Quantifying healthcare worker's preferences around COVID-19 vaccination: a single-profile DCE study in France

Carolina Díaz Luévano[a]

Jonathan Sicsic[b]

Gérard Pellissier[c]

Sandra Chyderiotis[d]

Pierre Arwidson[e]

Cyril Olivier[c]

Amandine Gagneux-Brunon[f,g]

Elisabeth Botelho-Nevers[f,g]

Elisabeth Bouvet[c]

Judith E. Mueller[a,d *]

Affiliations :

a. EHESP French School of Public Health, Paris and Rennes, 93210 La Plaine St Denis, France
b. University of Paris, LIRAES (EA4470). 75006 Paris, France
c. Research Group for the Prevention of Occupational Infections in Healthcare Workers (GERES), 75890 Paris cedex 18, France
d. Institut Pasteur, 75724 Paris cedex 15, France
e. Santé Publique France, 94415 Saint-Maurice cedex, France
f. Department of Infectious diseases, University Hopital of Saint-Etienne, 42055 Saint-Etienne, France

g. Chaire PreVacCI PRESAGE Institut, University Jean Monnet University, Lyon University, 42023, Saint-Etienne, France

* Corresponding author : Dr Judith Mueller, EHESP French School of Public Health, 20 avenue George Sand, 93210 La Plaine St Denis, France

Key Words: COVID-19**,** vaccination, healthcare workers, DCE, vaccine hesitancy, France,

Highlights

- COVID-19 vaccine preferences among healthcare workers in France can be evaluated
- Low vaccine efficacy has the most detrimental impact on hypothetical acceptance
- Collective benefits are motivating if presented as personal utility
- Collective benefits are motivating for highly hesitant participants
- Communication on positive risk-benefit balance may be disuasive

Abstract:

Background: Healthcare workers (HCWs) are prioritised for COVID-19 vaccination, but coverage is staggering in France below 70%. Analysing their vaccination preferences is crucial to understand suboptimal uptake and identify levers to increase acceptance among those hesitating.

Methods: : We conducted an online single-profile discrete choice experiment (DCE) among a snowballing sample of French HCWs, recruited during December 2020 to January 2021. Respondents in three random blocks chose between accepting or rejecting eight hypothetical COVID-19 vaccination scenarios.

The effects of attributes' levels on hypothetical acceptance were evaluated using mixed logit models, and on vaccine eagerness (certainty of decision, from -10 to +10) using linear random effect models.

Results: Among 4346 participants, 61.1% made uniform decisions, including 17.2% always refusing vaccination across all scenarios (serial non-demanders). Among 1691 respondents making variable decisions, a strong negative impact on acceptance was observed with 50% vaccine efficacy (compared to 90% efficacy: odds ratio 0.05, 95%-CI 0.04-0.06), and the mention of a positive benefit-risk balance (compared to absence of severe and frequent side effects: OR 0.40, 0.34-0.46. The highest positive impact was the prospect of safely meeting older people and contributing to epidemic control (compared to no indirect protection: OR 4.10, 3.49-4.82 and 2.87, 2.34-3.50, respectively. Predicted acceptance was 93.8% for optimized communication on mRNA vaccines and 16.0% for vector-based vaccines recommended to ≥55-year-old persons. Vaccine eagerness among serial non-demanders slightly but significantly

increased with the prospect of safely meeting older people and epidemic control; and reduced with lower vaccine efficacy.

Discussion: Vaccine promotion towards HCWs who hesitate or refuse vaccination, should avoid the notion of benefit-risk balance, while collective benefit communication with personal utility can lever acceptance. Vaccines with limited efficacy will unlikely achieve high uptake.

Introduction

During the current COVID-19 epidemic, healthcare workers (HCWs) are at increased risk of infection and disease, as well as transmitting the virus to patients, colleagues and their personal environment. Most countries have prioritized HCWs COVID-19 vaccination. Among HCWs in France, the seasonal influenza vaccine coverage has been as low as 35%[1] for more than a decade,[2] due to complacency and lack of confidence for some, and lack of convenience for others.[3] There is concern that this vaccine hesitancy may also apply to vaccination against COVID-19. At the end of May 2021, the COVID-19 vaccine coverage for at least one dose among HCW in France was estimated at 79%, 64% and 83% in nursing homes, hospitals and private practice, respectively. Furthermore, a strong gradient from medical professions (72%) to nurses (59%) and nurse assistants (50%) was described in hospitals. To increase coverage in all professional categories[5] and prepare for theoretical future re-vaccination, it will be important to understand which characteristics of the vaccine and vaccination context can make hesitant HCWs decide in favour of COVID-19 vaccination and to optimize communication messages accordingly.

Vaccine hesitancy is described as a continuum between complete acceptance and refusal.[6] Discrete choice experiments (DCE) have been increasingly used to study preferences around COVID-19 vaccines and predict uptake[7–12], focussing on fixed vaccine characteristics such as efficacy, duration of protection and risk of side effects. However, few studies have assessed the effect of contextual[8,10,13,14] inter-individual[11,13,14] and communication factors on the willingness to receive COVID-19 vaccine. To our knowledge, only one unpublished report[11] has focused on HCW, suggesting that vaccine intention was positively associated with acceptance among the

social contacts, in addition to vaccine effectiveness and safety, risk of disease and out-of-pocket payment.

In the present DCE study, we aimed at quantifying preferences around COVID-19 vaccination among HCWs in France, to understand incomplete vaccine uptake and identify targeted communication strategies, in particular among hesitating persons and on issues that will continue to be subject to scientific uncertainty for upcoming vaccines, such as vaccine capacity to block transmission, duration of vaccine protection, and vaccine safety.

Methods

Study Design and Participant Inclusion

We conducted a cross-sectional study among HCWs in France, including a single-profile DCE. Between December 18, 2020 through February 1, 2021, the Research Group for the Prevention of Occupational Infections in Healthcare Workers (GERES) published an online questionnaire on the Sphinx® online survey platform, which was disseminated throughout France by different HCW networks. Through the "snowball sampling" effect, the questionnaire reached a total of 9580 participants of diverse health-related careers and sectors. Since participants forwarded the questionnaire across their own networks, response rate could not be estimated.

At study start, vaccine efficacy data had been published or announced by AstraZeneca, Pfizer and Moderna. In France, vaccination in nursing homes (Pfizer) had started late December 2020, while vaccination for ≥50-year-old HCWs started on January 4, 2021. The vaccine campaign targeting persons ≥75-year-old persons was launched starting January 15, 2021 (using Pfizer and Moderna). During the entire study period, no travel or work restrictions were imposed, but a

curfew was in place 8pm-6am, which was extended to 6pm-6am starting January 15, 2021, as well.

Questionnaire

The first part of the survey collected socio-demographic, professional and health-related characteristics of participants, including previous vaccination against seasonal flu and intention to accept COVID-19 vaccine. Participants were then pseudo-randomly (based on a choice between square and circle) directed to one of the two questionnaires of the second part: either a standardized questionnaire on knowledge and attitudes, regarding COVID-19 vaccination; or the DCE presented in this report. Anticipated and effective survey completion took approximately ten minutes. To ensure complete survey responses in order to fully analyse preferences, all choice tasks of the DCE were mandatory.

Design of the Single Profile Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE)

We designed the DCE tool with five attributes (efficacy, indirect protection, safety, protection duration, recommendation/incentive source) and according levels (**Table 1**), based on a literature review on vaccine intention and vaccine-related preferences among HCWs,[15] COVID-19 vaccine intention available for the general population[16] and a study on COVID-19 vaccine acceptance conducted during summer 2020 among HCWs in France.[3] The tool was designed as a single-profile DCE, which implies that participants did not chose between two scenarios as in classical DCE,[17] but made binary decisions for or against accepting immediate vaccination presented through a series of imaginary scenarios (choice tasks) with varying attribute levels. This approach has been used for previous DCE studies on vaccination decisions (ConjointVac

studies)[15,18] because it is more appropriate to study the effect of inter-individual or contextual factors on choice. Immediately after the choice question, respondents were asked to self-report their level of certitude on a 0-10 scale (**Figure 1**).

The full-factorial design encompassing all five attributes with their corresponding variables resulted in 324 different combinations, from which we selected 24 scenarios for an efficient design (based on *a priori* assumptions regarding the direction of the effects, **Table 1**) using NGENE® software. The set of 24 scenarios were blocked into three versions of eight scenarios to which participants were pseudo-randomly directed (according to the choice of a geometrical figure). We included an interaction term between two attribute levels based on the hypothesis that in the scenario referring to the control of the epidemic, duration of protection beyond one year would have lower effect on acceptance. The tool was pilot tested in think-aloud sessions with HCWs.

Attribute description and assumptions

Vaccine Efficacy (3 levels). We hypothesized that compared to the information on 90% vaccine efficacy, 50% would have a lower hypothetical acceptance, while adding the specification "including against serious forms of COVID-19" would yield a higher acceptance. We utilized the second level as the reference (90% efficacy), since it allowed us to comment on the effect that a diminution of efficacy (50% efficacy) would have on the hypothetical vaccine acceptance.

Vaccine S*afety* (3 levels) described different types of information regarding the safety of the proposed vaccine. We hypothesized that information on strict safety monitoring in a joint effort of European countries would have a positive effect on hypothetical COVID-19 vaccine acceptance

compared to risk negation ("no severe and frequent adverse events in clinical trials"), while reference to a benefit-risk balance – although positive - would reduce it.

Indirect Protection (4 levels) described different information regarding vaccine impact beyond individual protection. We hypothesized that compared to "not known yet whether protects against infection", stating that there was no such indirect protection would decrease acceptance, while reference to control of the epidemic and the possibility to meet elderly friends and family would increase acceptance.

Protection Duration (3 levels). We hypothesized that, compared to annual vaccination, not knowing the duration of protection would be dissuasive and a duration of 3 years would be motivating.

Recommendation/Incentive (3 levels). We hypothesized that compared to a request from the Ministry of Health that HCWs get vaccinated, a recommendation formulated by professionals and researchers without conflict of interest with vaccine manufacturers would be motivating, as would an information - referring to social conformism - that 80% of HCWs in other European countries have been vaccinated.

Data Analysis

We used bivariate and multivariate models to assess the association between participant characteristics and the frequency of hypothetical vaccine acceptance across scenarios. Variables were included in the final model if they significantly interacted with one or more attributes at the 0.05 level. We estimated preference weights for each attribute levels using random intercept logit models. Due to the experimental nature of the data, random effects were not significantly different from fixed effects estimates (Hausman test: $p>0.194$).

Using interaction terms, we explored interactions between attributes and participant characteristics, as well as between attributes. We report separate preference weight estimates where significant interactions were found (**Table 3 & 4**).

Uniform respondents were participants who accepted (serial demanders) or refused (serial non-demanders) all eight scenarios. These participants did not contribute to the likelihood of the choice model, but information on decision certainty could be used to retrieve information on their preferences toward vaccination attributes. We created a variable "vaccine eagerness" based on certainty information, where certainty from refused scenarios was transformed into negative values. Thus, individuals refusing vaccination with a certainty of ten would have a score of -10 on the vaccine eagerness scale, and those accepting vaccination with a certainty of 10 would have a score of +10. A negative variation in certainty (e.g., decreasing from 10 to 7) among vaccine non-demanders was interpreted as an increase in vaccine eagerness. We used a panel linear regression model to analyse each attribute's impact on vaccine eagerness. Additionally, we created a variable for phase of study participation. According to the roll-out of the vaccination campaign described above, we defined the three phases of study participation: December 18, 2020 to January 4, 2021, January 5 to January 14, 2021, and lastly from January 15 to February 1, 2021.

Predicted acceptance

For non-uniform respondents, we calculated the predicted acceptance of specific scenarios of practical relevance (**SM Table 3**): 1) optimized communication on mRNA vaccines 2) vector-based vaccines recommended to ≥55-year-old persons as currently in place in France and 3) anticipated communication about future vaccines that will have recent licensure and uncertainty

around the safety profile and indirect protection. Predicted acceptance was estimated based on the simulation of the utility (assuming linear-in-parameters underlying utility functions) of the respective combination of attribute levels (for scenario *j*) using the standard formulae for predictions in logit models:

$$predicted\ accept = 1/[1 + e^{-utility j}]$$

Data analysis was performed using Stata/IC 16.0.

Ethics

The study protocol was approved by the IRB of CHU St Etienne (N° IRBN1092021/CHUSTE) and the database was registered by EHESP French School of Public Health according to the GRDP regulation. Because the data collection was observational, collected no sensitive and only self-declared biomedical information, no informed consent was required. Participants visiting the study website saw the complete study information and agreed to study participation before starting the questionnaire. Study participation was anonymous without any risk of indirect identification.

The funding source did not have any role in the conduct of the study or decision to submit this article.

Results

Participant characteristics

Among the 4346 participants assigned to the DCE (45.4%), all completed the questionnaire. Sixty-two percent of survey participants were younger than 50 years and 76.0% were female. Nurses represented 21.9%, nurse assistants and other short-trained HCW with patient contact

11.2% and biomedical professions (including physicians, midwives, pharmacists and biologists) 27.0% of the sample (Table 2). Administrative/technical careers accounted for 24.6%. Those who believed having a risk factor for severe COVID-19 accounted for 18.9% and 12.5% reported having been infected with the virus. The percentages indicating influenza vaccination during the 2019-2020 flu season were 76.1%, 51.2%, and 30.4%, respectively, among biomedical professions, nurses and nurse assistants, compared to the national estimates during 2018-19 of 72.2%, 35.9%, 20.9%,[1] respectively. Participants worked in hospital settings (61.2%), nursing homes or other long-term care institutions (16.2%), ambulatory/seeing patients outside any care institution setting (15.4%) or mixed exercise (6.0%). All French regions were comprised, including the overseas departments.

Preferences

Across scenarios, hypothetical vaccination was on average accepted by 60.1% of participants, ranging from 44.6% in the least favourable to 82.8% in the most favourable scenario (SM Table 1), and from 55.8% to 71.9% and 70.7% across the three phases of study participation. Uniform respondents comprised 61.1% of participants (n=2655), with 43.9% (n=1908) always accepting vaccination and 17.2% (n=747) always refusing. When removing participants with uniform respondents, vaccination was hypothetically accepted by 55.3% of participants across all scenarios.

Attribute impacts among participants with non-uniform decisions were all statistically significant, except for Recommendation/Incentive “experts without conflict of interest.” (Table 3). The strongest negative impact was observed with Vaccine Efficacy “50%” (OR 0.05, 95%-CI 0.04-0.60), followed by Protection Duration “unknown duration” [OR 0.49 (0.42-0.57)] and

Indirect Protection "individual protection only" [OR 0.47 (0.39-0.56)]. The strongest positive impacts were observed for the Individual Protection attribute: "meet older people" with OR 4.10 (3.48-4.82) and "control of epidemic" with OR 2.87 (2.35-3.50). Less pronounced but significant impact on vaccine acceptance relative to reference attribute levels was observed for Vaccine Efficacy "90% including against severe disease" (OR 1.70), "80% coverage among HCW in other European countries" (OR 1.32) and Protection Duration "probably 3 years" (OR 1.19). Based on marginal effects among the full sample respectively, among non-uniform respondents, Vaccine Efficacy "50%" reduced vaccine acceptance by 21 percentage points (resp., -38 pp), while Indirect Protection "meet older people" increased it by 7 percentage points (resp., +23 pp) and "control of epidemic" by 6 percentage points (resp., +17 pp). Moreover, compared to negating any severe and frequent adverse event, mentioning a positive benefit-risk ratio and "strictly monitored across the EU" both abated vaccine acceptance by 5 percentage points (resp., -15 pp). (SM Table 3, Figures 2a-b).

Interactions

Significant interactions with individual characteristics were observed for all attributes (Table 4 and 5), in particular for the attribute Vaccine Efficacy and characteristics age and phase. For example, the positive impact of the Indirect Protection attribute levels "control of epidemic" was weaker among the 35- to 49-year-old (OR 2.53) and ≥50-year-old age groups (OR 2.43) than the 18- to 34-year-old group (OR 4.77). A similar trend was observed for the level "meet older people".

We observed a significantly weaker aversion against the mention of a positive benefit-risk balance among bio-medical professions (OR 0.60), compared to nurses (0.35) and other

professional categories. Additionally, among nurse assistants, a recommendation by an expert group without conflict of interest had a significant negative impact [OR 0.67 (0.42-0.95)].
In assessing the interaction between attributes (SM Table 2), the positive impact of Protection Duration "probably 3 years" increased and became significant in scenarios with Indirect Protection "control of epidemic" [OR 1.98 (1.18-3.43)].

Vaccine Eagerness

Among the full sample of participants, including serial demanders and non-demanders, the average level of vaccine eagerness (on a -10 to 10 scale) in the 24 scenarios ranged from -0.78 to 5.86 (SM Table 1, SM Figure 1). Analyses based on vaccine eagerness in the full sample showed a similar pattern of preference weights as the analysis on vaccine acceptance among non-uniform responders, with strongest negative impact from Vaccine Efficacy "50%", ß=-2.89, (-3.01; -2.78) and the strongest positive impact from Indirect Protection "meet older people", ß=1.35, (1.22;1.48). Among serial non-demanders, all attribute levels showed a similar direction of effect as in the full sample, but effects were substantially weaker and mostly insignificant (Table 3).
We observed a significant negative impact from Vaccine Efficacy "50%" [ß -0.36 CI (-0.45;0.28)]; and significant positive impacts from Indirect Protection "meet older people" [ß 0.28 (0.19-0.38)] and "control of epidemic" [ß 0.20 (0.09-0.32)]. Moreover, Recommendation/Incentive "experts without conflict of interest" had a significant positive impact [ß 0.10 (0.01-0.18)].

Predicted acceptance

Among participants with non-uniform decisions, the predicted acceptance of specific scenarios was 93.8% for optimized communication on mRNA vaccines; 5.4% for vector-based vaccines recommended to ≥55-year-old persons and 65.2% for future COVID-19 vaccines with recent licensure (SM Table 3). For future COVID-19 vaccines with recent licensure, the predicted acceptance varied substantially between professional categories: 58.3% among nurses, 53.6% among nurse assistants, 77.7 % among other paramedical professions, 77.1% among biomedical professions and 58.7% among administrative and technical careers.

Discussion

We used an original single-profile DCE to estimate HCW preferences and trade-offs between characteristics of COVID-19 vaccination in France. We found that among HCW variably accepting or refusing vaccination, a reduced vaccine efficacy had the strongest negative effect on choices, followed by mentioning a positive benefit-risk ratio when communicating about vaccine safety, whereas communication about indirect protection effects (safely meet older people and epidemic control) had the strongest positive effect.

The finding of a strong preference against COVID-19 vaccines with limited efficacy is consistent with previous findings from DCEs among the general adult population.[8,11,12,19] This point is important in the current context of ongoing genetic diversification of SARS-CoV-2, which may lead to reduced vaccine effectiveness, and consequently lower acceptance of COVID-19 vaccination. This preference also may contribute to explaining slow uptake of Astra Zeneca vaccine when it was recommended to HCWs below 50 years of age at the start of the French vaccination campaign in early 2021.[20] Similarly, limited and variable effectiveness due to annual

strain variations is among known barriers to flu vaccine acceptance and the recommendation of the most effective vaccines is of highest importance.

At the start of our study, evidence on vaccine effectiveness against asymptomatic infection had not been available, while a substantial (although not perfect) protective effect against infection and transmission is now established for mRNA vaccines among HCW.[21,22] HCWs are at risk to transmit SARS-CoV-2 to their patients and private environment. Indirect protection is a motivator for flu vaccination among all professional categories,[15] and our current results suggest that it is an important motivator for COVID-19 vaccination, as well. Our results suggest that underpinning effectiveness against any infection and resulting protection of the social environment need to accompagny reports on high clinical efficacy. Moreover, our results show that mentioning uncertainty about the vaccine effectiveness against infection and transmission was preferable to stating that there is none, which is of importance for upcoming COVID-19 vaccines. Using the approach of vaccine eagerness (derived from certainty in decision), we had the particular opportunity to observe that HCWs who consistently refused hypothetical vaccination did have positive preferences towards indirect protection effects, in form of safe contacts with others and potential for epidemic control, similar to HCW with hesitating choices. Interestingly, these two attribute levels on collective benefits do create personal utility and represent altruism under its form of sympathy, rather than commitment.[23] This interpretation may explain the seeming incoherence of our results with a randomised controlled trial on communication towards adults of the general population with strong hesitancy against COVID-19 vaccination. This trial found significant positive effects on a vaccine hesitancy score from mention of personal benefits, but not from collective benefits.[24]

We proposed three formulations of positive communication on vaccine safety, referring to the fact that the vaccines' safety profiles were under evaluation and only short-term observations were available (three months at the time of the study). A clear risk negation was the preferable communication, even though the wording did not imply the absence of rare severe side effects. Similar to findings among French adolescents,[18] the reference to a positive benefit-risk balance was demotivating, while this effect was weaker among biomedical professionals. The wording "benefit-risk" itself implies the confirmation of a risk, and people may prefer negative consequences from omitting vaccination to negative consequences due to chosing vaccination.[25] This is also known as prospect theory or loss aversion, which posits that losses (e.g., health loss due to vaccine side effects) have more impact on individual decision-making than comparable gains.[26] On the other hand, information on the benefit-risk ratio is held imperative for the public to make an informed decision.[27] Similarly, the finding of the parallel KA-7C evaluation in our survey (personal communication coauthor JEM), where a confident attitude towards the vaccine's benefit-risk ratio was the single strongest predictor of COVID-19 vaccine intention. Further research is needed to explore how this benefit-risk notion can be translated into a more acceptable concept for communication, for example utilizing decision aids to reduce decisional conflict.[28]

Duration of vaccine protection was not a key attribute, possibly as HCWs are used to annual flu vaccination. However, uncertainty around it was demotivating and long-term protection became important in scenarios with the potential of epidemic control through vaccination. This may reflect strategic collective thinking by participants. Sources of recommendation did not substantially affect vaccine acceptance either, except for a demotivating effect from experts even if they are without conflict of interest specifically amongst nurse assistants and a motivating

effect from the sample attribute level among serial non-demanders. Finally, the positive impact of mentioning a high coverage among HCWs in other EU countries illustrates the importance of social conformism, which has been described in other vaccine DCEs for flu vaccination among HCWs[15] and COVID-19 among HCWs[11] and in the general population,[8] and appeared strongly in the parallel KA-7C evaluation (personal communication coauthor JEM).

We identified little heterogeneity of preferences across subgroups, which suggests that the recommendations emerging from our results can be applied to HCWs in general, without risk of negative impact in a specific subgroup. Our study's main information carries on persons who may accept or refuse vaccination according to its characteristics. We could predict future uptake of COVID-19 vaccination in this group: almost complete with mRNA vaccines, low with vector-based vaccines recommended to ≥55-year-old persons, and moderate for future vaccines with recent licensure and uncertainty about key characteristics. The great differences between professional categories underline the importance of targeted communication. Beyond this, recommending COVID-19 vaccines with limited effectiveness against severe disease and infection – albeit positive benefit-risk balance – will not meet HCWs' preferences and yield low uptake.

Study Limitations

Our study had several limitations. Firstly, the snowball method of participant recruitment encompasses selection bias. The coverage with seasonal flu vaccine in our sample (51.9%) suggests that participants were more favourable to vaccination compared to the HCW population in France (flu coverage estimated at 35%)[1]. This is also illustrated by the high percentage of participants who uniformly chose to accept vaccination. We therefore cannot provide valid prevalence estimates for HCWs in France, only investigate attribute impacts on preferences and

associations. However, the exploration of subgroups and results from vaccine eagerness among serial non-demanders suggest that the observed preference estimates may apply to the entire HCW population. Furthermore, preference studies are known to overestimate willingness,[29] and the stated preferences observed among participants in imaginary scenarios do not necessarily represent real-life choices. Finally, our DCE study was designed to evaluate the situation at the start of the COVID-19 vaccine campaign. Preferences may evolve over time as new data and vaccines emerge and other attributes may become more important to evaluate. Although our results are specific to French HCW, they likely can inform optimise communication towards HCWs in other countries, as the themes of vaccine hesitancy (in particular complacency, lack of confidence, collective responsability) have been described at international level.[30]

Conclusion

Despite these limitations, our study points towards several elements of improved COVID-19 vaccination promotion for HCWs, in particular those who are hesitating to get vaccinated: selecting vaccines with high efficacy and insisting on high effectiveness against severe disease; selecting vaccines for HCWs that substantially reduce infection or transmission and insisting on consequences for every day social life; avoiding the notion of "risk-benefit balance" but provide information on both benefits and risks. HCWs in France are a heterogeneous group with different levels of higher education, vaccine hesitancy and risk exposure. Their preferences around vaccination may apply to some degree to the general population, in particular items that reach beyond specific professional aspects and knowledge.

These results will be useful to inform vaccine promotion strategies and may help to develop adapted vaccine recommendations for HCWs as the vaccine response against the COVID-19 epidemic will most likely turn into a long-term vaccination strategy.

Acknowledgements

We thank the GERES network members, U.R.P.S. Auvergne Rhône-Alpes and Union Française pour la santé bucco dentaire for distribution of the study invitation.

This work was supported by the French Public Health Agency (Santé Publique France).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest in relation to the content of the article.

Data sharing

Individual anonymous participant data that underlie the results reported in this article and the analytic code can be shared beginning at and ending two years after publication. Researchers should direct a methodologically sound proposal to judith.mueller@ehesp.fr to gain access, data requestors will need to sign a data access agreement.

References

1. Santé Publique France. Bulletin de santé publique. Édition nationale. Couverture vaccinale antigrippale chez les professionnels de santé. 2019 [last accessed on April 21, 2021]. https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/determinants-de-sante/vaccination/documents/bulletin-national/bulletin-de-sante-publique-vaccination.-octobre-2019

2. Guthmann J, Abiteboul D. Vaccinations chez les soignants des établissements de soins de France, 2009. Couverture vaccinale, connaissances et perceptions vis-à-vis des vaccinations. Rapport final. Santé Publique France. 2011;76. [last accessed June 5, 2021] https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/determinants-de-sante/vaccination/documents/rapport-synthese/vaccinations-chez-les-soignants-des-etablissements-de-soins-de-france-2009.-couverture-vaccinale-connaissances-et-perceptions-vis-a-vis-des-vacci

3. Mueller JE, Olivier C, Diaz Luevano C, Bouvet E, Abiteboul D, Rouveix E. Cross-sectional study on the seasonal flu and COVID-19 vaccination intentions of healthcare professionals: Which levers for vaccine promotion? *Bulletin Epidémiologique Hebdomadaire Covid-19*. 2021 Jan 27;(2):9.

4. Santé Publique France. Point épidémiologique du 17 juin. [last accessed June 23, 2021]. Available from: https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/maladies-et-traumatismes/maladies-et-infections-respiratoires/infection-a-coronavirus/documents/bulletin-national/covid-19-point-epidemiologique-du-17-juin-2021

5. Gagneux-Brunon A, Detoc M, Bruel S, Tardy B, Rozaire O, Frappe P, et al. Intention to get vaccinations against COVID-19 in French healthcare workers during the first pandemic wave: a cross-sectional survey. JHI. 2021 Feb;108:168–73. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhin.2020.11.020

6. MacDonald NE. Vaccine hesitancy: Definition, scope and determinants. *Vaccine.* 2015 Aug;33(34):4161–4. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.036

7. Schwarzinger M, Watson V, Arwidson P, Alla F, Luchini S. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in a representative working-age population in France: a survey experiment based on vaccine characteristics. *Lancet Public Health*. 2021 Feb 5;6(2):E210-E221. DOI: 10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00012-8.

8. Leng A, Maitland E, Wang S, Nicholas S, Liu R, Wang J. Individual preferences for COVID-19 vaccination in China. *Vaccine*. 2021 Jan;39(2):247–54. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.12.009

9. Dong D, Xu RH, Wong EL, Hung C, Feng D, Feng Z, et al. Public preference for COVID-19 vaccines in China: A discrete choice experiment. *Health Expect.* 2020 Dec;23(6):1543–78. DOI: 10.1111/hex.13140

10. Craig BM. United States COVID-19 Vaccination Preferences (CVP): 2020 Hindsight. *Patient*. 2021 May;14(3):309–18. DOI: 10.1007/s40271-021-00508-0

11. Fu C, Wei Z, Pei S, Li S, Sun X, Liu P. Acceptance and preference for COVID-19 vaccination in health-care workers (HCWs) *medRxiv* 2020; published online April 14, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.09.20060103 (preprint).

12. Motta M. Can a COVID-19 vaccine live up to Americans' expectations? A conjoint analysis of how vaccine characteristics influence vaccination intentions. *Soc Sci Med*. 2021 Mar;272:113642. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113642

13. Borriello A, Master D, Pellegrini A, Rose JM. Preferences for a COVID-19 vaccine in Australia. *Vaccine.* 2021 Jan;39(3):473-9. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.12.032.

14. McPhedran R, Toombs B. Efficacy or delivery? An online Discrete Choice Experiment to explore preferences for COVID-19 vaccines in the UK. *Econ Lett*. 2021 Mar;200:109747. DOI: 10.1016/j.econlet.2021.109747.

15. Godinot LD, Sicsic J, Lachatre M, Bouvet E, Abiteboul D, Rouveix E, et al. Quantifying preferences around vaccination against frequent, mild disease with risk for vulnerable persons: A discrete choice experiment among French hospital health care workers. *Vaccine.* 2021 Jan;39(5):805–14. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.12.057.

16. Peretti-Watel P, Seror V, Cortaredona S, Launay O, Raude J, Verger P, et al. A future vaccination campaign against COVID-19 at risk of vaccine hesitancy and politicisation. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020 Jul;20(7):769–70. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30426-6.

17. Lancsar E, Louviere J. Conducting Discrete Choice Experiments to Inform Healthcare Decision Making: A User'ss Guide. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2008;26(8):661–77. DOI: 10.2165/00019053-200826080-00004.

18. Chyderiotis S, Sicsic J, Raude J, Bonmarin I, Jeanleboeuf F, Le Duc Banaszuk A-S, et al. Optimising HPV vaccination communication to adolescents: A discrete choice experiment. *Vaccine*. 2021 Jun; S0264-410X(21)00656-3. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.05.061.

19. Kreps SE, Kriner DL. Factors influencing Covid-19 vaccine acceptance across subgroups in the United States: Evidence from a conjoint experiment. *Vaccine*. 2021 Jun 2;39(24):3250–8. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.04.044

20. Madhi SA, Baillie V, Cutland CL, Voysey M, Koen AL, Fairlie L, et al. Efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 Covid-19 Vaccine against the B.1.351 Variant. *N Engl J Med*. 2021 Mar 16; 384:1885-1898 DOI 10.1056/NEJMoa2102214

21. Angel Y, Spitzer A, Henig O, Saiag E, Sprecher E, Padova H, et al. Association Between Vaccination With BNT162b2 and Incidence of Symptomatic and Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections Among Health Care Workers. *JAMA*. 2021 May 6. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2021.7152.

22. V Shah AS, Gribben C, Bishop J, Hanlon P, Caldwell D, Wood R, et al. Effect of vaccination on transmission of COVID-19: an observational study in healthcare workers and their households. *medRxiv*. 2021 Mar 21. DOI: 10.1101/2021.03.11.21253275 (preprint).

23. Shim E, Chapman GB, Townsend JP, Galvani AP. The influence of altruism on influenza vaccination decisions. *J R Soc Interface*. 2012 Sep 7;9(74):2234–43. DOI: 10.1098/rsif.2012.0115.

24. Freeman D, Loe BS, Yu L-M, Freeman J, Chadwick A, Vaccari C, et al. Effects of different types of written vaccination information on COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the UK (OCEANS-III): a single-blind, parallel-group, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Public Health*. 2021 May 12;E416-E427. DOI: 10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00096-7.

25. Asch DA, Baron J, Hershey JC, Kunreuther H, Meszaros J, Ritov I, et al. Omission bias and pertussis vaccination. *Med Decis Making*. 1994 Jun;14(2):118–23. DOI: 10.1177/0272989X9401400204.

26. Kahneman D, Tversky A. Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk. *Econometrica*. 1979 Mar;47(2):263. DOI: 10.2307/1914185.

27. Bégué P. Vaccine refusal and implications for public health in 2012. *Bull Acad Natl Med*. 2012 Mar;196(3):603–17; discussion 617-620. PMID: 23472350

28. Saunier F, Berthelot P, Mottet-Auselo B, Pelissier C, Fontana L, Botelho-Nevers E, et al. Impact of a decision-aid tool on influenza vaccine coverage among HCW in two French hospitals: A cluster-randomized trial. *Vaccine.* 2020 Aug;38(36):5759–63. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.07.011.

29. Lehmann BA, Ruiter RAC, Chapman G, Kok G. The intention to get vaccinated against influenza and actual vaccination uptake of Dutch healthcare personnel. *Vaccine*. 2014 Dec;32(51):6986-91. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.10.03.

30. Crawshaw J, Konnyu K, Castillo G, van Allen Z, Grimshaw J, Presseau J. Factors affecting COVID-19 vaccination acceptance and uptake among the general public: a living behavioural science evidence synthesis. [Internet] [last accessed June 05, 2021] https://www.mcmasterforum.org/docs/default-source/product-documents/living-evidence-syntheses/covid-19-living-evidence-synthesis-4.1---factors-affecting-covid-19-vaccination-acceptance-and-uptake-among-the-general-public.pdf?sfvrsn=5368712f_7

Figures




Figure 1. Example choice task

You are participating in an information session regarding the vaccine organized for healthcare workers. Following the information session, you will be able to immediately get vaccinated against COVID-19 at no cost. Below is the information regarding the vaccine.


Scenario 1	
	➢ The vaccine allows prevention of 90% of COVID-19 cases, including severe forms ➢ The vaccination will allow you to meet without risk older people of your family and patient roster. ➢ The vaccine safety is strictly monitored in a joint effort of European countries. ➢ The vaccination will probably be effective for a duration of 3 years. ➢ 80% of healthcare workers in other European countries have been vaccinated.


☐ I accept the vaccine

☐ I do not accept it

Certainty of your decision _____ (0=not at all certain; 10=absolutely certain

Figure 1. Example choice task





Figures 2a and 2b. Average marginal effects (change in probability of vaccine acceptance) of attribute levels on hypothetical acceptance of vaccination against COVID-19. ConjointVac survey among 4346 healthcare workers in France, December 18, 2020 to February 1, 2021.

Attributes: VE “Vaccine Efficacy,” VIP “Vaccine Indirect Protection,” VS “Vaccine Safety,” PD “Protection Duration,” RIS “Recommendation/Incentive”

Lecture note: Among all participating HCW, Vaccine Efficacy “50%” instead of “90%” decreased hypothetical vaccine acceptance by 21 percent points, whereas it decreased by 38% amongst non-uniform respondents only.

a. Full sample (N=4346).

b. Non-uniform respondents only (N=1691).

Table 1. Attributes and Levels with hypotheses on the expected effects (odds ratio relative to the reference level).

Attributes	**Levels**	**Assumptions to be tested**
Vaccine Efficacy	1 - The vaccine has 90% efficacy.	Reference
	2 - The vaccine has 50% efficacy.	H_1: OR < 1
	3 - The vaccine allows prevention of 90% of COVID-19 cases, including severe forms.	H_2: OR >1
Indirect Protection	1 - It is unknown if the vaccine prevents virus transmission to those around you in case of infection.	Reference
	2 - If you are infected, the vaccine will stop you from becoming sick from the disease, but it will not stop you from spreading the virus to those around you.	H_3: OR < 1
	3 - With the vaccination, you will contribute to the control of the COVID-19 epidemic.	H_4: OR> 1
	4 - The vaccination will allow you to meet without risk older people of your family and patient roster.	H_5: OR> 1
Vaccine Safety	1 - The clinical trials show an absence of severe and frequent side effects.	Reference
	2 - The scientific data suggests that even if you are young, the benefit that the vaccine provides is much larger than the hypothetical risk that we cannot yet rule out.	H_6: OR > 1
	3 - The vaccine safety is strictly monitored in a joint effort of European countries.	H_7: OR > 1
Protection Duration	1 - Annual vaccine will be necessary.	Reference
	2 - The duration and efficacity of the vaccine protection are yet unknown.	H_8: OR < 1
	3 - The vaccination will probably be effective for a duration of 3 years.	H_9: OR > 1
Recommendation/ Incentive	1 - The ministry of health asks healthcare workers to get vaccinated.	Reference
	2 - The vaccination recommendation is issued by a group of health professionals and scientists without any conflict of interest in relation to the vaccine producers.	H_{10}: OR > 1
	3 - 80% of healthcare workers in other European countries have been vaccinated.	H_{11}: OR > 1

H, hypothesis
OR, odds ratio

Table 2. Participant characteristics. ConjointVac survey among 4346 healthcare workers in France, December 18, 2020 to February 1, 2021.

				Hypothetical acceptance	Serial demander [1] n=1908	Serial non-demander [1] n=747	Bivariate model	Multivariate parsimonious model [2]
		N	Column %	%	N (row %)	N (row %)	OR [95%-CI]	OR [95%-CI]
Total		4346	100	NA	43.9	17.2	NA	NA
Gender	Women	3302	76	67.60	1321 (40)	623 (18.9)	Ref	Ref
	Men	1044	24	80.84	587 (56.2)	124 (11.9)	5.74***	2.53***
							[4.28; 7.69]	[1.93;3.32]
Age	18-34	941	21.6	60.68	296 (31.5)	236 (25.1)	Ref	Ref
	35-49	1764	40.6	69.44	744 (42.2)	306 (17.4)	3.54***	2.18***
							[2.50;5.0]	[1.64;2.90]
	50+	1641	37.8	78.00	868 (52.9)	205 (12.5)	11.32***	3.75 ***
							[7.98;16.05]	[2.79;5.05]
Profession	Nurse	951	21.9	65.10	327 (34.4)	187 (19.7)	Ref	Ref
	Nurse assistant	485	11.2	42.27	97 (20)	191 (39.4)	0.12***	0.42 ***
							[0.07;0.18]	[0.28;0.63]
	Other paramedical	672	15.5	69.64	280 (41.7)	129 (19.2)	1.87**	2.60***
							[1.25;2.81]	[1.83;3.70]
	Biomedical	1170	27	88.89	784 (67.01)	67 (5.7)	32.0 ***	7.32***
							[22.5;45.5]	[5.25;10.21]
	Admin./technical	1068	24.6	69.67	420 (39.3)	173 (16.2)	1.82***	1.18
							[1.27;2.6]	[0.86;1.60]
Works in nursing home	No	3640	83.8	72.99	1682 (46.2)	578 (15.9)	Ref	Ref
	Yes	706	16.2	59.35	226 (32.01)	169 (23.9)	0.20***	0.61**
							[0.14;0.29]	[0.45;0.82]
Believes having a risk factor	no	3264	79.8	71.14	1449 (44.4)	556 (17)	Ref	Ref
	Yes	825	20.2	72.12	370 (44.5)	129 (16.8)	1.2	..
							[0.85;1.65]	
Previously infected by SARS-CoV-2	No	3803	87.5	71.79	1702 (44.8)	638 (16.8)	Ref	Ref
	Yes	543	12.5	63.72	206 (38)	109 (20.1)	0.44	0.72
							[0.30;0.66]	[0.52;1.00]
Flu Vaccination 2019-20	No	2091	48.1	55.00	570 (27.3)	608(29.1)	Ref	Ref
	Yes	2255	51.9	85.4	1338 (59.3)	139 (6.2)	41.2***	8.51***
							[32.1;52.7]	[6.74;10.75]
Would accept Covid-19 vaccine	No	1786	41.1	31.5	108 (6.1)	744 (41.7)	Ref	..
	Yes	2560	58.9	98.2	1800 (70.3)	3 (0.1)	277.5	..

							[222.94;345.36]	
Confidence in crisis management [3]	Low	1187	27.3	45.83	262 (22.1)	454 (38.3)	Ref	Ref
	Medium	1771	40.8	73.35	767 (43.3)	230 (13)	19.6*** [14.5;26.4]	7.15*** [5.44;9.39]
	High	1388	31.9	88.83	879 (63.3)	63 (4.6)	161.42*** [116.0;222.4]	28.4*** [20.88;38.72]
Worry [4]	Low	442	10.2	42.76	108 (24.4)	190 (43)	Ref	Ref
	Medium	1283	29.5	67.11	516 (40.2)	239 (18.6)	16.9*** [10.6;27.0]	4.03*** [2.70;6.00]
	High	2621	60.3	77.30	1284 (49)	318 (12.1)	50.9*** [32.9;78.9]	5.83*** [3.98;8.55]

*p-value <0.05; **p-value <0.01; ***p-value ≤ 0.001

[1] Uniform responders are defined as those either refusing (serial non-demanders) or accepting (serial demanders) vaccination on all eight scenarios.

[2]Multivariate parsimonious model does not include COVID-19 vaccination intention due to collinearity with outcome variable.

[3] Confidence in authorities to manage sanitary and economic crisis due to COVID-19, assessed as 0 to 10; low (0-3), medium (4-6), high (7-10).

[4] General worry about COVID-19 epidemic; assessed as 0 to 10, low (0-3), medium (4-6), high (7-10).

Lecture note: 18.9% of women and 11.9% of men refused (serial non-demander) the hypothetical vaccine in all scenarios.

Table 3. Main effects for attributes of hypothetical COVID-19 vaccination acceptance (binary outcome) and ß-coefficient for vaccine eagerness. ConjointVac survey among 4346 healthcare workers in France, December 18, 2020 to February 1, 2021.

	Accept vaccination		Vaccine eagerness		Vaccine eagerness	
	N = 1691 (non-uniform respondents)		N = 4346 (full sample)		N = 747 (serial non-demanders)	
Attributes	OR	95%-CI	ß-coefficient	95%-CI	ß-coefficient	95%-CI
Vaccine Efficacy					Ref	
90%	Ref		Ref			
50%	0.05***	[0.04,0.06]	-2.89***	[-3.00; -2.78]	-0.36***	[-0.45; -0.28]
90%, severe cases	1.70 ***	[1.50,1.94]	0.48***	[-0.38;0.59]	0.08*	[0.01;0.16]
Vaccine Indirect Protection						
Unknown	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Individual protection only	0.47 ***	[0.39;0.56]	-0.76***	[-0.90; -0.61]	-0.09	[-0.20;0.19]
Control of epidemic	2.87 ***	[2.34;3.50]	0.89***	[0.73;1.04]	0.20***	[0.09;0.32]
Safely meet older people	4.10 ***	[3.49;4.82]	1.35***	[1.22;1.48]	0.28***	[0.19;0.38]
Vaccine Safety						
Absence of severe & frequent side effects	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Benefit>risk, even for young	0.40 ***	[0.34;0.46]	-0.77***	[-0.89; -0.64]	-0.06	[-0.15;0.03]
Strictly monitored across EU	0.38 ***	[0.33;0.44]	-0.89***	[-1.01; -0.77]	-0.06	[-0.15;0.13]
Protection Duration						
Annual vaccination	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Unknown duration	0.49 ***	[0.43;0.57]	-0.62***	[-0.74; -0.50]	-0.08	[-0.17; -0.01]
Probably 3 years	1.19 *	[1.02;1.37]	0.18**	[0.06;0.30]	0.04	[-0.05;0.13]
Recommendation/Incentive						
MoH asks	Ref		Ref			
Experts without CoI	0.97	[0.84;1.12]	0.07	[-0.04;0.19]	0.10*	[0.01;0.18]
80% HCWs EU	1.32 ***	[1.17;1.50]	0.31***	[0.20;0.42]	0.08	[-0.001,0.16]

OR: odds ratio. 95%-CI: 95% confidence interval. *p-value <0.05; **p-value <0.01; ***p-value ≤ 0.001

The ß-coefficient represents the change in vaccine eagerness on a scale from -10 to 10.

Table 4. Interaction effects between attribute levels and sociodemographic characteristics. ConjointVac survey among 4346 healthcare workers in France, December 18, 2020 to February 1, 2021.

		Gender		Professional category					Age		
	Attribute	Female	Male	Nurse	Nurse Assistant	Other paramedical	Biomedical	Admin./ Technical	18-34	35-49	50+
		Odds Ratio [95%-CI]									
Vaccine Efficacy	90%			Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
	50%			0.05 [0.04;0.07]	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.07 [0.05;0.09]	0.05	0.05*
	90%, severe cases			1.93 [1.53;2.43]	1.87	1.81	1.18**	1.60	1.84 [1.46;2.33]	1.82	1.42
Indirect Protection	Unknown								Ref	Ref	Ref
	Individual protection only								0.53 [0.39;0.71]	0.42	0.55
	Control of epidemic								4.77 [3.44;6.61]	2.53***	2.43***
	Safely meet older people								6.84 [5.10;9.17]	3.76***	3.08***
Vaccine Safety	Absence of severe & frequent side effects	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
	Benefit>risk, even for young	0.37 [0.32;0.44]	0.52*	0.35 [0.27;0.45]	0.41	0.52*	0.60**	0.34	0.33 [0.25;0.43]	0.46*	0.39
	Strictly monitored across EU	0.37 [0.31;0.43]	0.51*	0.39 [0.30;0.49]	0.45	0.47	0.46	0.32	0.28 [0.21;0.36]	0.42**	0.46**
Protection Duration	Annual vaccination								Ref	Ref	Ref

	Unknown duration						0.67 [0.52;0.87]	0.49	0.40**
	Probably 3 years						1.24	1.36	0.94
Recommendation/Incentive	MoH asks	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
	Experts without CoI	1.04	0.67*	1.11	0.85	1.12	0.79 [0.62;1.01]	0.96	1.14*
	80% HCWs EU	1.47 [1.16,1.84]	1.16	1.43	1.23	1.25	1.16 [0.91;1.47]	1.44	1.31

Asterisks represent the significance level of interaction terms of the given subgroup with the attribute level: *p-value <0.05; **p-value <0.01; ***p-value ≤0.001

[95%-CI], 95%-confidence intervals of the main effects in the given subgroup are shown, if they do not overlap 1 ($p<0.05$)

Lecture note: ≥50-year-old participants have significantly ($p\leq 0.001$) lower preference weights (OR) to contributing to epidemic control compared to those in the reference group (18- to 34-year-old participants). The effect of "control of epidemic" is significant ($p<0.05$) only among the group of 18- to 34-year-old participants

Table 5. **Interaction effects between attribute levels and participant characteristics.** ConjointVac survey among 4346 healthcare workers in France, December 18, 2020 to February 1, 2021.

		Flu Vaccine 19-20		Confidence in Crisis Management			Worry			Infected by SARS-CoV-2		Phase		
Attribute		no	yes	low	medium	high	low	medium	high	no	yes	1	2	3
							Odds Ratio [95%-CI]							
Efficacy	90%	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
	50%	0.06	0.05	0.09	0.05***	0.05***	0.14	0.06***	0.04***	0.05	0.09***	0.07	0.05**	0.04***
		[0.05;0.07]		[0.07;0.11]			[0.09;0.21]			[0.04;0.06]		[0.06;0.09]		
	90%, severe cases	1.91	1.41*	1.72	1.70	1.62	2.18	1.55	0.68	1.70	1.72	1.74	1.64	1.60
		[1.62;2.23]		[1.40;2.12]			[1.53;3.12]			[1.48;1.95]		[1.45;2.08]		
Indirect Protection	Unknown			Ref	Ref	Ref				Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
	Individual protection only			0.55	0.53	0.36*				0.50	0.30*	0.50	0.43	0.48
				[0.41;0.72]						[0.42;0.65]		[0.39;0.63]		
	Control of epidemic			2.82	3.07	2.59				2.87	2.90	3.73	2.46*	1.94***
				[2.12;3.76]						[2.33;3.52]		[2.88;4.84]		
	Safely meet older people			4.88	4.15	3.07*				3.87	6.11*	5.19	3.06**	3.42*
				[3.76;6.33]						[3.27;4.58]		[4.16;6.48]		
Safety	Absence of severe & frequent side effects	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref						Ref	Ref	Ref
	Benefit>risk, even for young	0.36	0.48*	0.41	0.36	0.50						0.34	0.52**	0.42
		[0.29;0.43]		[0.32;0.52]								[0.28;0.42]		
	Strictly monitored across EU	0.40	0.38	0.49	0.35*	0.38						0.34	0.43	0.43
		[0.34;0.48]		[0.39;0.61]								[0.28;0.42]		
Protection Duration	Annual vaccination	Ref	Ref				Ref	Ref	Ref					
	Unknown duration	0.53	0.46				0.64	0.47	0.48					

	[0.45;0.64]			[0.43;0.97]		
Probably 3 years	1.42	0.95**		2.10	1.13**	1.09**
	[1.18;1.70]			[1.40;3.17]		

Attribute Recommendation/Incentive not shown, as no significant interaction was found.

Asterisks represent the significance level of interaction terms of the given subgroup with the attribute level: *p-value <0.05; **p-value <0.01; ***p-value ≤0.001

[95%-CI], 95%-confidence intervals of the main effects in the given subgroup are shown if they do not overlap 1 (p<0.05)

Lecture note: We observe those with medium or high level of worry of epidemic have significantly (p<0.01) lower preference weights (OR) for longer duration of protection, compared to those with low worry of epidemic