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## Abstract

### Objectives

To explore attitudes and intentions towards COVID-19 vaccination, and influences and sources of information about COVID-19 across diverse ethnic groups (EGs) in the UK.

### Design

Remote qualitative interviews and focus groups (FGs) conducted June-October 2020 before UK COVID-19 vaccine approval. Data were transcribed and analysed through inductive thematic analysis.

### Setting

General public in the community across England and Wales.

### Participants

100 participants from 19 self-identified EGs with spoken English or Punjabi.

### Results

Mistrust and doubt were common themes across all EGs including white British and minority EGs, but more pronounced amongst Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Black ethnicities and Travellers. Many participants shared concerns about perceived lack of information about COVID-19 vaccine safety, efficacy and potential unknown adverse effects. Across EGs participants stated occupations with public contact, older adults and vulnerable groups should be prioritised for vaccination. Perceived risk, social influences, occupation, age, co-morbidities and engagement with healthcare influenced participants’ intentions to accept vaccination once available; all Jewish FG participants intended to accept, while all Traveller FG participants indicated they probably would not.

Facilitators to COVID-19 vaccine uptake across all EGs included: desire to return to normality and protect health and wellbeing; perceived higher risk of infection; evidence of vaccine safety and efficacy; vaccine availability and accessibility.

COVID-19 information sources were influenced by social factors, culture and religion and included: friends, family; media and news outlets; and research literature. Participants across most different EGs were concerned about misinformation or had negative attitudes towards the media.

### Conclusions

During vaccination programme roll-out, including boosters, commissioners and vaccine providers should provide accurate information, authentic community outreach, and use appropriate channels to disseminate information and counter misinformation. Adopting a context-specific approach to vaccine resources, interventions and policies and empowering communities has potential to increase trust in the programme.
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| S14 | Data analysis | Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and  developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually  references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale | 4 |
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