

1 **COVID-19 vaccine information, misinformation, and vaccine uptake in Malawi.**

2 John Songo^{1*}, Hannah S. Whitehead^{2*}, Khumbo Phiri¹, Pericles Kalande¹, Eric Lungu¹, Sam Phiri^{1,3},

3 Joep J. van Oosterhout^{1,2}, Agnes Moses¹, Risa M. Hoffman², Corrina Moucheraud⁴

4 ** co-first authors*

5 **Affiliations**

6 ¹Partners in Hope, Lilongwe, Malawi;

7 ²Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, David Geffen School of Medicine, UCLA, Los
8 Angeles, California, USA;

9 ³Department of Public Health and Family Medicine, Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Lilongwe,
10 Malawi

11 ⁴Department of Health Policy and Management, Fielding School of Public Health, UCLA, Los Angeles,
12 California, USA

13 Corresponding Author: **John Songo**

14 Email: **pemphosongo@gmail.com**

15

16

17

18

19 **Abstract**

20 *Background:* COVID-19 vaccine information – including source, content, and tone – may be an important
21 determinant of vaccination, but this dynamic is not well-understood in low-income countries where
22 COVID-19 vaccine uptake remains low. We assessed the COVID-19 vaccine information environment in
23 Malawi, and its correlation with vaccine uptake.

24 *Methods:* A survey was administered among 895 adult (≥ 18 years) clients at 32 Malawian health facilities
25 in mid-2022. Respondents reported their COVID-19 vaccination history, exposure to information about
26 the COVID-19 vaccine from different sources and its tone (positive, negative, or neutral/factual), and
27 whether they had heard of and believed in ten COVID-19 and COVID-19 vaccine conspiracy theories.
28 We described the COVID-19 vaccine information environment in Malawi and used logistic regression
29 analyses to assess the association of exposure to information sources and conspiracy theories with uptake
30 of the COVID-19 vaccine.

31 *Results:* Respondents had received information about the COVID-19 vaccine most commonly from
32 friends and neighbors, healthcare workers, and radio (each reported by $>90\%$). Men, urban residents, and
33 respondents with a higher education level were exposed to more COVID-19 vaccine information sources.
34 COVID-19 vaccine uptake was positively associated with exposure to a greater number of COVID-19
35 vaccine information sources (aOR 1.09, 95% CI 1.03-1.15), and more positive information (aOR 4.33,
36 95% CI 2.17-8.64) – and was negatively associated with believing COVID-19 vaccine conspiracy
37 theories to be true (OR 0.76, 95% CI 0.68-0.87).

38 *Conclusions:* Malawian adults were exposed to a variety of COVID-19 vaccine information sources, with
39 less access to information among women, rural residents, and people with lower educational attainment.
40 Exposure to misinformation was common, though infrequently believed. Vaccination was associated with
41 exposure to high number of COVID-19 vaccine information sources, exposure to positive vaccine
42 information and endorsing fewer conspiracy theories. Vaccination programs should disseminate
43 communication with positive messaging, through multiple information sources, prioritizing the less
44 exposed groups we identified.

45

46

47

48 **Key words:** COVID-19, COVID-19 vaccine, vaccine up-take, COVID-19 vaccine information.

49 **Background**

50 During public health crises, information can shape individuals' knowledge of and/or attitudes about health
51 interventions, and ultimately inform their behaviors (1,2). The COVID-19 pandemic, which occurred
52 amidst widespread technology use and social media connectedness, was deemed an “infodemic” by the
53 World Health Organization – i.e., it was characterized by an “overabundance of information,” both
54 accurate and misleading, about the virus, its origins, and control measures, including vaccines (3).
55 Misinformation about vaccines – i.e., incorrect or misleading information – can contribute to vaccine
56 hesitancy (4). The spread of vaccination misinformation accelerated during the COVID-19 pandemic (5)
57 and has been linked to decreased COVID-19 vaccination intent and behavior (6,7).

58 Two years into widespread availability of COVID-19 vaccines, most people in low-income countries have
59 still not been vaccinated (8); and the COVID-19 information and misinformation landscape in these
60 settings - and its association with vaccine uptake - remains poorly understood (9). In Malawi, a low-
61 income country in southeastern Africa that has recorded nearly 90,000 cumulative confirmed COVID-19
62 cases and close to 3,000 deaths (10), only approximately 1 in 4 people have received a COVID-19
63 vaccination (11). Misconceptions and conspiracy theories about the COVID-19 vaccine have been
64 documented in Malawi and throughout the region (12–14).

65 Globally, much of the literature on the COVID-19 “infodemic” focuses on the dissemination of
66 (mis)information online and via social media (15,16), but it is not well-understood whether the internet is
67 a major source of COVID-19 information in low-income countries. In countries like Malawi, access to
68 technology is rapidly changing and there is a need to understand what this means for the spread of
69 information during public health crises like the COVID-19 pandemic. Understanding what information
70 people are exposed to, the sources and tone of this information, and how this information influences
71 behaviors may help to inform vaccination promotion strategies in settings with low vaccine uptake. To
72 this end, we conducted a survey to describe the information environment about COVID-19 and the
73 COVID-19 vaccine in Malawi, and assessed how individuals' exposure to information (from different
74 sources, of differing tone) is correlated with vaccine uptake.

75

76 **METHODS**

77 *Study design, site & participant selection*

78 We conducted a cross-sectional survey of adults presenting at 32 purposefully-selected health facilities
79 supported by Partners In Hope (PIH), a Malawian non-governmental organization that assists with
80 implementation of the National HIV program across Malawi. Sites were selected to represent public and
81 faith-based health facilities in urban, peri-urban, and rural areas across all three of Malawi's regions
82 (Northern, Central, and Southern). Eligible clients were at least 18 years old and visited a selected facility
83 for care at an outpatient department (OPD), antiretroviral therapy (ART), or non-communicable disease
84 (NCD) clinic during a time when the COVID-19 vaccine was available to the general public in Malawi.
85 We used systematic random sampling (every second individual in queue to see a provider was
86 approached) to invite individuals to participate in the survey.

87 *Survey Domains and Variable Definitions*

88 The survey included questions asking whether respondents had been exposed to COVID-19 vaccine
89 information from different sources, and if so, whether the information was positive, negative, or
90 neutral/factual in tone. Respondents were also asked whether they had heard of ten common conspiracy
91 theories about COVID-19 and the COVID-19 vaccine and if they believed them to be true; these 10
92 pieces of misinformation were selected by study team members as relevant to and circulating in Malawi
93 from among those included in two prior COVID-19 surveys done in the UK and USA (17,18). We asked
94 respondents about their experiences with COVID-19 and with COVID-19 vaccines, including vaccination
95 details for those vaccinated (number of doses received, location, manufacturer, timing).
96 The survey instrument was developed in English and translated to Chichewa, the local language; it was
97 then reviewed by bilingual (English/Chichewa) study team members to ensure clarity and meaning.
98 *Exposure to COVID-19 vaccine information* was assessed by asking respondents if they had heard any
99 information about the COVID-19 vaccine from thirteen different potential sources of information,

100 spanning traditional media (newspaper; radio; television), health system and the government (health care
101 provider; government/Ministry of Health), community figures (church or religious leaders; traditional
102 medicine practitioner), personal relations (family member; friend; neighbor/community member), and
103 social media (posts on Facebook, Instagram or Twitter from a known person; posts from an organization,
104 company, or someone not known personally; conversations/groups in a messaging app such as WhatsApp
105 or Facebook Messenger). In analysis, “friend” and “neighbor/community member” were combined and
106 considered as a single information source. Exposure to information was quantified as the *count* of the
107 number of different information sources reported, as well as the *proportion* of respondents who had heard
108 information from a source.

109 *Tone of COVID-19 vaccine information* was measured as follows: for each source that a respondent
110 reported hearing COVID-19 vaccine information from, they were asked whether they felt the information
111 was overall positive, negative, neutral/factual, a mix of positive and negative, or that they did not know
112 the tone of the information. In analysis, these responses were combined into three categories: positive or
113 neutral, mixed tone or unknown, and negative. To quantify tone of information, for each respondent, we
114 calculated the *proportion* of the information sources they reported exposure to that were positive or
115 negative in tone (i.e., number of positive information sources divided by the total number of information
116 sources exposed to), as well as *counts* of the number of positive or negative information sources.

117 Respondents were also asked who they *trusted the most* to give them advice regarding COVID-19
118 vaccine.

119 *Vaccine uptake* was defined as having received any (1 or more) doses of any manufacturer’s COVID-19
120 vaccine (Johnson & Johnson, AstraZeneca or Pfizer).

121 *Exposure to COVID-19 misinformation* was characterized by asking whether the respondents had heard
122 10 common conspiracy theories about COVID-19 and the COVID-19 vaccine (17,18) and quantified as
123 the *count* of heard conspiracy theories. For each conspiracy theory that the respondent had heard of, they
124 were asked whether they believed it to be true, false, or did not know whether it was true or false.

125 *Endorsement of COVID-19 misinformation* was quantified as both the *proportion* of heard conspiracies

126 believed to be true (number of conspiracies believed to be true divided by the number of conspiracy
127 theories heard), as well as the *count* of conspiracies believed to be true.

128

129 ***Data Collection***

130 The survey was administered face-to-face as an interviewer-administered survey, in a private area within
131 the health facility by a trained research assistant. All respondents provided oral informed consent for
132 anonymous data collection prior to commencing the survey, and all responses were recorded using the
133 SurveyCTO mobile data collection platform on Android tablets. All respondents received 4000 Malawi
134 kwacha (approximately US\$5) as compensation for opportunity costs.

135 Data were collected from 19 May to 30 June, 2022. At the time of data collection, all adults 18 years of
136 age or older were eligible to receive the COVID-19 vaccine in Malawi. Ethical approval for the study
137 was obtained from the National Health Sciences Research Committee in Malawi (#2883) and the
138 University of California Los Angeles Institutional Review Board (#22-000380).

139

140 ***Data analysis***

141 We described sample characteristics, exposure to, and tone of COVID-19 vaccine information, and
142 exposure to and endorsement of COVID-19 misinformation. Exposure to COVID-19 conspiracy theories
143 was also visualized with a heat map table, in which cells were color-coded ranging from bright green
144 (smallest proportion of respondents had heard theory) to red (highest proportion of respondents had heard
145 theory). Chi-square tests, t-tests, and multivariable logistic regression models were used to assess whether
146 these variables were associated with various socio-demographic characteristics. We used multivariable
147 logistic regression models to assess whether COVID-19 vaccine uptake was associated with exposure to
148 and tone of COVID-19 vaccine information, or exposure to and endorsement of COVID-19 vaccine
149 misinformation. All multivariable logistic models were adjusted for gender, residence (urban/rural), age,
150 HIV status, and education. All analyses were conducted using Stata v17.

151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161

RESULTS

A total of 944 individuals were approached for participation in this survey; 46 declined to be screened or to consent to participation, and 3 were found to be ineligible (<18 years of age) during screening. The remaining 895 individuals (94.8% of those approached) completed the survey and are included in this analysis. Nearly half (43%) of respondents had received at least one dose of a COVID-19 vaccine. Over half of the respondents were female (57%) and three-quarters (75%) were married (Table 1). The majority of the respondents were residing in rural areas (82%), were employed (68%) and identified as Christian (91%).

	n	%
Gender		
Male	382	42.7
Female	513	57.3
Age		
18-29	216	24.1
30-39	239	26.7
40-49	225	25.1
50-59	122	13.6
60+	93	10.4
Marital status		
Unmarried	226	25.3
Married	669	74.7
Place of residence		
Urban	158	17.7
Rural	737	82.3
Religious		
Christian	818	91.4
Other religion	50	5.6
Not religious	27	3.0

Educational attainment		
No school	250	27.9
Primary school	401	44.8
Secondary school	213	23.8
Beyond secondary	31	3.5
Employment status		
Employed	610	68.2
Not employed	285	31.8
Household income over past 12 months		
Insufficient	277	32.7
Just met expenses	443	52.3
Allowed for saving	127	15.0
COVID-19 vaccination status		
Unvaccinated	510	57.0
Vaccinated (1+ doses of any COVID-19 vaccine)	385	43.0

162

163 **Information about COVID-19 vaccines**

164 *Exposure to information about COVID-19 vaccine*

165 All but one survey respondent had heard information about COVID-19 vaccines from at least one source.

166 Respondents had been exposed to information from a median of 7 sources (IQR 6-9). The most common

167 sources were friends and neighbors, health care workers, and radio – each reported by >90% of

168 respondents (Figure 1). Receiving vaccine information from a traditional medicine practitioner was least

169 common (3% of respondents), followed by social media, messaging apps, television and newspapers,

170 each reported by 25-35% of respondents.

171 **Figure 1:** Exposure to information about COVID-19 vaccine, by source and tone.

172

173 Men, urban residents, and respondents with a higher education level were exposed to a higher mean

174 number of COVID-19 vaccine information sources (men 8.2 vs. women 6.9; $p < 0.001$; urban 8.6 vs. rural

175 7.2; $p < 0.001$; secondary or higher education 9.3 vs. primary school or less 6.8; $p < 0.001$). No differences
176 were seen in the mean number of information sources by age, HIV status, or marital status.

177
178 Among specific information sources, men were significantly more likely than women to have heard
179 COVID-19 information from nearly all sources, as were people with more educational attainment (Figure
180 2). Significantly less rural respondents reported exposure to information from traditional media
181 (newspaper, television, radio) and social media than rural residents (OR 0.23, 95%CI: 0.079-0.609, $p =$
182 0.004)

183
184 **Figure 2:** Odds of having received COVID-19 vaccine information from various sources, by respondent
185 characteristics.

186
187 *Tone of information about COVID-19 vaccine*
188 Information about COVID-19 from health care workers, the government/Ministry of Health, religious
189 leaders, friends and family, and traditional media (newspapers, television, radio) was largely (>80%)
190 perceived as positive or neutral (Figure 1). Approximately one-fifth of people exposed to COVID-19
191 vaccine information on social media and messaging apps felt it was negative in tone and so did half of the
192 people exposed to COVID-19 vaccine information from traditional medicine practitioners.

193
194 Women reported that a greater share of their information sources about COVID-19 vaccine was negative
195 in tone: on average, women considered 10.2% of their information sources about COVID-19 vaccines
196 negative in tone, versus 7.6% for men ($p = 0.015$). Respondents with lower educational attainment reported
197 that a lower share of their information sources was negative in tone (29% for those with a primary school
198 education or less, versus 32% for those with secondary school education or higher, $p = 0.034$). No
199 differences were seen by HIV status, area of residence, or marital status.

200

201 *Most trusted information sources*

202 Respondents were asked who they trust most for advice regarding the COVID-19 vaccine. A healthcare
203 provider was selected most often (69.4%), followed by a community health worker (22.1%); family,
204 friends, religious leaders, and celebrities were selected infrequently (0.2-5% of respondents each).
205 Unvaccinated individuals were twice as likely to most trust family, friends, or a religious leader for
206 COVID-19 vaccine information as individuals who had been vaccinated (10.6% versus 5.2%, $p=0.017$).
207 No significant differences in trusted information were seen by gender, HIV status, age, or education level.

208

209 *Association of COVID-19 vaccine information with vaccine uptake*

210 Having received information about COVID-19 vaccines from more sources was positively associated
211 with COVID-19 vaccine uptake, with each additional source increasing vaccination probability by 9%
212 (OR 1.09, 95% CI 1.03-1.15). Among subgroups, this relationship was found primarily among men (OR:
213 1.13, 95% CI: 1.04-1.23), respondents 40 years and older (OR: 1.15, 95% CI: 1.06-1.24), people living
214 with HIV (OR: 1.17, 95% CI: 1.09-1.27), and those with a secondary school education or higher (OR:
215 1.15, 95% CI: 1.03-1.28) (Appendix 1). Adjusting for gender, residence (urban/rural), age, HIV status,
216 and education, the positive association between information exposure (number of reported sources) and
217 COVID-19 vaccination persisted (aOR 1.08, 95% CI 1.01-1.15) and the odds of vaccination was higher
218 when respondents reported a greater proportion of COVID-19 information being positive in tone (aOR
219 4.33, 95% CI 2.17-8.64).

220

221 **Misinformation about COVID-19 vaccines**

222 *Exposure to misinformation about COVID-19 and COVID-19 vaccines*

223 Respondents reported having heard a median of 5 of the 10 surveyed conspiracy theories. The most
224 commonly heard were “The spread of COVID-19 is a deliberate attempt to reduce the size of the global
225 population” (80.7% of respondents) and “The COVID-19 virus is a hoax” (74.1% of respondents) (Figure
226 3).

227

228 **Figure 3:** Heat map displaying the proportion of survey respondents (overall, by gender, and by place of
229 residence) who reported hearing of 10 common COVID-19 conspiracies. Color scale spans from bright
230 green (smallest proportion) to red (highest proportion).

231

232 Men, respondents with higher educational attainment, and urban respondents were exposed to a higher
233 mean number of conspiracy theories: men 5.5 versus women 4.8 ($p=0.0001$); urban residents 5.7 versus
234 rural residents 5.0 ($p=0.002$), and individuals with a secondary school education or higher heard 5.9
235 versus those with primary school or less 4.8 ($p<0.001$).

236

237 *Endorsing misinformation about COVID-19 vaccines*

238 Most respondents (72%) did not believe any of the 10 conspiracy theories to be true. Overall, respondents
239 endorsed (believed to be true) a mean of 0.56 conspiracy theories; this increased to a mean of 1.96 among
240 the 254 respondents who believed in at least one conspiracy theory. Younger age groups, urban
241 respondents and respondents with higher education attainment endorsed more conspiracy theories: 18–39-
242 year-olds endorsed 0.66 conspiracy theories versus 0.45 among 40+ year olds ($p = 0.007$), urban
243 respondents endorsed 0.75 versus 0.51 among rural respondents ($p=0.01$), and individuals with a
244 secondary school education or higher endorsed 0.76 versus 0.48 among those with primary school or less
245 ($p=0.001$)

246

247 The most commonly endorsed myths were “The government is exaggerating the number of COVID-19
248 deaths” (22.7%), “Big pharmaceutical companies created COVID-19 to profit from vaccines” (17.3%),
249 “The spread of COVID-19 is a deliberate attempt to reduce the size of the global population” (16.9%) and
250 “Bill Gates has created COVID-19 in order to reduce the world population” (15.2%) (Table 2).

251

252 *Association with COVID-19 vaccine uptake*

253
 254 Exposure to a greater number of COVID-19 conspiracy theories was associated with increased odds of
 255 vaccine uptake (OR 1.10, 95% CI 1.05-1.16), while endorsing more conspiracy theories was associated
 256 with lower odds of COVID-19 vaccine uptake (OR 0.76, 95% CI 0.68-0.87). This association between
 257 conspiracy theory endorsement and vaccine uptake remained significant in univariate analyses among all
 258 considered subgroups (by gender, HIV status, age, and education) except urban residents (Appendix
 259 Table 2).
 260

Table 2: Endorsement of 10 common conspiracy theories and association with COVID-19 vaccine uptake

Conspiracy theory	% Believe true, among those who have heard of the conspiracy theory	Odds of vaccination if believed theory to be true		
		OR	95% CI	p-value
The government is exaggerating the number of COVID-19 deaths	22.7	0.75	0.50-1.10	0.14
Big pharmaceutical companies created COVID-19 to profit from vaccines	17.3	0.44	0.26-0.75	0.00
The spread of COVID-19 is a deliberate attempt to reduce the size of the global population	16.9	0.33	0.21-0.52	0.00
Bill Gates has created COVID-19 in order to reduce the world population	15.2	0.4	0.20-0.80	0.01
Deaths due to COVID-19 are being intentionally hidden by the government	10.7	0.71	0.34-1.50	0.37
The COVID-19 vaccine can change your DNA	8.4	0.13	0.04-0.46	0.00
You can get COVID-19 from the vaccine	5.5	0.23	0.07-0.82	0.02
The COVID-19 vaccine will be used to carry out mass sterilization	4.1	0.27	0.09-0.82	0.01
COVID-19 vaccines have been shown to cause infertility	3.1	0.23	0.06-0.81	0.02
The COVID-19 virus is a hoax	2.9	0.22	0.06-0.75	0.01

261
 262
 263 Respondents who believed that COVID-19 vaccines can change your DNA had the lowest odds of
 264 vaccination (OR 0.13, 95% CI 0.04-0.46), followed by those who believed that the COVID-19 virus is a
 265 hoax (OR 0.22, 95% CI 0.06-0.75) compared to those who believed these conspiracy theories to be false
 266 or didn't know. Believing that the government is exaggerating the number of COVID-19 deaths and that
 267 deaths due to COVID-19 are being intentionally hidden by government were not associated with vaccine
 268 uptake.

269
 270 **DISCUSSION**

271 In a survey of adults presenting at health facilities in Malawi conducted while the COVID-19 vaccine was
272 available to the general public, we found that people hear COVID-19 vaccine information from a variety
273 of sources, and exposure to information – including the source, content, and tone – is associated with
274 COVID-19 vaccine uptake. Exposure to more sources of information and to positive information were
275 strongly associated with vaccine uptake. Endorsement of common COVID-19 conspiracy theories –
276 though quite uncommon – was associated with decreased odds of vaccination.

277
278 Respondents heard COVID-19 vaccine information from a mean of 7 different sources. The 3 most
279 common sources were peers, health care providers, and the radio. Information from health care providers,
280 the Ministry of Health, traditional media, and church or religious leaders was mostly perceived as
281 positive. Health care providers were reported as the most trusted source of COVID-19 vaccine
282 information, as has been reported in other settings in sub-Saharan Africa (19,20). Information from peers
283 (friends, neighbors, and community members) was largely mixed in tone, while information from social
284 media, messaging apps, and traditional medicine practitioners was mostly perceived to be negative in
285 tone. We found that the odds of vaccine uptake increased as the proportion of information sources that
286 were positive in tone increased. Additionally, most people in our sample had heard several conspiracy
287 theories about COVID-19, and endorsement of misinformation, while uncommon, was associated with
288 decreased odds of vaccination. Negative vaccine information and misinformation have been reported in
289 Malawi (21) and the harmful impacts on vaccine uptake have been well researched (5,15,16). Our
290 findings underline the need for greater monitoring and action against vaccine information that is negative
291 in tone as well as information that is intentionally misleading (15).

292
293 The degree of exposure to COVID-19 vaccine information varied across socio-demographic groups, with
294 men, urban respondents, and individuals with more education tending to report exposure to a greater
295 number of both vaccine information sources and conspiracy theories, likely reflecting greater literacy,
296 internet/mobile penetration, and media access among these groups. Given the association between greater

297 information exposure and vaccine uptake, these findings bolster previous studies that have found higher
298 COVID-19 vaccine acceptance among males and individuals with more education (22). We also found
299 greater endorsement of conspiracy theories among younger, less educated and urban respondents,
300 possibly explaining findings from previous studies in sub-Saharan Africa that younger (23) and urban
301 (24) respondents are more likely to be vaccine hesitant or believe in certain COVID-19 conspiracy
302 theories, but conflicting with findings from Ghana that individuals with higher education are more likely
303 to be vaccine hesitant(24). Our findings highlight demographic groups that may need to be reached with
304 COVID-19 vaccine information, as well as where to target efforts at countering misinformation.

305
306 Our results point to important implications for programming to encourage COVID-19 vaccine uptake.
307 Our finding that exposure to more information sources and information that is positive in tone is
308 associated with increased vaccine uptake adds to an emerging literature on this topic (25,26) and is the
309 first of its kind in Africa. This positive relationship has direct implications for communication strategies
310 aimed at increasing vaccination. Campaigns should disseminate positive information through a variety of
311 sources, and aim to reach less-exposed populations (such as women, rural residents, and those with less
312 education) via multiple information sources, particularly those that have been shown to predominantly
313 disseminate positive vaccine information (e.g., radio, television, or health care workers). Trust in
314 healthcare workers should be leveraged by positioning them as spokespeople and vaccine “champions”,
315 and by training them to share accurate, factual information about COVID-19 vaccines during one-on-one
316 clinical encounters. While found to be low in our sample, endorsement of misinformation should be
317 closely monitored, and vaccination programs may need to counter misinformation and conspiracy theories
318 through culturally appropriate messaging targeted at the groups most susceptible to misinformation (15).
319 Effective approaches would address and correct both negative and false information, particularly as
320 spread by community members and via social media. More research is needed to identify effective and
321 locally-relevant strategies for this in Malawi and similar contexts; one promising approach is a
322 WhatsApp-based counselling intervention for countering COVID-19 fake news trialed in Nigeria (27).

323

324 We note several limitations of this study. The study respondents were recruited at health facilities hence
325 our sample is very likely to over-represent people with stronger trust in health care services, including
326 COVID-19 vaccination. Vaccination status was ascertained based on self-report, which may have
327 overestimated coverage and underestimated due to social desirability bias.

328

329 **Conclusion:**

330 This study represents one of the first in-depth explorations of the COVID-19 vaccine information
331 environment and how it affects vaccine uptake in sub-Saharan Africa. Our findings provide important
332 insights on how people's vaccination behavior may be shaped by their local vaccine information sources,
333 tone, and content. Investment is needed in targeted information interventions that leverage prominent and
334 trusted sources of COVID-19 vaccine information, are designed to reach all socio-demographic groups,
335 and combat misinformation.

336

337 **Acknowledgements**

338 We are grateful for the support of the participating health facilities and their management teams for
339 allowing us to conduct surveys at the health facilities. We are also thankful to the research assistants who
340 conducted the surveys.

341

342 **APPENDIX**

343 Appendix 1: Association between hearing more information sources about COVID-19 vaccine, and
 344 COVID-19 vaccination, unadjusted odds ratios

Subgroup	COVID-19 vaccination (OR)	95% CI	p-value
Male	1.13	1.04-1.23	0.004
Female	1.05	0.98-1.13	0.136
Urban	1.12	1.00-1.25	0.054
Rural	1.08	1.02-1.15	0.009
HIV+	1.17	1.09-1.27	0.000
HIV-	1.01	0.94-1.09	0.724
18-39 years	1.05	0.98-1.13	0.169
40+ years	1.15	1.06-1.24	0.001
Primary school or less	1.06	0.99-1.13	0.111
Secondary school or higher	1.15	1.03-1.28	0.010

345

346 Appendix 2: Association between endorsing more conspiracy theories about COVID-19 and COVID-19

347 vaccine uptake

Subgroup	OR for vax uptake	95% CI	p-value
Male	0.70	0.57-0.86	0.001
Female	0.82	0.68-0.98	0.026
Urban	0.86	0.67-1.09	0.209
Rural	0.72	0.61-0.85	<0.001
HIV+	0.77	0.64-0.94	0.009
HIV-	0.75	0.62-0.91	0.004
18-39 years	0.82	0.68-0.99	0.034
40+ years	0.74	0.61-0.91	0.004
Primary school or less	0.75	0.63-0.90	0.002
Secondary school or higher	0.75	0.60-0.92	0.006


349 REFERENCE

- 350 1. Anwar A, Malik M, Raees V, Anwar A. Role of Mass Media and Public Health Communications
351 in the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Cureus* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 14; Available from:
352 [https://www.cureus.com/articles/38293-role-of-mass-media-and-public-health-communications-](https://www.cureus.com/articles/38293-role-of-mass-media-and-public-health-communications-in-the-covid-19-pandemic)
353 [in-the-covid-19-pandemic](https://www.cureus.com/articles/38293-role-of-mass-media-and-public-health-communications-in-the-covid-19-pandemic)
- 354 2. Garfin DR, Silver RC, Holman EA. The novel coronavirus (COVID-2019) outbreak:
355 Amplification of public health consequences by media exposure. *Heal Psychol* [Internet]. 2020
356 May;39(5):355–7. Available from: <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/hea0000875>
- 357 3. World Health Organization. The COVID-19 infodemic [Internet]. Available from:
358 https://www.who.int/health-topics/infodemic/the-covid-19-infodemic#tab=tab_1
- 359 4. Carrieri V, Madio L, Principe F. Vaccine hesitancy and (fake) news: Quasi-experimental evidence
360 from Italy. *Health Econ* [Internet]. 2019 Nov 20;28(11):1377–82. Available from:
361 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hec.3937>
- 362 5. Naeem S Bin, Bhatti R, Khan A. An exploration of how fake news is taking over social media and
363 putting public health at risk. *Heal Inf Libr J* [Internet]. 2021 Jun 12;38(2):143–9. Available from:
364 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/hir.12320>
- 365 6. Roozenbeek J, Schneider CR, Dryhurst S, Kerr J, Freeman ALJ, Recchia G, et al. Susceptibility to
366 misinformation about COVID-19 around the world. *R Soc Open Sci* [Internet]. 2020 Oct
367 14;7(10):201199. Available from: <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsos.201199>
- 368 7. Loomba S, de Figueiredo A, Piatek SJ, de Graaf K, Larson HJ. Measuring the impact of COVID-
369 19 vaccine misinformation on vaccination intent in the UK and USA. *Nat Hum Behav* [Internet].
370 2021 Feb 5;5(3):337–48. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-021-01056-1>
- 371 8. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Global Dashboard for Vaccine Equity
372 [Internet]. Available from: <https://data.undp.org/vaccine-equity/>
- 373 9. Safary E, Mtaita C. A qualitative exploration of perceptions of the COVID-19 vaccine in Malawi
374 during the vaccine rollout phase. *One Heal Implement Res* [Internet]. 2022;2(2):79–87. Available
375 from: <https://ohirjournal.com/article/view/4965>
- 376 10. Ministry of Health Malawi. COVID-19 National Information Dashboard [Internet]. Available
377 from: <https://covid19.health.gov.mw/>
- 378 11. OurWorldInData.org. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Vaccinations [Internet]. Available from:
379 <https://ourworldindata.org/covid-vaccinations>
- 380 12. Aron MB, Connolly E, Vrkljan K, Zaniku HR, Nyirongo R, Mailosi B, et al. Attitudes toward
381 COVID-19 Vaccines among Patients with Complex Non-Communicable Disease and Their
382 Caregivers in Rural Malawi. *Vaccines* [Internet]. 2022 May 17;10(5):792. Available from:
383 <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/10/5/792>
- 384 13. Wonodi C, Obi-Jeff C, Adewumi F, Keluo-Udeke SC, Gur-Arie R, Krubiner C, et al. Conspiracy
385 theories and misinformation about COVID-19 in Nigeria: Implications for vaccine demand
386 generation communications. *Vaccine* [Internet]. 2022;40(13):2114–21. Available from:
387 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264410X22001268>
- 388 14. Dereje N, Tesfaye A, Tamene B, Alemeshet D, Abe H, Tesfa N, et al. COVID-19 vaccine
389 hesitancy in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a mixed-method study. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2022 May
390 1;12(5):e052432. Available from: <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/12/5/e052432.abstract>
- 391 15. Gisondi MA, Barber R, Faust JS, Raja A, Strehlow MC, Westafer LM, et al. A Deadly Infodemic:
392 Social Media and the Power of COVID-19 Misinformation. *J Med Internet Res* [Internet]. 2022
393 Feb 1;24(2):e35552. Available from: <https://www.jmir.org/2022/2/e35552>
- 394 16. Cinelli M, Quattrocioni W, Galeazzi A, Valensise CM, Brugnoli E, Schmidt AL, et al. The
395 COVID-19 social media infodemic. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 2020 Oct 6;10(1):16598. Available from:
396 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-020-73510-5>
- 397 17. Freeman D, Loe BS, Chadwick A, Vaccari C, Waite F, Rosebrock L, et al. COVID-19 vaccine
398 hesitancy in the UK: the Oxford coronavirus explanations, attitudes, and narratives survey

- 399 (Oceans) II. *Psychol Med* [Internet]. 2022 Oct 11;52(14):3127–41. Available from:
400 https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0033291720005188/type/journal_article
- 401 18. Hamel, Liz; Lopes, Luna; Ashley, Kirzinger; Sparks, Grace; Broddie M. KFF COVID-19 Vaccine
402 Monitor: Media and Misinformation. *KFF* [Internet]. 2018; Available from:
403 [https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/poll-finding/kff-covid-19-vaccine-monitor-media-and-](https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/poll-finding/kff-covid-19-vaccine-monitor-media-and-misinformation/)
404 [misinformation/](https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/poll-finding/kff-covid-19-vaccine-monitor-media-and-misinformation/)
- 405 19. Katoto PDMC, Parker S, Coulson N, Pillay N, Cooper S, Jaca A, et al. Predictors of COVID-19
406 Vaccine Hesitancy in South African Local Communities: The VaxScenes Study. *Vaccines*
407 [Internet]. 2022 Feb 25;10(3):353. Available from: <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/10/3/353>
- 408 20. Solís Arce JS, Warren SS, Meriggi NF, Scacco A, McMurry N, Voors M, et al. COVID-19
409 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy in low- and middle-income countries. *Nat Med* [Internet]. 2021
410 Aug 16;27(8):1385–94. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-021-01454-y>
- 411 21. Chimatiro C, Hajison P, Jella C, Tshotetsi L, Mpachika-Mfipa F. Barriers affecting COVID-19
412 vaccination in Phalombe District, Malawi: A qualitative study. *South African Med J* [Internet].
413 2023 Mar 8; Available from: <https://samajournals.co.za/index.php/samj/article/view/842>
- 414 22. Moola S, Gudi N, Nambiar D, Dumka N, Ahmed T, Sonawane IR, et al. A rapid review of
415 evidence on the determinants of and strategies for COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in low- and
416 middle-income countries. *J Glob Health* [Internet]. 2021 Nov 20;11:05027. Available from:
417 <http://jogh.org/documents/2021/jogh-11-05027.pdf>
- 418 23. Oveneri-Ogbomo G, Ishaya T, Osuagwu UL, Abu EK, Nwaeze O, Oloruntoba R, et al. Factors
419 associated with the myth about 5G network during COVID-19 pandemic in sub-Saharan Africa. *J*
420 *Glob Heal Reports* [Internet]. 2020 Nov 3;4. Available from: [https://www.joghr.org/article/17606-](https://www.joghr.org/article/17606-factors-associated-with-the-myth-about-5g-network-during-covid-19-pandemic-in-sub-saharan-africa)
421 [factors-associated-with-the-myth-about-5g-network-during-covid-19-pandemic-in-sub-saharan-](https://www.joghr.org/article/17606-factors-associated-with-the-myth-about-5g-network-during-covid-19-pandemic-in-sub-saharan-africa)
422 [africa](https://www.joghr.org/article/17606-factors-associated-with-the-myth-about-5g-network-during-covid-19-pandemic-in-sub-saharan-africa)
- 423 24. Brackstone K, Atengble K, Head M, Boateng L. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy trends in Ghana: a
424 cross-sectional study exploring the roles of political allegiance, misinformation beliefs, and
425 sociodemographic factors. *Pan Afr Med J* [Internet]. 2022;43. Available from:
426 <https://www.panafrican-med-journal.com/content/article/43/165/full>
- 427 25. Kamal A, Hodson A, Pearce JM. A Rapid Systematic Review of Factors Influencing COVID-19
428 Vaccination Uptake in Minority Ethnic Groups in the UK. *Vaccines* [Internet]. 2021;9(10).
429 Available from: <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/9/10/1121>
- 430 26. Umakanthan S, Patil S, Subramaniam N, Sharma R. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Resistance
431 in India Explored through a Population-Based Longitudinal Survey. *Vaccines* [Internet].
432 2021;9(10). Available from: <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/9/10/1064>
- 433 27. Talabi FO, Ugbor IP, Talabi MJ, Ugwuoke JC, Oloyede D, Aiyesimoju AB, et al. Effect of a
434 social media-based counselling intervention in countering fake news on COVID-19 vaccine in
435 Nigeria. *Health Promot Int* [Internet]. 2022 Apr 29;37(2). Available from:
436 <https://academic.oup.com/heapro/article/doi/10.1093/heapro/daab140/6369161>
437


	% of respondents reporting they have heard conspiracy theory				
Conspiracy Theory	Overall	Male	Female	Urban	Rural
The spread of COVID-19 is a deliberate attempt to reduce the size of the global population	80.7	85.0	77.4	82.9	80.2
The COVID-19 virus is a hoax	74.1	77.7	71.3	79.7	72.9
The government is exaggerating the number of COVID-19 deaths	65.9	70.9	62.2	77.2	63.5
COVID-19 vaccines have been shown to cause infertility	54.3	55.5	53.4	58.2	53.5
The COVID-19 vaccine will be used to carry out mass sterilization	51.4	52.9	50.3	51.3	51.4
Big pharmaceutical companies created COVID-19 to profit from vaccines	47.2	52.4	43.3	60.1	44.4
You can get COVID-19 from the vaccine	36.9	41.6	33.3	38.6	36.5
Deaths due to COVID-19 are being intentionally hidden by the government	34.5	35.1	34.1	35.4	34.3
The COVID-19 vaccine can change your DNA	33.3	39.5	28.7	36.1	32.7
Bill Gates has created COVID-19 in order to reduce the world population	30.1	40.3	22.4	50.0	25.8

Figure 3



*Traditional media= newspapers, radio, tv; Traditional medicine practitioner/Religious leaders; social media =social media and messaging apps; Personal relations =family and friends; Healthcare worker/MoH = healthcare worker & Ministry of health

Figure 2



Created with Datawrapper

Figure 1