

1 **Title:** When do persuasive messages on vaccine safety steer
2 COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and recommendations? Behavioral
3 insights from a randomised controlled experiment in Malaysia.
4

5

6 Nicholas Yee Liang Hing¹, Yuan Liang Woon¹, Yew Kong Lee², Joon Kim Hyung³,
7 Nurhyikmah M. Lothfi², Elizabeth Wong³, Komathi Perialathan⁴, Nor Haryati Ahmad
8 Sanusi⁴, Affendi Isa⁵, Chin Tho Leong¹, Joan Costa-Font⁶

9

10

- 11 1. Institute for Clinical Research, National Institutes of Health, Ministry of Health, Shah Alam, Malaysia
12 2. Department of Primary Care Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University Malaya, Ministry of Higher
13 Education, Petaling Jaya, Malaysia
14 3. United Nations Children's Fund, Malaysia, Country Office, Putrajaya, Malaysia.
15 4. Institute for Health Behavioral Research, National Institutes of Health, Ministry of Health, Shah
16 Alam, Malaysia
17 5. Health Education Division, Ministry of Health, Putrajaya, Malaysia
18 6. Department of Health Policy, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 **First Author/Corresponding Author**

27

28 Name: Nicholas Yee Liang Hing

29

30 ORCID: 0000-0003-4530-8466

31

32 Institutional address: Centre for Clinical Epidemiology,
33 Institute for Clinical Research,
34 National Institutes of Health, Ministry of Health,
35 Block B4, Jalan Setia Murni,
36 U13/52, Seksyen U13, Setia Alam,
37 40170, Shah Alam,
38 Selangor, Malaysia.
39

40 Email: nicholas.hingyl@gmail.com

41 Phone: +60333628817

42 Fax: +60333627701

43

44

45 (Word count: 6,000 words)

46

47

48

49

50

51

52 **Key Messages:**

53 1. What is already known?

54 • Persuasive messages have been shown to influence COVID-19 vaccination
55 intentions, but evidence from Low- and Middle- income countries are limited.

56

57 • There are limited studies investigating the effect of persuasive messages in
58 influencing decisions to recommend the COVID-19 vaccine, with only a single
59 study to date which investigated effects directed at recommending the COVID-
60 19 vaccine to a friend, but without considering the individual's health and age
61 profile.

62

63 2. What are the new findings?

64 • Persuasive messages that focused on vaccine safety did not positively influence
65 Malaysian adults to take the COVID-19 vaccine or recommend it to healthy
66 adults and the elderly, while messages framed as descriptive norms, negative
67 attribute, and risky choices, significantly backfired for some of these outcomes.

68

69 • Several persuasive messages focusing on vaccine safety significantly improved
70 intent to recommend the COVID-19 vaccine to people with pre-existing health
71 conditions.

72

73 3. What do the new findings imply?

74 • Instead of only addressing safety, persuasive messages aimed at nudging
75 vaccination should incorporate multiple behavioral determinants linked to vaccine
76 acceptance.

77
78 • Persuasive messages that are intended to promote uptake of novel health
79 interventions should incorporate safety dimensions as a form of assurance for
80 others to recommend it to people with pre-existing health conditions, given that
81 they may be perceived as more susceptible to hazards from adverse events.

82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108

109 **Abstract**

110

111 **Introduction**

112

113 Vaccine safety is a primary concern among vaccine hesitant individuals. We examined
114 how seven persuasive messages with different frames, all focusing on vaccine safety,
115 influenced Malaysians to accept the COVID-19 vaccine, and recommend it to individuals
116 with different health and age profiles; i.e. healthy adults, elderly, and people with pre-
117 existing health conditions.

118

119 **Methods**

120

121 A randomized controlled experiment was conducted among 5,784 Malaysians who were
122 randomly allocated into 14 experimental arms. They were exposed to one or two
123 messages that promoted COVID-19 vaccination. Interventional messages were applied
124 alone or in combination and compared against a control message. Outcome measures
125 were assessed as intent to both take the vaccine and recommend it to healthy adults,
126 elderly, and people with pre-existing health conditions, before and after message
127 exposure. Changes in intent after message exposure were modeled and we estimate the
128 average marginal effects with respect to changes in the predicted probability of selecting
129 a positive intent for all four outcomes.

130

131 **Results**

132

133 The average baseline proportion of participants with positive intents in each arm to take,
134 and recommend the vaccine to healthy adults, elderly, and people with pre-existing health
135 conditions was 61.6%, 84.9%, 72.7% and 51.4% respectively. We found that persuasive
136 communication via several of the experimented messages improved recommendation
137 intent to people with pre-existing health conditions, with improvements ranging between
138 4 to 8 percentage points. In contrast, none of the messages neither significantly improved
139 vaccination intentions, nor recommendations to healthy adults and the elderly. Instead,
140 we found evidence suggestive of backfiring among this group with messages using
141 negative frames, risky choice frames, and priming descriptive norms.

142

143 **Conclusion**

144

145 Persuasive messages aimed at influencing vaccination decisions should
146 incorporate a combination of factors linked to hesitancy. Messages intended to promote
147 recommendation of novel health interventions to people with pre-existing health
148 conditions should incorporate safety dimensions.

149

150 (Abstract word count: 300 words)

151

152 **Clinical Trials registration number:** NCT05244356

153

154 **Keywords:** nudge, framing, persuasive messages, COVID-19, vaccine hesitancy, vaccine
155 recommendation, vaccination intent, incentive backfiring.

156

157 **Introduction**

158

159 The COVID-19 pandemic has sparked global efforts to develop counter measures
160 against SARS-CoV-2. One such measure lies with the rapid research and development of
161 effective COVID-19 vaccines[1] which are critical to achieve impactful COVID-19
162 vaccination campaigns.[2] Although credible vaccine information from official sources
163 are abundantly available,[3–6] vaccine hesitant individuals risk compromising
164 widespread vaccination[7] as they delay or refuse to take a vaccine once it is made
165 available.[8]

166

167 Vaccine safety remains one of the top reasons cited by vaccine hesitant
168 individuals in Malaysia and abroad.[9–12] This is aggravated by misinformation
169 regarding COVID-19 vaccine safety.[13] Hence, a question that emerges is how best to
170 effectively communicate vaccine safety information. A potential method stems from
171 applying nudges, which alters the environmental or information context to encourage a
172 particular behavior.[14] One such form involves using various frames of persuasive
173 messages that employ nudge techniques to encourage behaviour change[15,16].

174

175 Few studies have experimented messages that specifically address COVID-19
176 vaccine safety among unvaccinated individuals. Persuasive messages emphasizing

177 vaccine safety either through explaining the rigorous process of drug development,
178 leveraging the authority of a clinician to explain vaccine safety, or highlighting vaccine
179 approval from a regulatory agency, failed to significantly improve vaccination intent.[17–
180 19] Conversely, positive effects were observed with risky choice framed messages that
181 favorably juxtaposed vaccine risk versus contracting COVID-19.[20] However, the
182 message was tested among employees of a healthcare organisation who may have higher
183 health awareness compared to the general public. Barnes & Colagiuri also observed
184 positive effects with messages applying attribute framing whereby vaccine side effect
185 rates were framed positively or negatively.[21] However, they investigated booster shot
186 intentions among fully vaccinated individuals.

187

188 Based on current available evidence, there are several knowledge gaps. The
189 effects of attribute framing have yet to be explored among unvaccinated individuals.
190 Risky choice frames that pit vaccine related death rates or side effects against the
191 COVID-19 disease has not been studied among the general public. Although descriptive
192 norms have been widely studied to nudge COVID-19 vaccination by invoking
193 psychological judgments that vaccination is a societally approved behavior, [19,20,22,23]
194 these messages have yet to be framed to imply vaccine safety as a motivation for
195 vaccination among the majority. The effect of using vaccinated health authorities to
196 imply vaccine safety and recommend the vaccine has also not been thoroughly studied.
197 Finally, given that individual decision and behavior are intrinsically linked to context and
198 culture,[24–26] there are reasons to believe that vaccination nudges ought to be adapted
199 to Low- and Middle-income countries (LMIC) such as Malaysia. However, there exists a

200 paucity of information for using such nudges in LMIC, with most published evidence
201 originating from developed countries .[16]

202

203 Furthermore, previous studies have widely investigated nudges to influence
204 personal interests to vaccinate one's self or own child [16,27,28] rather than a person's
205 decision to recommend vaccination. Although James *et al* did investigate the effects of
206 persuasive messages in recommending a COVID-19 vaccine to a friend, they did not
207 consider the health or age profile of the person being recommended.[29] Having a finer
208 gauge on which group of people have higher likelihoods to be recommended is important
209 especially in Asian communities who pay special attention to advice sought from family
210 and friends with significance when making a health related decision.[30]

211

212 Therefore, an experiment using various message frames intended to narrow the
213 current knowledge gaps was conducted in Malaysia. Our primary objectives were to
214 investigate whether persuasive messages focusing on vaccine safety influenced the
215 intention to take the COVID-19 vaccine, and recommend it to healthy adults, the elderly
216 who are aged 60 and above, and people with pre-existing health conditions. Apart from
217 examining single messages, we investigate the effects of combining messages together to
218 mimic a real-world environment where people are exposed to multiple messages. This
219 allows us to determine if combining messages resulted in improved effectiveness from a
220 higher message dose effect,[31] or reduced effectiveness due to message interactions
221 causing a boomerang effect.

222

223 **Methods**

224

225 **Study design**

226

227 We conducted a prospective 14-arm randomised controlled experiment with a
228 parallel design. The experiment was conducted using a web-based survey that was
229 launched on a platform belonging to Dynata, an international market research company
230 based in America. The company has an online survey panel composed of Malaysians who
231 have signed up on the survey platform. Participants who complete a survey will receive
232 reward points as per Dynata's policy.

233

234 **Study participants and setting**

235

236 The experimental survey was conducted from the 29th of April to 7th of June 2021
237 (more details about the COVID-19 situation in Malaysia during participant recruitment
238 can be found in the online supplemental material). Participants were recruited from
239 Dynata's online survey panel. Eligible participants were adult Malaysians aged 18 years
240 and above who could understand either the English or Malay language and had not
241 received any dose of the COVID-19 vaccine. The latter criterion was included as the
242 majority of the population has not been vaccinated during the experimental period.
243 Additionally, this criterion allowed us to investigate the effectiveness of messages in an
244 unvaccinated population, which is an important aspect prior to any novel vaccination roll-
245 out.

246

247 Sample size requirement was calculated based on a logistic model to detect a
248 small effect size of 0.1, with the baseline proportion of people who definitely will take
249 the COVID-19 vaccine set at 0.67. This baseline value was chosen based on the reported
250 proportion of Malaysians willing to accept the COVID-19 vaccine in a national survey
251 that was conducted before this study was being planned.[12] Sample size was calculated
252 to be 318 respondents per arm, after setting power at 80% and significance level at 0.05.
253 Taking into account a 20% drop out rate in the event of invalid responses, calculated
254 sample size was 400 participants per arm. Participants were recruited via stratified
255 sampling based on age, gender, ethnicity and household income to obtain an
256 approximately population-representative sample (more details about the stratified
257 sampling can be found in the online supplemental material).

258

259 All participants were shown a page that described background information about
260 the study before they provided informed consent by clicking on a button indicating
261 agreement to join the experiment. This experiment received ethical approval from the
262 Medical Research Ethics Committee of the Malaysian Ministry of Health.

263

264

265 **Randomisation and masking**

266

267 Enrolled participants were randomly allocated into a particular experimental arm
268 by Dynata through an automated computer randomization system. This experiment was

269 double blinded whereby participants were unaware of what interventional message was
270 given to them and investigators had no control over treatment assignment as this aspect
271 was completely handled by the market research company.

272

273 **Data collection and intervention**

274

275 Sociodemographic variables that screened for inclusion criteria and enabled
276 stratified sampling during experimental arm allocation were first collected from
277 approached participants. Recruited participants were measured on their general attitude
278 towards vaccines as this factor has been shown to significantly influence vaccine uptake
279 intent.[28,32] Attitude was assessed by measuring the level of agreement; using a five-
280 point Likert scale, of two statements regarding the efficacy of vaccines in protecting
281 against serious diseases, and personal religious or cultural backing for vaccination.
282 Participants were also asked in the remaining sociodemography section, whether they had
283 refused towards vaccinating their child in the past. These questions were adapted from
284 locally conducted studies.[32,33] Participants were categorised as having potential
285 negative attitudes if they provided responses indicating disagreement, uncertainty or
286 refusal to any of those questions.

287

288 Participants were then asked a series of questions relating to their baseline
289 intentions to accept and recommend the COVID-19 vaccine before being randomly
290 assigned to an experimental arm. Participants were exposed to either one or two messages
291 from a selection of 8 different types of messages and were instructed to read the message

292 completely before clicking a button to proceed. Each message was calibrated to be on
293 screen for at least eight seconds before participants could proceed to prevent them from
294 skipping the message. Table 1 describes the content of each message and the
295 corresponding nudge technique that the content was incorporated with. The source of the
296 information displayed is stated below the message's content to provide information
297 credibility.

298

299 The control message was devoid of any nudge element and only displays a slogan
300 that rallies the reader to get the COVID-19 vaccine because it is safe and effective. The
301 other experimental messages begin with an opening tagline highlighting the main concern
302 that Malaysians have about the COVID-19 vaccine and serves as a precursor for the
303 following message content which attempts to alleviate that concern. Each message
304 concludes with a rally slogan that is identical with the control message. Each message
305 was validated with at least five people and went through a series of iterations to ensure
306 that the content was interpreted correctly (details about the message design and examples
307 of actual messages can be found in the online supplemental material and supplemental
308 figure S1 respectively).

309

310 **Table 1:** Content of each experimental treatment message used along with the corresponding nudge
311 technique employed. Each message is assigned a code to ease referencing.

No.	Nudge technique	Content	Message code
1	Descriptive norm.	Around 70% of Malaysians said they will get the COVID-19 vaccine. <i>Source:</i> <i>Ministry of Health, Malaysia; 31 December 2020 [12]</i>	DN(70%)

2	Descriptive norm.	<p>The COVID-19 vaccine was tested with thousands of people, including the elderly, and people with existing health conditions.</p> <p>Now millions of people worldwide have received it.</p> <p>When it's your turn, you can be confident that it is safe and effective.</p> <p><i>Source:</i></p> <p><i>Kyriakidis et al. NPJ Vaccines. 2020 February 22;6(1):28 [34]</i></p> <p><i>John Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center, United States of America [35]</i></p>	DN
3	Influence from a Government official and health authority, and descriptive norm.	<p>Malaysia's Health Director General, Dr.Noor Hisham Abdullah, and 9 out of 10 healthcare workers in Malaysia have received the COVID-19 vaccine.</p> <p>They recommend that you get it too.</p> <p><i>Source:</i></p> <p><i>COVID-19 Immunisation Task Force, Malaysia; 23 February, 29 March 2021 [36,37]</i></p>	HCW
4	Negative attribute framing.	<p>Only 4 out of 100 people who received the COVID-19 vaccine experienced side effects.</p> <p><i>Source:</i></p> <p><i>Ministry of Health, Malaysia; 2 April 2021 [38]</i></p>	NF
5	Positive attribute framing.	<p>996 out of 100 people who received the COVID-19 vaccine did not experience any side effects.</p> <p><i>Source:</i></p> <p><i>Ministry of Health, Malaysia; 2 April 2021 [38]</i></p>	PF
6	Risky choice framing (Safety).	<p>There are 0 deaths caused by the COVID-19 vaccines.</p> <p>On the other hand, over 1,400 people have died due to COVID-19.</p> <p><i>Source:</i></p> <p><i>Ministry of Health, Malaysia; 18 March 2021[39]</i></p> <p><i>Crisis Preparedness and Response Centre (CPRC), Malaysia; 23 April 2021 [40]</i></p>	RC(S)

7	Risky choice framing (Side effects).	Only 4 in 1 million people who received the COVID-19 vaccine experienced blood clots. On the other hand, 200,000 in 1 million people infected with COVID-19 experienced blood clots. <i>Source:</i> <i>Torjesen I. The British Medical Journal. 2021;373:n1005 [41]</i> <i>Malas et al. EClinicalMedicine. 2020 December; 29:100639. [42]</i>	RC(SE)
8	Control message.	Get the COVID-19 Vaccine. It's safe and effective!	N/A

312

313

314

Our experiment presents a total of 14 arms. Participants were exposed to one message in the first eight arms, and two messages in the remaining arms. *DN(70%)* exposure was held constant in arms bearing two messages. This message was made a constant because it focuses on Malaysians as the persona of interest, which makes it the most personally relevant message to our Malaysian participants. Participants who received two messages were exposed to each message one at a time, with the sequence of appearance being random.

321

After message exposure, participants were asked again regarding intentions to receive and recommend the COVID-19 vaccine. Participants who were hesitant about taking or recommending the vaccine post exposure were asked about the possible reasons for such responses. Lastly, remaining sociodemographic variables such as education level were collected.

327

328 **Outcomes**

329

330 Intent to accept the COVID-19 vaccine was assessed by asking participants
331 whether they would take the COVID-19 vaccine. Participants answered using a four-
332 Likert scale which indicated “Definitely no”, “Not sure, but probably no”, “Not sure, but
333 probably yes” and “Definitely yes”. This scale was used to eliminate subjective
334 ambiguity and allows participants to express their intent in detail which is capably
335 determined as it involves an internalised decision.[43]

336

337 Intent to recommend the COVID-19 vaccine was assessed by asking participants
338 to rate their level of agreement on recommending the vaccine to three groups of family
339 members namely, healthy adults, elderly, and members with any pre-existing health
340 conditions. Family members were chosen as a target character because they are related to
341 respondents, thus yielding unbiased responses regarding intent to recommend to each of
342 the three studied groups. Participants rated their agreement via a five-Likert scale which
343 provided options of “Definitely no”, “Probably no”, “Not sure”, “Probably yes”, and
344 “Definitely yes”. This scale was chosen to provide a neutral answer in the form of a “Not
345 sure” option, because the decision to recommend may influence the outcome of another
346 individual, which may be a difficult decision and thus warrant a neutral stance.

347

348 Our four study objectives were based on outcomes measured at baseline and post
349 intervention. Positive intent was defined as responding “Definitely yes” and “Agree” or
350 “Strongly agree” for accepting and recommending the vaccine respectively. These

351 responses indicated absolutely no hesitancy towards the action in question whereas the
352 remaining options reflected uncertainty or refusal.

353

354 **Statistical analyses**

355

356 Summary statistics (frequency and percentages, mean and standard deviation) of
357 recruited participants' demographics, attitude towards vaccines, and intent to accept and
358 recommend the COVID-19 vaccine in each experimental arm, was reported. Balance tests
359 were conducted to check if baseline characteristics were significantly different between
360 each experimental arm.

361

362 Since the responses for all four outcome measures were ordinal in nature, we
363 applied four separate generalised ordered logistic regressions to estimate how each
364 experimental arm affected the propensity of selecting a particular level of intent. Each
365 regression model was adjusted for general attitude towards vaccines and baseline intent
366 that corresponds to the outcome measure analysed. Generated regression models were
367 subsequently used to compute the average marginal effects of each interventional arm
368 relative to the control arm with respect to changes in the predicted probability of selecting
369 a positive intent for all four outcome measures. This provided an estimate behind the
370 effectiveness and probability change magnitudes exerted by experimented messages.

371

372 Additionally, we tested heterogeneous treatment effects of age, gender, and
373 education level to investigate whether our intervention messages impacted certain groups

374 of individuals differently. All analyses were conducted using Stata version 16. This study
375 was registered on clinicaltrials.gov (ID number: NCT05244356).

376

377 **Results**


378

379 A total of 5,784 participants were recruited into the experiment. Each arm was
380 assigned between 410 to 416 participants. Figure 1 presents the experimental design flow
381 chart. Due to the experiment being an online survey, our sampled dataset was skewed
382 towards younger participants and those who had pre-university or tertiary education.
383 However, all experimental arms were balanced and showed no significant differences
384 with respect to key baseline characteristics. The average baseline proportion of
385 participants with positive intents in each arm to take, and recommend the COVID-19
386 vaccine to healthy adults, elderly, and people with health conditions, was 61.6%, 84.9%,
387 72.7% and 51.4% respectively. Summary statistics of survey participants stratified
388 according to experimental arms can be found in online supplemental table S1.

389

390

391



392
393
394
395
396


Figure 1: Experimental design flow chart presenting sample size, arm allocations, and item wordings for outcomes.

397 Figure 2 depicts forest plots that describe the average marginal effects of
398 providing positive responses for each interventional arm relative to the control arm in all
399 outcomes measured. A summary of marginal effects for all levels of responses can be
400 found under online supplemental tables S2 and S3. In terms of participant's intent to
401 accept the COVID-19 vaccine, none of the interventional arms were significantly
402 effective at improving intent compared to the control message. However, we found that
403 intent to vaccinate significantly dropped by 3.3 percentage points (95% CI -6.3 to -0.2)
404 among participants assigned to the *NF* message. Combining *DN(70%)* to *NF* had a
405 transient added reduction in intent to vaccinate (3.5 percentage points, 95% CI -6.6 to -
406 0.5). None of the interventional arms were significantly effective at improving
407 recommendation intent towards healthy adults and the elderly. Instead, recommendation
408 intent towards healthy adults significantly fell in the *DN(70%)* and *RC(S)* arm by 3.8
409 percentage points (95% CI -7.0 to -0.7) and 4.3 percentage points (95% CI -7.5 to -1.0)
410 respectively. Intent to recommend healthy adults in the combination message arm
411 containing *DN* dropped by 3.3 percentage points (95% CI -6.4 to -0.1) whilst the arm
412 with *RC(S)* reduced by 3.2 percentage points (95% CI -6.4 to -0.0). Conversely, five
413 interventional arms were significantly effective at improving recommendation intent to
414 people with pre-existing health conditions. The *DN* arm showed highest significant
415 improvements at 8 percentage points (95% CI 4.1 to 12.0). The *PF* was the second-best
416 performing arm, improving intent by 5.6 percentage points (95% CI 1.7 to 9.5). The
417 remaining arms showing significant improvements were the combination messages
418 containing *DN* (4.2 percentage points, 95% CI 0.2 to 8.1), *HCW* (4.7 percentage points,
419 95% CI 0.8 to 8.6), and *RC(S)* (4.6 percentage points, 95% CI 0.7 to 8.5) message.

420

421 Being worried about the safety or side effects of the vaccine was the main reason
 422 for hesitancy, with 70% to 80% participants who were hesitant in each outcome
 423 answering as such. A tabulation that shows the proportion of respondents citing reasons
 424 for hesitancy for each outcome can be found under online supplemental figures S2 to S5.
 425 We found no significant differences between all arms with respect to proportion of
 426 respondents citing this top reason (online supplemental table S4).

427



428

429 **Figure 2:** Average marginal effects of predicted probabilities for each interventional arm relative to the control arm for all primary
 430 outcome measures; i) Intention to vaccinate, ii) Recommend healthy adults (Healthy adults), iii) Recommend elderly (Elderly), iv)
 431 Recommend people with pre-existing health conditions (Health condition). Scatter plots present point estimates, 95% confidence
 432 intervals and the line of indifference.

433

434 Figure 3 shows forest plots with 95% confidence intervals for heterogeneous treatment
435 effects that indicate definite intentions of accepting the COVID-19 vaccine and agreeing to
436 recommend it. A summary of treatment effect values can be found under online supplemental
437 tables S5 to S7. There is evidence showing certain sociodemographic groups are more impacted
438 by our experimented messages.

439 Subgroup analysis for participants aged below and above 30 years old was conducted.
440 This grouping was selected to investigate if youths, who have much lesser risk for suffering
441 severe disease but have their future wellbeing affected,[44] responded differently compared to
442 the older age groups who have higher risk for serious complications.[45] Our analyses show that
443 only the older participants were significantly affected by the *NF* message when applied alone or
444 when in combination with *DN(70%)*, registering a drop in intent by almost 5 percentage points.
445 A similar drop in intent to recommend healthy adults was observed among the older age group
446 and youths who were exposed to the *RC(S)* and *PF* message respectively. There was also an
447 almost equal drop in intent to recommend the vaccine to elderly among older participants
448 exposed to *DN(70%)* and *RC(S)*. Both age groups responded positively to the *DN* message for
449 intent to recommend people with health conditions, whereby youths and older people saw an
450 increase in intent by 6.6 percentage points (95% CI 0.1 to 13.0) and 8.7 percentage points (95%
451 CI 3.7 to 13.8) respectively. Older people also showed an increase in intent to recommend by 5.3
452 percentage points (95% CI 0.3 to 10.3) when exposed to *PF*. Intent increased to 7.4 percentage
453 points (95% CI 2.5 to 12.3) when *DN(70%)* was added. Additionally, older people were
454 positively influenced to recommend when *DN(70%)* was combined with *HCW* (6.5 percentage
455 points, 95% CI 1.5 to 11.5).

456

457 Between sexes, males were more negatively impacted by the *NF* message, having
458 vaccination intent drop by 4.6 percentage points (95% CI -9.0 to -0.2). Vaccination intent further
459 declined to 5.8 percentage points (95% CI -10.2 to -1.5) when *DN(70%)* was added. Females
460 were more negatively influenced by the *RC(S)* message, causing a reduction in intent to
461 recommend healthy adults by 4.8 percentage points (95% CI -9.5 to -0.0). However, both sexes
462 had significantly increased intent to recommend people with health conditions when they were
463 exposed to the *DN* message whereby intent improved by 6.8 percentage points (95% CI 1.2 to
464 12.3) and 9.4 percentage points (95% CI 3.8 to 15.1) for males and females respectively. Males
465 were also more positively influenced by both *PF* and *RC(SE)* messages. Moreover, males tended
466 to positively respond when *DN(70%)* was combined with *RC(S)* whilst females exhibited a
467 similar response when *DN(70%)* was combined with *HCW*.


468

469 Subgroup analysis was conducted between participants with and without tertiary
470 education to observe any differences in behavioral response to the messages, given that
471 Malaysians with a bachelor's degree or higher were more accepting of the COVID-19
472 vaccine.[46] None of the messages significantly impacted vaccination intent among the two
473 groups. However, several messages significantly reduced intent to recommend vaccine to healthy
474 adults among participants with tertiary education. The *DN(70%)* arm showed the highest drop in
475 intent (-7.9 percentage points, 95% CI -12.6 to -3.2), followed by the *NF* arm (- 5.7 percentage
476 points, 95% CI -10.1 to -1.2), *DN* arm (-4.6 percentage points, 95% CI -8.8 to -0.3), and *RC(S)*
477 arm (-4.5 percentage points, 95% CI -8.8 to -0.1). There were also significant reductions in intent
478 between 5.5 to 6.6 percentage points among tertiary educated participants who were exposed to

479 combination messages containing *PF* and *RC(S)*. However, participants without tertiary
480 education had significantly lower intents to recommend elderly when exposed to combination
481 messages containing *NF* (-7.2 percentage points, 95% CI -12.4 to -2.1) and *RC(SE)* (-5.5
482 percentage points, 95% CI -10.6 to -0.5). Apart from *DN(70%)*, *HCW*, and combination
483 messages containing *PF* and *RC(SE)*, all arms showed significant improvement in intent among
484 those with tertiary education to recommend people with health conditions, ranging from 6.0 to
485 9.3 percentage points. The only exception was the *DN* arm whereby intent improved between 7.3
486 to 11.6 percentage points, irrespective of education level.

487

488



489
490
491
492
493
494

Figure 3: Sociodemographic determinants of average marginal treatment effects to select option of definitely intending to accept the vaccine and agreeing to recommend the vaccine based on age, sex and education for each treatment arm relative to control arm, with respect to all 4 primary outcome measures; i) Intention to vaccinate , ii) Recommend healthy adults (Healthy adults) , iii) Recommend elderly (Elderly) , iv) Recommend people with pre-existing health conditions (Health condition). Scatter plots present point estimates, 95% confidence intervals and the line of indifference.

495

496 **Discussion**

497

498 This study reports the results of one of the first experiments in the Southeast Asian
499 region, and Malaysia specifically, that apply persuasive health messages to influence vaccine
500 uptake and recommendation intentions. Hence, our results may serve as a reference benchmark
501 of outcomes across various types of message frames from a middle-income country's
502 perspective.

503

504 Our estimates suggest that employed persuasive messages neither improved intent to
505 vaccinate, nor recommendation intent to healthy and older individuals. In contrast, we find
506 significant and sizeable effect of persuasive messages in improving the intent to recommend the
507 vaccine to people with health conditions across several experimental arms.

508

509 Brief messages plus a short intervention time may have insufficiently addressed vaccine
510 safety concerns to influence most of our outcomes. Moreover, consistent with the health belief
511 model, concerns over vaccine safety are categorised as a perceived barrier towards vaccine
512 uptake behaviour. Survey evidence among Malaysians documents both perceived benefits and
513 perceived susceptibility as significant predictors of the intent to receive the COVID-19 vaccine
514 in addition to barriers.[10] Hence, addressing only one predictor could be insufficient to
515 influence vaccine hesitant individuals.

516

517 Attribute appeal is another possible reason driving the differences in recommendation
518 intent between our studied outcomes. More than 80% of our participants agreed to recommend
519 the vaccine to healthy adults at baseline. This observation suggests a general perception that
520 healthy adults are fit enough to take the vaccine without any cause for safety concerns. Hence,
521 addressing vaccine safety may not be a suitable nudge for the hesitant minority who may have
522 deeper qualms about other issues. Conversely, about half of our participants were hesitant at
523 baseline to recommend people with health issues. Such low baseline proportions may be driven
524 by perceptions that vaccines are potentially harmful to individuals with pre-existing health
525 conditions who may have higher susceptibility to vaccine adverse effects, given their poorer
526 health state. This presumption is evidenced by the significant improvement in recommendation
527 intent after exposure to several of our messages promoting vaccine safety, a key attribute that
528 appealed to influenced participants. Similarly, vaccine safety may be a concern among
529 participants who were hesitant to recommend the elderly, given that they are more frail and
530 fragile to be recommended an intervention perceived as risky. However, the elderly are regarded
531 highly in Asian societies such as Malaysia.[47] Given that our current sample skews towards
532 younger individuals, recommending a perceived risky intervention to an elder may seem
533 disrespectful. Therefore, persuasive vaccine safety messages proved insufficient to nudge those
534 hesitant to recommend amidst an additional cultural barrier.

535

536 Our descriptive norm messages are grounded on the perceived sense of safety generated
537 from knowledge that a vast majority are taking or have taken the COVID-19 vaccine, making it a
538 social norm deemed as the right choice. However, this norms effect proved ineffective in
539 significantly raising self-vaccination intent compared to the control message, consistent with

540 COVID-19 vaccine studies involving norms.[22,23]. Helfinstein *et al.* also found that descriptive
541 norms had little effect on risk recommendation to others, which reflects our negative
542 observations with respect to vaccine recommendation.[48] However, we observe the *DN*
543 message increasing recommendation intent to people with pre-existing health conditions.
544 Message targeting may have made the *DN* message relatable to the recommended target group,
545 since it highlights that many people with health conditions have tested and taken the COVID-19
546 vaccine.[49] However, the addition of *DN(70%)* weakened this effect. *DN(70%)* on its own
547 reduced intentions to recommend healthy adults. This backfire could be due to perceptions that
548 70% of Malaysians, as stated in the *DN(70%)* message, is insufficient to be a convincing norm
549 since mass media widely reports target inoculation rates of 80% by the government through the
550 national immunisation programme.[50,51]

551
552 Both *NF* and *PF* messages induced opposite effects in two separate outcome measures.
553 The *NF* message reduced intent to accept the COVID-19 vaccine, whilst the *PF* message
554 improved intentions to recommend people with health conditions. The former result was
555 similarly observed when the *DN(70%)* message was added, indicating that the descriptive norm
556 message did not strengthen or dampen the effects from the negative attribute frame. Generally,
557 studies have shown attribute frames to be more effective when framed positively rather than
558 negatively.[52–55] However, Barnes & Colagiuri found that both positive and negative attribute
559 framed messages increased intentions to accept a booster dose among COVID-19 vaccinated
560 participants if the offered vaccine was unfamiliar or familiar respectively.[21] Their findings
561 differed from our results possibly because our participants have not been vaccinated but were
562 already familiar with the type of COVID-19 vaccine offered that was being widely promoted on

563 mass media, given that our survey coincided with the national immunisation programme.[56–58]
564 Inexperience towards the vaccine may have heightened negative safety perceptions arising from
565 negative attribute framing whilst negating positive effects observed with positive attribute
566 framing with respect to vaccination intent. A study involving influenza vaccine similarly found
567 that participants who were exposed to negative framed messages had higher expectations or
568 perceived severity of side effects as compared to their counterparts.[59] Interestingly,
569 inexperience did not cloud positive perceptions arising from the *PF* message to drive improved
570 intentions to recommend people with health conditions. Pre-conceived views that this target
571 population is more susceptible to vaccine adverse effects given their poorer state of health may
572 have been alleviated by this extra boost in safety perception.

573
574 Participants exposed to the *HCW* message did not show any significant changes in intent
575 for all outcome measures. There are several possible reasons. The social norm cue used with
576 reference to the majority of healthcare workers already vaccinated was probably ineffective due
577 to participants being unable to identify with the reference population used.[23] Furthermore, the
578 message may not have provided the personal touch and physical interaction from a healthcare
579 provider necessary to invoke changes in intent, a condition which is observed among studies
580 reporting raised vaccination intents [27,60,61]. This explanation is further supported by findings
581 from Motta *et al.* whereby vaccination intent did not differ from the control group when the
582 message encouraging vaccine uptake came from a medical expert.[62] Additionally, leveraging
583 the Director General of Health’s influence, who is a government official, may portray him as
584 accomplishing a bureaucratic task driven by political motives.[63] The use of a celebrity who is
585 viewed as politically neutral yet popular, could prove more efficacious, as shown in a study

586 which found celebrities inducing higher vaccine skepticism reductions compared to government
587 officials or medical experts.[63] Interestingly, when both *HCW* and *DN(70%)* were combined,
588 intent to recommend people with health conditions was significantly raised. This observation is
589 probably borne from positive interactions between a low descriptive norm and a high injunctive
590 norm. Recommendation from a convincing proportion of healthcare workers confers the
591 perception that getting vaccinated is a socially desirable action that is expected to be done, which
592 results in a high injunctive norm.[64] Habib *et al.* found that willingness to register as an organ
593 donor increased when a low descriptive norm was combined with a high injunctive norm, as
594 opposed to applying the norms individually.[65] This interaction arises by stoking a sense of
595 responsibility to act after the incongruent norms makes salient regarding inconsistencies existing
596 within the group. Although unmeasured, we believe this sense of responsibility to recommend
597 was invoked from this similar interaction. Our finding thus expands knowledge on normative
598 influence by proving such interactions also exist for behavior recommendation.

599
600 When risky choice framed messages were applied individually, only intent to recommend
601 healthy adults was significantly negatively affected by *RC(S)*. The use of death rates from
602 COVID-19 could be perceived as an irrelevant risk to healthy adults, since most deaths are
603 associated with elderly and people with medical issues.[66] A mismatch with the target group for
604 recommendation could have led to drops in intent. Moreover, the number of deaths featured on
605 the message may not be convincing enough to require a need for healthy people to take the
606 vaccine. However, based on shifts in the point estimate, this effect was slightly reduced when
607 *DN(70%)* was added together, presumably because the higher dosage of pro-vaccination
608 messages counteracted the negative effects of each message when applied individually.[31] A

609 similar dose response interaction may be occurring when $DN(70\%)$ was combined with $RC(S)$ to
610 yield a significant increase in intent to recommend people with health conditions. Although
611 $RC(S)$ and $RC(SE)$ addressed safety attributes which are relevant to elderly and people with
612 health conditions, their effects did not differ from the control message when applied alone. A
613 possible reason lies with the message bringing attention to possible health risks associated with
614 the vaccine such as deaths or blood clots. Despite the probability favouring vaccine uptake, the
615 mention of these health risks may have caused hesitant individuals to remain hesitant for fear of
616 recommending something harmful.

617
618 Our analysis on heterogeneity treatment effects revealed varied impacts of different
619 messages for each socio-demographic variable. Intent to vaccinate for both older participants and
620 males were negatively influenced by a negative attribute frame. Studies show older people have
621 higher risk perceptions towards health related risks.[67] This characteristic makes them more
622 susceptible to negatively framed attribute messages as negative frames heighten risk perception.
623 Studies have also shown that men tend to be more optimistic about perceived susceptibility and
624 severity from COVID-19,[68,69] rendering males being more likely to take a risk with
625 contracting the virus as compared to taking a vaccine that is perceived unsafe due to the negative
626 attribute framing effect. Our findings highlight the damaging effect such frames can cause
627 amongst males who generally have higher vaccination intentions compared to females.[70]

628
629 Most of the messages which induced positive intents to recommend people with health
630 conditions impacted the older age group, males, and those with a tertiary education. There are
631 several postulations to this pattern of results. Studies show that self-esteem increases with

632 age.[71,72] This may confer older people with more confidence to recommend the vaccine if
633 there is information that supports this action. Moreover, our youths may be more hesitant to
634 recommend even when nudged as Malaysia practices a collectivist culture.[47] People with
635 medical condition tend to be older, which makes it more challenging for youths to recommend
636 due to social hierarchy barriers. In terms of males having higher intents, we postulate differences
637 in risk acceptance as a possible explanation. Recommending a health intervention involves some
638 risk taking since it advocates something that may bring risk to another individual. Studies have
639 shown males have higher risk taking behaviour compared to females.[73] Therefore, males could
640 be more willing to accept risks associated with recommendation, thus responding positively to
641 more of the messages compared to females. On the other hand, behavioural differences to
642 recommend based on education level are probably related to cognitive capabilities to synthesize
643 information and perceived vaccine safety. People with tertiary education could have understood
644 and synthesised the health messages better to infer that the vaccine was safe to be used by people
645 with health issues. Being higher educated also gives more confidence and a higher sense of
646 social responsibility to recommend.

647
648 Individuals with tertiary education were also more impacted by messages which reduced
649 intent to recommend healthy adults. A deeper synthesis of messages by those who have higher
650 education does not necessarily produce positive results and could backfire instead. These people
651 may tend to have more complex interpretations amidst wider information obtained from various
652 sources, resulting in certain messages inducing negative responses. Studies have shown that there
653 is strong associations between education level and extent of COVID-19 related knowledge, both
654 factual and perceived.[74,75] Coupled with a lesser perceived severity of the virus by more

655 educated individuals, these messages may have been interpreted with a risk benefit analysis to
656 suggest healthy individuals not requiring the vaccine.[75]

657

658 **Limitations**

659

660 Our experiment exhibits the following limitations. Study outcomes measured how
661 messages affect intent and do not really indicate whether participants would actually receive or
662 recommend the vaccine in reality. Although actual vaccination behaviour should be the prime
663 outcome of interest, intent has been shown to be a strong predictor for behavioural actions over
664 various contexts, even for actual vaccination uptake.[76] However, significant intention-behavior
665 gaps for vaccination has been shown to exist,[77] with a study even concluding that nudges are
666 ineffective at significantly raising actual COVID-19 vaccination rates.[18] Previous research
667 have also shown differing results when applying behavioral nudges to promote COVID-19
668 vaccination under experimental conditions versus in the field.[78] These findings underscore the
669 need to field test behavioural interventions that are proven successful in survey experiments to
670 confirm their true effectiveness under real world conditions.

671

672 The extent of misinformation that participants were exposed to prior to our experiment
673 was not measured. Misinformation has been proven to significantly affect vaccination intent.[43]
674 Actual vaccination rates declined depending on the theme and quantity of misinformation
675 exposure.[13] Therefore, misinformation exposure may be a strong predictor for resisting nudges
676 from health messages. Future studies should find ways of incorporating this measure to further
677 elucidate true effectiveness of messages under various levels of misinformation exposure.

678

679 The dynamic nature of the COVID-19 pandemic may have altered attitudes towards the
680 COVID-19 vaccines since our experiment was initiated. This is especially so after the vaccines
681 have been safely rolled out and shown to be effective as time progresses. Hence, the efficacy of
682 these messages may have changed over the course of the pandemic.

683

684 Lastly, we did not specify any particular COVID-19 vaccine when asking participants to
685 take or recommend. During the experimental survey roll out, vaccines from three different
686 companies were widely mentioned in Malaysia, namely Pfizer-BioNTech, Oxford/Astra Zeneca,
687 and Sinovac.[58,79] Each of these vaccines were developed using different technologies to yield
688 differing effectiveness and safety profiles. The public may hold differing views about the
689 vaccines based on the familiarity of the technology used to develop them. Hence, we were
690 unsure whether responses obtained were based on a particular vaccine in mind or aggregated in
691 nature.

692

693 **Further work**

694

695 Explanations regarding behavioural responses observed were inferred based on past
696 research. More in depth qualitative research based on theoretical frameworks should be
697 conducted to gain a firmer understanding on how these messages affect individual perceptions
698 that result in provided responses. Additionally, more research should be conducted to understand
699 the science behind individuals recommending healthcare interventions to others, as this aspect of
700 knowledge in the health behavioural field is scarce.

701

702

703 **Conclusion:**

704

705 Despite safety being the main concern for COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy, crafting
706 messages that focus solely on this attribute does not significantly improve vaccination intent or
707 vaccine recommendation, except to people who have pre-existing health conditions. Our findings
708 prove that addressing a single attribute that is of highest concern for vaccine hesitancy may not
709 necessarily improve vaccination uptake

710

711 We documented several examples where combining messages weakened or strengthened
712 intent, thus providing further proof about message interactions between different frames. A
713 deeper understanding of such interactions is needed, especially when conducting health
714 promotion campaigns that utilise a series of messages together to influence individual decision
715 making.

716

717 Our study suggests two important findings. Firstly, persuasive messages aimed at
718 influencing vaccination decisions should incorporate a combination of factors linked to hesitancy
719 instead of only one single attribute. Lastly, messages incorporating safety dimensions are capable
720 of updating the belief of individuals to advocate an intervention that was previously deemed
721 risky to a vulnerable population. This evidence suggests that persuasive messages should
722 emphasize on safety when promoting recommendation of novel health interventions to

723 individuals with pre-existing health conditions, especially if the intervention is perceived as
724 harmful to them.

725

726

727 **Data availability statement**

728 The dataset used for this study belongs to the Ministry of Health, Malaysia. Hence, the dataset
729 may be available from the corresponding author via a formal request through relevant authorities
730 at the Ministry of Health, Malaysia.

731

732 **Informed Consent Statement**

733

734 Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study. Participants consented to
735 participation if they clicked on an informed consent button after reading the online survey's
736 introductory section and participant information sheet.

737

738 **Ethics statements**

739

740 **Patient consent for publication**

741 Not required.

742

743 **Patient and Public Involvement statement**

744

745 Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination
746 plans of our research.

747

748 **Ethics approval**

749 Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Medical Research Ethics Committee of the
750 Ministry of Health Malaysia on 25 Feb 2021 (KKM/NIHSEC/ P21-130 (4)).

751

752 **Acknowledgments**

753 We would like to thank the Director General of Health Malaysia for his permission to publish
754 this article. We would also like to thank the team at Dynata for their efficient service in making
755 the data collection process for this study a success.

756

757 **Contributors**

758 NYLH, YLW, YKL, NML and JCF contributed to the conception and design of the study.
759 NYLH, YLW, YKL, NML, JKH, EW, KP, NHAS and AI contributed to content and design of
760 experimented messages, and questionnaire development. Questionnaire and message validation

761 was conducted by NYLH, YLW, YKL, NML, KP and NHAS. Project management was handled
762 by NYLH. NYLH and CTL conducted statistical analysis. JCF was consulted for data analysis.
763 Visualisations of results were prepared by NYHL. NYHL wrote the original draft of the
764 manuscript. JCF supervised the drafting of the manuscript. All authors interpreted the results and
765 critically reviewed the drafts of this manuscript. All authors read and approved the final
766 manuscript.

767

768 **Funding**

769

770 This study was supported by an Australian aid initiative from the Department of Foreign Affairs
771 and Trade of the Australian Government for COVID-19 Vaccines Strategic Communications
772 (Award number: SM210337). Funding was mainly used to engage the services of Dynata to
773 execute the online survey. The funder had no involvement in the study design, data collection,
774 analysis or interpretation of the study.

775

776 **Competing Interests**

777

778 The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the Malaysian
779 Ministry of Health, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) Malaysia, University Malaya or
780 The London School of Economics and Political Science. JKH and EW are employees of
781 UNICEF, Malaysia and assisted with administrating the funds that supported the work reported

782 in this paper. Funding was channelled from the funder to UNICEF, Malaysia under a cooperation
783 agreement. All other authors declare no competing interest.

784

785 **Exclusive License statement**

786

787 I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the
788 Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive
789 licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has
790 agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US
791 Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide,
792 perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd (“BMJ”) its licensees and
793 where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the
794 Work in BMJ Global Health and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in
795 our license.

796

797 The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made
798 by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your
799 employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable
800 article publishing charge (“APC”) for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author
801 wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant
802 APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence
803 – details of these licences and which Creative Commons licence will apply to this Work are set
804 out in our licence referred to above.

805
806

807 **Author Reflexivity Statement**

808
809

1. How does this study address local research and policy priorities?

810

811 This study addresses the need to investigate what message frames are effective at influencing Malaysians
812 to take up the COVID-19 vaccine, as well as recommending it to others in society. At the time of the
813 study, Malaysia was just only rolling out the COVID-19 vaccination programme and there was an urgent
814 need to determine what message frames would be effective to bolster vaccination registration and uptake
815 rates.

816

2. How were local researchers involved in study design?

818

819 The first group of local researchers who initiated the research question and idea were NYLH and YLW.
820 Both researchers were based at the Institute for Clinical Research at the Malaysian National Institute of
821 Health and were well connected and capable of conducting, leading, and organising local and
822 international research collaborations. The second group of researchers who were invited by the core team
823 to plan and discuss the conduct of the research project were local researchers based in local academic,
824 research and government policy institutions (YKL, NML, KP, NHAS and AI). These researchers were
825 from a diverse background and had intermediate to advanced research skills that helped solidify the study
826 design. The third group of local researchers consisted were from a non-governmental organisation (JKH
827 and EW) and had specific experience in risk communication, which is a vital part of this study. JCF was
828 the only research member who was based abroad in a high-income country. JCF was invited to join the
829 study to provide his expertise related to behavioral economics. Therefore, almost the entire research team
830 who are based in a middle-income country were actively involved with the study design. Our researcher

831 that is based in a high income country was mainly responsible for providing guidance and support in
832 terms of ensuring study design and interventions used were valid and scientifically sound.

833

834

835 **3. How has funding been used to support the local research team?**

836

837 Funding was mainly used to engage the services of an international market research company (i.e. Dynata)
838 to conduct the study's online survey through their survey panel in Malaysia.

839

840

841 **4. How are research staff who conducted data collection acknowledged?**

842

843 All members of the research team were included into the authorship of this paper as a form of
844 acknowledgement for their contributions offered.

845

846 **5. Do all members of the research partnership have access to study data?**

847

848 All members of the partnership have access to the data except JCF. This exception is due to data
849 confidentiality and security restrictions imposed by the Malaysian government for government owned
850 data. Data cannot be transferred abroad unless a formal application is applied by the foreign party.

851

852 **6. How was data used to develop analytical skills within the partnership?**

853

854 JCF was consulted by members of the Malaysian research team who were tasked with data analysis.
855 Knowledge transfer obtained from consultations provided sufficient analytical skills needed to analyse
856 data.

857

858 **7. How have research partners collaborated in interpreting study data?**

859

860 Two online meetings were held among all study team members during the process of study data
861 interpretations. Meetings involved presenting summary of data collected, discussion of analysis plans,
862 presentation of draft and finalized results, and data interpretations. Three other separate online meetings
863 were held between NYLH, CTL and JCF to discuss further queries and data interpretation during
864 manuscript write up.

865

866 **8. How were research partners supported to develop writing skills?**

867

868 NYLH, who is the main author of the current manuscript, was guided and supported by JCF who is a
869 senior academic at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Guidance and support entailed
870 writing style, techniques to formulate critical discussions, and assistance in editing the final manuscript.

871

872 **9. How will research products be shared to address local needs?**

873

874 Research outputs were shared to local and international stakeholders who were involved with risk
875 communication activities to improve COVID-19 vaccination uptake among Malaysians. These included
876 the Health Education Division at the Malaysian Ministry of Health, the World Health Organisation
877 (Western Pacific Region) and UNICEF, Malaysia.

878

879

880 **10. How is the leadership, contribution and ownership of this work by LMIC researchers**
881 **recognised within the authorship?**

882

883 Authors NYLH and JCF worked as part of the authorship team in developing this manuscript. Their
884 contribution has been recognised as joint first and joint last authors respectively. Hence both middle
885 income and high income country authors share main authorships for this paper, amidst an authorship team
886 that is predominantly based in a middle-income country.

887

888 **11. How have early career researchers across the partnership been included within the authorship**
889 **team?**

890

891 We have included an early career researcher (NML) within the authorship team. She attended all project
892 meetings, contributed to the literature review, and assisted with both the development and validation of
893 the survey questionnaire and experimental messages. We acknowledge that she is based in a middle-
894 income country.

895

896 **12. How has gender balance been addressed within the authorship?**

897

898 Seven authors are male (NYLH, YLW, CTL, YKL, JKH, AI and JCF) and AI) and four authors are
899 female (NML, EW, KP and NHAS). We admit that gender balance was slightly skewed towards males in
900 this study's authorship list. We hope to ensure a more gender balanced group of authors in the future.

901

902 **13. How has the project contributed to training of LMIC researchers?**

903

904 The project has exposed and taught Malaysian researchers in the team on how to conduct behavioral
905 insights research work, along with data analysis techniques arising from such projects.

906

907 **14. How has the project contributed to improvements in local infrastructure?**

908

909 This project has not directly contributed to improvements in local infrastructure.

910

911 **15. What safeguarding procedures were used to protect local study participants and researchers?**

912

913 Local study participants were safeguarded by not collecting their personal identifiers throughout the
914 online survey. Dynata does not share personal information of participants who responded to the survey, in
915 accordance to data privacy policies. This question is not directly applicable to researchers as the study
916 conduct only requires recruited participants to answer an online survey.

917

918 **References**

919

920 1 Cohen J. Breakthrough of the year 2020: shots of hope. *Science* 2020;:1392–4.
921 doi:10.1126/science.370.6523.1392

922 2 Randolph HE, Barreiro LB. Herd Immunity: Understanding COVID-19. *Immunity*
923 2020;**52**:737–41. doi:10.1016/j.immuni.2020.04.012

924 3 Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, *et al.* Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2
925 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med* 2020;**383**:2603–15.
926 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2034577

927 4 Lopez Bernal J, Andrews N, Gower C, *et al.* Effectiveness of the Pfizer-BioNTech
928 and Oxford-AstraZeneca vaccines on covid-19 related symptoms, hospital
929 admissions, and mortality in older adults in England: test negative case-control
930 study. *BMJ* 2021;**373**:n1088. doi:10.1136/bmj.n1088

931 5 China Sinovac Shot Seen Highly Effective in Real World Study. Bloom. News.
932 2021.[https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-05-11/china-s-sinovac-shot-](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-05-11/china-s-sinovac-shot-found-highly-effective-in-real-world-study)
933 [found-highly-effective-in-real-world-study](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-05-11/china-s-sinovac-shot-found-highly-effective-in-real-world-study) (accessed 21 Feb 2022).

934 6 Jara A, Undurraga EA, González C, *et al.* Effectiveness of an Inactivated SARS-
935 CoV-2 Vaccine in Chile. *N Engl J Med* 2021;**385**:875–84.
936 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2107715

937 7 Sallam M. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy Worldwide: A Concise Systematic

- 938 Review of Vaccine Acceptance Rates. *Vaccines* 2021;**9**:160.
939 doi:10.3390/vaccines9020160
- 940 8 The Sage Working Group. Report of the Sage Working Group on Vaccine
941 Hesitancy. 2014.
- 942 9 Advisor G, August J. Global Attitudes on a COVID-19 Vaccine Ipsos survey for
943 the World Economic Forum. 2020.
- 944 10 Wong LP, Alias H, Wong P, *et al.* The use of the health belief model to assess
945 predictors of intent to receive the COVID-19 vaccine and willingness to pay. *Hum*
946 *Vaccin Immunother* 2020;**16**:2204–14. doi:10.1080/21645515.2020.1790279
- 947 11 Alwi SARS, Rafidah E, Zurraini A, *et al.* A survey on COVID-19 vaccine
948 acceptance and concern among Malaysians. 2021;:1–12.
- 949 12 Zahiid SJ. Health Ministry survey shows a third of Malaysians still fear, doubt
950 Covid-19 vaccine. Malay Mail. 2020.
- 951 13 Neely SR, Eldredge C, Ersing R, *et al.* Vaccine Hesitancy and Exposure to
952 Misinformation: a Survey Analysis. *J Gen Intern Med* 2022;**37**:179–87.
953 doi:10.1007/s11606-021-07171-z
- 954 14 Thaler R, Sunstein CR. *Nudge: improving decisions about health, wealth and*
955 *happiness*. Yale University Press 2008.
- 956 15 Bálint KE, Bilandzic H. Health Communication Through Media Narratives : Factors
957 , Processes , and Effects - Introduction. *Int. J. Commun.* 2017;**11**:4858–64.
- 958 16 Reñosa MDC, Landicho J, Wachinger J, *et al.* Nudging toward vaccination : a
959 systematic review. *BMJ Glob Heal* 2021;**6**:1–20. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2021-006237
- 960 17 Ashworth M, Thunström L, Cherry TL, *et al.* Emphasize personal health benefits
961 to boost COVID-19 vaccination rates. *PNAS* 2021;**118**:1–3.
962 doi:10.1073/pnas.2108225118/-/DCSupplemental.Published
- 963 18 Chang T, Jacobson M, Shah M, *et al.* Financial Incentives and other nudges do
964 not increase COVID-19 vaccinations among the vaccine hesitant. Cambridge:
965 2021.
- 966 19 Kachurka R, Krawczyk M, Rachubik J. Persuasive Messages Will Not Increase
967 COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance : Evidence from a Nationwide Online Experiment.
968 *Vaccines* 2021;**9**:1–13. doi:https:// doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9101113
- 969 20 Santos HC, Goren A, Chabris CF, *et al.* Effect of Targeted Behavioral Science
970 Messages on COVID-19 Vaccination Registration Among Employees of a Large
971 Health System A Randomized Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021;**4**:2–5.
972 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.18702
- 973 21 Barnes K, Colagiuri B. Positive attribute framing increases COVID-19 booster
974 vaccine intention for unfamiliar vaccines. *medRxiv* [Preprint]. Jan 28, 2022. [cited
975 2022 Feb 8] doi:10.1101/2022.01.25.22269855.
976 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.01.25.22269855v1.full-text>.
- 977 22 Sasaki S, Saito T, Ohtake F. Nudges for COVID-19 voluntary vaccination: How to
978 explain peer information? *Soc Sci Med* 2022;**292**:114561.
979 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114561
- 980 23 Sinclair S, Agerström J. Do Social Norms Influence Young People ' s Willingness
981 to Take the COVID-19 Vaccine ? *Health Commun* 2021;**00**:1–8.
982 doi:10.1080/10410236.2021.1937832
- 983 24 Nam Y, Park HG, Kim Y-H. Do you favor positive information or dislike negative

- 984 information? Cultural variations in the derivation of the framing effect. *Curr*
985 *Psychol* Published Online First: 2021. doi:10.1007/s12144-020-01234-w
- 986 25 Cheon JE, Nam Y, Kim KJ, *et al.* Cultural Variability in the Attribute Framing Effect
987 . *Front. Psychol.* . 2021;**12**.
- 988 26 Pattison AB, Reinfelde M, Chang H, *et al.* Finding the facts in an infodemic:
989 framing effective COVID-19 messages to connect people to authoritative content.
990 *BMJ Glob Heal* 2022;**7**:e007582. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2021-007582
- 991 27 Kasting ML, Head KJ, Cox D, *et al.* The effects of message framing and
992 healthcare provider recommendation on adult hepatitis B vaccination: A
993 randomized controlled tria. *Prev Med (Baltim)* 2019;**127**:1–18.
994 doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2019.105798.The
- 995 28 Nyhan B, Reifler J, Richey S, *et al.* Effective Messages in Vaccine Promotion : A
996 Randomized Trial. *Pediatrics* 2014;:835–42. doi:10.1542/peds.2013-2365
- 997 29 James EK, Bokemper SE, Gerber AS, *et al.* Persuasive messaging to increase
998 COVID-19 vaccine uptake intentions. *Vaccine* 2021;**39**:7158–65.
999 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.10.039
- 1000 30 Kumari A, Ranjan P, Chopra S, *et al.* Knowledge, barriers and facilitators
1001 regarding COVID-19 vaccine and vaccination programme among the general
1002 population: A cross-sectional survey from one thousand two hundred and forty-
1003 nine participants. *Diabetes Metab Syndr* 2021;**15**:987–92.
1004 doi:10.1016/j.dsx.2021.04.015
- 1005 31 Ratcliff CL, Jensen JD, Scherr CL, *et al.* Loss/Gain Framing, Dose, and
1006 Reactance: A Message Experiment. *Risk Anal* 2019;**39**:2640–52.
1007 doi:10.1111/risa.13379
- 1008 32 Fei J, Lau W, Woon YL, *et al.* Factors influencing acceptance of the COVID-19
1009 vaccine in Malaysia : a web-based survey. *Osong Public Heal Res Perspect*
1010 2021;**12**:361–73.
- 1011 33 Teh HS, Woon YL, Leong CT, *et al.* Malaysian Public Preferences and Decision
1012 Making for COVID-19 Vaccination: A Discrete Choice Experiment. *SSRN*
1013 4057234 [Preprint]. Mar 14, 2022; [cited 2022 Mar 20]
- 1014 34 Kyriakidis NC, López-Cortés A, González EV, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 vaccines
1015 strategies: a comprehensive review of phase 3 candidates. *NPJ vaccines*
1016 2021;**6**:28. doi:10.1038/s41541-021-00292-w
- 1017 35 Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. Vaccines. Johns Hopkins Univ.
1018 2021.<https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/vaccines> (accessed 2 Mar 2021).
- 1019 36 Harun HN, Arumugam T. Covid-19: PM, Health DG receive vaccine. *New Straits*
1020 *Times*. 2021.
- 1021 37 Covid-19 vaccination: 90% of healthcare personnel got first dose, says Khairy.
1022 *The Star*. 2021.[https://www.thestartv.com/v/covid-19-vaccination-90-of-](https://www.thestartv.com/v/covid-19-vaccination-90-of-healthcare-personnel-got-first-dose-says-khairy)
1023 [healthcare-personnel-got-first-dose-says-khairy](https://www.thestartv.com/v/covid-19-vaccination-90-of-healthcare-personnel-got-first-dose-says-khairy) (accessed 1 Apr 2021).
- 1024 38 Health minister: 3.5pc vaccine recipients experience mild to serious side effects.
1025 *Malay Mail*. 2021.
- 1026 39 Kaos JJ. Health Ministry confirms that nurse’s death not related to Covid-19
1027 vaccine. *The Star*. 2021.
- 1028 40 COVID-19 Deaths in Malaysia. *CovidNow*.
1029 2022.<https://covidnow.moh.gov.my/deaths/> (accessed 23 Apr 2021).

- 1030 41 Torjesen I. Covid-19: Risk of cerebral blood clots from disease is 10 times that
1031 from vaccination, study finds. *BMJ* 2021;**373**:n1005. doi:10.1136/bmj.n1005
- 1032 42 Malas MB, Naazie IN, Elsayed N, *et al.* Thromboembolism risk of COVID-19 is
1033 high and associated with a higher risk of mortality: A systematic review and meta-
1034 analysis. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020;**29**:100639. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100639
- 1035 43 Loomba S, Figueiredo A De, Piatek SJ, *et al.* Measuring the impact of COVID-19
1036 vaccine misinformation on vaccination intent in the UK and USA. *Nat Hum Behav*
1037 2021;**5**:1–14. doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01056-1
- 1038 44 Bonami B, Muchena C, Rogobete E, *et al.* COVID-19 Youth Survey: Report.
1039 2020.
- 1040 45 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Risk for COVID-19 Infection,
1041 Hospitalization, and Death By Age Group.
1042 2022.[https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/investigations-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/investigations-discovery/hospitalization-death-by-age.html)
1043 [discovery/hospitalization-death-by-age.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/investigations-discovery/hospitalization-death-by-age.html) (accessed 20 Feb 2022).
- 1044 46 Mohamed NA, Maizuliana H, Id S, *et al.* Knowledge , acceptance and perception
1045 on COVID-19 vaccine among Malaysians : A web- based survey. *PLoS One*
1046 2021;**16**:1–17. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0256110
- 1047 47 Sumari M, Baharudin DF, Khalid NM, *et al.* Family Functioning in a Collectivist
1048 Culture of Malaysia: A Qualitative Study. *Fam J* 2019;**28**:396–402.
1049 doi:10.1177/1066480719844334
- 1050 48 Helfinstein SM, Mumford JA, Poldrack RA. If all your friends jumped off a bridge:
1051 the effect of others’ actions on engagement in and recommendation of risky
1052 behaviors. *J Exp Psychol Gen* 2015;**144**:12–7. doi:10.1037/xge0000043
- 1053 49 Schmid KL, Rivers SE, Latimer AE, *et al.* Targeting or Tailoring? Maximizing
1054 Resources to Create Effective Health Communications. *Mark Health Serv*
1055 2008;**28**:32–7.
- 1056 50 Zainul E. PM: Malaysia to meet target of vaccinating 80% of population by 1Q22.
1057 Edge Mark. 2021.
- 1058 51 Anand R. Malaysia maintains target of vaccinating 80% of population by Feb 2022
1059 despite doubts. The Straits Times. 2021.
- 1060 52 Levin IP, Schneider SL, Gaeth GJ. All Frames Are Not Created Equal : A
1061 Typology and Critical Analysis of Framing Effects. *Organ Behav Hum Decis*
1062 *Process* 1998;**76**:149–88. doi:10.1006/obhd.1998.2804
- 1063 53 Krishnamurthy P, Carter P, Blair E. Attribute Framing and Goal Framing Effects in
1064 Health Decisions. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process* 2001;**85**:382–99.
1065 doi:10.1006/obhd.2001.2962
- 1066 54 Ferguson E, Gallagher L. Message framing with respect to decisions about
1067 vaccination: The roles of frame valence, frame method and perceived risk. *Br J*
1068 *Psychol* 2007;**98**:667–80. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1348/000712607X190692>
- 1069 55 Akl E, Oxman A, Herrin J, *et al.* Framing of health information messages
1070 (Review). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011;:1–77.
1071 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006777.pub2.www.cochranelibrary.com
- 1072 56 The Special Committee for Ensuring Access to COVID-19 Vaccine Supply
1073 (JKJAV). National COVID-19 imunisation programme.
1074 2021.<https://www.vaksinovid.gov.my/> (accessed 8 Aug 2021).
- 1075 57 Loo K, Letchumanan V. COVID-19 : Malaysia’ s fight against this deadly virus.

- 1076 *Prog Microbes Mol Biol* 2021;**4**:1–11. doi:10.36877/pmmb.a0000204
- 1077 58 Malaysia approves Sinovac, AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccines for use. Channel
1078 News Asia. 2021.[https://www.channelnewsasia.com/asia/covid-19-malaysia-](https://www.channelnewsasia.com/asia/covid-19-malaysia-approves-sinovac-astrazeneca-vaccines-uk-china-251736)
1079 [approves-sinovac-astrazeneca-vaccines-uk-china-251736](https://www.channelnewsasia.com/asia/covid-19-malaysia-approves-sinovac-astrazeneca-vaccines-uk-china-251736) (accessed 28 Dec
1080 2021).
- 1081 59 O'Connor AM, Pennie RA, Dales RE. Framing effects on expectations, decisions,
1082 and side effects experienced: the case of influenza immunization. *J Clin*
1083 *Epidemiol* 1996;**49**:1271–6. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(96)00177-1
- 1084 60 Enticott J, Gill JS, Bacon SL, *et al.* Attitudes towards vaccines and intention to
1085 vaccinate against COVID- 19: a cross- sectional analysis— implications for public
1086 health communications in Australia. *BMJ Open* 2021;**12**:1–13.
1087 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-057127
- 1088 61 Nguyen KH, Yankey D, Lu P, *et al.* Report of Health Care Provider
1089 Recommendation for COVID-19 Vaccination Among Adults, by Recipient COVID-
1090 19 Vaccination Status and Attitudes — United States, April–September 2021.
1091 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021;**70**:1723–1730.
1092 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7050a1>
- 1093 62 Motta M, Sylvester S, Callaghan T, *et al.* Encouraging COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake
1094 Through Effective Health Communication. *Front Polit Sci* 2021;**3**:1–12.
1095 doi:10.3389/fpos.2021.630133
- 1096 63 Honora A, Wang K, Chih W. How does information overload about COVID-19
1097 vaccines influence individuals' vaccination intentions? The roles of cyberchondria,
1098 perceived risk, and vaccine skepticism. *Comput Human Behav* 2022;**130**:1–13.
- 1099 64 Cialdini RB, Kallgren CA, Reno RR. A Focus Theory of Normative Conduct: A
1100 Theoretical Refinement and Reevaluation of the Role of Norms in Human
1101 Behavior. *Adv Exp Soc Psychol* 1991;**24**:201–34.
1102 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60330-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60330-5)
- 1103 65 Habib R, White K, Hoegg J. Everybody Thinks We Should but Nobody Does: How
1104 Combined Injunctive and Descriptive Norms Motivate Organ Donor Registration. *J*
1105 *Consum Psychol* 2021;**31**:6231–630.
- 1106 66 Sanyaolu A, Okorie C, Marinkovic A, *et al.* Comorbidity and its Impact on Patients
1107 with COVID-19. *SN Compr Clin Med* 2020;**2**:1069–76. doi:10.1007/s42399-020-
1108 00363-4
- 1109 67 Bonem EM, Ellsworth PC, Gonzalez R. Age Differences in Risk : Perceptions ,
1110 Intentions and Domains. *J Behav Decis Mak* Published Online First: 2015.
1111 doi:10.1002/bdm.1848
- 1112 68 Alsharawy A, Spoon R, Smith A, *et al.* Gender Differences in Fear and Risk
1113 Perception During the COVID-19 Pandemic . *Front. Psychol.* . 2021;**12**.
- 1114 69 Lewis A, Duch R. Gender differences in perceived risk of COVID-19. *Soc Sci Q*
1115 2021;**102**:2124–33. doi:10.1111/ssqu.13079
- 1116 70 Zintel S, Flock C, Arbogast AL, *et al.* Gender differences in the intention to get
1117 vaccinated against COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Public*
1118 *Health (Bangkok)* Published Online First: 2022. doi:10.1007/s10389-021-01677-w
- 1119 71 Robins RW, Trzesniewski KH, Tracy JL, *et al.* Global self-esteem across the life
1120 span. *Psychol Aging* 2002;**17**:423–34.
- 1121 72 Ogihara Y, Kusumi T. The Developmental Trajectory of Self-Esteem Across the

- 1122 Life Span in Japan: Age Differences in Scores on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem
1123 Scale From Adolescence to Old Age. *Front Public Health*. 2020;**8**:132. doi:
1124 10.3389/fpubh.2020.00132. PMID: 32850566; PMCID: PMC7423839.
- 1125 73 Charness G, Gneezy U. Strong Evidence for Gender Differences in Risk Taking. *J*
1126 *Econ Behav Organ* 2012;**83**:50–8. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2011.06.007>
- 1127 74 Gerosa T, Gui M, Hargittai E, *et al.* (Mis) informed During COVID-19 : How
1128 Education Level and Information Sources Contribute to Knowledge Gaps. *Int J*
1129 *Commun* 2021;**15**:2196–217.
- 1130 75 Rattay P, Michalski N, Domanska OM, *et al.* Differences in risk perception ,
1131 knowledge and protective behaviour regarding COVID-19 by education level
1132 among women and men in Germany . Results from the COVID-19 Snapshot
1133 Monitoring (COSMO) study. *PLoS One* 2021;**16**:1–26.
1134 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0251694
- 1135 76 Lehmann BA, Ruitter RAC, Chapman G, *et al.* The intention to get vaccinated
1136 against influenza and actual vaccination uptake of Dutch healthcare personnel.
1137 *Vaccine* 2014;**32**:6986–91. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.10.034
- 1138 77 Ye L, Fang T, Cui J, *et al.* The intentions to get vaccinated against influenza and
1139 actual vaccine uptake among diabetic patients in Ningbo , China : identifying
1140 motivators and barriers. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 2021;**17**:106–18.
1141 doi:10.1080/21645515.2020.1761201
- 1142 78 Dai H, Saccardo S, Han MA, *et al.* Behavioural nudges increase COVID-19
1143 vaccinations. *Nature* 2021;**597**:404–9. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03843-2
- 1144 79 Lim I. Khairy: Malaysia can use Pfizer's Covid-19 vaccine now as conditional
1145 registration granted. Malay Mail. 2021.
- 1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152