role in ensuring the high uptake of vaccines in  
11 the population. COVID-19 vaccines have been proven efficacious, and vaccination campaigns  
12 have been ongoing, however, there is a perceived high vaccine hesitancy among health care  
13 workers in Uganda. This study describes the level and determinants of uptake of COVID-19  
14 vaccines among HCWs in Entebbe municipality, Uganda.

15 **Materials and methods:** We conducted a health facility based cross-sectional study  
16 among HCWs from private and government health facilities in Entebbe municipality between  
17 July 2021 and August 2021. Structured questionnaires were used, and data were analysed using  
18 Stata version 12. We defined uptake as having received at least the first doze of COVID-19  
19 vaccine or completed the two dozes.

20 **Results:** The level of vaccine uptake was 65.6% with higher uptake among males than  
21 females. HCWs aged 30-39 years were 2.7 times more likely to have been vaccinated than  
22 those less than 30 years (OR 2.72, 95% CI: 1.26-5.88, P-value <0.01), and the odds of having  
23 been vaccinated were 4 times higher among health workers above 40 years (OR 4.29, 95% CI  
24 1.50-12.24, P-value < 0.01). Additionally, the odds of having been vaccinated were 4 times  
25 higher among health care workers that participated in COVID-19 vaccine related activities (OR  
26 4.18, 95% CI 2.16-8.10, p-value <0.001). Healthcare workers (98%) had confidence in the  
27 vaccines although 45% of those that were not vaccinated felt that the vaccines were ineffective.

28 **Conclusion.** Vaccine uptake among HCWs was relatively high compared to the WHO  
29 recommended uptake of 70% by mid-2022, although some HCWs were still hesitant. The  
30 convenience of vaccination services was an important factor in vaccine uptake. Hence,  
31 governments should endeavour to improve access to vaccination both for HCWs and the public.

## 32 **Background**

33 Vaccination is one of the cost-effective public health interventions in the control of infectious  
34 diseases in populations (1). The incidences of childhood vaccine preventable diseases such as  
35 measles, polio, pertussis have drastically decreased due to global vaccination campaigns (1, 2),  
36 and other infectious diseases such as influenza have been reduced through periodic vaccination  
37 programs (3, 4). Besides the direct effect of protection to the vaccinated individual, high  
38 vaccination coverage rates provide indirect benefits to the community through herd immunity  
39 (5, 6). This protection is important in reducing transmission rates thus decreasing the risk of  
40 infections among susceptible, un-vaccinated individuals within the community (7).

41 Although vaccination is globally accepted as one of the most successful measures in the control  
42 of infectious diseases, (8, 9) vaccine hesitancy persists in the population and health care

43 workers(HCWs) specifically (10) with some individuals perceiving vaccines as unsafe and  
44 unnecessary (11). Highest scepticism has been reported among those with highest level of  
45 education (12). Vaccine hesitancy among HCWs remains a public health threat (13), and is  
46 highly context-, vaccine-, and profession specific (14). Unvaccinated HCWs are at a risk of  
47 contracting infections from their patients, and similarly, patients could contract infections from  
48 HCWs. A study carried out among HCWs in Los Angeles showed that acceptance of COVID-  
49 19 vaccine varied with the role of HCWs with physicians and research scientists being more  
50 likely to take vaccines than others (15).

51 Globally, vaccination against SARS-COV-2 met hesitancy or low uptake which threatens the  
52 attainment of the WHO recommended uptake of 70% by mid-2022. Additionally, the relatively  
53 high risk of severe corona virus disease among the elderly and those with comorbidities  
54 increases COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among those perceived to be at low risk of severe  
55 disease. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance rates vary from region to region with Africa being one  
56 of the regions found with low rates of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance (16). A worldwide  
57 systematic review about COVID-19 vaccine acceptance among HCWs showed vaccine  
58 acceptance rates ranging from 27.7% in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to 78.1% in  
59 Israel (16) with many countries falling in between. The highest vaccine hesitancy to COVID-  
60 19 was reported in Cameroon (17). The major reasons reported by the hesitant people included;  
61 (i) being against vaccines in general; (ii) concerns about safety (thinking that a vaccine  
62 produced in a rush is too dangerous); (iii) considering the vaccine useless because of the  
63 harmless nature of COVID-19; (iv) general lack of trust; (v) doubts about the efficiency of the  
64 vaccine; (vi) belief to be already immunized; and (vii) doubt about the provenance of vaccine  
65 (18). While several studies have explored intentions to be vaccinated in the general population,  
66 few studies have assessed actual vaccine uptake, more so among HCWs. Therefore, the study

67 assessed the level of uptake of COVID-19 vaccines among HCWs within Entebbe municipality  
68 in Uganda.

## 69 **Materials and methods**

### 70 **Study Design, Setting and Participants**

71 A cross-section study design was used to assess the level of uptake and determinants of  
72 COVID-19 vaccine uptake among HCWs from Entebbe Municipality Wakiso District in  
73 Uganda between July and August 2021. Entebbe town has a population of 67 271 people. The  
74 municipality has 1 research centre, and 40 healthcare facilities 33 of which are privately owned  
75 while 7 are government owned facilities. The government health facilities are distributed as  
76 follows; i) one regional referral hospital, ii) one health centre IV, iii) three health centre III,  
77 and iv) 2 health centre II. The study was carried out in both private and primary health care  
78 government health facilities (II, III, & IV) including health research centers within Entebbe  
79 Municipality. The regional referral hospital was excluded due to a similar study that was  
80 ongoing at that time.

81 COVID-19 vaccination schedules in Entebbe was first prioritized for the elderly above 45  
82 years, those with other chronic illness, and workers in risky environments including healthcare  
83 workers. But later extended to all above 18years of age.

84 Participants were mainly HCWs providing direct clinical care to patients in community, health  
85 facility and or research centers. These included medical doctors, nurses, nursing assistants,  
86 allied health professionals, social workers, research scientists and other roles involving direct  
87 patient interaction. The study also included all non HCWs not involved in providing clinical  
88 services in health facilities and research centers, such as managers, receptionists, other  
89 administrative roles, cleaners, porters, janitors and other non-clinical roles.

90 Sample size was determined to be 304 participants using Daniel 1999 formula for one sample,  
91 using vaccine hesitance rate of 72,3% based on a study by Sellam et al(16) in Democratic  
92 Republic of Congo (DRC). The study was conducted during lockdown period and healthcare  
93 workers were working in shifts. Therefore, the anticipated non response was 20%  
94 (61participants) leading to a total 364 participants.

## 95 **Data source**

96 Data was collected using a structured questionnaire that was distributed either as a hard copy  
97 or electronically and stored and managed according to Uganda Virus Research Institute (UVRI)  
98 data management guidelines.

99 Level of uptake of COVID-19 vaccines for the different HCWs was reported as proportions,  
100 and the determinants of COVID-19 vaccine uptake were analyzed using logistic regression.

101 The study was conducted according to ICH/GCP and the national and international regulations  
102 for research in humans.

103 Ethical approval was obtained from UVRI Research Ethics Committee (REC).

104 Informed consent was sought from all participants. All information was kept confidential and  
105 safe under lock and key.

## 106 **COVID-19 risk management**

107 Research Assistants were provided with face masks and handed sanitizers throughout the study.

108 Both the research assistant and the participants wore masks during interviews. During  
109 interviews a physical distance of at least two meters was maintained between the participants  
110 and the research assistant. As much as possible interviews were conducted in an open space.

## 111 **Measurements**

112 The study outcome was uptake of COVID-19 vaccination either as initiation or completion.

113 The independent variables were the social demographics, healthcare level of service,  
114 profession, level of education, type of facility, testing for COVID-19, participation in COVID-  
115 19 vaccination activities, and having cared for a COVID-19 patient.

## 116 **Statistical analysis**

117 Data was analyzed using stata version 12

## 118 **Results**

### 119 **Level of uptake of COVID-19 vaccines**

120 Overall, 360(98.5%) healthcare workers in Entebbe municipality participated in study 236  
121 (65.6%) of whom had been vaccinated.

### 122 **Socio-demographic characteristics**

123 More than half of the participants were female 222 (61.7%) With a mean age of 31.0 years  
124 (SD± 7.95). Most of the participants had a Bachelors/diploma 263 (73.1%), 66 (18.3%) had  
125 completed Secondary level and 24(6.7%) had a Masters' degree. Majority 248 (68.9%) of the  
126 study participants were medical workers such as medical officers, nurses, dentists among  
127 others, while the non-medical workers included accountants, administrators, and security  
128 personnel. Of the 248 medical workers; 39.9% were nurses, 21.0% were laboratory personnel,  
129 10.9% were clinical officers (diploma level clinician), 8.8% were medical doctors and 19.3%  
130 belonged to other medical fields that included radiologists, pharmacists, physiotherapists,  
131 dental officers, and nutritionists. On the other hand, among 112 non-medical workers, more  
132 than half (52.6%) were support staff whereas 47.4% had administrative roles. Table 1 shows  
133 the social demographic factors of the respondents.

134 **Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents (N=360)**

Category	Vaccine uptake		
	Total (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)
<b>Gender</b>			
Female	222 (61.7)	71 (57.3)	151 (64.0)
Male	138 (38.3)	53 (42.7)	85 (36.0)
<b>Adult Age group</b>			
18-29 Years	191 (53.1)	83 (66.9)	108 (45.8)
30-39 Years	111 (30.8)	31 (25.0)	80 (33.9)
>40 years	58 (16.1)	10 (8.1)	48 (20.3)
<b>Level of education</b>			
Primary	7 (1.9)	4 (3.2)	3 (1.3)
Secondary	66 (18.3)	25 (20.2)	41 (17.4)
Diploma/Bachelors	263 (73.1)	92 (74.2)	171 (72.5)
Masters	24 (6.7)	3 (2.4)	21 (8.9)
<b>Job category</b>			
Medical	248 (68.9)	81 (65.3)	167 (70.8)
Non-medical	112 (31.1)	43 (34.7)	69 (29.2)
<b>Cadre/job title(n=248)</b>			
Consultant/senior consultant/Professor	3 (1.2)	1 (1.2)	2 (1.2)
Medical officer special grade/registrar	6 (2.4)	0 (0.0)	6 (3.6)
Medical officer/Dental surgeon	12 (4.8)	3 (3.7)	9 (5.4)
Intern doctor	1 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.6)
Clinical officer/Paramedic	27 (10.9)	8 (9.9)	19 (11.4)
Nursing officer/midwife	99 (39.9)	30 (37.0)	69 (41.3)
Laboratory technologist	52 (21.0)	25 (30.9)	27 (16.2)
Dental officer	3 (1.2)	1 (1.2)	2 (1.2)
Radiologist, Physiotherapists, pharmacists & nutritionists	45 (18.1)	13 (16.0)	32 (19.2)
<b>Non-medical (n=112)</b>			
Receptionist	13 (11.6)	6 (14.0)	7 (10.1)
Cashier	6 (5.4)	2 (4.7)	4 (5.8)
Administrator	29 (25.9)	10 (23.3)	19 (27.5)
Accountant	5 (4.5)	2 (4.7)	3 (4.3)
Cleaner	19 (17.0)	6 (14.0)	13 (18.8)
Security	14 (12.5)	8 (18.6)	6 (8.7)
Driver	4 (3.6)	1 (2.3)	3 (4.3)
Storekeeper/procurement	2 (1.8)	2 (4.7)	0 (0.0)
Executives & gardeners	20 (17.9)	6 (14.0)	14 (20.3)

135 The distribution of health workers' areas of operation is shown in Table 2. One hundred and  
136 three (28%) of the respondents worked in the out-patients department. Other work-areas  
137 included maternity 53 (14.7%), in-patient ward 19 (5.2%), operating theatres 1 (0.3%),  
138 intensive care unit 2 (0.6%), laboratory 59 (16.4%), ART clinic 12 (3.3%), non-clinical area 9  
139 (2.5%), administrative offices 47 (13.0%) and isolation rooms 1 (0.03%). Regarding the level

140 of service, the health workers worked at the following establishments: hospital 54 (15.0%),  
141 Health Centre IV 3 (0.8%), Health Centre II & III 144 (37.9%), medical centre 61 (16.9%),  
142 and private clinics 98 (27.2%).

143 **Table 2. Distribution of health service-related factors (N=360)**

Category	Vaccine uptake		
	Total (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)
<b>Area of operation</b>			
Out-patient	103 (28.6)	34 (27.4)	69 (29.2)
Maternity/Antenatal	53 (14.7)	18 (14.5)	35 (14.8)
In-patient ward	19 (5.3)	1 (0.8)	18 (7.6)
Operating theatre	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)
Intensive Care Unit	2 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.8)
Laboratory	59 (16.4)	28 (22.6)	31 (13.1)
ART clinic	12 (3.3)	3 (2.4)	9 (3.8)
Non-clinical area	9 (2.5)	4 (3.2)	5 (2.1)
Administrative office	47 (13.1)	14 (11.3)	33 (14.0)
Isolation wards/rooms	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)
Others	54 (15.0)	22 (17.7)	32 (13.6)
<b>Service providers</b>			
Hospital	54 (15.0)	17 (13.7)	37 (15.7)
Health centre IV	3 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	3 (1.3)
Health centre II & III	144 (37.9)	30 (20.8)	114 (79.2)
Medical centre	61 (16.9)	26 (21.0)	35 (14.8)
Private clinic	98 (27.2)	51 (41.1)	47 (19.9)
<b>Type of hospital ownership</b>			
Private not for profit (PNFP)	84 (23.3)	39 (31.5)	45 (19.1)
Private for profit (PFP)	146 (40.6)	72 (58.1)	74 (31.4)
Government	130 (36.1)	13 (10.5)	117 (49.6)
<b>Had ever cared for COVID-19 patients</b>			
No	134 (37.2)	54 (43.5)	80 (33.9)
Yes	226 (62.8)	70 (56.5)	156 (66.1)
<b>Had ever tested for COVID-19</b>			
No	89 (24.7)	58 (46.8)	31 (13.1)
Yes	271 (75.3)	66 (53.2)	205 (86.9)
<b>If YES, what were the results?</b>			
Negative	230 (84.9)	53 (80.3)	177 (86.3)
Positive	41 (15.1)	13 (19.7)	28 (13.7)
<b>Took part in COVID-19 vaccine activities</b>			
No	150 (41.7)	91 (73.4)	59 (25.0)
Yes	210 (58.3)	33 (26.6)	177 (75.0)

144



145 One hundred and forty-six (40%) of the health workers worked for Private-For-Profit (PFPs)  
 146 health facilities, while one hundred and thirty (36%) worked at government-run health  
 147 facilities.

## 148 **Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine uptake among** 149 **healthcare workers in Entebbe**

### 150 **Socio-demographic characteristics**

151 At bivariate analysis, the odds of being vaccinated were almost 10 times higher among health  
 152 workers who were 40 years and more (OR 9.33, 95% CI 1.36-63.60, P value = 0.02). The odds  
 153 of being vaccinated were 0.9 times lower among health workers who were female, but this was  
 154 not statistically significant (OR 0.93, CI 0.57-1.53, P value = 0.78). No other socio-  
 155 demographic factor was found to have a significant association with vaccine uptake (Table  
 156 3).

157 Table 3. Bivariate analysis of socio-demographic characteristics

Category	Vaccine Uptake			OR (95% CI)	p-value
	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total (%)		
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	53 (38.4)	85 (61.6)	138 (100.0)	Ref.	
Female	71 (32.0)	151 (68.0)	222 (100.0)	0.93 (0.57-1.53)	0.78
<b>Adult Age group</b>					
18-29 Years	83 (43.5)	108 (56.5)	191 (100.0)	Ref.	
30-39 Years	31 (27.9)	80 (72.1)	111 (100.0)	2.48 (0.54-11.31)	0.24
>40 years	10 (17.2)	48 (82.8)	58 (100.0)	9.33 (1.36-63.96)	0.02
<b>Level of education</b>					
Primary	4 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	7 (100.0)	0.55 (0.10-3.12)	0.50
Secondary	25 (37.9)	41 (62.1)	66 (100.0)	0.68 (0.25-1.86)	0.45
Diploma/Bachelors	92 (35.0)	171 (65.0)	263 (100.0)	1.59 (0.63-4.04)	0.33
Masters	3 (12.5)	21 (87.5)	24 (100.0)	Ref.	
<b>Job category</b>					
Medical	81 (32.7)	167 (67.3)	248 (100.0)	1.53 (0.93-2.53)	0.10
Non-medical	43 (38.4)	69 (61.2)	112 (100.0)	Ref.	
<b>Cadre/job title(n=248)</b>					

Consultant/senior consultant/Professor	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	3 (100.0)	0.43 (0.04-5.37)	0.51
Medical officer special grade/registrar	0 (0.0)	6 (100.0)	6 (100.0)	1.08 (0.11-10.56)	0.95
Medical officer/Dental surgeon	3 (25.0)	9 (75.0)	12 (100.0)	1.08 (0.20-5.92)	0.93
Intern doctor	0 (0.0)	1(100.0)	1 (100.0)	-	-
Clinical officer/Paramedic	8 (29.6)	19 (70.4)	27 (100.0)	0.75 (.231-2.478)	.645
Nursing officer/midwife	30 (30.3)	69 (69.7)	99 (100.0)	.714 (.292-1.749)	.46
Laboratory technologist	25 (48.1)	27 (51.9)	52 (100.0)	.649 (.241-1.744)	.391
Dental officer	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	3 (100.0)	.432 (.035-5.370)	.514
Radiologist, pharmacists & nutritionists	13 (28.9)	32 (71.1)	45 (100.0)	Ref.	
<b>Non-medical (n=112)</b>					
Receptionist	6 (46.2)	7 (53.8)	13 (100.0)	.292 (.062-1.368)	.118
Cashier	2 (33.3)	4 (66.7)	6 (100.0)	.50 (.066-3.770)	.501
Administrator	10 (34.5)	19 (65.5)	29 (100.0)	1.562 (.341-7.154)	.565
Accountant	2 (40.0)	3 (60.0)	5 (100.0)	-	-
Cleaner	6 (31.6)	13 (68.4)	19 (100.0)	.278 (.067-1.147)	.077
Security	8 (57.1)	6 (42.9)	14 (100.0)	.250 (.055-1.138)	.073
Driver	1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)	4 (100.0)	.750 (.061-9.270)	.823
Storekeeper/procurement	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0)	-	
Gardeners, executives	6 (30.0)	14 (70.0)	20 (100.0)	Ref	

158 †95% confidence intervals for odds ratios (OR) are in brackets, ref. reference category

159 \*p<0.05 at 5% level of significance, (-) OR could not be computed

## 160 Health service-related factors

161 Among the health service-related factors, working in the in-patient wards increased the odds  
 162 of having been vaccinated by more than 120 times (OR 12.38, 95% CI 1.54 -99.61), P-value  
 163 0.018. However, the 95% CI is wide, and these should be interpreted with caution. Similarly,  
 164 working in a hospital (OR 2.36, 95% CI 1.18-4.75), P-value 0.016 and working at a health II  
 165 or III level (OR 4.12, 95% CI 2.34-7.25), P-value <0.01 increased the odds of having been  
 166 vaccinated.

167 The health workers in privately-run health care facilities (Private-For-Profit & Private-Not-  
 168 For-Profit) were less likely to have been vaccinated compared to government facilities. The  
 169 odds of having been vaccinated were 87% less in the private not for profit (OR 0.13, 95% CI  
 170 0.06 – 0.33) P-value <0.001, and almost 90% less in private for-profit facilities (OR 0.09, 95%

171 CI 0.03- 0.20), P-value <0.001. More associations of health service-related factors and uptake  
172 of vaccines are in Table 4.

173 **Table 4. Health service factors and association with uptake of COVID-19 vaccines**

Category	Vaccine uptake			OR (95% CI)	p-value
	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total (%)		
<b>Area of operation</b>					
Out-patient	34 (33.0)	69 (67.0)	103 (100.0)	1.40 (0.71-2.76)	0.338
Maternity/Antenatal	18 (34.0)	35 (66.0)	53 (100.0)	1.34 (0.61-2.93)	0.469
In-patient ward	1 (5.3)	18 (94.7)	19 (100.0)	12.38 (1.54-99.61)	0.018*
Operating theatre	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	-	-
Intensive Care Unit	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	-	-
Laboratory	28 (47.5)	31 (52.5)	59 (100.0)	0.76 (0.36-1.60)	0.473
ART clinic	3 (25.0)	9 (75.0)	12 (100.0)	2.062 (0.50-8.49)	0.316
Non-clinical area	4 (44.4)	5 (55.6)	9 (100.0)	.859 (0.21-3.56)	0.835
Administrative office	14 (29.8)	33 (70.2)	47 (100.0)	1.62 (0.71-3.71)	0.253
Isolation wards/rooms	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	-	-
Others	54	22 (17.7)	32 (13.6)	Ref.	
<b>Service providers</b>					
Hospital	17 (31.5)	37 (68.5)	54 (100.0)	2.36 (1.18-4.75)	0.016
Health centre IV	0 (0.0)	3 (100.0)	3 (100.0)	-	-
Health centre II & III	30 (20.8)	114 (79.2)	144(100.0)	4.12 (2.34-7.25)	<.001
Medical centre	26 (42.6)	35 (57.4)	61 (100.0)	1.46 (0.77-2.78)	0.249
Private clinic	51 (52.0)	47 (48.0)	98 (100.0)	Ref	
<b>Type of ownership</b>					
Private not for profit (PNFP)	39 (46.4)	45 (53.6)	84 (100.0)	0.13 (0.06-0.33)	<.001
Private for profit (PFP)	72 (49.3)	74 (50.7)	146 (100.0)	0.09 (0.04-0.20)	<.001
Government	13 (10.0)	117 (90.0)	130 (100.0)	Ref.	
<b>Have ever cared for COVID-19 patients</b>					
No	54 (40.3)	80 (59.7)	134 (100.0)	Ref.	
Yes	70 (31.0)	156 (69.0)	226 (100.0)	1.50 (0.96-2.35)	0.073
<b>Have ever tested for COVID-19</b>					
No	58 (65.2)	31 (34.8)	89 (100.0)	Ref.	
Yes	66 (24.4)	205 (75.6)	271 (100.0)	5.81 (3.47-9.74)	<.001
<b>If YES, what were the results?</b>					
Negative	53 (23.0)	177 (77.0)	230 (100.0)	1.55 (0.75-3.20)	0.236
Positive	13 (31.7)	28 (68.3)	41 (100.0)	Ref.	
<b>Taken part in COVID-19 vaccine activities</b>					
No	91 (60.7)	59 (39.3)	150 (100.0)	Ref.	
Yes	33 (15.7)	177 (84.3)	210 (100.0)	8.27 (5.04-13.56)	<.001

174 †95% confidence intervals for odds ratios (OR) are in brackets, ref. reference category

175 \*p<0.05 at 5% level of significance, (-) OR could not be computed

176 At Multivariate analysis, respondents that were aged 30-39 years were 2.7 times more likely to  
 177 have been vaccinated than those less than 30 years (OR 2.72, 95% CI: 1.26-5.88, P value  
 178 <0.01), and the odds of having been vaccinated were 4 times higher among health workers  
 179 above 40 years (OR 4.29, 95% CI 1.50-12.24, P value < 0.01). Additionally, the odds of having  
 180 been vaccinated were 4 times higher among health care workers that participated in COVID-  
 181 19 vaccine related activities (OR 4.18, 95% CI 2.16-8.10, p-value <0.001).

182 The HCWs that worked in Private-Not-Profit (PNFP) organizations were less likely to have  
 183 been vaccinated (OR 0.23; 95% CI: 0.07-0.53, P value <0.001) or for Private-For-Profit (PFP)  
 184 organizations (OR 0.19; 95% CI: 0.05-0.48, P value <0.001).

185 A health worker with a negative test result was 1.7 times more likely to have been vaccinated  
 186 than one with a positive result (OR 1.79, 95% CI: 0.74-4.32, P value 0.12), however, this was  
 187 not significant. Table 5 has the details of the multivariate analysis.

188 **Table 5. Determinants of COVID-19 uptake**

Categories	Odds Ratio	95% C.I. for Odds Ratio	P-value
<b>Gender (male)</b>	1.985	1.006-3.916	0.048
<b>Age group</b>			
18-29	1		
30-39 Years	2.72	1.26-5.89	0.011
+40 Years	4.29	1.50-12.24	0.006
<b>Type of ownership</b>			
Government	1		
Private not for profit (PNFP)	0.23	0.09-0.57	<0.001
Private for profit (PFP)	0.19	0.08-0.42	<0.001
<b>Had cared for a coronavirus patient</b>			
Yes	0.73	0.37-1.45	0.365
<b>COVID-19 test results</b>			
Negative	1.79	0.74-4.32	0.199
<b>Participated in any COVID-19 vaccine related activities</b>			
Yes	4.18	2.16-8.11	<0.001

189 95% confidence intervals for odds ratios (OR), \*p<0.05 at 5% level of significance

## 190 **Discussion**

191 In this study, the uptake of COVID-19 vaccines among HCWs within Entebbe municipality  
192 was 65.6%. This uptake is close to the WHO globally recommended 70% vaccine uptake level  
193 by mid-2022 and the finding of Lubega et al 2021 who reported an uptake of up to 70% among  
194 health care workers in two hospitals in Uganda (19). Whereas Lubega studied health care  
195 workers in tertiary hospitals, this study was conducted among health care workers in primary  
196 health care units thus the differences in uptake of the vaccines. Our findings differ from a study  
197 in Nigeria that reported uptake rate of 33% that completed two doses of the COVID -19 vaccine  
198 (20). The Nigeria study was conducted in the early days of COVID-19 vaccine introduction,  
199 when many unknowns about the vaccine existed, while our study was carried out much later  
200 and after the highly fatal increase in mortality due to the delta variant of the COVID-19  
201 pandemic. It is probable that the relatively high uptake of vaccines by HCWs observed in our  
202 study was driven by the fear resulting from the ‘delta wave’. A multi-ethnic study in the UK  
203 healthcare workforce by Christopher A. Martins et al 2021 reported uptake rates of 64.5% (21),  
204 and this is similar to the findings of our study. A study by Maria L. Pacella-LaBarbara et al  
205 2021 among emergency HCWs in US (22) reported vaccine uptake of 79% which is much  
206 higher than what we found. This could be due to differences in risk perceptions by the HCWs  
207 in the two studies. Unlike in our study where the mean age was 31 years, the mean age study  
208 of participants in Maria’s was 41 years. It is well known that the risk of severe disease increases  
209 with increased age, therefore the difference in age could have led to a higher uptake in Maria’s  
210 study compared to ours. Furthermore, 29% of the participants had underlying health conditions,  
211 a variable that was not assessed for in this study.

212 Most studies both in Africa and globally have explored vaccine acceptance among HCWs and  
213 reported acceptance rates ranging between 50-70% (23-26). In Pakistan, vaccine acceptance

214 was reported at 70.2% (27) while in Canada, Stefania Dzieciolowska et al 2021 reported  
215 vaccine acceptance rate of 80.9% (28), and China reported vaccine acceptance of 86.2% (29).  
216 While these studies showed that health care workers were likely to take up COVID-19 vaccines  
217 once available, it should be noted that the actual uptake may be different from the intention  
218 (30, 31). Studies in the United Kingdom of Saudi Arabia showed that the intention of HCWs  
219 taking vaccination was 70%, but when they studied actual uptake, the acceptance rate was  
220 33.2% (26, 32). However as noted above few studies have explored the actual vaccine uptake  
221 and this requires further investigation.

222 We found that being at least forty years increased the odds of taking up the COVID-19  
223 vaccines. This is not surprising since the disease is known to preferentially affect the older  
224 people and other studies have reported similar findings (33-36). This age related perception of  
225 risk also explains why younger health care workers were less likely to be vaccinated, since the  
226 risk of severe disease has been reported to be low among younger age groups (37) although  
227 some studies have reported severe diseases among younger age groups. Andrea et al reported  
228 that almost 70% of the young ‘low risk’ with ongoing symptoms of COVID-19 had impairment  
229 in one or more organs four months after initial symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 infection (38). This  
230 study seems to suggest that even though low risk individuals have lower mortality rates, their  
231 severity of disease is seen by organ temporary impairment and follow up of this category is of  
232 public health importance.

233 The findings of our study showed that the men were more likely to be vaccinated as compared  
234 to women, which agrees with other studies (22, 25). Just like the age related risk perception,  
235 the male gender has been reported to suffer more severe acute respiratory distress syndrome  
236 compared to females (39-41) and this could have driven more men to seek vaccination.

237 Although a study in Western Uganda reported that having attained tertiary level of education  
238 increased the intention to be vaccinated (25) and Megan Halbrook et al, 2021 in California  
239 reported that vaccine uptake was associated with higher level of education (42), we found that  
240 level of education did not affect uptake of vaccines among health care workers in Entebbe.  
241 Level of education may increase perception of risk, and since HCWs have a good  
242 understanding of risk, their education level may thus not be a factor affecting actual uptake of  
243 vaccination.

244 Working at the in-patient departments was associated with increased uptake of the vaccines.  
245 Being hospitalized is an indicator of disease severity, hence, HCWs working in these  
246 departments care for more sick patients than their counterparts at out-patients. This brings  
247 about differences in risk perceptions. Having cared for patients suffering from COVID-19 also  
248 increased the likelihood of being vaccinated. This further emphasizes the risk perception.

249 The convenience/reliability of vaccination services is critical in vaccine uptake. In this study,  
250 we found out that being a government worker was associated with increased uptake of vaccines  
251 than working in private for profit and private not for profit healthy facilities. Rollout of  
252 COVID-19 vaccination in Uganda has been majorly in government hospital. This accessibility  
253 to vaccination services could have led to higher uptake among HCWs in these facilities. Similar  
254 studies have reported that accessibility to vaccine services played a key role in completion of  
255 vaccination schedules in children (43). The participation in COVID-19 vaccine related  
256 activities was associated with increased uptake of the vaccines. Participating in such activities  
257 builds vaccine confidence. HCWs who have been vaccinated are more likely to encourage their  
258 clients/patients to get vaccinated than the hesitant workers. These workers are trained and given  
259 more information about the vaccines which further builds confidence and trust in vaccines.  
260 However, no studies have been done in this area hence a need for further research.

261 The study further explored the relationship between previous testing for SARS-COV-2 and  
262 vaccine uptake among HCWs. We found out that HCWs who had ever tested for SARS-COV-2  
263 virus were more likely to take the vaccines than their counter parts. Similar findings were  
264 reported by Mazin Barry et al 2021 Participants who tested negative were more likely to take  
265 the vaccine. Testing positive was possibly taken as natural immunization, therefore, the HCWs  
266 didn't see the need to be vaccinated. More to this, there has been theoretical belief of immune  
267 enhancement of disease implying that those that tested positive could have feared to take the  
268 vaccine.

269 The study was carried out during lock down, and this was a limitation since participants were  
270 mainly reached via internet. Their assertion of having been vaccinated couldn't be verified.  
271 Random sampling was not possible due to prioritization of only essential workers and also  
272 working in shifts.

## 273 **Conclusion**

274 The study reported a high level of uptake of vaccines among HCWs within Entebbe  
275 municipality. However, there remains a significant proportion of HCWs who are hesitant to  
276 take vaccination and further studies are needed to understand and better address the reasons for  
277 the vaccine hesitancy.

278 The study found a relatively moderate uptake of vaccines among HCWs in Entebbe  
279 municipality. Confidence in vaccines and an enabling work environment are among the reasons  
280 that increased vaccine uptake. However, there remains a significant proportion of HCWs that  
281 is hesitant to take the COVID-19 vaccines and HCWs combined efforts to reduce this  
282 proportions are needed.



## 283 Recommendation

284 This study found out that uptake was improved by vaccine accessibility and participation in  
285 COVID-19 vaccination services. Hence, the government should ensure that vaccination  
286 services are accessible to HCWs and the general public. The involvement of private health  
287 facilities in the COVID-19 vaccination campaign would improve vaccine uptake both among  
288 HCWs and the general public. Further longitudinal studies involving multi stage health  
289 professionals exploring determinants of vaccine uptake is recommended as this will elicit an  
290 understanding of the drivers of vaccine hesitancy among HCWs.

## 291 Acknowledgment

292 We thank our study participants for accepting to take part in this study.

## 293 References

- 294 1. Andre FE, Booy R, Bock HL, Clemens J, Datta SK, John TJ, et al. Vaccination greatly reduces  
295 disease, disability, death and inequity worldwide. *Bulletin of the World health organization*.  
296 2008;86:140-6.
- 297 2. Fenner F. Global eradication of smallpox. *Reviews of infectious diseases*. 1982;4(5):916-30.
- 298 3. Preaud E, Durand L, Macabeo B, Farkas N, Sloesen B, Palache A, et al. Annual public health  
299 and economic benefits of seasonal influenza vaccination: a European estimate. *BMC public health*.  
300 2014;14(1):1-12.
- 301 4. Ohmit SE, Thompson MG, Petrie JG, Thaker SN, Jackson ML, Belongia EA, et al. Influenza  
302 vaccine effectiveness in the 2011–2012 season: protection against each circulating virus and the effect  
303 of prior vaccination on estimates. *Clinical infectious diseases*. 2014;58(3):319-27.
- 304 5. Brisson M, Edmunds WJ. Economic evaluation of vaccination programs: the impact of herd-  
305 immunity. *Medical Decision Making*. 2003;23(1):76-82.
- 306 6. Betsch C, Böhm R, Korn L, Holtmann C. On the benefits of explaining herd immunity in vaccine  
307 advocacy. *Nature human behaviour*. 2017;1(3):1-6.
- 308 7. Fine P, Eames K, Heymann DL. “Herd immunity”: a rough guide. *Clinical infectious diseases*.  
309 2011;52(7):911-6.
- 310 8. Gessner BD, Kaslow D, Louis J, Neuzil K, O'Brien KL, Picot V, et al. Estimating the full public  
311 health value of vaccination. *Vaccine*. 2017;35(46):6255-63.
- 312 9. Bloom DE, Fan VY, Sevilla J. The broad socioeconomic benefits of vaccination. *Science*  
313 *translational medicine*. 2018;10(441).
- 314 10. Hough-Telford C, Kimberlin DW, Aban I, Hitchcock WP, Almquist J, Kratz R, et al. Vaccine  
315 delays, refusals, and patient dismissals: a survey of pediatricians. *Pediatrics*. 2016;138(3).

- 316 11. Verger P, Collange F, Fressard L, Bocquier A, Gautier A, Pulcini C, et al. Prevalence and  
317 correlates of vaccine hesitancy among general practitioners: a cross-sectional telephone survey in  
318 France, April to July 2014. *Eurosurveillance*. 2016;21(47):30406.
- 319 12. Durbach N. 'They might as well brand us': working-class resistance to compulsory vaccination  
320 in Victorian England. *Social History of Medicine*. 2000;13(1):45-63.
- 321 13. Di Pietro ML, Poscia A, Teleman AA, Maged D, Ricciardi W. Vaccine hesitancy: parental,  
322 professional and public responsibility. *Annali dell'Istituto Superiore di Sanità*. 2017;53(2):157-62.
- 323 14. Paterson P, Meurice F, Stanberry LR, Glismann S, Rosenthal SL, Larson HJ. Vaccine hesitancy  
324 and healthcare providers. *Vaccine*. 2016;34(52):6700-6.
- 325 15. Shaw J, Stewart T, Anderson KB, Hanley S, Thomas SJ, Salmon DA, et al. Assessment of US  
326 health care personnel (HCP) attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination in a large university health care  
327 system. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2021.
- 328 16. Sallam M. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy worldwide: a concise systematic review of vaccine  
329 acceptance rates. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(2):160.
- 330 17. Dinga JN, Sinda LK, Titanji VP. Assessment of vaccine hesitancy to a COVID-19 vaccine in  
331 Cameroonian adults and its global implication. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(2):175.
- 332 18. Troiano G, Nardi A. Vaccine hesitancy in the era of COVID-19. *Public Health*. 2021.
- 333 19. Muhamadi L, Edith N, James W, Tumwesigye NM, Museene SK, Peterson SS, et al. Health  
334 workers Motivators to uptake of the Covid-19 vaccine at Iganga Hospital Eastern Uganda, and Mengo  
335 Hospital Kampala Uganda; A qualitative study. *medRxiv*. 2021.
- 336 20. Agha S, Chine A, Lalika M, Pandey S, Seth A, Wiyeh A, et al. Drivers of COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake  
337 amongst Healthcare Workers (HCWs) in Nigeria. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(10):1162.
- 338 21. Martin CA, Marshall C, Patel P, Goss C, Jenkins DR, Ellwood C, et al. Association of demographic  
339 and occupational factors with SARS-CoV-2 vaccine uptake in a multi-ethnic UK healthcare workforce:  
340 a rapid real-world analysis. *MedRxiv*. 2021.
- 341 22. Pacella-LaBarbara ML, Park YL, Patterson PD, Doshi A, Guyette MK, Wong AH, et al. COVID-19  
342 Vaccine Uptake and Intent Among Emergency Healthcare Workers: A Cross-Sectional Survey. *Journal*  
343 *of occupational and environmental medicine*. 2021;63(10):852.
- 344 23. El-Sokkary RH, El Seifi OS, Hassan HM, Mortada EM, Hashem MK, Gadelrab MRMA, et al.  
345 Predictors of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among Egyptian healthcare workers: a cross-sectional study.  
346 *BMC infectious diseases*. 2021;21(1):1-9.
- 347 24. Amuzie CI, Odiini F, Kalu KU, Izuka M, Nwamoh U, Emma-Ukaegbu U, et al. COVID-19 vaccine  
348 hesitancy among healthcare workers and its socio-demographic determinants in Abia State,  
349 Southeastern Nigeria: a cross-sectional study. *The Pan African Medical Journal*. 2021;40.
- 350 25. Echoru I, Ajambo PD, Keirania E, Bukenya EE. Sociodemographic factors associated with  
351 acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine and clinical trials in Uganda: a cross-sectional study in western  
352 Uganda. *BMC public health*. 2021;21(1):1-8.
- 353 26. Elharake JA, Galal B, Alqahtani SA, Kattan RF, Barry MA, Temsah M-H, et al. COVID-19 vaccine  
354 acceptance among health care workers in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of*  
355 *Infectious Diseases*. 2021;109:286-93.
- 356 27. Malik A, Malik J, Ishaq U. Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine in Pakistan among health care  
357 workers. *medRxiv*. 2021.
- 358 28. Dzieciolowska S, Hamel D, Gadio S, Dionne M, Gagnon D, Robitaille L, et al. Covid-19 vaccine  
359 acceptance, hesitancy, and refusal among Canadian healthcare workers: A multicenter survey.  
360 *American journal of infection control*. 2021.
- 361 29. Xu B, Gao X, Zhang X, Hu Y, Yang H, Zhou Y-H. Real-world acceptance of COVID-19 vaccines  
362 among healthcare workers in perinatal medicine in China. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(7):704.
- 363 30. Godin G, Bélanger-Gravel A, Eccles M, Grimshaw J. Healthcare professionals' intentions and  
364 behaviours: A systematic review of studies based on social cognitive theories. *Implementation science*.  
365 2008;3(1):1-12.

- 366 31. Brewer NT, Chapman GB, Rothman AJ, Leask J, Kempe A. Increasing vaccination: putting  
367 psychological science into action. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*. 2017;18(3):149-207.
- 368 32. Barry M, Temsah M-H, Aljamaan F, Saddik B, Al-Eyadhy A, Alanazi S, et al. COVID-19 vaccine  
369 uptake among healthcare workers in the fourth country to authorize BNT162b2 during the first month  
370 of rollout. *MedRxiv*. 2021.
- 371 33. Roy J, Jain R, Golamari R, Vunnam R, Sahu N. COVID-19 in the geriatric population.  
372 *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*. 2020;35(12):1437-41.
- 373 34. Li H, Wang S, Zhong F, Bao W, Li Y, Liu L, et al. Age-dependent risks of incidence and mortality  
374 of COVID-19 in Hubei Province and other parts of China. *Frontiers in medicine*. 2020;7:190.
- 375 35. Docherty A, Harrison E, Green C, Hardwick H, Pius R, Norman L, et al. Features of 20 133 UK  
376 patients in hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: Prospective  
377 observational cohort study. *BMJ*. 2020;369.
- 378 36. Perrotta F, Corbi G, Mazzeo G, Boccia M, Aronne L, D'Agnano V, et al. COVID-19 and the  
379 elderly: insights into pathogenesis and clinical decision-making. *Aging Clin Exp Res*. 2020:1599-608.
- 380 37. Kang S-J, Jung SI. Age-related morbidity and mortality among patients with COVID-19.  
381 *Infection & chemotherapy*. 2020;52(2):154.
- 382 38. Dennis A, Wamil M, Alberts J, Oben J, Cuthbertson DJ, Wootton D, et al. Multiorgan  
383 impairment in low-risk individuals with post-COVID-19 syndrome: a prospective, community-based  
384 study. *BMJ open*. 2021;11(3):e048391.
- 385 39. Karlberg J, Chong D, Lai W. Do men have a higher case fatality rate of severe acute respiratory  
386 syndrome than women do? *American journal of epidemiology*. 2004;159(3):229-31.
- 387 40. Leong H-N, Earnest A, Lim H-H, Chin C-F, Tan CS, Puhaindran ME, et al. SARS in Singapore-  
388 predictors of disease severity. *Annals-Academy of Medicine Singapore*. 2006;35(5):326.
- 389 41. Conti P, Younes A. Coronavirus COV-19/SARS-CoV-2 affects women less than men: clinical  
390 response to viral infection. *J Biol Regul Homeost Agents*. 2020;34(2):339-43.
- 391 42. Halbrook M, Gadoth A, Martin-Blais R, Gray AN, Kashani S, Kazan C, et al. Longitudinal  
392 assessment of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and uptake among frontline medical workers in Los  
393 Angeles, California. *Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases  
394 Society of America*. 2021.
- 395 43. Malande OO, Munube D, Afaayo RN, Annet K, Bodo B, Bakainaga A, et al. Barriers to effective  
396 uptake and provision of immunization in a rural district in Uganda. *PloS one*. 2019;14(2):e0212270.