

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

Mapping COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and uptake amongst Chinese residents: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Hassan Masood¹, Syed Irfan¹

Affiliation

¹Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada

Correspondence*

Hassan Masood M.Sc.

McMaster University

1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON L8S4L8, Canada

(289) 684-3075

hassan.masood9@gmail.com

31 **Abstract**

32 **Objective:** Controlling the COVID-19 pandemic depends on the widespread acceptance of
33 vaccination. Vaccine hesitancy is a growing area of concern in China. The aim of the study is to
34 map the overall acceptance and uptake rates of COVID-19 vaccines across different groups.

35 **Methods:** Five peer-reviewed databases bases were searched (PubMed, EMBASE, Web of
36 Science, EBSCO, and Scopus). Studies that conducted cross-sectional surveys in China to
37 understand the acceptance/willingness to receive COVID-19 vaccines were included.

38 **Results:** Among 2420 identified studies, 47 studies with 327,046 participants were eligible for
39 data extraction. Males had a higher uptake of COVID-19 vaccines (OR=1.17; 95% CI:1.08 -
40 1.27) along with Chinese residents with ≥ 5000 RMB monthly income (OR=1.08; 95% CI:1.02 -
41 1.14).

42 **Conclusion:** COVID-19 vaccination uptake rates in China need to be improved. To inform
43 public health decisions, continuous vaccination uptake monitoring is required.

44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

62

63 **1. Introduction**

64 **1.1. Background of COVID-19**

65 The emergence of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), a respiratory illness caused by
66 the virus SARS-CoV-2, has resulted in a global pandemic since its breakout in 2019 [1]. More
67 than 213 countries have reported COVID-19 outbreaks [2]. As of November 2022, there were
68 more than 600 million confirmed cases of COVID-19 across the globe, resulting in
69 approximately 7 million mortalities [1]. Looking at China alone, the World Health Organization
70 (WHO) reported over 99 million COVID-19 cases and 121,000 deaths [3]. COVID-19 continues
71 to impact public health as novel contagious variants of SARS-CoV-2 can affect fully immunized
72 individuals [4]. According to data published by the WHO, different population groups are
73 impacted disproportionately [4]. For instance, healthcare workers are at higher risk of contracting
74 COVID-19 infection due to their occupational exposure to patients [4]. COVID-19 cases among
75 young adults have a higher probability of resulting in asymptomatic infections compared to their
76 older counterparts [1]. Similarly, sociodemographic factors such as age, gender, and level of
77 knowledge influence the rate of uptake of vaccines and contribute to vaccine hesitancy [4]
78 Scientific literature also indicates that the COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted the functionality of
79 different systems, such as health and education [1]. In addition to the virus' physical health
80 impacts, reports show that there are also severe mental health repercussions of this deadly
81 COVID-19 infection [1].

82

83 **1.2. Importance of vaccines**

84 The cataclysmic consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic have resulted in rapid vaccine
85 research and development [5]. Vaccine development is a rigorous and time-consuming process,

86 and it can take up to 10 years to develop a safe and effective vaccine [5]. However, the deadly
87 impacts of COVID-19 have increased the pace of vaccine production, where vaccines were
88 developed within one year [5]. Scientific evidence emphasizes the importance of vaccines as
89 they are critical to ensure protection amongst the public [5]. Promoting the uptake of vaccination
90 services results in the state of herd immunity, which is a fundamental method to control the
91 spread of such infections [2] Considering the delta variant of the SARS-CoV-2, roughly 85% of
92 the population should gain immunity to COVID-19 either via natural infection or by uptaking
93 vaccination services [5]. However, the omicron variant of SARS-CoV-2 displayed stronger
94 abilities to fight neutralizing antibodies produced by vaccines [5]. In this case, scientific
95 evidence suggests that more than 85% of the population needs to be immunized to achieve herd
96 immunity [5]. Therefore, achieving high vaccine coverage within a population is key to reducing
97 the severity of the COVID-19 pandemic [2].

98

99 **1.3. COVID-19 Protocols in China**

100 In order to fight the COVID-19 pandemic, the government of China established several
101 safety protocols [2]. These restrictions included lockdown, isolation, quarantine mandates, travel
102 restrictions and prohibition of mass gatherings [2]. While these protocols displayed increased
103 success over time in controlling the spread of the infection, they yielded negative consequences
104 for economic growth and social development [2]. Therefore, several restrictions were lifted in
105 China, and the focus shifted more toward vaccine development and promotion amongst the
106 general public [2].

107

108 ***1.3.1. China's Zero-covid Policy***

109 China makes a unique global case due to its strict zero Covid policy implementation over
110 three years. When the COVID-19 pandemic was declared, the Chinese government viewed it as a
111 major threat and placed strict restrictions to keep the COVID-19 cases close to zero [6]. These
112 steps were collectively termed China's COVID zero policy [6]. While these strategies effectively
113 controlled the spread, they severely affected the economy and fueled protests across many cities
114 [7]. Government finances were strained as most of the funds were directed toward COVID-19
115 safety protocols [7].

116

117 ***1.3.2. Overnight wholesale re-opening***

118 Due to these substantial economic and social losses, the Chinese government decided to
119 ease the stringent regime. In December 2022, China lifted the restrictions to open up the
120 factories, companies, stores and restaurants in an attempt to return back to pre-pandemic
121 conditions [8]. The cases surged dramatically, and an extremely low vaccination rate was
122 reported among older adults [9]. After relaxing the restrictions, over a million COVID-19 cases
123 and 5000 deaths per day have been reported [9].

124 This recent surge of COVID-19 cases has severely impacted two populations: the elderly
125 and those with underlying medical conditions. A study conducted by Ioannidis et al. [10]
126 explored the increase in cases and deaths after the abandonment of the zero COVID policy and
127 found that from December 2023 till the summer of 2023, 691,219 new cases of COVID-19 were
128 recorded in China [10]. The majority of the fatalities were observed in senior citizens that were
129 aged 60 years and above. In Hong Kong alone, 70.6% of deaths due to COVID-19 were among
130 those aged 80 and above [10] The second highest deaths were recorded for those that were 70-79
131 years old (Ioannidis et al., 2023). These disproportionate fatal outcomes among the elderly are of

132 high concern considering that as of December 2022, only 40% of the people over the age of 80
133 are vaccinated against COVID-19 [10]. This figure is even worse in some parts of China such as
134 Hong Kong, where only 25% of people over the age of 80 are vaccinated [10].

135

136 **1.4. Vaccine Development in China**

137 After extensive research and testing, the China National Medical Products Administration
138 (CNMPA) approved two COVID-19 vaccines: Sinopharm and Sinovac [11]. Sinopharm was
139 approved in December 2020, whereas Sinovac was approved in February 2021 [11]. According
140 to recent studies, there are three types of vaccines that are available in China for uptake [1].
141 These include the single-dose adenovirus vector vaccine, the 2-dose inactivated vaccine and the
142 3-dose recombinant subunit vaccine [1]. Most vaccine research in China was conducted before
143 the approval of Chinese vaccines, whereby the population's perceptions were based on the
144 benefits and barriers to hypothetical COVID-19 vaccines [11]. Findings by Lin et al. [12] show
145 that some Chinese residents prefer domestic vaccines over imported ones. Therefore, it is crucial
146 to conduct in-depth research that aims to evaluate the different COVID-19 vaccine uptake rates
147 along with reasons to create targeted approaches.

148

149 **1.5. Vaccine Hesitancy in China**

150 Due to widespread misinformation, public vaccine acceptance can vary over time. Social
151 media is one of the avenues where misinformation is spread [13]. “Weibo” is China's most
152 popular social media platform, with reportedly 500 million active users [13]. Since the rise of the
153 COVID-19 pandemic, Weibo has been one of the outlets where the general public in China has
154 been having discussions regarding COVID-19 vaccines [13]. Due to the vast outreach of Wiebo,

155 it is cited as one of the sources that breed COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy amongst the Chinese
156 population in particular [13].

157 Research conducted by Liu et al. [14] demonstrated that there is variation in vaccine
158 hesitancy between China and the United States (US). Chinese residents hold a different
159 viewpoint, as they reported being more concerned about the adverse effects of COVID-19
160 vaccines (19.68%) compared to US residents (6.12%) [14]. While the overall prevalence of
161 hesitancy was found to be high in both countries, the reasons for vaccine refusal were drastically
162 different. In order to develop innovative and personalized solutions to achieving herd immunity,
163 it is important to understand the unique challenges that are at play within different countries.

164 While significant research has examined the acceptance of COVID-19 vaccines, there are
165 few studies that have systematically reviewed and compiled the current evidence [5]. As China is
166 a heavily populated country with complex national conditions, it is imperative to investigate the
167 COVID-19 vaccine acceptance, uptake, and reasons for vaccine hesitancy. By understanding the
168 factors fueling vaccine refusal, tailored strategies can be undertaken to increase the efficacy of
169 COVID-19 vaccination campaigns in China.

170

171 **1.6. Research objective**

172 This systematic review and meta-analysis aims to examine the 1) acceptance and uptake
173 of COVID-19 vaccines across different population groups (adults, healthcare workers, patients
174 with chronic diseases, pregnant women, university students, and parents) in China; 2) compare
175 the differences in uptake rates across diverse subgroups based on their sociodemographic
176 characteristics; and 3) common reasons for vaccine refusal. The population subgroups
177 investigated in this study include age, gender, income, and level of education. This in-depth

178 analysis will add context to current research and help guide vaccine promotion strategies in
179 China by understanding each subgroup's concerns, beliefs, and needs. The findings can also
180 function as a reference for future studies that investigate COVID-19 vaccination beliefs in China.

181

182 **2. Materials and methods**

183 **2.1. Data Sources and Strategy**

184 This systematic review and meta-analysis was developed according to the Preferred
185 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [15]. The
186 following peer-reviewed databases were searched: PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science,
187 EBSCO, and Scopus.

188 Within these databases, the following search terms were employed: coronavirus terms
189 (“coronavirus disease”[All Fields] OR “coronavirus”[MeSH Terms] OR “coronavirus”[All
190 Fields] OR “coronaviruses”[All Fields] OR “2019-nCoV”[All Fields] OR “2019ncov”[All
191 Fields] OR “covid 19”[All Fields] OR “severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2”[All
192 Fields]) AND vaccine terms (“vaccin”[All Fields] OR “vaccine”[All Fields] OR “vaccines”[All
193 Fields] OR “vaccination”[All Fields] OR “vaccinable”[All Fields] OR “vaccinal”[All Fields] OR
194 “vaccinate”[All Fields] OR “vaccinated”[All Fields] OR “vaccinates”[All Fields] OR
195 “vaccinating”[All Fields] OR “vaccinations”[All Fields] OR “vaccination’s”[All Fields] OR
196 “vaccinator”[All Fields] OR “vaccinators”[All Fields] OR “immunization”[All Fields] OR
197 “immunizations”[All Fields] OR immuniz* OR immunis*) AND survey terms (“survey”[All
198 Fields] OR “surveys”[All Fields] OR “survey’s”[All Fields] OR “surveyed”[All Fields] OR
199 “surveying”[All Fields] OR “questionnaire”[All Fields] OR “questionnaires”[All Fields]) OR
200 “poll”[All Fields]).

201 All research articles published in the English language between December 1, 2019, and
202 June 1, 2023, were collected using the search terms mentioned above.

203

204 **2.2. Selection and Eligibility Criteria**

205 Collected research articles were imported into COVIDENCE, a screening and data
206 extraction tool for conducting systematic reviews [16]. COVIDENCE automatically removed all
207 duplicate articles, yielding a set of studies to review. Subsequently, abstract and full-text
208 screening were conducted by HM and SIT independently conducted on the resultant pool of
209 articles and conflicts were addressed through unanimous consensus. Articles were included in
210 this systematic review and meta-analysis based on the following inclusion criteria 1) they
211 investigated COVID-19 vaccine acceptance, willingness, and uptake, 2) they were original cross-
212 sectional survey studies, and 3) if they were conducted in China. The exclusion criteria were
213 studies assessing 1) wrong outcome of interest, 2) willingness-to-pay or conditional vaccine
214 acceptance, 3) non-COVID-19 vaccine acceptance, 4) continuous variables as they adopted
215 different ranges of responses, and 5) studies conducted outside of China. Editorials, intervention
216 studies, reviews, commentaries, letters, and qualitative research articles were also excluded for
217 the purpose of this review.

218

219 **2.3. Data Extraction**

220 Data was extracted from all studies that met the inclusion criteria. The following data was
221 collected onto an Excel sheet: article title, author name, date of publication, country, study
222 design, sample size, sampling method, response rate, age of participants, data collection period,
223 study objective, and type of publication (journal or pre-print service). To meet the goals of this

224 systematic review, the following outcomes were also extracted: 1) overall COVID-19 vaccine
225 acceptance/willingness (total sample), 2) overall COVID-19 vaccine uptake (total sample), 3)
226 COVID-19 vaccination uptake across different subgroups (age, gender, income, and education),
227 4) COVID-19 vaccination acceptance/willingness, uptake, unsure, across different population
228 groups (adults, healthcare workers, patients with chronic diseases, pregnant women, university
229 students, and parents), and 5) reasons for COVID-19 vaccination refusal.

230

231 **2.4. Risk of Bias Assessment**

232 The NHLBI Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional
233 Studies was used to assess the methodological risk of bias for all studies included in this
234 systematic review and meta-analysis [17]. 14 criteria were used within this tool to answer the
235 following questions for each study: (1) Was the research question or objective in this paper
236 clearly stated? (2) Was the study population clearly specified and defined? (3) Was the
237 participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%? (4) Were all the subjects selected or recruited
238 from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and
239 exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?
240 (5) Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?
241 (6) For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the
242 outcome(s) being measured? (7) Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably
243 expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed? (8) For exposures that
244 can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to
245 the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure or exposure measured as a continuous variable)? (9)
246 Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and

247 implemented consistently across all study participants? (10) Was the exposure(s) assessed more
248 than once over time? (11) Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined,
249 valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? (12) Were the
250 outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants? (13) Was the loss to follow-up
251 after baseline 20% or less? (14) Were key potential confounding variables measured and
252 adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?

253 For each question, there were three answer options: 1) Criteria satisfied, 2) criteria
254 unsatisfied, and 3) Not applicable. Overall study quality ratings were assigned based on author
255 rating, including three levels: “good,” “fair,” and “poor.” Each study was initially assigned a
256 “good” rating and was demoted by one level per unsatisfied criteria.

257

258 **2.5. Statistical analysis**

259 Data organization and analysis from the included peer-reviewed studies were conducted
260 using Microsoft Excel and Review Manager 5.4.1, respectively. All figures were created using
261 Review Manager 5.4.1. Microsoft Excel was used to compute data in the tables and the pooled
262 uptake, acceptance, and unsure rates.

263

264 **2.5.1. COVID-19 vaccine uptake outcome measures**

265 The primary outcome was the uptake rates of COVID-19 vaccination amongst the
266 population surveyed in China. The uptake status of Chinese residents was categorized into two
267 groups: 1) Yes and 2) No. The pooled uptake rates were categorized for the overall study
268 participants and divided according to respective population groups, such as 1) adults, 2)
269 healthcare workers, 3) patients with chronic diseases, 4) pregnant women, 5) university/college

270 students, and 6) parents. The category labelled “other” populations refers to individuals that
271 cannot be categorized into the six categories mentioned above. These types of populations
272 included caregivers, cold-chain workers, and the general public.

273

274 **2.5.2. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance outcome measures**

275 Another outcome of interest was the rate of acceptance of COVID-19 vaccination.
276 Acceptance was defined as study participants willing to/accepting/intending to receive the
277 COVID-19 vaccination if the opportunity was made available. Acceptance was stratified based
278 on the survey responses reported in the selected studies: 1) Yes/definitely; 2) Unsure/Do not
279 know; 3) No/Definitely not. The pooled acceptance rates were reported for the overall study
280 participants and for the different population groups outlined above.

281

282 **2.5.3. Data synthesis**

283 Data were synthesized in the form of forest plots to compare the likelihood of uptake of
284 the COVID-19 vaccination service across four population sub-groups. The sub-groups were
285 created based on the following socio-demographic characteristics: (1) Age; (2) Gender; (3)
286 Income; and (4) Education. Age was divided into five categories: (1) 18-29; (2) 30-39; (3) 40-49;
287 (4) 50-59; (5) ≥ 60 . Gender was reported as two categories: (1) Male; (2) Female. Income also
288 had two categories: (1) < 5000 ; (2) ≥ 5000 . The income was reported as the local currency of
289 China, Renminbi (RMB). Education had two categories: (1) High School or below; (2)
290 Bachelor's/college or above.

291 Each socio-demographic group had a reference range, and the Odds Ratio (OR) and 95%
292 confidence interval (CI) were reported for each range. An OR > 1 indicates a higher likelihood to

293 uptake compared to the reference group. The pooled uptake outcome was reported if the
294 following criteria were met: 1) two or more studies reported the same COVID-19 vaccine uptake
295 outcome measure, and 2) the I^2 statistic $\leq 60\%$.

296 An I^2 value of $>60\%$ was considered to be heterogeneous on a statistical level. To meta-
297 analyse the data, an inverse variance statistical analysis was conducted with a random-effects
298 model. Meta-analysis was only conducted if there were two or more studies in the pool.
299 Additionally, a P-value of <0.05 was considered to be statistically significant. A sensitivity
300 analysis was conducted to examine outliers for the OR and 95% CI values for COVID-19
301 vaccination acceptance.

302

303 **2.6. Quality of evidence evaluation**

304 The quality of evidence gathered in the meta-analysis was assessed using Cochrane's
305 GRADE approach [18]. The quality rating had four levels: "high," "moderate," "low," and "very
306 low." All of the resulting outcomes started with a "high" rating and were demoted one level per
307 unsatisfied criteria

308

309 **2.6.1. Publication bias**

310 Publication bias was assessed through the analysis of funnel plot symmetry.
311 Publication bias was not assessed for quantitative analyses with <5 studies due to a lack of
312 statistical power. The funnel plot was created for two forest plots (Age and Gender) through the
313 Review Manager 5.4.1 statistical analysis software. To test for the presence of publication bias,
314 the funnel plots were visually analyzed and interpreted.

315

316

317

318 **3. Results**

319 **3.1. Identification and Selection of Studies**

320 A total of 2420 studies were found through the literature searches 881 were found
321 through the Web of Science journal, 781 through Embase, 593 through Scopus, 144 through
322 EBSCO, and 21 through PubMed. 1161 duplicates were found and excluded. A total of 1259
323 studies were available for screening. 1075 studies were excluded in the abstract screening, and
324 184 studies remained for full-text screening. A total of 137 studies were excluded after the full-
325 text screening: 3 for having the wrong study setting, 115 for analyzing the wrong outcome
326 measure, 3 for using the wrong comparator, 2 for having the wrong intervention, 10 for having
327 the wrong study design, and 4 for studying the wrong population. Finally, 47 studies were
328 available for data extraction. A flowchart of study selection according to PRISMA guidelines can
329 be seen in Figure 1 below.

330

331 **Figure 1. PRISMA Flowchart of Study Selection**

332

333 3.2. Study Characteristics

334 The main characteristics of the studies included in the systematic review and meta-analysis are presented in Table 1, and data
 335 collection times for the selected studies ranged from March 2020 to December 2022. The age ranges of the study participants ranged
 336 from 12-75 years. All of the included studies were conducted in China, and the sample sizes ranged from 208 to 96498 participants.
 337 While some studies did not report the response rates of the surveys used to obtain data, the lowest response rate recorded was 55%,
 338 and the highest was 99.3%. There were 19 studies that did not report the sampling method used to select study participants. 13 studies
 339 utilized convenience sampling, five studies used snowball sampling, two used multi-stage sampling, five used random sampling, two
 340 used cluster sampling, and 1 study used purposive sampling. All 47 articles were cross-sectional studies published in peer-reviewed
 341 journals, and there were no studies published in a pre-print service.

342

343 **Table 1. Overview of studies included in systematic review and meta-analysis**

#	Author/ publication year	Study Design	Country	Data collection time	Age range (years)	Sample size (n)	Respo nse rate (%)	Sampl ing method	Publicat ion
1	Chang et al. 2023 [19]	cross-sectional	China	December 2021 to April 2022	≥18	261	NR	NR	Journal
2	Chan et al. 2021 [20]	cross-sectional	China	31 January 2021 and 15 February 2021	≥18	660	75	Convenience	Journal
3	Chen et al. 2021 [21]	cross-sectional	China	May to June 2020	≥18	3195	NR	Snowball	Journal

4	Feng et al. 2021 [22]	cross-sectional	China	November 17, 2020, to January 28, 2021	≥ 20	3703	NR	Multi-stage	Journal
5	Fu et al. 2022 [23]	cross-sectional	China	August to November 2021	≥ 18	343	NR	NR	Journal
6	Gan et al. 2021 [24]	cross-sectional	China	23 October to 10 November 2020	18 to 74	1009	NR	Convenience	Journal
7	Hao et al. 2022 [25]	cross-sectional	China	April 2021 to June 2021	18 to 60	621	93.67	Convenience	Journal
8	Hou et al. 2022 [26]	cross-sectional	China	September 14 to November 18, 2021	≥ 18	Caregivers: 2588 HCW: 1700	84.8	Multi-stage	Journal
9	Huang et al. 2021 [27]	cross-sectional	China	January and February 2021	18-65	2740	NR	NR	Journal
10	Huang et al. 2023 [28]	cross-sectional	China	May 1 to 31, 2022	≥ 18	11565	77.81	NR	Journal
11	Huang et al. 2022 [29]	cross-sectional	China	First survey: January 2021 Second survey: June of 2021	NR	NR	97	NR	Journal
12	Hu et al. 2022 [30]	cross-sectional	China	1 and 20 May 2021	≥ 18	359	NR	NR	Journal
13	Kong et al. 2022 [31]	cross-sectional	China	19 June 2021 to 23 June 2021	≥ 18	786	NR	Snowball	Journal
14	Li et al. 2022 [32]	cross-sectional	China	May 19 to June 18, 2021	≥ 18	2176	NR	NR	Journal
15	Li et al. 2022 [33]	cross-sectional	China	20 to 27 January 2022	≥ 18	11141	NR	Convenience	Journal
16	Li et al. 2021 [34]	cross-sectional	China	June 2020	≥ 18	2377	88.04	Snowball	Journal
17	Lin et al. 2020 [35]	cross-sectional	China	1–19 May 2020	≥ 18	3541	NR	NR	Journal

18	Li et al. 2022 [36]	cross-sectional	China	10 and 28 June 2021	18-23	721	83.9	Random	Journal
19	Li et al. 2022 [37]	cross-sectional	China	16 August to 28 October 2021	12-17	2048	NR	Cluster	Journal
20	Liu et al. 2022 [38]	cross-sectional	China	16 December 2020 and 21 December 2020	≥18	244	96	Random	Journal
21	Liu et al. 2023 [39]	cross-sectional	China	NR	≥18	96498	80	Random	Journal
22	Li et al. 2021 [40]	cross-sectional	China	January 20 to February 20, 2021	≥18	1779	95.5	Convenience	Journal
23	Luk et al. 2021 [41]	cross-sectional	China	9 to 23 April 2020	≥18	1501	61.3	NR	Journal
24	Lv et al. 2023 [42]	cross-sectional	China	January 2022 to March 2022	≥18	1424	91.6	Convenience	Journal
25	Mo et al. 2022 [43]	cross-sectional	China	October and November 2020	≥18	1733	NR	NR	Journal
26	Pan et al. 2022 [44]	cross-sectional	China	26 April to 10 May 2022	≥18	449	97.3	Convenience	Journal
27	Qin et al. 2023 [45]	cross-sectional	China	26 December to 31 December 2022	≥18	42565	99	Cluster	Journal
28	Qin et al. 2021 [46]	cross-sectional	China	November 12, 2021	≥18	1724	NR	NR	Journal
29	Song et al. 2022 [47]	cross-sectional	China	January 29 to February 4, 2021.	≥18	2244	NR	Snowball	Journal
30	Sun et al. 2022 [48]	cross-sectional	China	December 1 to December 9, 2020	≥18	3047	NR	NR	Journal
31	Tao et al. 2021 [49]	cross-sectional	China	November 13 to 27, 2020.	≥18	1392	NR	NR	Journal
32	Wang et al. 2021 [50]	cross-sectional	China	January 10 to January 22, 2021	18-60	8742	91.7	NR	Journal
33	Wang et al. 2021 [51]	cross-sectional	China	10 January to 22 January 2021	18-60	2386	NR	Convenience	Journal
34	Wang et al. 2020 [52]	cross-sectional	China	March 2020	≥18	2,058	98	Random	Journal

35	Wang et al. 2021 [53]	cross-sectional	China	November 2020 to January 2021	≥18	7259	NR	Convenience	Journal
36	Wang et al. 2021 [54]	cross-sectional	China	January 2021	≥18	2580	NR	NR	Journal
37	Wong et al. 2021 [55]	cross-sectional	China	July to August, 2020	≥18	1200	55	Random	Journal
38	Wu et al. 2022 [56]	cross-sectional	China	July 10, 2021	≥18	29925	NR	Snowball	Journal
39	Wu et al. 2022 [57]	cross-sectional	China	May to June 2021	60-75	1,067	97	Convenience	Journal
40	Wu et al. 2022 [58]	cross-sectional	China	4 April to 18 April 2021	≥18	1126	NR	NR	Journal
41	Xie et al. 2023 [59]	cross-sectional	China	NR	≥60	951	NR	NR	Journal
42	Yin et al. 2021 [60]	cross-sectional	China	March 25, 2021 to April 2, 2021	≥18	23940	NR	Convenience	Journal
43	Zhang et al. 2021 [61]	cross-sectional	China	August 16–20, 2021	≥22	631	NR	NR	Journal
44	Zhang et al. 2022 [62]	cross-sectional	China	26 and 31 October 2021	≥18	2329	85.8	Purposive	Journal
45	Zhang et al. 2023 [63]	cross-sectional	China	Round1: 1 to 7 September 2020 Round 2: 26 to 31 October 2021	≥18	Round 1: 208 Round 2: 229	85.8	NR	Journal
46	Zhao et al. 2021 [64]	cross-sectional	China	29 January 2021 to 26 April 2021	≥18	34041	99.3	Convenience	Journal
47	Zhou et al. 2021 [65]	cross-sectional	China	1 March 2021 and 10 April 2021	18-65	3940	NR	Convenience	Journal

HCW = Healthcare workers; NR = Not reported

345 **3.2.1. Participant characteristics**

346 For qualitative data synthesis in this systematic review, data were collected from a total
347 of 327,046 participants. For the meta-analysis, data from 130,441 participants was used.

348

349 **3.2.2. COVID-19 vaccine uptake outcome measures**

350 Amongst the 47 studies included in the review, ten studies (21.3%) reported the OR and
351 95% CI for the uptake of COVID-19 vaccines for different socio-demographic factors. The
352 remaining 37 studies reported the OR and 95% CI for the acceptance/willingness to receive
353 COVID-19 vaccines. For the purpose of meta-analysis, data was only used for uptake of
354 vaccination because it was deemed to be a more robust metric for assessing vaccination habits
355 compared to acceptance/willingness which may be translatable. Thus, ten studies were included
356 in the meta-analysis.

357

358 **3.3. Risk of bias (quality) analysis for included studies**

359 Results from the risk of bias assessment are reported in S1 Table. After conducting the
360 quality assessment, the majority of the studies were rated as good quality (42/47), while the
361 remaining studies were rated as fair quality (5/47). These five studies were demoted to having
362 fair quality as they failed to report the outcome measures (dependent variables) consistently and
363 clearly. Within these studies, the socio-demographic groups were not completely reported or the
364 ranges differed substantially from the remaining study pool [31, 45, 60, 61, 65].

365

366

367 **3.4. Estimated percentage of acceptance, unsure, and uptake outcomes**

368 Based on data collected from all 47 studies, the acceptance, unsure, and uptake rates of
369 COVID-19 vaccination were reported in Table 2. 35 studies investigated the rate of
370 acceptance/willingness to receive COVID-19 vaccines, 8 studies reported the number of
371 participants unsure about receiving the vaccine, and 21 studies reported the uptake rates of
372 COVID-19 vaccines. The overall acceptance rate of COVID-19 vaccination in China was
373 calculated to be 59.5%. In comparison, 20.9% of the sampled population was found to be unsure
374 about COVID-19 vaccines. The estimated COVID-19 vaccination uptake rate was found to be
375 69.9% amongst the sampled population. The acceptance, unsure, and uptake rates varied across
376 each population group. The highest vaccination acceptance rate was found to be for
377 university/college students (87.4%), while the lowest rate was observed for patients with chronic
378 diseases (42.6%). The highest unsure rate was reported for patients with chronic diseases (48.3),
379 while university/college students had the lowest (2.5%). Additionally, the highest COVID-19
380 vaccination uptake rate was observed for Chinese adults (92%), and the lowest was seen for
381 patients with chronic diseases (43.5%).

382

383

384

385

386

387

388 Table 2. Summary of estimated acceptance, unsure, uptake rates

Population groups	Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccines				Unsure				Uptake of COVID-19 Vaccines			
	No. of studies	No. of participants	Total no. of accepting	Estimated acceptance (%)	No. of studies	No. of participants	Total no. of unsure	Estimated unsure (%)	No. of studies	No. of participants	Total no. of uptake	Estimated uptake (%)
Overall	35	135657	80,705	59.5	8	35332	7400	20.9	21	258124	180358	69.9
Adults	7	39043	28,360	72.6	4	29211	5101	17.5	3	44302	40774	92.0
Healthcare Workers	5	12806	9796	76.5	0	NA	NA	NA	3	8453	6183	73.2
Patients with underlying health conditions	3	4526	1,926	42.6	2	3400	1642	48.3	4	4,768	2076	43.5
Pregnant women	1	1,392	1077	77.4	0	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	NA
University/college students	1	721	630	87.4	1	721	18	2.5	2	990	762	76.9
Parents	4	10152	8,863	87.3	0	NA	NA	NA	3	26994	23184	85.9
Others	14	67017	30,053	44.8	1	2000	639	31.9	6	172617	107379	62.2
NA = Not applicable												

389

390

391

392 3.5. Reasons for COVID-19 vaccine refusal

393 The most commonly cited reasons for refusing the COVID-19 vaccine among the study
394 samples are presented in Table 3. The reasons are shown for studies included in the meta-
395 analysis. Amongst these ten studies, 7 (70%) investigated the factors that affect the Chinese
396 population's decision to uptake COVID-19 vaccination services and the reasons for refusing
397 vaccines. Among these 7 studies that report this data, 6 (85.7%) utilized descriptive statistics to
398 showcase the percentage of total participants that refused the COVID-19 vaccine due to the
399 stated reasons.

400 The majority of the studies found that concern about COVID-19 vaccine safety was the
401 most common area of concern amongst the sampled population. Other most commonly stated
402 reasons for vaccine refusal were fear about its side effects and the overall efficacy of the vaccine
403 against COVID-19. Hou et al. (2022) found that out of the proportion of participants that refused
404 to receive the COVID-19 vaccine, 82.26% refused to get immunized due to a lack of information
405 regarding vaccine safety.

406

407 **Table 3. Reasons for vaccine refusal in studies included in meta-analysis**

Reference	Common reasons for refusal	No. of refusers (% of sample pool)
Fu et al. 2022 [23]	Worried about vaccine safety	67%
Hou et al. 2022 [26]	Lack of evidence about vaccine safety	82.26
Huang et al. 2021 [27]	NR	NR
Huang et al. 2023 [28]	Fear of side-effects	53.78
Li et al. 2021 [34]	vaccine's safety	37.6%
Qin et al. 2023 [45]	NR	NR
Song et al. 2022 [47]	Concerns about safety and efficacy	NR

Wu et al. 2022 [56]	Skepticism about vaccine	47.2
Xie et al. 2023 [59]	NR	NR
Zhao et al. 2021 [64]	Concerns about vaccine safety	71.9
NR = Not reported		

408

409 3.6. Sensitivity analysis

410 Two sensitivity analyses were conducted. The first sensitivity analysis was the exclusion
411 of uptake outcome values (OR, 95% CI), whereby the socio-demographic groups (age and
412 income) were substantially far apart from the reference group. Uptake outcome values were also
413 excluded for studies that had incongruent reference groups. This sensitivity was conducted in 4
414 out of 14 studies that reported OR and 95% CI for socio-demographic groups and were excluded
415 from the meta-analysis: [19, 31, 42, 61].

416 The second sensitivity analysis was the exclusion of Fu et al. [23] from the meta-analysis
417 for income. This was done in order to assess whether this study was a detrimental outlier and
418 played a significant role in the overall uptake outcome.

419

420 3.7. Quality of evidence

421 GRADE assessment was conducted for all four meta-analyses (Age, gender, income,
422 education) and is presented in S2 - S5 Tables. One meta-analysis for OR - Income was assessed
423 to have high quality. Two meta-analyses for OR - Age and OR - Gender were assessed to have
424 moderate quality. One meta-analysis for education was analyzed to be low in quality according
425 to the GRADE criteria.

426

427 3.8. Meta-analysis

428 Forest plots were created for four socio-graphic groups: (1) Age; (2) Gender; (3) Income;
429 (4) Education.

430

431 **3.8.1. Odds Ratio – Age**

432 Five studies with fifteen outcomes displayed varied results for OR of vaccine uptake.

433 Statistical pooling was inappropriate for the age group because of statistical heterogeneity ($I^2 =$

434 77%) (Figure 2).

435

436 **Figure 2. Age Odds Ratio for sub-groups uptaking COVID-19 vaccine compared to**
437 **reference group**

438

439 **3.8.2 Odds Ratio – Gender**

440 Nine studies with nine outcomes displayed varied results for OR of vaccine uptake.

441 Statistical pooling was inappropriate for the gender group because of statistical heterogeneity (I^2

442 = 97%) (Figure 3). The OR value and 95% CI for the uptake likelihood of male gender were

443 statistically significant as the P-value was equal to 0.0001 and the data was homogeneous ($I^2 =$

444 0%). Males were more likely to uptake COVID-19 vaccination (OR=1.17, 95% CI:1.08-1.27)

445 (Figure 3).

446

447 **Figure 3. Gender Odds Ratio for sub-groups uptaking COVID-19 vaccine compared to**
448 **reference group**

449

450 **3.8.3 Odds Ratio – Income**

451 Three studies with three outcomes had different results for OR of vaccine uptake. Li et al.

452 [40], Xie et al. [59], and Zhao et al. [64] reported an increase in the likelihood of uptaking

453 COVID-19 vaccination for individuals with a monthly income or more than or equal to 5000

454 RMB. The reference group for this analysis included participants with a monthly income of less

455 than 5000 RMB. Statistical pooling was appropriate due to statistical homogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$)
456 (Figure 4). There was an overall increase in the likelihood of vaccine uptake (OR=1.08, 95%
457 CI:1.02-1.14), and it was statistically significant (P-value = 0.005).

458
459 **Figure 4. Income Odds Ratio for sub-groups uptaking COVID-19 vaccine compared to**
460 **reference group**

461
462 **3.8.4 Odds Ratio – Education**

463 Four studies with four outcomes displayed varied results for OR of vaccine uptake.
464 Statistical pooling was inappropriate for the gender OR values because of statistical
465 heterogeneity ($I^2 = 88\%$) (Figure 5).

466
467 **Figure 5. Education Odds Ratio for sub-groups uptaking COVID-19 vaccine compared to**
468 **reference group**

469
470 **3.9. Publication bias**

471 The funnel plots generated to detect publication bias are presented in S1 - S2 Fig. As the
472 quantitative analysis for income and education socio-demographic groups were derived from 3
473 and 4 studies, respectively, funnel plots were not assessed for publication bias due to a lack of
474 statistical power.

475
476 **3.9.1. Odds Ratio – Age**

477 The funnel plot for the age socio-demographic group is presented in S1 Fig. The majority
478 of the studies are plotted near the average (dotted line), which indicates high precision.

479 Therefore, no publication bias was detected visually.

480

481 **3.9.2. Odds Ratio – Gender**

482 The funnel plot for the gender socio-demographic group is presented in S2 Fig. The
483 majority of the studies are plotted near the average (dotted line), which indicates high precision.
484 Therefore, no publication bias was detected visually.

485

486 **3.9.3. Odds Ratio – Income**

487 A funnel plot was not created for the Income funnel plot as there were insufficient studies
488 (<5), lowering the statistical power of publication bias analysis.

489

490 **3.9.4. Odds Ratio – Education**

491 A funnel plot was not created for the Education funnel plot as there were insufficient
492 studies (<5), lowering the statistical power of publication bias analysis.

493

494 **4. Discussion**

495 The purpose of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to extrapolate the
496 acceptance and uptake of COVID-19 vaccination among Chinese residents. This paper also
497 reports common reasons for vaccine refusal among the Chinese population, along with factors
498 influencing the decision to vaccinate. Currently, there are no systematic reviews that identify the
499 uptake and willingness to vaccinate oneself across different population groups in China. This
500 paper reports for the first time vaccination behaviours across different groups (adults, healthcare
501 workers, patients with chronic diseases, pregnant women, university students, and parents) and
502 meta-analyzes the likelihood of specific socio-demographic factors (age, gender, income, and
503 education) influencing uptake COVID-19 vaccines.

504

505 **4.1. Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccines**

506 The analysis conducted in this review revealed that more than half of the overall Chinese
507 population (59.5%) was accepting of the COVID-19 vaccination and believed that it was
508 necessary to control the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, this review also indicated
509 that there is variation regarding the rate of acceptance of COVID-19 vaccines across different
510 population groups. The highest rate of acceptance in China was observed amongst
511 university/college students (87.4%). Greater exposure to the scientific curriculum as per the
512 academic curriculum could potentially explain the higher acceptance rate among students, as
513 they might be more aware of the efficacy of vaccines.

514 The review also found that the acceptance of COVID-19 vaccines was lower amongst
515 healthcare workers (HCWs) compared to other groups, such as students and pregnant women.
516 These HCWs were not willing to receive COVID-19 vaccines despite having access is crucial to
517 increase the rate of acceptance and willingness of COVID-19 vaccination among the healthcare
518 workforce as they provide care to patients and are a high-risk group for spreading infectious
519 diseases [40].

520

521 ***4.1.1. Vaccine hesitancy among those with underlying health conditions***

522 Furthermore, this systematic review found that the lowest acceptance rate of COVID-19
523 vaccination was amongst patients with chronic diseases (42.6%). These patients were diagnosed
524 with diseases such as asthma, HIV/AIDS, cancer, and hypertension [39, 27, 23, 19, 20].
525 Comparing these acceptance rates with those of healthy adults (72.6%), this is a substantial
526 difference. There is also a difference in uptake rates, with 92% of healthy adults receiving

527 COVID-19 vaccines compared to 43.5% of patients with underlying disease. These observable
528 differences could be due to concern about the side effects of COVID-19 vaccines on underlying
529 conditions, many of which are rooted in misinformation (citation). It is important to increase
530 knowledge dissemination regarding the safety of COVID-19 vaccines and potential side effects,
531 to fight disinformation and gain patient confidence.

532 Another study by Lv et al. [42] found that people with underlying conditions were more
533 likely to be of old age. Lv et al. [42] found that older people with underlying conditions had
534 difficulty grasping, assessing and analyzing media content, which further added to the
535 development of misconceptions. People with health conditions also had a higher likelihood of
536 dealing with anxiety and depression [42]. Chinese residents with moderate or high levels of
537 anxiety had a significantly higher vaccine refusal rate [42]. Moreover, the anxiety suppressors
538 being taken by these patients were found to have a correlation with increasing vaccine hesitancy
539 amongst those with underlying conditions [42]. These findings point to the intersectionality of
540 multifarious factors that lead to vaccine hesitancy and consequent refusal. It is vital to
541 understand these factors at length to make informed decisions about ways to increase the overall
542 COVID-19 vaccine acceptable rate in China.

543

544 **4.2. Uncertainty about COVID-19 vaccines**

545 This review uncovered that a substantial amount of the Chinese population is unsure
546 about receiving the COVID-19 vaccine. Overall, the rate of unsure participants was 20.9%.
547 However, there is a lot of variation amongst different population groups. The highest percentage
548 of people unsure about COVID-19 vaccination were found to be patients with chronic diseases
549 (48.3%). In fact, 17.5% of the adult population in China was unsure regarding the safety and

550 efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines. On the other hand, the lowest rate of uncertainty was found
551 within students enrolled in colleges or universities (2.5%). This goes to show that education is an
552 important determinant of vaccine hesitancy.

553 No articles included in this review reported quantitative data for HCWs and pregnant
554 women, which indicates a knowledge gap regarding vaccination perceptions and behaviours
555 within these groups.

556

557 **4.3. Uptake of COVID-19 vaccines**

558 The overall prevalence of COVID-19 vaccine uptake among the Chinese population was
559 69.9%. The findings revealed notable differences in the rates of uptake of COVID-19 vaccines
560 across population groups. The highest uptake rate was found to be for Chinese adults (92%).
561 Some reasons for this exceptionally high rate could be due to the serious impacts of the COVID-
562 19 pandemic on their daily lives. Notably the disruptions regarding work, travel restrictions, and
563 severe economic losses [21]. Consequently, this might have led to dynamic changes where adults
564 were more informed about preventative measures such as COVID-19 vaccines, increasing their
565 rate of uptake. However, the rate of uptake of COVID-19 vaccination was lower for healthcare
566 workers (73.2%). The most common reason for this low uptake rate is the aforementioned lack
567 of confidence in the safety and efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines [50]. More importantly, some
568 HCWs did not believe that the vaccine was a reliable method of tackling the spread of the
569 COVID-19 pandemic [50]. The uptake rates were also vastly different for the type of HCWs.
570 Administration employees in healthcare environments were more likely to be skeptical about the
571 vaccines, whereas doctors and nurses had a higher uptake rate [50] This could be due to the
572 nature of the jobs. HCWs, such as doctors, have a stronger medical background and are more

573 knowledgeable about the benefits of vaccines. In comparison, the lowest uptake rate was
574 observed for patients with chronic diseases in China. This is in accordance with the high level of
575 concerns about vaccines and low acceptance observed earlier.

576 Males were also more likely to uptake COVID-19 vaccination services (OR=1.17; 95%
577 CI:1.08 - 1.27) when compared to females in China. These results imply that males are 17%
578 more likely to get vaccinated against COVID-19 compared to females. Given that P-
579 value=0.0001, the findings were also statistically significant. Similar to acceptance/uncertainty
580 regarding COVID-19 vaccines, reasons for the higher uptake rate amongst Chinese males could
581 be due to a higher perception of the detrimental effects of COVID-19 and less observance of
582 misconceptions

583 The quantitative analysis further highlighted important differences in COVID-19 vaccine
584 uptake rates based on the income of Chinese residents. In terms of the local currency of China
585 (RMB), it was observed that having a higher monthly income corresponded to a greater
586 likelihood of uptake of COVID-19 vaccines. Specifically, Chinese residents with a monthly
587 income \geq 5000 RMB had higher uptake of vaccination (OR=1.08; 95% CI:1.02 - 1.14) when
588 compared to those with a monthly income $<$ 5000 RMB. This shows that having an income \geq
589 5000 RMB results in an 8% higher likelihood of uptake of COVID-19 vaccines. As the P-value
590 =0.005, the results were also statistically significant. Possible reasons for these findings include
591 higher access to transportation, which can act as a facilitator to uptaking vaccination.
592 Furthermore, a lower income could be associated with the geographic location or place of
593 residence in China, whereby such individuals do not have access to an abundance of vaccination
594 clinics. Individuals living in remote locations and lower-income households might not be able to
595 receive the vaccine despite having the willingness. Also, income can function as a determinant of

596 the daily schedules of Chinese residents. It is possible that having a lower household income
597 increases stress and creates hectic daily schedules, which can lead to a lower likelihood of having
598 the time to uptake COVID-19 vaccination.

599

600 *4.3.1. Varying degrees of vaccine hesitancy among different age groups*

601 This analysis revealed a lower likelihood of COVID-19 vaccine uptake amongst older-
602 aged individuals in China. Those within the 50-59 age bracket had a 2% lower uptake of
603 COVID-19 vaccine. However, this percentage increases dramatically with age. Amongst those
604 that were ≥ 60 years of age, there was a 10% lower uptake of vaccination. However, there were a
605 low amount of studies reporting data for those over the age of 60, which is why the findings of
606 this analysis need to be utilized with caution. There is a need to investigate in-depth recent
607 changes in vaccination uptake rates amongst those over the age of 60 and specifically those that
608 are 80 and above. The reason is that recent reports, as mentioned earlier, with the termination of
609 restrictive policies from the zero-covid policy, show a steep rise in COVID-19 cases and
610 mortality amongst those over the age of 80 in China.

611 A research study conducted by Smith et al. [66] has demonstrated clear findings
612 showcasing a higher vaccination hesitancy/refusal and an extremely low coverage rate amongst
613 Chinese elders. Among those aged 60 and above, the COVID-19 vaccination coverage rate
614 declined with age. Only 48% of those that fall within the 70-79 year age bracket had received at
615 least one dose of the COVID-19 vaccine [66]. Furthermore, amongst those that were ≥ 80 years,
616 only 20% had received at least one vaccine [66]. The consequences of these low vaccination
617 uptake rates are evident by looking at the case and fatality statistics. Amongst 5,906 deaths that
618 were reported, 5,655 (96%) occurred among people in China aged 60 and above [66]. Moreover,

619 of these deaths, 70% occurred among those that were unvaccinated against COVID-19 [66].
620 Notably, Smith et al. [66] found that within the 60 and above age group in China, the risk of
621 death among unvaccinated individuals was 21.3 times higher than those that were vaccinated.

622

623 **4.4. Strengths and Limitations**

624 This study has several strengths and limitations. Firstly, this review was conducted
625 according to the Cochrane guidance to ensure that the methodologies were robust and
626 appropriate. Secondly, developing clear and focused inclusion/exclusion criteria allowed a clear
627 scope for this systematic review. Thirdly, the database searches were conducted by clearly
628 outlined and comprehensive search terms, which were applied to multiple databases (PubMed,
629 EMBASE, Web of Science, EBSCO, and Scopus). Only peer-reviewed databases were screened,
630 which allowed searching a broad spectrum of articles to gather detailed information on the
631 research topic. Furthermore, the presence of publication biases and assessment of reporting
632 biases were accounted for through the creation of funnel plots. These funnel plots were visually
633 assessed for asymmetry to determine whether bias was present. No publication bias was detected
634 for this systematic review and meta-analysis. This enhances the validity of this study and ensures
635 transparency of the data reported.

636 However, there are some limitations to this study. Firstly, the research studies used to
637 conduct this systematic review and meta-analysis derived data from cross-sectional analyses,
638 which are referred to as snapshots of COVID-19 vaccination behaviours in each region. Cross-
639 sectional studies can have diverse sampling methods such as convenience sampling, snowball
640 sampling, multi-stage sampling, random sampling, cluster sampling, and purposive sampling.
641 These differences can, to some extent, explain the differences observed in the acceptance,

642 unsure, and uptake rates of COVID-19 vaccines across studies from a single country. Therefore,
643 these results gathered need to be interpreted with caution as they might not be able to predict
644 future changes in COVID-19 vaccination behaviours in China. Secondly, an essential limitation
645 is with regard to the different methods used to acquire data regarding willingness and acceptance
646 of COVID-19 vaccines amongst different population groups in China. Some studies utilized a
647 binary response system within the questionnaires/surveys (yes/no), whereas other studies used a
648 different breakdown of options (strongly agree/agree/neutral/disagree/strongly disagree) to assess
649 attitudes regarding vaccination. Answers can differ based on the subjective perceptions of the
650 participants surveyed within these studies. Therefore, these variables should be taken into
651 consideration to ensure an accurate comparison of vaccination behaviours across the different
652 studies included in this review.

653

654 **4.5. Next steps of research**

655 This review guides several next steps for prospective research studies. The current studies
656 available for this review lacked an in-depth analysis of the perceptions of the general public
657 regarding vaccines, as they only offered binary answers. Future research studies should conduct
658 a more in-depth qualitative analysis by creating focus groups and conducting interviews with the
659 sampled study participants. Employing such methods can help build a positive group dynamic
660 and synergy where everyone is provided equal opportunity to share their opinions freely in a
661 non-judgmental atmosphere. Not only is this method cost-effective, but it is efficient in gathering
662 data to look beyond the numbers and truly understand the meaning behind the results. Future
663 studies should also investigate the engagement of the Chinese population with media sources and
664 other outlets to map out sources of misinformation and popular platforms in China and guide

665 solutions to increase vaccination uptake rates. Also, future research studies regarding this topic
666 should utilize a consistent model, such as during the design of the questionnaires, to enhance the
667 precision and applicability of the findings.

668

669 **4.6. Recommendations**

670 There are several recommendations to bolster the overall acceptance and uptake of
671 COVID-19 vaccination services in China. Firstly, a community health training model can be
672 utilized as per the common reasons for refusal observed from this review. Lack of knowledge,
673 negative attitudes towards vaccines, and misconceptions are possible reasons why the majority of
674 the Chinese population is worried about the safety of COVID-19 vaccines. To address this, home
675 visits and informational campaigns should be initiated that would aid in addressing the common
676 misconceptions through one-on-one conversations between trained health professionals and the
677 public. The public would be able to ask questions on the spot, which can lead to an overall
678 increase in the acceptance of the campaign as well as vaccination services. A research study by
679 Singh et al. [67] showcases that employing such strategies led to an overall increase in
680 vaccination coverage rates from 21 to 33%.

681 Secondly, incentivizing the uptake of COVID-19 vaccines is an effective tool to improve
682 vaccination coverage. In particular, this method can be helpful in targeting the rural and remote
683 regions of China as they might be more willing to accept the notion due to the incentives set in
684 place [67]. Monetary incentives will help overcome barriers to receiving vaccines, such as lack
685 of transportation or the possibility of using the incentives for personal use among low
686 socioeconomic individuals.

687 Thirdly, Technology-based health literacy is a method that can improve the overall
688 acceptance of COVID-19 vaccines in China. This includes leveraging health literacy by using
689 technologies such as posters, leaflets, social media platforms, and educational videos [67].
690 However, while doing so, it is important to ensure the creation of innovative educational
691 information pieces that are engaging for the public. This will greatly maximize the engagement
692 of the public and improve the knowledge regarding vaccines to address rumours,
693 misconceptions, and concerns.

694 Additionally, interventions such as sending reminders through calls, text messages, and
695 emails can function as media-based strategies to address vaccine hesitancy. These recall
696 messages would help remind those individuals in China that are accepting COVID-19 vaccines
697 and have not received the vaccine yet, possibly due to forgetting to book an appointment.

698 Overall, whilst working to pursue these educational-based approaches to address the
699 current skepticism about vaccines, it is crucial to be mindful of jargon. While engaging with the
700 public, layperson terminology should be used to convey scientific findings about the safety and
701 efficacy of vaccines. This approach would help foster trust and a sense of belonging between the
702 public and the scientific community and ultimately help boost the overall acceptance and uptake
703 of COVID-19 vaccination services in China.

704

705 **5. Conclusion**

706 The results of this systematic review and meta-analysis map out the overall attitude of the
707 population in China toward COVID-19 vaccines. An outcome faced following the COVID-19
708 pandemic and the creation of vaccines is vaccine resistance and hesitancy. This study showed
709 that there is a notable variation with regard to vaccine acceptance and uptake in China across

710 different population groups. There remains a deep-seated unwillingness and skepticism of the
711 efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines amongst certain populations, such as patients with chronic
712 diseases in China. Furthermore, this analysis uncovered statistically significant differences in the
713 likelihood of vaccine uptake across various socio-demographic factors. Specifically, Chinese
714 males and individuals with more than or equal to 5000 RMB had a higher COVID-19 vaccine
715 uptake rate.

716 More studies are recommended to assess the behaviours of other population groups, such
717 as remote employees, ethnic minorities, and religious people, to develop a broader
718 understanding. Such studies would help evaluate the prevalence of vaccine uncertainty across
719 diverse groups to help guide strategies to boost overall vaccine uptake. Vaccine hesitancy can
720 prove to be a source of hindrance to vaccination campaigns and lessen the negative impacts of
721 the COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, hesitancy regarding COVID-19 vaccines can also lead to
722 the refusal of other routine immunizations. The prevalence of low willingness/acceptance and
723 uptake of the COVID-19 vaccine mandates collaboration from the government, policy-makers,
724 and media to campaign efforts to mitigate current barriers. It is recommended to focus on
725 building trust between the public and government to prioritize clear communication and advocate
726 for the need for vaccinations to achieve herd immunity among the overall population.

727 Future studies should also take into account key factors such as education level, residency
728 status (rural/urban), and race to tailor current educational and vaccination programs according to
729 the needs of the population. Novel research should also investigate other factors that lead to
730 distrust and concern regarding COVID-19 vaccines by gathering the subjective experiences of
731 the public. Overall, this study informs key considerations for the development of integrated
732 models and a community-based transparent approach to guide future research and efforts.

733

734

735 **Acknowledgments**

736 I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Zhou Xing for advising me throughout this
737 scholarly paper project and for their insightful and valuable comments on the manuscript that
738 helped to improve its quality to a great degree. This research received no external funding. All
739 data utilized within this systematic review and meta-analysis is available in this manuscript.

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

References

- 768
769
770 1. Xu X, Bian J, Guo Z, Li X, Zhang W, Wang B, Sun Y, Meng X, Zou H. Uptake of
771 COVID-19 Vaccination and Its Associated Factors among College Students in China: A
772 Nationwide Cross-Sectional Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and*
773 *Public Health*. 2023 Feb 8;20(4):2951.
- 774 2. Hong L, Jin Z, Xu K, Shen G, Zou Y, Li R, Xu L, Wang D, Chen L, Wu Y, Song W.
775 COVID-19 vaccine uptake and vaccine hesitancy in rural-to-urban migrant workers at the
776 first round of COVID-19 vaccination in China. *BMC Public Health*. 2023 Dec;23(1):1-3.
- 777 3. China: WHO coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) dashboard with vaccination data
778 [Internet]. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard With Vaccination Data. Available
779 from: <https://covid19.who.int/region/wpro/country/cn>
- 780 4. Galanis P, Vraka I, Katsiroumpa A, Siskou O, Konstantakopoulou O, Katsoulas T,
781 Mariolis-Sapsakos T, Kaitelidou D. COVID-19 vaccine uptake among healthcare
782 workers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Vaccines*. 2022 Sep 29;10(10):1637.
- 783 5. Wang Q, Hu S, Du F, Zang S, Xing Y, Qu Z, Zhang X, Lin L, Hou Z. Mapping global
784 acceptance and uptake of COVID-19 vaccination: A systematic review and meta-
785 analysis. *Communications medicine*. 2022 Sep 12;2(1):113.
- 786 6. Liu L, Zhang M, Chen H, Xian J, Cao H, Zhou X, Gu Z, Liu H, Li Q, Wu F, Chen Q.
787 COVID-19 vaccine acceptance among cold-chain workers in Shenzhen, China: A cross-
788 sectional survey. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*. 2022 Nov 30;18(5):2056400.
- 789 7. Bai W, Sha S, Cheung T, Su Z, Jackson T, Xiang YT. Optimizing the dynamic zero-
790 COVID policy in China. *International Journal of Biological Sciences*. 2022;18(14):5314.

- 791 8. He L. China's Covid surge hits factories and consumer market [Internet]. CNN. 2022
792 [cited 2023 Aug 7]. Available from: [https://www.cnn.com/2022/12/26/economy/china-](https://www.cnn.com/2022/12/26/economy/china-covid-surge-economy-strain-intl-hnk/index.html)
793 [covid-surge-economy-strain-intl-hnk/index.html](https://www.cnn.com/2022/12/26/economy/china-covid-surge-economy-strain-intl-hnk/index.html)
- 794 9. Davey M. China's move to open up travel sparks concern over spread of new variants.
795 The Guardian [Internet]. 2023 Jan 5; Available from:
796 [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/dec/28/chinas-move-to-open-up-travel-sparks-](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/dec/28/chinas-move-to-open-up-travel-sparks-concern-over-spread-of-new-covid-variants)
797 [concern-over-spread-of-new-covid-variants](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/dec/28/chinas-move-to-open-up-travel-sparks-concern-over-spread-of-new-covid-variants)
- 798 10. Ioannidis JP, Zonta F, Levitt M. Estimates of COVID-19 deaths in Mainland China after
799 abandoning zero COVID policy. *European Journal of Clinical Investigation*. 2023
800 Apr;53(4):e13956.
- 801 11. Luo W, Song S. Perceived benefits and barriers to Chinese COVID-19 vaccine uptake
802 among young adults in China. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2022 Jun 3;10:825874.
- 803 12. Lin Y, Hu Z, Zhao Q, Alias H, Danaee M, Wong LP. Understanding COVID-19 vaccine
804 demand and hesitancy: A nationwide online survey in China. *PLoS neglected tropical*
805 *diseases*. 2020 Dec 17;14(12):e0008961.
- 806 13. Sun Y, Li X, Guo D. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy in China: An Analysis of Reasons
807 through Mixed Methods. *Vaccines*. 2023 Mar 22;11(3):712.
- 808 14. Liu T, He Z, Huang J, Yan N, Chen Q, Huang F, Zhang Y, Akinwunmi OM, Akinwunmi
809 BO, Zhang CJ, Wu Y. A comparison of vaccine hesitancy of COVID-19 vaccination in
810 China and the United States. *Vaccines*. 2021 Jun 14;9(6):649.
- 811 15. Moher, D., Shamseer, L., Clarke, M., Ghersi, D., Liberati, A., Petticrew, M., ... &
812 Stewart, L. A. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis
813 protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic reviews*, 4(1), 1-9.

- 814 16. Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence systematic review software [Internet]. Covidence.
815 [cited 2023 Jul 03]. Available from: www.covidence.org
- 816 17. Study quality assessment tools. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. NHLBI
817 [Internet]. <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-qualityassessment-tools>
- 818 18. Schünemann HJ, Brożek J, Guyatt G, Oxman A. Handbook for grading the quality of
819 evidence and the strength of recommendations using the GRADE approach. Updated
820 October. 2013 Oct;2013:15.
- 821 19. Chang C, Zhang X, Feng Y, Jin R, Sun L, Liang Y, Liu X, Ma Y, Song J, Xiang P, Zhang
822 E. COVID-19 vaccine uptake and hesitancy in Chinese patients with asthma. *Journal of*
823 *Asthma*. 2023 May 31(just-accepted):1-8.
- 824 20. Chan WL, Ho YH, Wong CK, Choi HC, Lam KO, Yuen KK, Kwong D, Hung I.
825 Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccination in cancer patients in Hong Kong: approaches to
826 improve the vaccination rate. *Vaccines*. 2021 Jul 16;9(7):792.
- 827 21. Chen M, Li Y, Chen J, Wen Z, Feng F, Zou H, Fu C, Chen L, Shu Y, Sun C. An online
828 survey of the attitude and willingness of Chinese adults to receive COVID-19
829 vaccination. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*. 2021 Jul 3;17(7):2279-88.
- 830 22. Feng H, Zhu H, Zhang H, Cao L, Li L, Wang J, Huang Y, Lai X, Lyu Y, Jing R, Guo J.
831 Caregivers' intentions to COVID-19 vaccination for their children in China: A cross-
832 sectional survey. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*. 2021 Dec 2;17(12):4799-805.
- 833 23. Fu L, Wu S, Wang B, Zheng W, Sun Y, Tian T, Zhang X, Xu L, Sun Y, Zhan J, Peng Z.
834 COVID-19 vaccination perception and uptake among cancer patients in Guangzhou,
835 China. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*. 2022 Nov 30;18(6):2102329.

- 836 24. Gan L, Chen Y, Hu P, Wu D, Zhu Y, Tan J, Li Y, Zhang D. Willingness to receive
837 SARS-CoV-2 vaccination and associated factors among Chinese adults: a cross sectional
838 survey. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2021
839 Feb;18(4):1993.
- 840 25. Hao J, Liu H, Shi J, Wang Q, Su X, Shi Z, Yu Y, Liu B, Qiao Y. A study on the
841 willingness and influencing factors of novel coronavirus vaccination among medical
842 personnel in North China. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*. 2022 Nov
843 30;18(5):2031775.
- 844 26. Hou Z, Song K, Wang Q, Zang S, Tu S, Chantler T, Larson HJ. Childhood COVID-19
845 vaccine acceptance and preference from caregivers and healthcare workers in China: A
846 survey experiment. *Preventive Medicine*. 2022 Aug 1;161:107138.
- 847 27. Huang X, Yu M, Fu G, Lan G, Li L, Yang J, Qiao Y, Zhao J, Qian HZ, Zhang X, Liu X.
848 Willingness to receive COVID-19 vaccination among people living with HIV and AIDS
849 in China: nationwide cross-sectional online survey. *JMIR public health and surveillance*.
850 2021 Oct 21;7(10):e31125.
- 851 28. Huang Y, Wu Q, Xu S, Zhao X, Wang L, Lv Q, Wu S, Zhang X. COVID-19 vaccine
852 uptake and its determinants among teenagers and their parents in Zhejiang, China: An
853 online cross-sectional study. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Medicine*. 2023 Apr
854 1;16(4):176-86.
- 855 29. Huang N, Wang C, Han B, Zhao T, Liu B, Chen L, Xie M, Zheng H, Zhang S, Wang Y,
856 Juan D. Change in willingness to COVID-19 vaccination in China: Two online surveys
857 during the pandemic. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2022 Nov;94(11):5271-8.

- 858 30. Hu X, Yan D, Liao M, Wei S, Wang J. Vaccination practices, knowledge and attitudes
859 regarding COVID-19 vaccines among Chinese university students: a cross-sectional
860 study from a comprehensive university in Wuhan. *BMJ open*. 2022 Nov
861 1;12(11):e058328.
- 862 31. Kong Y, Jiang H, Liu Z, Guo Y, Hu D. The uptake and vaccination willingness of
863 COVID-19 vaccine among Chinese residents: web-based online cross-sectional study.
864 *Vaccines*. 2022 Jan 8;10(1):90.
- 865 32. Li H, Cheng L, Tao J, Chen D, Zeng C. Knowledge and willingness to receive a COVID-
866 19 vaccine: a survey from Anhui Province, China. *Human Vaccines &*
867 *Immunotherapeutics*. 2022 Jan 31;18(1):2024064.
- 868 33. Li JB, Lau EY, Chan DK. Why do Hong Kong parents have low intention to vaccinate
869 their children against COVID-19? Testing health belief model and theory of planned
870 behavior in a large-scale survey. *Vaccine*. 2022 Apr 26;40(19):2772-80.
- 871 34. Li L, Wang J, Nicholas S, Maitland E, Leng A, Liu R. The intention to receive the
872 COVID-19 vaccine in China: Insights from protection motivation theory. *Vaccines*. 2021
873 May 2;9(5):445.
- 874 35. Lin Y, Hu Z, Zhao Q, Alias H, Danaee M, Wong LP. Understanding COVID-19 vaccine
875 demand and hesitancy: A nationwide online survey in China. *PLoS neglected tropical*
876 *diseases*. 2020 Dec 17;14(12):e0008961.
- 877 36. Li S, Gao Z, Zhong M, Yu Z, Li J, Bi H. Chinese university students' awareness and
878 acceptance of the COVID-19 vaccine: a cross-sectional study. *Risk Management and*
879 *Healthcare Policy*. 2022 Apr 29;845-64.

- 880 37. Li T, Qi R, Chen B, Luo Y, Zhang W, Zhou YH, Xu B. COVID-19 vaccination coverage
881 among adolescents aged 12–17 years in three provinces of eastern China: a cross-
882 sectional survey, 2021. *Frontiers in public health*. 2022 Jul 22;10:919190.
- 883 38. Liu J, Liu M, Liang W. The dynamic COVID-zero strategy in China. *China CDC*
884 *Weekly*. 2022 Jan 1;4(4):74.
- 885 39. Liu S, Jiang C, Wang J, Liu Y. The factors correlated with COVID-19 vaccination
886 coverage in Chinese hypertensive patients managed by community general practitioner.
887 *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*. 2023 Dec 31;19(1):2197839.
- 888 40. Li XH, Chen L, Pan QN, Liu J, Zhang X, Yi JJ, Chen CM, Luo QH, Tao PY, Pan X, Lu
889 SY. Vaccination status, acceptance, and knowledge toward a COVID-19 vaccine among
890 healthcare workers: a cross-sectional survey in China. *Human Vaccines &*
891 *Immunotherapeutics*. 2021 Nov 2;17(11):4065-73.
- 892 41. Luk TT, Zhao S, Wu Y, Wong JY, Wang MP, Lam TH. Prevalence and determinants of
893 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine hesitancy in Hong Kong: A population-based survey. *Vaccine*.
894 2021 Jun 16;39(27):3602-7.
- 895 42. Lv X, Zhao C, Song B, Huang H, Song S, Long H, Liu W, Du M, Liu M, Liu J. COVID-
896 19 vaccination in people living with HIV and AIDS (PLWHA) in China: A cross-
897 sectional study. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*. 2023 Dec 31;19(1):2151798.
- 898 43. Mo PK, She R, Yu Y, Li L, Yang Q, Lin J, Ye X, Wu S, Yang Z, Guan S, Zhang J.
899 Resilience and intention of healthcare workers in China to receive a COVID-19
900 vaccination: The mediating role of life satisfaction and stigma. *Journal of Advanced*
901 *Nursing*. 2022 Aug;78(8):2327-38.

- 902 44. Pan Y, Gong S, Zhu X, Xue C, Jing Y, Sun Y, Qian Y, Zhang J, Xia Q. Investigation on
903 the hesitancy of COVID-19 vaccination among liver transplant recipients: a cross-
904 sectional study in China. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2022 Dec 15;10:1014942.
- 905 45. Qin C, Du M, Wang Y, Li M, Wu H, Li S, Liu J. COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage
906 among 42,565 Adults Amid the Spread of Omicron Variant in Beijing, China. *Vaccines*.
907 2023 Mar 27;11(4):739.
- 908 46. Qin C, Wang R, Tao L, Liu M, Liu J. Association between risk perception and
909 acceptance for a booster dose of COVID-19 vaccine to children among child caregivers
910 in China. *Frontiers in public health*. 2022 Mar 16;10:834572.
- 911 47. Song S, Zang S, Gong L, Xu C, Lin L, Francis MR, Hou Z. Willingness and uptake of the
912 COVID-19 testing and vaccination in urban China during the low-risk period: a cross-
913 sectional study. *BMC Public Health*. 2022 Dec;22(1):1-3.
- 914 48. Sun Y, Li B, Li N, Li B, Chen P, Hao F, Sun C. Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine
915 among high-risk occupations in a Port city of China and multifaceted strategies for
916 increasing vaccination coverage: a cross-sectional study. *Risk Management and
917 Healthcare Policy*. 2022 Apr 14:643-55.
- 918 49. Tao L, Wang R, Han N, Liu J, Yuan C, Deng L, Han C, Sun F, Liu M, Liu J. Acceptance
919 of a COVID-19 vaccine and associated factors among pregnant women in China: a multi-
920 center cross-sectional study based on health belief model. *Human Vaccines &
921 Immunotherapeutics*. 2021 Aug 3;17(8):2378-88.
- 922 50. Wang C, Wang Y, Han B, Zhao TS, Liu B, Liu H, Chen L, Xie M, Zheng H, Zhang S,
923 Zeng J. Willingness and SARS-CoV-2 vaccination coverage among healthcare workers
924 in China: A nationwide study. *Vaccines*. 2021 Sep 6;9(9):993.

- 925 51. Wang C, Han B, Zhao T, Liu H, Liu B, Chen L, Xie M, Liu J, Zheng H, Zhang S, Wang
926 Y. Vaccination willingness, vaccine hesitancy, and estimated coverage at the first round
927 of COVID-19 vaccination in China: A national cross-sectional study. *Vaccine*. 2021 May
928 18;39(21):2833-42.
- 929 52. Wang J, Jing R, Lai X, Zhang H, Lyu Y, Knoll MD, Fang H. Acceptance of COVID-19
930 Vaccination during the COVID-19 Pandemic in China. *Vaccines*. 2020 Aug 27;8(3):482.
- 931 53. Wang J, Yuan B, Lu X, Liu X, Li L, Geng S, Zhang H, Lai X, Lyu Y, Feng H, Jing R.
932 Willingness to accept COVID-19 vaccine among the elderly and the chronic disease
933 population in China. *Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics*. 2021 Dec 2;17(12):4873-
934 88.
- 935 54. Wang MW, Wen W, Wang N, Zhou MY, Wang CY, Ni J, Jiang JJ, Zhang XW, Feng ZH,
936 Cheng YR. COVID-19 vaccination acceptance among healthcare workers and non-
937 healthcare workers in China: a survey. *Frontiers in public health*. 2021 Aug 2;9:709056.
- 938 55. Wong MC, Wong EL, Huang J, Cheung AW, Law K, Chong MK, Ng RW, Lai CK, Boon
939 SS, Lau JT, Chen Z. Acceptance of the COVID-19 vaccine based on the health belief
940 model: A population-based survey in Hong Kong. *Vaccine*. 2021 Feb 12;39(7):1148-56.
- 941 56. Wu J, Ma M, Miao Y, Ye B, Li Q, Tarimo CS, Wang M, Gu J, Wei W, Zhao L, Mu Z.
942 COVID-19 vaccination acceptance among Chinese population and its implications for the
943 pandemic: a national cross-sectional study. *Frontiers in public health*. 2022 Feb
944 8;10:796467.
- 945 57. Wu L, Wang X, Li R, Huang Z, Guo X, Liu J, Yan H, Sun X. Willingness to receive a
946 COVID-19 vaccine and associated factors among older adults: a cross-sectional survey in
947 Shanghai, China. *Vaccines*. 2022 Apr 21;10(5):654.

- 948 58. Wu S, Ming F, Xing Z, Zhang Z, Zhu S, Guo W, Zou S, Liu J, Liu Y, Liang K. COVID-
949 19 vaccination willingness among people living with HIV in wuhan, China. *Frontiers in*
950 *Public Health*. 2022 May 9;10:883453.
- 951 59. Xie P, Shi X, Zhu B, Zhao W, Li X, Zou X, Liu G, Han X. COVID-19 vaccine uptake,
952 reasons, and associated factors among older adults in Shenzhen, China. *Human Vaccines*
953 *& Immunotherapeutics*. 2023 Dec 31;19(1):2196914.
- 954 60. Yin D, Chen H, Deng Z, Yuan Y, Chen M, Cao H, Zhou X, Luo J, Zhang W, Gu Z, Wen
955 Z. Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination acceptance among industrial workers
956 in the post-vaccination era: a large-scale cross-sectional survey in China. *Human*
957 *Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*. 2021 Dec 2;17(12):5069-75.
- 958 61. Zhang J, Dean J, Yin Y, Wang D, Sun Y, Zhao Z, Wang J. Determinants of COVID-19
959 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy: a health care student-based online survey in Northwest
960 China. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2022 Jan 6;9:777565.
- 961 62. Zhang K, Fang Y, Chan PS, Cao H, Chen H, Hu T, Chen Y, Zhou X, Wang Z.
962 Behavioral intention to get a booster dose of COVID-19 vaccine among Chinese factory
963 workers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2022 Apr
964 26;19(9):5245.
- 965 63. Zhang K, Liang X, Tam KL, Kawuki J, Chan PS, Chen S, Fang Y, Cao H, Zhou X, Chen
966 Y, Hu T. Changes in COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptability among Parents with Children
967 Aged 6–35 Months in China—Repeated Cross-Sectional Surveys in 2020 and 2021.
968 *Vaccines*. 2023 Jan 12;11(1):170.

- 969 64. Zhao YM, Liu L, Sun J, Yan W, Yuan K, Zheng YB, Lu ZA, Liu L, Ni SY, Su SZ, Zhu
970 XM. Public willingness and determinants of COVID-19 vaccination at the initial stage of
971 mass vaccination in China. *Vaccines*. 2021 Oct 13;9(10):1172.
- 972 65. Zhou Q, Tian T, Ni J, Zhao X, Li H, Yang Y, Zhang Y, Pan J. COVID-19 vaccination
973 acceptance in China after it becomes available: a cross-sectional study. *Vaccines*. 2021
974 Nov 25;9(12):1398.
- 975 66. Smith DJ, Hakim AJ, Leung GM, Xu W, Schluter WW, Novak RT, Marston B, Hersh
976 BS. COVID-19 mortality and vaccine coverage—Hong Kong special administrative
977 region, China, January 6, 2022–March 21, 2022. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly*
978 *Report*. 2022 Apr 4;71(15):545.
- 979 67. Singh P, Dhalaria P, Kashyap S, Soni GK, Nandi P, Ghosh S, Mohapatra MK, Rastogi A,
980 Prakash D. Strategies to overcome vaccine hesitancy: a systematic review. *Systematic*
981 *reviews*. 2022 Dec;11(1):1-3.

982

983

984 **Supporting Information Captions:**

985

986 **S1 Table. Quality assessment [19-65]**

987 **S2 Table. GRADE Assessment for Odds Ratio - Age**

988 **S3 Table. GRADE Assessment for Odds Ratio - Gender**

989 **S4 Table. GRADE Assessment for Odds Ratio - Income**

990 **S5 Table. GRADE Assessment for Odds Ratio – Education**

991 **S6 Table. PRISMA Checklist**

992 **S1 Fig. Odds Ratio – Age funnel plot**

993 **S2 Fig. Odds Ratio – Gender funnel plot**




Fig 1




Fig 2




Fig 3




Fig 4




Fig 5