Willingness and influential factors of parents to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Petros Galanis[a], Irene Vraka[b], Olga Siskou[c], Olympia Konstantakopoulou[c], Aglaia Katsiroumpa[a], Daphne Kaitelidou[c]

[a] Clinical Epidemiology Laboratory, Faculty of Nursing, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

[b] Department of Radiology, P & A Kyriakou Children's Hospital, Athens, Greece

[c] Center for Health Services Management and Evaluation, Faculty of Nursing, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

Corresponding author: Petros Galanis, Assistant Professor, Clinical Epidemiology Laboratory, Faculty of Nursing, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, e-mail: pegalan@nurs.uoa.gr, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1308-5782

Conflicts of interest: none

Funding: None

Declarations of interest: None

Author contributions

P.G and I.V. were responsible for the conception and design of the study. P.G, I.V., O.S., O.K., A.K., and D.K. were responsible for the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data. All the authors drafted the article or revised it critically for important intellectual content, and provided final approval of the version to be submitted.

Abstract

Background: Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) vaccine uptake among children will be critical in limiting the spread of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and the disease. Parents are key decision-makers for whether their children will receive a COVID-19 vaccine.

Objective: To estimate parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19, and to investigate the predictors for their decision.

Methods: We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis guidelines for this systematic review and meta-analysis. We searched Scopus, Web of Science, Medline, PubMed, ProQuest, and CINAHL from inception to August 11, 2021. The review protocol was registered with PROSPERO (CRD42021273125). We applied a random effect model to estimate pooled effects since the heterogeneity was very high. We used subgroup analysis and meta-regression analysis to explore sources of heterogeneity.

Results: We found 17 studies including 45,783 parents. The overall proportion of parents that intend to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 was 56.8% (95% confidence interval: 51.8-61.8%). Parents' willingness ranged from 29% to 72.7%. Studies quality, sample size, data collection time, and the continent that studies were conducted did not affect the results. The main predictors of parents' intention to vaccinate their children against COVID-19 were male gender, older age of parents and children, higher socio-economic status, white race, positive attitudes toward vaccination, higher levels of knowledge, and higher levels of perceived threat from the COVID-19, worry, fear, and anxiety.

Conclusions: Parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 is moderate and several factors affect this decision. Understanding parental COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy does help policy makers to change the stereotypes and establish broad community COVID-19 vaccination. Identification of the factors that affect parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against COVID-19 will provide opportunities to

enhance parents trust in the COVID-19 vaccines and optimize children's uptake of a COVID-19 vaccine.

Keywords: COVID-19; vaccination, willingness; predictors; SARS-CoV-2; children; parents

Introduction

Given the human, social and economic burden of the Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, the uptake of a safe and effective vaccine remains a critical strategy to curb its impact (Graham, 2020). Simulation experiments revealed that up to 80% of the population needs to receive a COVID-19 vaccine that is at least 80% effective to largely extinguish the COVID-19 pandemic without any other non-pharmaceutical measures (e.g., social distancing, masks etc.) (Bartsch et al., 2020). Thus, COVID-19 vaccine uptake among children will be instrumental in limiting the spread of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and the disease.

COVID-19 vaccine uptake relies on adequate production, fair distribution, and high levels of acceptance among the general public (Neumann-Böhme et al., 2020). Recent meta-analyses found that the overall COVID-19 vaccine acceptance rate was approximately 73%, while acceptance among the general population is higher than among healthcare workers (Galanis et al., 2020; Luo et al., 2021; Snehota et al., 2021; Wang, Yang, et al., 2021). Also, real-world data from early studies reveal that COVID-19 vaccination uptake ranges from 28.6% to 98% in the general population (Galanis et al., 2021). Several factors influence vaccination intention and uptake in the general population such as socio-demographic characteristics, attitudes towards vaccination, psychological factors, perceptions of risk and susceptibility to COVID-19, knowledge, information, personal factors, medical conditions, etc. (Al-Amer et al., 2021; Galanis et al., 2021; Snehota et al., 2021; Wake, 2021; Wang, Yang, et al., 2021).

The risk of severe illness and death from the COVID-19 remains quite low for children, but children COVID-19 cases rise sharply due to the highly transmissible delta variant (Tanne, 2021). For instance, since the COVID-19 pandemic began, children represent 14.4% of total COVID-19 cases in the USA but for the week ending August 12, 2021, children were 18% of weekly cases (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2021). Moreover, children make up about 2.4% of total hospitalizations in the USA and about 1% of all pediatric COVID-19 cases resulted in hospitalization since the start of the pandemic (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2021). Thus, there is a need for safe and effective COVID-19 vaccines for children of all ages as swiftly as possible (Tanne, 2021).

Currently, COVID-19 vaccines are approved for children aged 12 and older and it is anticipated that younger children will become eligible since pharmaceutical companies are running clinical trials with children to study the safety and efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines (European Medicines Agency, 2021a, 2021b; Health Canada, 2021).

Since parents are key decision-makers for whether their children will receive a COVID-19 vaccine, it is important to measure willingness of parents to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19. Early studies have already investigated parents' intention to vaccinate their children but until now, no systematic review on this field is published. Thus, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis to estimate parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19, and to investigate the predictors for their decision.

Methods

Data sources and strategy

We performed a systematic review and meta-analysis, applying the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines (Moher et al., 2009). We searched Scopus, Web of Science, Medline, PubMed, ProQuest, and CINAHL from inception to August 11, 2021. We used the following strategy in all fields: ((vaccin*) AND (COVID-19)) AND (parent*). The review protocol was registered with PROSPERO (CRD42021273125).

Selection and eligibility criteria

Firstly, we removed duplicates, and then we screened consecutively titles, abstracts, and full texts. Also, we examined reference lists of all relevant articles. Two independent researchers performed study selection and a third, senior researcher resolved the discrepancies. We included quantitative studies reporting parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19. Also, we included quantitative studies that examine factors that affect parents' willingness to vaccinate their children. Study population included parents and guardians of children aged <18 years. We did not apply criteria regarding study population, e.g. gender, age, race, sample size, etc. Studies

published in English in journals with peer review system were eligible to be included. We excluded protocols, reviews, case reports, editorials, and letters to the Editor.

Data extraction and quality assessment

Two authors independently extracted the following data from the studies: reference, country, data collection time, sample size, age of parents and children, population, study design, sampling method, response rate, percentage of parents that agree to vaccinate their children, and factors that affect parents' willingness to vaccinate their children. Studies quality was assessed with the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tool (Santos et al., 2018).

Statistical Analysis

Parents' intention to vaccinate their children was assessed with statements or questions like these "When a vaccine for Coronavirus becomes available, I will have my child get it", "If a COVID-19 vaccine are safe and available to your child for free, how likely would your child be to get vaccinated?", "At this moment, are you willing to receive COVID-19 vaccination for your child?" etc. Possible answers were in Likert scales (e.g. strongly disagree; disagree; neither disagree nor agree; agree; strongly agree) or in yes/no/uncertain options. For each study, we followed the authors' decision regarding the positive answer of parents. For instance, in studies where authors used Likert scales, a positive answer could be only one answer (strongly agree) or two answers (agree and strongly agree). We divided the positive answers of parents with the total number of parents to calculate the proportion of parents that agreed to vaccinate their children. Then, we transformed the proportions with the Freeman-Tukey Double Arcsine method and we calculated the proportion of parents that intend to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 and the 95% confidence interval (CI) (Barendregt et al., 2013).

We used the Hedges Q statistics and I^2 to assess heterogeneity between studies. A p-value<0.1 for the Hedges Q statistic indicates statistically significant heterogeneity, while I^2 value higher than 75% indicates high heterogeneity (Higgins, 2003). We applied a random effect model to estimate pooled effects since the heterogeneity between results was very high (Higgins, 2003). We considered sample size, data collection time, age of

parents and children, sampling method, response rate, studies quality, and the continent that studies were conducted as pre-specified sources of heterogeneity. Due to the limited number of studies, we decided to perform subgroup analysis for studies quality and the continent that studies were conducted. Also, we performed meta-regression analysis using sample size and data collection time as the independent variables. We treated data collection time as a continuous variable giving the number 1 for studies that were conducted in January 2020, the number 2 for studies that were conducted in February 2020 etc. We conducted a leave-one-out sensitivity analysis to determine the influence of each study on the overall effect. We used the funnel plot and the Egger's test to assess the publication bias. Regarding the Egger's test, a P-value<0.05 indicating publication bias (Egger et al., 1997). We did not perform meta-analysis for the factors that influence parents' decision to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 since the data were highly heterogeneous and limited. We used OpenMeta[Analyst] for the meta-analysis (Wallace et al., 2009).

Results

Identification and selection of studies

After initial search, we found 4325 unique records. Applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria, we identified 17 articles (Figure 1).

Please, insert Figure 1 about here

Characteristics of the studies

We found 17 studies including 45,783 parents. Details of the studies included in this systematic review are presented in Table 1. Five studies were conducted in the USA (Kelly et al., 2021; Ruggiero et al., 2021; A. M. Scherer et al., 2021; Szilagyi et al., 2021; Teasdale et al., 2021), three studies in China (Wang, Xiu, et al., 2021; Y. Xu et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2020), two studies in Turkey (Yigit et al., 2021; Yilmaz & Sahin, 2021), one study in Canada (Hetherington et al., 2021), one study in New Zealand (Jeffs et al.,

2021), and three studies in Europe (United Kingdom, Germany and Italy) (S. Bell et al., 2020; Brandstetter et al., 2021; Montalti et al., 2021). Also, two studies were multicenter including participants from several countries (Goldman et al., 2020; Skjefte et al., 2021). Data collection time among studies ranged from March 2020 (Goldman et al., 2020) to April 2021 (A. M. Scherer et al., 2021). Sample size ranged from 427 (Ruggiero et al., 2021) to 17,054 parents (Skjefte et al., 2021). All studies were cross-sectional, while 14 studies used a convenience sample (S. Bell et al., 2020; Brandstetter et al., 2021; Goldman et al., 2020; Hetherington et al., 2021; Jeffs et al., 2021; Montalti et al., 2021; A. M. Scherer et al., 2021; Skjefte et al., 2021; Teasdale et al., 2021; Wang, Xiu, et al., 2021; Y. Xu et al., 2021; Yigit et al., 2021; Yilmaz & Sahin, 2021; Zhang et al., 2020), two studies used a probability sample (Kelly et al., 2021; Szilagyi et al., 2021), and one study used the snowball sampling method (Ruggiero et al., 2021).

Thirteen studies did not report data regarding response rate (S. Bell et al., 2020; Goldman et al., 2020; Jeffs et al., 2021; Kelly et al., 2021; Montalti et al., 2021; Ruggiero et al., 2021; Skjefte et al., 2021; Teasdale et al., 2021; Wang, Xiu, et al., 2021; Y. Xu et al., 2021, 2021; Yigit et al., 2021; Yilmaz & Sahin, 2021; Zhang et al., 2020), five regarding children's age (Hetherington et al., 2021; Jeffs et al., 2021; Kelly et al., 2021; Skjefte et al., 2021; Yigit et al., 2021), and three regarding parents' age (Brandstetter et al., 2021; Ruggiero et al., 2021; A. M. Scherer et al., 2021).

Please, insert Table 1 about here

Quality assessment

Quality assessment of cross-sectional studies included in this review is shown in Table 3. Quality was good in 14 studies (S. Bell et al., 2020; Brandstetter et al., 2021; Goldman et al., 2020; Kelly et al., 2021; Montalti et al., 2021; Ruggiero et al., 2021; A. M. Scherer et al., 2021; Skjefte et al., 2021; Szilagyi et al., 2021; Teasdale et al., 2021; Wang, Xiu, et al., 2021; Y. Xu et al., 2021; Yilmaz & Sahin, 2021), and moderate in three studies (Hetherington et al., 2021; Jeffs et al., 2021; Yigit et al., 2021). Quality assessment of studies is shown in Supplementary Table 1.

Meta-analysis

The overall proportion of parents that intend to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 was 56.8% (95% CI: 51.8-61.8%) (Figure 2). The heterogeneity between results was very high (I^2=99.08%, p-value for the Hedges Q statistic<0.001). Parents' willingness ranged from 29% (Yigit et al., 2021) to 72.7% (Y. Xu et al., 2021). A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis showed that no single study had a disproportional effect on the overall proportion, which varied between 55.8% (95% CI: 50.6-61.0%), with Kelly et al. (2021) excluded, and 58.5% (95% CI: 53.7-63.3%), with Yigit et al. (2021) excluded (Supplementary Figure S1). P-value for Egger's test (<0.05) and funnel plot (Supplementary Figure S2) indicated potential publication bias.

According to subgroup analysis, there were no differences regarding studies quality and the continent that studies were conducted. In particular, the proportion of parents that intend to vaccinate their children in studies that were conducted in North America was 55.2% (95% CI: 45.6-64.7%, I^2=98.8), in Asia was 54.1% (95% CI=39.8%-68.3%, I^2=99.5%), and in Europe was 53.2% (95% CI=44.6%-62.2%, I^2=97.3%). Moreover, the proportion was almost the same for the studies with good quality (57.6% [95% CI: 52.3-62.9%], I^2=99.16) and those with moderate quality (53.0% [95% CI: 33.2-72.8%], I^2=99.2). Meta-regression analysis showed that parents' intention to vaccinate their children was independent sample size (p=0.087) and data collection time (p=0.083).

Please insert Figure 2 about here

Factors related with parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against COVID-19

Fifteen studies investigated factors that affect positively parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against COVID-19, while seven studies investigated factors with a negative impact. Statistically significant factors related with parents' intention to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 are shown in Table 2. Two studies used univariate

analysis (Goldman et al., 2020; Yigit et al., 2021), while the other 15 studies used multivariate analysis eliminating confounders.

Several socio-demographic characteristics affected parents' intention to vaccinate their children against COVID-19. Higher socio-economic status was related with an increase in COVID-19 vaccine acceptance. In particular, higher educational level (Brandstetter et al., 2021; Hetherington et al., 2021; Kelly et al., 2021; Montalti et al., 2021; A. M. Scherer et al., 2021; Skjefte et al., 2021; Szilagyi et al., 2021; Teasdale et al., 2021), higher income (Hetherington et al., 2021; Kelly et al., 2021; Skjefte et al., 2021; Teasdale et al., 2021), and health insurance (Skjefte et al., 2021) were associated with parents' intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination for their children. Increased intended uptake of a COVID-19 vaccine was associated with older age of children (Goldman et al., 2020; Szilagyi et al., 2021) and parents (Kelly et al., 2021; Montalti et al., 2021; Skjefte et al., 2021), and increased number of children (S. Bell et al., 2020). Intention of parents to vaccinate their children against COVID-19 increased, when fathers completed the survey (Goldman et al., 2020; Kelly et al., 2021; Montalti et al., 2021; A. M. Scherer et al., 2021; Teasdale et al., 2021; Yigit et al., 2021). Also, parents from Black, Asian or minority ethnic groups were more hesitant to vaccinate their children against COVID-19 (S. Bell et al., 2020; Kelly et al., 2021; A. M. Scherer et al., 2021).

Positive attitudes with regards to vaccination affected positively parents' intention to vaccinate their children against COVID-19. In particular, children's complete vaccination history, recent history of vaccination against influenza, confidence in vaccines, confidence in COVID-19 vaccine safety and efficacy, and COVID-19 vaccine uptake among parents were associated with increased intended uptake of a COVID-19 vaccine (Goldman et al., 2020; Hetherington et al., 2021; Kelly et al., 2021; Ruggiero et al., 2021; Skjefte et al., 2021; Szilagyi et al., 2021; Yilmaz & Sahin, 2021; Zhang et al., 2020). On the other hand, overall vaccination hesitancy, and concerns for serious side effects and effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination decreased parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against COVID-19 (Montalti et al., 2021; Ruggiero et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2020).

Higher levels of perceived threat from the COVID-19, worry, fear, and anxiety were associated with parents' intention to accept COVID-19 vaccination for their children (Kelly et al., 2021; Skjefte et al., 2021; Yigit et al., 2021; Yilmaz & Sahin, 2021). Also, parents with higher levels of knowledge about prevention measures, information about the COVID-19 pandemic, confidence in public health agencies/health science, and compliance to mask guidelines were more likely to vaccinate their children (Brandstetter et al., 2021; Skjefte et al., 2021).

Please, insert Table 2 about here

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis that assesses the willingness of parents to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 and investigates the predictors for their decision. Seventeen papers including 45,783 parents met our inclusion criteria. The primary reasons that papers were excluded from our systematic review include other types of publications (e.g. reviews, qualitative studies, case reports, protocols, etc.) and irrelevant research question.

We found that the overall proportion of parents that intend to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 is moderate (56.8%) with a wide range among studies from 29% to 72.7%. Parents' intention to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 is lower than intention of the general population to take a COVID-19 vaccine (56.8% vs. 73%) (Snehota et al., 2021; Wang, Yang, et al., 2021). Also, the willingness of high-risk groups such as healthcare workers to accept COVID-19 vaccination is higher than parents' willingness to vaccinate their children (63.5% vs. 56.8%) (Galanis et al., 2020; Luo et al., 2021). A possible explanation for the lower overall intention of parents to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 demonstrated by our meta-analysis could be the perception of a very low risk of severe COVID-19 in children and the fact that children are often asymptomatic carriers. The wide range of parents' willingness among studies is confirmed by similar reviews in the general population and could be due to different study designs, study populations, levels of knowledge and information, attitudes towards

vaccination etc. (Galanis et al., 2021; Snehota et al., 2021; Wang, Yang, et al., 2021). Interestingly, we did not find differences in parents' willingness to vaccinate their children according to the continent that studies were conducted. However, the low number of studies including in our subgroup analysis could affect this finding and thus more studies should be performed to infer more valid conclusions.

It is noteworthy that our meta-regression analysis revealed that data collection time does not affect parents' intention to vaccinate their children but studies of current and ongoing attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination should be conducted since information and knowledge about COVID-19 vaccines are still evolving.

According to our review, several socio-demographic characteristics affect parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against COVID-19. In particular, mothers and older parents were more hesitant, a finding that is confirmed by the literature since females and older individuals are in general more likely to report vaccine hesitancy (Galanis et al., 2021; C. Lin et al., 2020; Neumann-Böhme et al., 2020; Schwarzinger et al., 2021). This could be due to the fact that males and older individuals, reported to be at higher risk of intensive care unit admission and death from COVID-19, and so could be more prone to vaccination (Bienvenu et al., 2020; Peckham et al., 2020). On the other hand, females tend to experience more adverse events after COVID-19 vaccination and their vaccine hesitancy may be related with poor knowledge regarding issues such as fertility, pregnancy, and breastfeeding (Schrading et al., 2021; B. Xu et al., 2021). Therefore, mothers could be more worried about potential side effects of the COVID-19 vaccines in their children, and thus are more reluctant to vaccinate their children.

Moreover, we found that higher educational level is associated with increased intended uptake of a COVID-19 vaccine. Impact of parents' educational level on vaccine hesitancy is a controversial issue since previous studies have shown that lower educational level is associated with more concerns about vaccine safety and efficacy (Gust et al., 2003; Shui et al., 2006; Smith et al., 2004), but other studies found the opposite (Opel et al., 2011). Also, a higher level of parents' education is related with higher confidence toward vaccination by giving more tools for decision-making (Bocquier et al., 2018; Gualano et

al., 2018; Kempe et al., 2020), but higher educated parents are more likely to forego immunizations (Gilkey et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2011).

Our review revealed that parents from Black, Asian and minority ethnic groups are less willing than White parents to vaccinate their children against COVID-19. This is consistent with a systematic review which shows that COVID-19 vaccination uptake is higher among individuals from White race than individuals from Black race (Galanis et al., 2021). Also, individuals from Black, Asian and minority ethnic groups have a lower level of COVID-19 vaccine acceptability (Funk & Tyson, 2021; Hamel et al., 2021; Malik et al., 2020; Ruiz & Bell, 2021) and they have lower seasonal influence vaccine coverage (Williams et al., 2017). Given that people from Black, Asian and minority ethnic groups are at higher risk of acquiring SARS-CoV-2 infection and at increased risk of adverse outcomes from COVID-19, a concerted effort must be made to minimize inequalities in COVID-19 vaccination uptake and ensure equitable access to the COVID-19 vaccines (Martin et al., 2020; Sze et al., 2020; Voysey et al., 2021).

We found that parents' positive attitudes towards vaccination affect their decision to vaccinate their children against COVID-19. In particular, parents whose children had recently received the influenza vaccination or had a completed vaccination history reported a higher likelihood of COVID-19 vaccination for their children. During the COVID-19 pandemic, an important predictor of future behavior remains past behavior (Bourassa et al., 2020). Past behavior predicts future behavior in a direct pathway, where a habitual process occurring, or in an indirect pathway via conscious, intentional processes (Ouellette & Wood, 1998; Schwarzer & Hamilton, 2020). For instance, several studies have identified the relation between individuals' vaccination in the past and uptake of the pandemic H1N1 vaccine (Bish et al., 2011; Rubin et al., 2011; Setbon & Raude, 2010; Torun et al., 2010). This pattern is similar to our finding that COVID-19 vaccine uptake among parents is associated with increased intended uptake of a COVID-19 vaccine among children. Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic seems to increase polarization of parents' vaccination behaviors since parents who did not vaccinate their children in the past reported becoming even less likely to vaccinate them in the near future (Sokol & Grummon, 2020).

According to our review, confidence in vaccination, concerns for serious side effects and effectiveness of vaccines, and vaccine hesitancy are significant predictors of parents' attitudes regarding vaccination. These findings are confirmed by the literature since parents in the USA are hesitant to vaccinate their children with routine immunizations because of safety, side effects and low effectiveness concerns (Kempe et al., 2020; Nyhan & Reifler, 2015). Vaccine hesitancy is a complex issue and one of the main obstacles to control the COVID-19 pandemic since an instrumental percentage of the general population refuses COVID-19 vaccines (Jaca et al., 2021; Wiysonge et al., 2021). Unfortunately, providing information on vaccine safety and effectiveness to individuals who are vaccine-hesitant can be counterproductive (Nyhan et al., 2014; Nyhan & Reifler, 2015; L. D. Scherer et al., 2016). Tailored and targeted communication materials, and balanced information on vaccines providing both the benefits and risks of vaccination are necessary to optimize vaccine uptake (Dubé et al., 2015, 2020). A robust, transparent, reasonable, and widespread COVID-19 vaccine educational campaign harnessing media, healthcare workers, leaders, and social influencers should be implemented by the public health officials to diminish parents' concerns for COVID-19 vaccine safety and efficacy (Schaffer DeRoo et al., 2020). Also, behavioral-change theories (e.g., the health-belief model) have already been effectively adapted to improve individual medical use and should be used by government and health authorities to curb COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among parents (L. Lin et al., 2020; Opel et al., 2009).

Since COVID-19 vaccine safety and effectiveness are key parental concerns, it is critical to emphasize the safety profile of COVID-19 vaccines for children based on evidence from randomized controlled trials and post-approval data. Well-informed parents experience less worry, fear, and anxiety about COVID-19 and are more likely to receive a COVID-19 vaccine for their children as suggested by our review. The rigorous development and approval process of COVID-19 vaccines by the federal agencies worldwide increase parents' concerns and there is a need for continued transparency and active public education regarding the COVID-19 vaccines development (B. P. Bell et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2020). In that case, the role of primary care physicians to communicate about COVID-19 vaccines for children is critical since prior studies show that clear messages and recommendations by primary care physicians have a large impact on

vaccine uptake (Braun & O'Leary, 2020; Dempsey & O'Leary, 2018; Edwards et al., 2016).

Limitations

This systematic review has several limitations. In particular, findings of our review could not be generalized since the number of studies is relatively low and studies were conducted mainly in the USA and China. Moreover, the statistical heterogeneity was very high due probably to heterogeneity in study designs and populations. To account for this heterogeneity, we applied a random effects model and we performed subgroup and meta-regression analysis. Unfortunately, due to the limited number of studies, we performed subgroup analysis only for two variables. At least, subgroup analysis and leave-one-out sensitivity analysis revealed that our results are robust. We searched for studies conducted till to August 11, 2021 but availability of COVID-19 vaccines and evidence from randomized controlled trials and post-approval data are increasing on an on-going basis and parents' attitudes could be changed. Thus, our findings may not be generalizable to later in the COVID-19 pandemic. Since all studies in our review were cross-sectional, we cannot infer causal relationships between parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 and predictors of this attitude. We consider predictors of parents' intention to vaccinate their children as a potential area for future study since only socio-demographic variables have so far been investigated thoroughly. Future studies should assess broader and diverse parent populations to fully understand the factors that affect parents' intention to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19. Finally, the proportion of parents that agreed to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19 may be a biased estimation since studies measured willingness and not COVID-19 vaccination uptake.

Conclusions

High vaccination coverage is indispensable to control the COVID-19 pandemic. Given the highly transmissible delta variant, COVID-19 vaccination coverage should be increased to achieve herd immunity to COVID-19. This is the main reason that the

COVID-19 vaccine rollout is just expanding to the children population. Thus, it is critical to better understand what factors affect parents' decision to vaccinate their children against COVID-19. Understanding parental COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy does help policy makers to change the stereotypes and establish broad community COVID-19 vaccination. As global COVID-19 vaccines rollout continue, our review could help policy makers and healthcare workers to understand parental decision around COVID-19 vaccination. This information can be used for evidence-based targeted campaigns and health interventions to ultimately maximize future COVID-19 vaccine uptake among children. There is a need to build vaccine confidence during the COVID-19 pandemic through clear messages and effective community engagement. Targeted public health strategies should aim to assuage parents' concerns regarding COVID-19 vaccines. Identification of the factors that affect parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against COVID-19 will provide opportunities to enhance parents trust in the COVID-19 vaccines and optimize children's uptake of a COVID-19 vaccine.

Figure 1. Flowchart of the literature search according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis.

Figure 2. Forest plot of parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19.

Supplementary Figure S1. A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis of parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19.

Supplementary Figure S2. Funnel plot of parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19.

References

Al-Amer, R., Maneze, D., Everett, B., Montayre, J., Villarosa, A. R., Dwekat, E., & Salamonson, Y. (2021). COVID-19 vaccination intention in the first year of the pandemic: A systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15951

American Academy of Pediatrics. (2021). *Children and COVID-19: State-level data report*. https://www.aap.org/en/pages/2019-novel-coronavirus-covid-19-infections/children-and-covid-19-state-level-data-report/

Barendregt, J. J., Doi, S. A., Lee, Y. Y., Norman, R. E., & Vos, T. (2013). Meta-analysis of prevalence. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, *67*(11), 974–978. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2013-203104

Bartsch, S. M., O'Shea, K. J., Ferguson, M. C., Bottazzi, M. E., Wedlock, P. T., Strych, U., McKinnell, J. A., Siegmund, S. S., Cox, S. N., Hotez, P. J., & Lee, B. Y. (2020). Vaccine Efficacy Needed for a COVID-19 Coronavirus Vaccine to Prevent or Stop an Epidemic as the Sole Intervention. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *59*(4), 493–503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2020.06.011

Bell, B. P., Romero, J. R., & Lee, G. M. (2020). Scientific and Ethical Principles Underlying Recommendations From the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices for COVID-19 Vaccination Implementation. *JAMA*, *324*(20), 2025–2026. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.20847

Bell, S., Clarke, R., Mounier-Jack, S., Walker, J., & Paterson, P. (2020). Parents' and guardians' views on the acceptability of a future COVID-19 vaccine: A multi-methods study in England. *VACCINE*, *38*(49), 7789–7798. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.10.027

Bienvenu, L. A., Noonan, J., Wang, X., & Peter, K. (2020). Higher mortality of COVID-19 in males: Sex differences in immune response and cardiovascular comorbidities. *Cardiovascular Research*, *116*(14), 2197–2206. https://doi.org/10.1093/cvr/cvaa284

Bish, A., Yardley, L., Nicoll, A., & Michie, S. (2011). Factors associated with uptake of vaccination against pandemic influenza: A systematic review. *Vaccine*, *29*(38), 6472–6484. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.06.107

Bocquier, A., Fressard, L., Cortaredona, S., Zaytseva, A., Ward, J., Gautier, A., Peretti-Watel, P., Verger, P., & Baromètre santé 2016 group. (2018). Social differentiation of vaccine hesitancy among French parents and the mediating role of trust and commitment to health: A nationwide cross-sectional study. *Vaccine*, *36*(50), 7666–7673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.10.085

Bourassa, K. J., Sbarra, D. A., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2020). Social Distancing as a Health Behavior: County-Level Movement in the United States During the COVID-19 Pandemic Is Associated with Conventional Health Behaviors. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, *54*(8), 548–556. https://doi.org/10.1093/abm/kaaa049

Brandstetter, S., Bohmer, M., Pawellek, M., Seelbach-Gobel, B., Melter, M., Kabesch, M., Apfelbacher, C., & KUNO-Kids Study Grp. (2021). Parents' intention to get vaccinated and to have their child vaccinated against COVID-19: Cross-sectional analyses using data from the KUNO-Kids health study. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PEDIATRICS*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00431-021-04094-z

Braun, C., & O'Leary, S. T. (2020). Recent advances in addressing vaccine hesitancy. *Current Opinion in Pediatrics*, *32*(4), 601–609. https://doi.org/10.1097/MOP.0000000000000929

Dempsey, A. F., & O'Leary, S. T. (2018). Human Papillomavirus Vaccination: Narrative Review of Studies on How Providers' Vaccine Communication Affects Attitudes and Uptake. *Academic Pediatrics*, *18*(2S), S23–S27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2017.09.001

Dubé, E., Gagnon, D., MacDonald, N. E., & SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. (2015). Strategies intended to address vaccine hesitancy: Review of published reviews. *Vaccine*, *33*(34), 4191–4203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.041

Dubé, E., Gagnon, D., & Vivion, M. (2020). Optimizing communication material to address vaccine hesitancy. *Canada Communicable Disease Report = Releve Des*

Maladies Transmissibles Au Canada, *46*(2–3), 48–52. https://doi.org/10.14745/ccdr.v46i23a05

Edwards, K. M., Hackell, J. M., & COMMITTEE ON INFECTIOUS DISEASES, THE COMMITTEE ON PRACTICE AND AMBULATORY MEDICINE. (2016). Countering Vaccine Hesitancy. *Pediatrics*, *138*(3), e20162146. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-2146

Egger, M., Smith, G. D., Schneider, M., & Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*, *315*(7109), 629–634. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629

European Medicines Agency. (2021a). *First COVID-19 vaccine approved for children aged 12 to 15 in EU*. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/first-covid-19-vaccine-approved-children-aged-12-15-eu

European Medicines Agency. (2021b). *COVID-19 vaccine Spikevax approved for children aged 12 to 17 in EU*. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/covid-19-vaccine-spikevax-approved-children-aged-12-17-eu

Funk, C., & Tyson, A. (2021). *Growing share of Americans say they plan to get a COVID-19 vaccine – or already have*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2021/03/05/growing-share-of-americans-say-they-plan-to-get-a-covid-19-vaccine-or-already-have/

Galanis, P., Vraka, I., Fragkou, D., Bilali, A., & Kaitelidou, D. (2020). *Intention of health care workers to accept COVID-19 vaccination and related factors: A systematic review and meta-analysis* [Preprint]. Public and Global Health. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246041

Galanis, P., Vraka, I., Siskou, O., Konstantakopoulou, O., Katsiroumpa, A., & Kaitelidou, D. (2021). *Predictors of COVID-19 vaccination uptake and reasons for decline of vaccination: A systematic review* [Preprint]. Public and Global Health. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.28.21261261

Gilkey, M. B., McRee, A.-L., & Brewer, N. T. (2013). Forgone vaccination during childhood and adolescence: Findings of a statewide survey of parents. *Preventive Medicine*, *56*(3–4), 202–206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2012.12.019

Goldman, R. D., Yan, T. D., Seiler, M., Parra Cotanda, C., Brown, J. C., Klein, E. J., Hoeffe, J., Gelernter, R., Hall, J. E., Davis, A. L., Griffiths, M. A., Mater, A., Manzano, S., Gualco, G., Shimizu, N., Hurt, T. L., Ahmed, S., Hansen, M., Sheridan, D., … Staubli, G. (2020). Caregiver willingness to vaccinate their children against COVID-19: Cross sectional survey. *Vaccine*, *38*(48), 7668–7673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.09.084

Graham, B. S. (2020). Rapid COVID-19 vaccine development. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, *368*(6494), 945–946. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb8923

Gualano, M. R., Bert, F., Voglino, G., Buttinelli, E., D'Errico, M. M., De Waure, C., Di Giovanni, P., Fantini, M. P., Giuliani, A. R., Marranzano, M., Masanotti, G., Massimi, A., Nante, N., Pennino, F., Squeri, R., Stefanati, A., Signorelli, C., Siliquini, R., Castaldi, S., … Zappalà, G. (2018). Attitudes towards compulsory vaccination in Italy: Results from the NAVIDAD multicentre study. *Vaccine*, *36*(23), 3368–3374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.04.029

Gust, D. A., Woodruff, R., Kennedy, A., Brown, C., Sheedy, K., & Hibbs, B. (2003). Parental perceptions surrounding risks and benefits of immunization. *Seminars in Pediatric Infectious Diseases*, *14*(3), 207–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1045-1870(03)00035-9

Hamel, L., Kirzinger, A., Lopes, L., Sparks, G., Kearney, A., Stokes, M., & Brodie, M. (2021). *KFF COVID-19 vaccine monitor: May 2021*. Kaiser Family Foundation. https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/poll-finding/kff-covid-19-vaccine-monitor-may-2021/

Health Canada. (2021). *Health Canada authorizes use of the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine in children 12 to 15 years of age*. https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/news/2021/05/health-canada-authorizes-use-of-the-pfizer-biontech-covid-19-vaccine-in-children-12-to-15-years-of-age.html

Hetherington, E., Edwards, S. A., MacDonald, S. E., Racine, N., Madigan, S., McDonald, S., & Tough, S. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 vaccination intentions among mothers of children aged 9 to 12 years: A survey of the All Our Families cohort. *CMAJ Open*, *9*(2), E548–E555. https://doi.org/10.9778/cmajo.20200302

Higgins, J. P. T. (2003). Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*, *327*(7414), 557–560. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557

Jaca, A., Iwu-Jaja, C. J., Balakrishna, Y., Pienaar, E., & Wiysonge, C. S. (2021). A global bibliometric analysis of research productivity on vaccine hesitancy from 1974 to 2019. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/21645515.2021.1903294

Jeffs, E., Lucas, N., & Walls, T. (2021). COVID-19: Parent and caregiver concerns about reopening New Zealand schools. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, *57*(3), 403–408. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpc.15234

Kelly, B. J., Southwell, B. G., McCormack, L. A., Bann, C. M., MacDonald, P. D. M., Frasier, A. M., Bevc, C. A., Brewer, N. T., & Squiers, L. B. (2021). Predictors of willingness to get a COVID-19 vaccine in the U.S. *BMC Infectious Diseases*, *21*(1), 338. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-06023-9

Kempe, A., Saville, A. W., Albertin, C., Zimet, G., Breck, A., Helmkamp, L., Vangala, S., Dickinson, L. M., Rand, C., Humiston, S., & Szilagyi, P. G. (2020). Parental Hesitancy About Routine Childhood and Influenza Vaccinations: A National Survey. *Pediatrics*, *146*(1), e20193852. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2019-3852

Lee, G. M., Bell, B. P., & Romero, J. R. (2020). The Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices and Its Role in the Pandemic Vaccine Response. *JAMA*, *324*(6), 546–547. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.13167

Lin, C., Tu, P., & Beitsch, L. M. (2020). Confidence and Receptivity for COVID-19 Vaccines: A Rapid Systematic Review. *Vaccines*, *9*(1), 16. https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9010016

Lin, L., Sun, R., Yao, T., Zhou, X., & Harbarth, S. (2020). Factors influencing inappropriate use of antibiotics in outpatient and community settings in China: A mixed-methods systematic review. *BMJ Global Health*, *5*(11), e003599. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003599

Luo, C., Yang, Y., Liu, Y., Zheng, D., Shao, L., Jin, J., & He, Q. (2021). Intention to COVID-19 vaccination and associated factors among health care workers: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-sectional studies. *American Journal*

of Infection Control, S0196-6553(21)00460-0. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2021.06.020

Malik, A. A., McFadden, S. M., Elharake, J., & Omer, S. B. (2020). Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the US. *EClinicalMedicine*, *26*, 100495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100495

Martin, C. A., Jenkins, D. R., Minhas, J. S., Gray, L. J., Tang, J., Williams, C., Sze, S., Pan, D., Jones, W., Verma, R., Knapp, S., Major, R., Davies, M., Brunskill, N., Wiselka, M., Brightling, C., Khunti, K., Haldar, P., Pareek, M., & Leicester COVID-19 consortium. (2020). Socio-demographic heterogeneity in the prevalence of COVID-19 during lockdown is associated with ethnicity and household size: Results from an observational cohort study. *EClinicalMedicine*, *25*, 100466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100466

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & The PRISMA Group. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Medicine*, *6*(7), e1000097. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097

Montalti, M., Rallo, F., Guaraldi, F., Bartoli, L., Po, G., Stillo, M., Perrone, P., Squillace, L., Dallolio, L., Pandolfi, P., Resi, D., Fantini, M. P., Reno, C., & Gori, D. (2021). Would Parents Get Their Children Vaccinated Against SARS-CoV-2? Rate and Predictors of Vaccine Hesitancy According to a Survey over 5000 Families from Bologna, Italy. *Vaccines*, *9*(4), 366. https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9040366

Neumann-Böhme, S., Varghese, N. E., Sabat, I., Barros, P. P., Brouwer, W., van Exel, J., Schreyögg, J., & Stargardt, T. (2020). Once we have it, will we use it? A European survey on willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19. *The European Journal of Health Economics: HEPAC: Health Economics in Prevention and Care*, *21*(7), 977–982. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10198-020-01208-6

Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2015). Does correcting myths about the flu vaccine work? An experimental evaluation of the effects of corrective information. *Vaccine*, *33*(3), 459–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.11.017

Nyhan, B., Reifler, J., Richey, S., & Freed, G. (2014). Effective Messages in Vaccine Promotion: A Randomized Trial. *PEDIATRICS*, *133*(4), e835–e842. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2013-2365

Opel, D. J., Diekema, D. S., Lee, N. R., & Marcuse, E. K. (2009). Social Marketing as a Strategy to Increase Immunization Rates. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, *163*(5), 432. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpediatrics.2009.42

Opel, D. J., Taylor, J. A., Mangione-Smith, R., Solomon, C., Zhao, C., Catz, S., & Martin, D. (2011). Validity and reliability of a survey to identify vaccine-hesitant parents. *Vaccine*, *29*(38), 6598–6605. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.06.115

Ouellette, J. A., & Wood, W. (1998). Habit and intention in everyday life: The multiple processes by which past behavior predicts future behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*(1), 54–74. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.1.54

Peckham, H., de Gruijter, N. M., Raine, C., Radziszewska, A., Ciurtin, C., Wedderburn, L. R., Rosser, E. C., Webb, K., & Deakin, C. T. (2020). Male sex identified by global COVID-19 meta-analysis as a risk factor for death and ITU admission. *Nature Communications*, *11*(1), 6317. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19741-6

Rubin, G. J., Potts, H. W. W., & Michie, S. (2011). Likely uptake of swine and seasonal flu vaccines among healthcare workers. A cross-sectional analysis of UK telephone survey data. *Vaccine*, *29*(13), 2421–2428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.01.035

Ruggiero, K. M., Wong, J., Sweeney, C. F., Avola, A., Auger, A., Macaluso, M., & Reidy, P. (2021). Parents' Intentions to Vaccinate Their Children Against COVID-19. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedhc.2021.04.005

Ruiz, J. B., & Bell, R. A. (2021). Predictors of intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: Results of a nationwide survey. *Vaccine*, *39*(7), 1080–1086. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.01.010

Santos, W. M. dos, Secoli, S. R., & Püschel, V. A. de A. (2018). The Joanna Briggs Institute approach for systematic reviews. *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem*, *26*(0). https://doi.org/10.1590/1518-8345.2885.3074

Schaffer DeRoo, S., Pudalov, N. J., & Fu, L. Y. (2020). Planning for a COVID-19 Vaccination Program. *JAMA*, *323*(24), 2458. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.8711

Scherer, A. M., Gedlinske, A. M., Parker, A. M., Gidengil, C. A., Askelson, N. M., Petersen, C. A., Woodworth, K. R., & Lindley, M. C. (2021). Acceptability of adolescent COVID-19 vaccination among adolescents and parents of adolescents—United States, April 15–23, 2021. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, *70*(29), 997–1003. Scopus.

Scherer, L. D., Shaffer, V. A., Patel, N., & Zikmund-Fisher, B. J. (2016). Can the vaccine adverse event reporting system be used to increase vaccine acceptance and trust? *Vaccine*, *34*(21), 2424–2429. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.03.087

Schrading, W. A., Trent, S. A., Paxton, J. H., Rodriguez, R. M., Swanson, M. B., Mohr, N. M., Talan, D. A., & Project COVERED Emergency Department Network. (2021). Vaccination rates and acceptance of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination among U.S. emergency department health care personnel. *Academic Emergency Medicine: Official Journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine*, *28*(4), 455–458. https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.14236

Schwarzer, R., & Hamilton, K. (2020). Changing Behavior Using the Health Action Process Approach. In M. S. Hagger, L. D. Cameron, K. Hamilton, N. Hankonen, & T. Lintunen (Eds.), *The Handbook of Behavior Change* (1st ed., pp. 89–103). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108677318.007

Schwarzinger, M., Watson, V., Arwidson, P., Alla, F., & Luchini, S. (2021). COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in a representative working-age population in France: A survey experiment based on vaccine characteristics. *The Lancet Public Health*, *6*(4), e210–e221. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00012-8

Setbon, M., & Raude, J. (2010). Factors in vaccination intention against the pandemic influenza A/H1N1. *The European Journal of Public Health*, *20*(5), 490–494. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckq054

Shui, I. M., Weintraub, E. S., & Gust, D. A. (2006). Parents concerned about vaccine safety: Differences in race/ethnicity and attitudes. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 31*(3), 244–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2006.04.006

Skjefte, M., Ngirbabul, M., Akeju, O., Escudero, D., Hernandez-Diaz, S., Wyszynski, D. F., & Wu, J. W. (2021). COVID-19 vaccine acceptance among pregnant women and mothers of young children: Results of a survey in 16 countries. *European Journal of Epidemiology*, *36*(2), 197–211. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-021-00728-6

Smith, P. J., Chu, S. Y., & Barker, L. E. (2004). Children who have received no vaccines: Who are they and where do they live? *Pediatrics*, *114*(1), 187–195. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.114.1.187

Smith, P. J., Humiston, S. G., Marcuse, E. K., Zhao, Z., Dorell, C. G., Howes, C., & Hibbs, B. (2011). Parental delay or refusal of vaccine doses, childhood vaccination coverage at 24 months of age, and the Health Belief Model. *Public Health Reports (Washington, D.C.: 1974)*, *126 Suppl 2*, 135–146. https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549111260S215

Snehota, M., Vlckova, J., Cizkova, K., Vachutka, J., Kolarova, H., Klaskova, E., & Kollarova, H. (2021). Acceptance of a vaccine against COVID-19—A systematic review of surveys conducted worldwide. *Bratislavske Lekarske Listy*, *122*(8), 538–547. https://doi.org/10.4149/BLL_2021_086

Sokol, R. L., & Grummon, A. H. (2020). COVID-19 and parent intention to vaccinate their children against influenza. *Pediatrics*, *146*(6). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2020-022871

Sze, S., Pan, D., Nevill, C. R., Gray, L. J., Martin, C. A., Nazareth, J., Minhas, J. S., Divall, P., Khunti, K., Abrams, K. R., Nellums, L. B., & Pareek, M. (2020). Ethnicity and clinical outcomes in COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine*, *29*, 100630. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100630

Szilagyi, P. G., Shah, M. D., Delgado, J. R., Thomas, K., Vizueta, N., Cui, Y., Vangala, S., Shetgiri, R., & Kapteyn, A. (2021). Parents' Intentions and Perceptions About

COVID-19 Vaccination for Their Children: Results From a National Survey. *Pediatrics*. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2021-052335

Tanne, J. H. (2021). Covid-19: Cases in children rise sharply in US as doctors call for vaccine approval. *BMJ*, n2030. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n2030

Teasdale, C. A., Borrell, L. N., Kimball, S., Rinke, M. L., Rane, M., Fleary, S. A., & Nash, D. (2021). Plans to Vaccinate Children for COVID-19: A Survey of Us Parents. *The Journal of Pediatrics*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2021.07.021

Torun, S. D., Torun, F., & Catak, B. (2010). Healthcare workers as parents: Attitudes toward vaccinating their children against pandemic influenza A/H1N1. *BMC Public Health*, *10*(1), 596. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-10-596

Voysey, M., Clemens, S. A. C., Madhi, S. A., Weckx, L. Y., Folegatti, P. M., Aley, P. K., Angus, B., Baillie, V. L., Barnabas, S. L., Bhorat, Q. E., Bibi, S., Briner, C., Cicconi, P., Collins, A. M., Colin-Jones, R., Cutland, C. L., Darton, T. C., Dheda, K., Duncan, C. J. A., … Oxford COVID Vaccine Trial Group. (2021). Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: An interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *Lancet (London, England)*, *397*(10269), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32661-1

Wake, A. D. (2021). The Willingness to Receive COVID-19 Vaccine and Its Associated Factors: "Vaccination Refusal Could Prolong the War of This Pandemic" - A Systematic Review. *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy*, *14*, 2609–2623. https://doi.org/10.2147/RMHP.S311074

Wallace, B. C., Schmid, C. H., Lau, J., & Trikalinos, T. A. (2009). Meta-Analyst: Software for meta-analysis of binary, continuous and diagnostic data. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *9*(1), 80. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-9-80

Wang, Q., Xiu, S., Zhao, S., Wang, J., Han, Y., Dong, S., Huang, J., Cui, T., Yang, L., Shi, N., Liu, M., Han, Y., Wang, X., Shen, Y., Chen, E., Lu, B., Jin, H., & Lin, L. (2021). Vaccine Hesitancy: COVID-19 and Influenza Vaccine Willingness among Parents in Wuxi, China—A Cross-Sectional Study. *VACCINES*, *9*(4). https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9040342

Wang, Q., Yang, L., Jin, H., & Lin, L. (2021). Vaccination against COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis of acceptability and its predictors. *Preventive Medicine, 150*, 106694. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106694

Williams, W. W., Lu, P.-J., O'Halloran, A., Kim, D. K., Grohskopf, L. A., Pilishvili, T., Skoff, T. H., Nelson, N. P., Harpaz, R., Markowitz, L. E., Rodriguez-Lainz, A., & Fiebelkorn, A. P. (2017). Surveillance of Vaccination Coverage among Adult Populations—United States, 2015. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. Surveillance Summaries (Washington, D.C.: 2002)*, *66*(11), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.ss6611a1

Wiysonge, C. S., Ndwandwe, D., Ryan, J., Jaca, A., Batouré, O., Anya, B.-P. M., & Cooper, S. (2021). Vaccine hesitancy in the era of COVID-19: Could lessons from the past help in divining the future? *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1080/21645515.2021.1893062

Xu, B., Gao, X., Zhang, X., Hu, Y., Yang, H., & Zhou, Y.-H. (2021). Real-World Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccines among Healthcare Workers in Perinatal Medicine in China. *Vaccines*, *9*(7), 704. https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9070704

Xu, Y., Zhang, R., Zhou, Z., Fan, J., Liang, J., Cai, L., Peng, L., Ren, F., & Lin, W. (2021). Parental psychological distress and attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination: A cross-sectional survey in Shenzhen, China. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *292*, 552–558. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2021.06.003

Yigit, M., Ozkaya-Parlakay, A., & Senel, E. (2021). Evaluation of COVID-19 Vaccine Refusal in Parents. *PEDIATRIC INFECTIOUS DISEASE JOURNAL*, *40*(4), E134–E136. https://doi.org/10.1097/INF.0000000000003042

Yilmaz, M., & Sahin, M. (2021). Parents' willingness and attitudes concerning the COVID-19 vaccine: A cross-sectional study. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CLINICAL PRACTICE*. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcp.14364

Zhang, K. C., Fang, Y., Cao, H., Chen, H., Hu, T., Chen, Y. Q., Zhou, X., & Wang, Z. (2020). Parental acceptability of COVID-19 vaccination for children under the age of 18 years: Cross-sectional online survey. *JMIR Pediatrics and Parenting*, *3*(2). Scopus. https://doi.org/10.2196/24827

Table 1. Overview of the 17 studies included in this systematic review.

Reference	Country	Data collection time	Sample size (n)	Age of parents, mean (SD)	Age of children, mean (SD)	Study design	Sampling method	Response rate (%)	Willingness to vaccinate (%)
(Ruggiero et al., 2021)	USA	November 2020 to January 2021	427	NR	<3 years, 23.1%; 4-12 years, 59.2%; 13-18 years, 23.6%	Cross-sectional	Snowball	NR	44.3
(Wang, Xiu, et al., 2021)	China	September 21 to October 17, 2020	3,009	31.4 (4.5)	2.2 (2.4)	Cross-sectional	Convenience	NR	59.3
(Szilagyi et al., 2021)	USA	February 17 to March 30, 2021	1,745	18-39 years, 23.3%; 40-49 years, 34.3%; ≥50 years, 38.2%	<5 years, 21.8%; 5-10 years, 27%; 11-18 years, 32.7%	Cross-sectional	Probability	87	48
(Montalti et al., 2021)	Italy	December 2020 to January 2021	4,993	≤29 years, 1.8%; 30-39 years, 18.9%; 40-49 years, 55.4%; ≥50 years, 24%	≤5 years, 12.7%; 6-13 years, 62.5%; ≥14 years, 24.9%	Cross-sectional	Convenience	NR	60.4
(Kelly et al., 2021)	USA	April 2020	2,279	≤34 years, 27%; 35-49 years, 24%; 50-64 years, 26%; ≥65 years, 22%	NR	Cross-sectional	Probability	NR	73
(S. Bell et al., 2020)	United Kingdom	April 19 to May 11, 2020	1,252	32.9 (4.6)	≤14 months, 88.9%; 14-18 months, 11.1%	Cross-sectional	Convenience	NR	48
(Y. Xu et al., 2021)	China	December 2020	4,748	40.2 (5.1)	<10 years, 27.9%; 10-14 years, 49.5%;	Cross-sectional	Convenience	NR	72.7

					≥14 years, 22.6%				
(Brandstetter et al., 2021)	Germany	May 2020	612	NR	3.4 (0.9)	Cross-sectional	Convenience	50.1	51
(Skjefte et al., 2021)	USA, India, Brazil, Russia, Spain, Argentina, Colombia, UK, Mexico, Peru, South Africa, Italy, Chile and the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand	October 28 to November 18, 2020	17,054	34.4 (7.3)	NR	Cross-sectional	Convenience	NR	69.2
(Goldman et al., 2020)	USA, Canada, Spain, Israel, Japan, and Switzerland	March 26 to May 31, 2020	1,541	39.9 (7.6)[a]	7.5 (5.0)[a]	Cross-sectional	Convenience	NR	65.2
(Hetherington et al., 2021)	Canada	May to June, 2020	1321	42.2 (4.4)	NR	Cross-sectional	Convenience	53.8	60.4
(Yigit et al., 2021)	Turkey	NR	428	39.7 (10.7)	NR	Cross-sectional	Convenience	NR	29
(Yilmaz & Sahin, 2021)	Turkey	February 2021	1,035	≤29 years, 12.6%; 30-39 years, 53.3%; ≥40 years, 34.1%	≤6 years, 49.8%; 7-12 years, 28.9%; ≥13 years, 21.4%	Cross-sectional	Convenience	NR	36.3
(Teasdale et al.,	USA	March 2021	2,074	≤29 years, 20.3%; 30-44 years,	4.7 (1.7-8.3)[b]	Cross-	Convenience	NR	49.4

2021)				65.1%; ≥45 years, 14.6%		sectional			
(Jeffs et al., 2021)	New Zealand	May 2020	1,191	39.9 (NR)	NR	Cross-sectional	Convenience	NR	69.5
(A. M. Scherer et al., 2021)	USA	April 2021	1,022	NR	≤15 years, 62%; ≥16 years, 38%	Cross-sectional	Convenience	77.5	55.5
(Zhang et al., 2020)	China	September 2020	1,052	≤30 years, 22.6%; 31-40 years, 55.7%; ≥41 years, 21.7%	≤12 years, 82%; ≥13 years, 18%	Cross-sectional	Convenience	NR	72.6

NR: not reported

[a] median (standard deviation)

[b] median (interquartile range)

Table 2. Statistically significant factors related with parents' willingness to vaccinate their children against the COVID-19.

Reference	**Positive factors**	**Negative factors**	**Level of analysis**
(Ruggiero et al., 2021)	Recent history of children's vaccination against influenza, confidence in vaccines, children with chronic illness	Overall vaccination hesitancy, concerns for serious side effects and effectiveness	Multivariate
(Wang, Xiu, et al., 2021)	Lower educational level		Multivariate
(Szilagyi et al., 2021)	Older children, higher educational level, COVID-19 vaccine uptake		Multivariate
(Montalti et al., 2021)	Fathers, higher educational level, older age	Information based in the web/social media, overall vaccination hesitancy	Multivariate
(Kelly et al., 2021)	Fathers, older age, higher educational level, higher income, recent history of parents' vaccination against influenza, increased worry about getting infected, increased perceived threat from the COVID-19	Black parents	Multivariate
(S. Bell et al., 2020)	Increased number of children	Parents from Black, Asian or minority ethnic groups	Multivariate
(Y. Xu et al., 2021)		Psychological distress	Multivariate
(Brandstetter et al., 2021)	Higher educational level, knowledge about prevention measures, high level of information about the COVID-19 pandemic	Stronger beliefs that policy measures were exaggerated, consideration of family or friends as	Multivariate

		risk group members	
(Skjefte et al., 2021)	Older age, higher income, higher educational level, health insurance, confidence in COVID-19 vaccine safety and efficacy, belief in the importance of vaccines/mass vaccination, children's complete vaccination history, increased perceived threat from the COVID-19, trust of public health agencies/health science, compliance to mask guidelines		Multivariate
(Goldman et al., 2020)	Fathers, older children, children with no chronic illness, children's complete vaccination history, recent history of parents' vaccination against influenza		Univariate
(Hetherington et al., 2021)	Higher educational level, higher income, children's complete vaccination history		Multivariate
(Yigit et al., 2021)	Fathers, lower educational level, higher levels of fear and anxiety		Univariate
(Yilmaz & Sahin, 2021)	Healthcare workers, parents' willingness to receive a COVID-19 vaccine, increased perceived threat from the COVID-19, confidence in COVID-19 vaccine safety and efficacy		Multivariate
(Teasdale et al., 2021)	Fathers, higher educational level, higher income, Asian parents		Multivariate
(A. M. Scherer et al., 2021)	Fathers, higher educational level	Black parents	Multivariate

(Zhang et al., 2020)	Confidence in COVID-19 vaccine safety and efficacy, higher exposure to positive information related to COVID-19 vaccination	Higher exposure to negative information related to COVID-19 vaccination	Multivariate

Supplementary Table 1. Quality of studies included in this systematic review.

	(Ruggiero et al., 2021)	(Wang, Xiu, et al., 2021)	(Szilagyi et al., 2021)	(Montalti et al., 2021)	(Kelly et al., 2021)	(S. Bell et al., 2020)	(Y. Xu et al., 2021)	(Brandstetter et al., 2021)	(Skjefte et al., 2021)	(Goldman et al., 2020)
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
5. Were confounding factors identified?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Total quality	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good

Supplementary Table 1 (continued). Quality of cross-sectional studies included in this systematic review.

	(Hetherington et al., 2021)	(Yigit et al., 2021)	(Yilmaz & Sahin, 2021)	(Teasdale et al., 2021)	(Jeffs et al., 2021)	(A. M. Scherer et al., 2021)	(Zhang et al., 2020)
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	√			√	√	√	√
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	√		√	√		√	√
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
5. Were confounding factors identified?			√	√		√	√
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?			√	√		√	√
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Total quality	Moderate	Moderate	Good	Good	Moderate	Good	Good


Identification
Screening
Eligibility
Included
Records identified through Scopus searching (n=2993), Web of Science (n=1410), Medline (n=371), PubMed (n=191), ProQuest (n=1625), and CINAHL (n=320)
Records after duplicates removed (n=4325)
Records screened (n=4305)
Records excluded at first screening (title/abstract) (n=4137)
Full text articles assessed for eligibility (n=168)
Full text articles excluded, for not meeting inclusion criteria (n=151)
Studies included in the qualitative analysis (n=17)
Studies included in the quantitative analysis (n=17)


Studies
Estimate (95% C.I.)
Ev/Trt
Ruggiero et al. 2021 0.443 (0.396, 0.490) 189/427
Wang et al. 2021 0.593 (0.575, 0.610) 1784/3009
Szilagyi et al. 2021 0.480 (0.457, 0.504) 838/1745
Montalti et al. 2021 0.604 (0.591, 0.618) 3017/4993
Kelly et al. 2021 0.730 (0.712, 0.748) 1664/2279
Bell et al. 2020 0.480 (0.452, 0.508) 601/1252
Xu et al. 2021 0.727 (0.714, 0.740) 3452/4748
Brandstetter et al. 2021 0.510 (0.470, 0.549) 312/612
Skjefte et al. 2021 0.692 (0.685, 0.699) 11900/17054
Goldman et al. 2021 0.652 (0.628, 0.676) 1005/1541
Hetherington et al. 2021 0.604 (0.578, 0.630) 798/1321
Yigit et al. 2021 0.290 (0.248, 0.334) 124/428
Yilmaz & Sahin 2021 0.363 (0.334, 0.393) 376/1036
Teasdale et al. 2021 0.494 (0.473, 0.516) 1025/2074
Jeffs et al. 2021 0.695 (0.669, 0.721) 828/1191
Scherer et al. 2021 0.555 (0.524, 0.585) 567/1022
Zhang et al. 2021 0.726 (0.699, 0.753) 764/1052
Overall (I^2=99.09 % , P< 0.001) 0.570 (0.518, 0.620) 29144/45783
0.25
0.37
0.5
0.63
0.75
Arcsine of Square Root Proportion


Studies
Estimate (95% C.I.)
Overall
0.568 (0.518, 0.618)
- Ruggiero et al.
0.576 (0.525, 0.626)
- Wang et al.
0.566 (0.513, 0.620)
- Szilagyi et al.
0.574 (0.524, 0.624)
- Montalti et al.
0.566 (0.511, 0.620)
- Kelly et al.
0.558 (0.506, 0.610)
- Bell et al.
0.574 (0.523, 0.624)
- Xu et al.
0.558 (0.505, 0.611)
- Brandstetter et al.
0.572 (0.521, 0.623)
- Skjefte et al.
0.560 (0.504, 0.616)
- Goldman et al.
0.563 (0.510, 0.615)
- Hetherington et al.
0.566 (0.514, 0.618)
- Yigit et al.
0.585 (0.537, 0.633)
- Yilmaz & Sahin
0.581 (0.534, 0.628)
- Teasdale et al.
0.573 (0.523, 0.623)
- Jeffs et al.
0.560 (0.508, 0.612)
- Scherer et al.
0.569 (0.517, 0.621)
- Zhang et al.
0.558 (0.507, 0.610)
0.52
0.54
0.56
0.58
0.6
0.62
Proportion


Random effects
Standard error
0,008
0.01
0.012
0.014
0,016
0,018
0,02
0.022
0,024
0,026
0,028
0,03
0,032
0.034
0.036
0.038
0,04
0.042
0.044
0.046
0,048
0,05
0,052
1,15
1,2
1,25
1,3
1,35
1,4
1,45
1,5
1,55
1,6
1,65
1,7
1,75
1,8
1,85
1,9
1,95
2
2,05
Double Arcsin Prevalence