CONVERGE COVID-19 Working Groups for Public Health and Social Sciences Research

Research Agenda-Setting Paper

Working Group Name:

Readying Populations for the COVID-19 Vaccine

Working Group Description:

The group developed an agenda to guide the aggregation, generation, and translation of known and novel research about social, behavioral, and communication challenges associated with COVID-19 vaccine, thus helping to build an evidence base with which better to plan and execute a vaccination campaign in the United States (US).

Challenge:

COVID-19 vaccination promises the opportunity to create individual and population-level immunity and to resume social and economic activity without excess disease. Yet, all segments of the public may not accept a vaccine, uneven access to vaccine could amplify social and economic disparities, and society could become further polarized as mask and physical distancing opposition converges with anti-vaccine sentiments distrustful of public health, government, and pharmaceutical companies. Because of the lag time in vaccine availability, however, the US has an opportunity to foresee and study such challenges, and to develop evidence-informed policies and practices that enhance public understanding of, access to, and acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine.

Context:

COVID-19 vaccines will become available amidst known trends and uncertain developments including:

- A protracted, lethal, and disruptive pandemic has heightened vaccination's perceived value [1].
- Understandings of COVID-19 virology and immunology (e.g., mutations, community immunity levels) are still evolving [2-4].
- Key vaccine attributes are not yet known (e.g., platforms, immunogenicity, duration of immunity) [5-6].
- Pressures to make a vaccine widely available on an accelerated basis may challenge previous beliefs about how fast is too fast for adequate safety and effectiveness [7].
- Urgent deployment of vaccines, determined to be safe and effective yet still classified as "investigational," will require Emergency Use Authorization by FDA, generating a complex communication environment [8].
- Manufacturing and distribution constraints with high vaccine demand will necessitate allocation decisions [9-10].
- The potential for multiple doses, multiple manufacturers, and/or adjuvant use will greatly complicate logistical planning and its explanation [11].
- The pandemic has had uneven geographical effects with communities of color disproportionately affected [12].
- Inconsistent messages about COVID-19 risk and its mitigation have fostered highly divergent threat perceptions [13-14].

- Deeply partisan actions threaten science-based public health [15-16].
- COVID-19 vaccine dis-/misinformation (e.g., profiteering, government control) has begun [17-18].
- If the perceived risk lessens (e.g. medicines prove effective in treatment), public demand could drop off [19].

Application of Known and Novel Research:

Conceived within applied traditions of the social, behavioral, and communication sciences, this agenda relies on existing, high-value evidence and proposes new, urgent lines of inquiry – to improve the three core components of COVID-19 vaccination planning (described below) while adding a cross-cutting objective: advance equity and solidarity. Current models suggest that vaccine hesitancy and confidence determinants are complex, context-driven, and differently weighted; they include vaccine issues (e.g., cost, safety/risks), individual/social group influences (e.g., personal experience, cognitive biases, social norms, racism and discrimination), and environmental factors (e.g., governance systems, media environment) [20-22]. Improving vaccination rates consequently entails reconfiguring medical and public health systems as well as altering individual beliefs [23].

1. **ALLOCATE: Facilitate Community Input on and Acceptance of Prioritization Decisions**

   Known Finding(s): In a crisis, strong feelings of vulnerability may prompt persons to protest their lack of access to a vaccine with limited availability [24-25]. Likewise, pre-existing socioeconomic inequalities, especially inequalities in health care access, may exacerbate concerns about vaccine access [26-28]. Facilitating input from affected communities in allocation decisions can generate innovative solutions, greater trust in authorities, feelings of ownership and understanding for decisions, and an informed populace able to exercise responsibility for collective well-being [29-35].

   Novel Inquiry(s): Given their potential promise, how might traditionally face-to-face public engagement methods (e.g., people-centered design, deliberative democracy, principled pluralism) be modified to work in an environment of physical distancing and uneven access to communication technologies so that they remain inclusive and retain known positive effects?

   Implications: People will judge a COVID-19 vaccination campaign's integrity, not simply on biomedical merits, but on matters of fairness and equity – that is, have people received their just portion of health services, and is disease prevention, ultimately, fairly distributed. More transparency and community engagement at the outset can increase the chance that people understand and embrace an allocation plan, even one in which they may not be among the first groups to be vaccinated. Moreover, community ownership of allocation decisions can strengthen the intent to vaccinate, thus helping to assure the fitting use of a public good.

2. **DEPLOY: Have a Delivery Plan that Meets People "Where They Are"**

   Known Finding(s): Vaccine acceptance increases when governmental health and human service delivery, as a whole, responds to community priorities and ongoing needs [23, 36-37]. Close coordination with health systems for vaccine availability, accessibility, and affordability further increases likelihood of vaccine uptake [38-39]. Convenient access (time/location), helpful reminders, and elimination of barriers – including fears of usual points of vaccination – increases uptake [40-42]. Health care practitioners are a critical linchpin in vaccination, first, as an at-risk population where some individuals may be vaccine hesitant, and second, as trusted intermediaries to the larger public [43-45].

Novel Inquiry(s): Can embedding COVID-19 vaccine access within a broader system of services (e.g., food security, rent assistance), trusted institutions, or familiar places that people frequent strengthen acceptance? How have local health agencies previously overcome vaccine hesitation in crisis contexts, especially among medically and socially vulnerable persons? Can less trained, yet trusted personnel deliver vaccines successfully to groups wary of authority figures? What would individuals and groups seeking out COVID-19 vaccination perceive as a "safe" place: e.g., protections from COVID-19 exposure, absence of immigration officials, presence of a familiar health provider, lack of military involvement? What innovative partnerships with mid-level entities (e.g., United Food and Commercial Workers Union, Transport Workers Union, United Farm Workers) can reach non-healthcare essential workers, many from disproportionately affected communities? What partnerships with national organizations representing racial/ethnic minorities can provide valuable input and collaboration?

*Implication*s: Americans, especially those with already precarious lives, may define their wellbeing and experience day-to-day pressures differently than public health policy makers do. Successful COVID-19 vaccination will likely hinge on concrete actions to meet diverse people where they are – literally in terms of place and figuratively in terms of mindset – while also attending to practical delivery requirements.

3. **COMMUNICATE: Inform and Update Communities Using Salient Terms and Trusted Messengers**

   A. Setting Expectations

   Known Finding(s): Novel technology, fast-tracked R&D, use of an adjuvant, and/or accelerated regulatory approval may heighten the perception of a vaccine as "risky," "rushed," and "experimental," fueling public concern [46-47]. Past unethical practices (e.g., unconsented testing on Black people's bodies) and continuing racial bias in health care have led some persons of color to be wary of health authorities and vaccinations in prior emergencies (e.g., 2009 H1N1, 2001 anthrax) [48-52].

   Novel Inquiry(s): What is the best approach to set public and provider expectations: e.g., striking the right balance between fostering hope for a COVID-19 vaccine and patience in obtaining it (due to safety precautions and allocation); readying people for reports of potential adverse effects (with broad vaccination) while educating them that not all observed effects are attributable to the vaccine? How can vaccination be encouraged in communities of color with high rates of chronic conditions, or other marginalized communities, while properly addressing wariness toward a novel vaccine?

   Implications: "Operation Warp Speed," as the current US vaccine enterprise has been labeled, suggests a fast, space-age solution to the COVID-19 pandemic; yet, this image may inadvertently prompt perceptions of a *rush* to make a vaccine, without due diligence for safety and effectiveness. More evidence-based, salient, and tempered communication that also conveys trustworthiness is required.

   B. Speaking Meaningfully

   Known Finding(s): Vaccine misinformation abounds in social media where users encounter disproportionate negative reports and images, can be moved more by personal stories of adverse effects than the science, and tend to judge disparate ideas about vaccines as equally valid, regardless of the source's expertise [53-56]. Values, world views, and identity (e.g. independence, collectivism) are enduring influencers in vaccine decision-making [57-60].

Novel Inquiry(s): What can proactively and effectively counter COVID-19 vaccine misinformation, given diverse agents (e.g., individuals, organizations, malicious actors, some political leaders) and media (e.g., traditional, social, homemade [street flyers])? What hesitations do specific populations (e.g., essential workers, parents, groups with high co-morbidity rates, racial and ethnic minorities) hold; how might concerns be effectively addressed? Apart from scientific facts (e.g., immunity), what alternate reasoning could prompt vaccination: Being free to return to work or worship more quickly? Adhering to social and cultural norms (e.g., altruism, collective obligation)? Lowering risk for vulnerable loved ones? Who (e.g. religious leaders, popular personalities) can serve as trusted spokespersons for these narratives? And how can these strategies be adapted to fit local communities?

Implications: Health communicators face the enduring problem of how best to engage, educate, and empower audiences with diverse beliefs and life circumstances. Listening and learning about specific COVID-19 vaccine-related hopes and worries – and tracking these sentiments over time and within particular communities – can enhance rollout success. Authorities also need innovative countermeasures, including identifying and working with trusted spokespersons, to counteract the inadvertent or deliberate misinformation common in social media.

Further Background and Related Resources:

See more details regarding the Working Group on Readying Populations for the COVID-19 Vaccine at:
https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/our-work/Center-projects/CONVERGE.html

See more details about the CONVERGE Initiative's COVID-19 Working Groups for Public Health and Social Sciences Research at:
https://converge.colorado.edu/resources/covid-19/working-groups

Contributors:

Emily K. Brunson, MPH, PhD (Co-Chair), Department of Anthropology, Texas State University

Monica Schoch-Spana, PhD (Co-Chair), Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security

Luciana Borio, MD, IQT

Janesse Brewer, MPA, Johns Hopkins Institute for Vaccine Safety

Joseph Buccina, MS, MA, IQT

Nancy Connell, PhD, Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security

Nancy Kass, ScD, Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics

Anna Kirkland, PhD, JD, Department of Women's Studies, University of Michigan

Lisa Koonin, DrPH, MN, MPH, Health Preparedness Partners LLC

Heidi Larson, PhD, The Vaccine Confidence Project™, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine

Brooke Fisher Liu, PhD, Department of Communication, University of Maryland

Rex Long, MA, Department of Anthropology, Texas State University

Saad Omer, MBBS, MPH, PhD, FIDSA, Department of Internal Medicine (Infectious Diseases), Yale School of Medicine; Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health

Walter Orenstein, MD, Department of Medicine (Infectious Diseases), Emory University School of Medicine

Gregory Poland, MD, Department of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine (Pediatric Infectious Diseases); Department of Molecular Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, Mayo Clinic

Lois Privor-Dumm, IMBA, Johns Hopkins International Vaccine Access Center

Sandra Crouse Quinn, PhD, Department of Family Science, Center for Health Equity, School of Public Health at the University of Maryland

Sanjana Ravi, MPH, PhD, Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security

Ali Ruth, AB, Department of Health Policy and Management, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health

Daniel Salmon, PhD, Johns Hopkins Institute for Vaccine Safety

Marc Trotochaud, MSPH, Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security

Alexandre White, PhD, Departments of Sociology and History of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University

References:

1. Goldstein A, Clement S. 7 in 10 Americans would be likely to get a coronavirus vaccine, post-ABC poll finds. *The Washington Post*. June 2, 2020. Accessed June 16, 2020. https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/7-in-10-americans-would-be-likely-to-get-a-coronavirus-vaccine-a-post-abc-poll-finds/2020/06/01/4d1f8f68-a429-11ea-bb20-ebf0921f3bbd_story.html

2. Yi Y, Lagniton PNP, Ye S, Li E, Xu R-H. COVID-19: what has been learned and to be learned about the novel coronavirus disease. *Int J Biol Sci*. 2020;16(10):1753-1766. doi:10.7150/ijbs.45134

3. Kirkcaldy RD, King BA, Brooks JT. COVID-19 and postinfection immunity: limited evidence, many remaining questions. *JAMA*. 2020;323(22):2245-2246. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.7869

4. Huzar, T. Scientists discover unique mutation of new coronavirus. *Medical News Today*. May 7, 2020. Accessed June 16, 2020. https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/scientists-discover-unique-mutation-of-new-coronavirus

5. Lurie N, Saville M, Hatchett R, Halton A. Developing COVID-19 vaccines at pandemic speed. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382:1969-1973. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2005630

6. Corey L, Mascola JR, Fauci AS, Collins FS. A strategic approach to COVID-19 vaccine R&D. *Science*. 2020;368(6494):948-950. doi:10.1126/science.abc5312

7. Allen A. Why the push for a quick coronavirus vaccine could backfire. *Politico*. March 20, 2020. Accessed June 16, 2020. https://www.politico.com/news/2020/03/20/why-the-push-for-a-quick-coronavirus-vaccine-could-backfire-139854

8. Quinn SC, Kumar S, Freimuth VS, Kidwell K, Musa D. Public willingness to take a vaccine or drug under Emergency Use Authorization during the 2009 H1N1 pandemic. *Biosecur Bioterror*. 2009;7(3):275-290. doi:10.1089/bsp.2009.0041

9. Bollyky TJ, Gostin LO, Hamburg MA. The equitable distribution of COVID-19 therapeutics and vaccines. *JAMA*. 2020 May 7. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6641

10. Emanuel E, Persad G, Upshur R, et al. Fair allocation of scarce medical resources in the time of COVID-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382:2049-2055. doi:10.1056/NEJMsb2005114

11. Khamsi R. If a coronavirus vaccine arrives, can the world make enough? *Nature*. 2020;580:578-580. doi:10.1038/d41586-020-01063-8

12. World Health Organization (WHO). Draft landscape of COVID-19 candidate vaccines. WHO website. Published June 16, 2016. Accessed June 16, 2016. https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/draft-landscape-of-covid-19-candidate-vaccines

13. Chowkwanyun M, Reed AL Jr. Racial health disparities and Covid-19 – caution and context. *NEJM*. 2020 May 6. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2012910

14. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). COVID-19 in racial and ethnic minority groups. CDC website. Last reviewed June 4, 2020. Accessed June 16, 2020. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/racial-ethnic-minorities.html

15. Healy J, Roberston C, Tavernise S. How coronavirus is already being viewed through a partisan lens. *The New York Times*. March 1, 2020. Updated March 5, 2020. Accessed June 6, 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/01/us/coronavirus-us-politics.html

16. Hersh ED, Goldenberg MN. Democratic and republican physicians provide different care on politicized health issues. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2016;113(42):11811-11816. doi:10.1073/pnas.1606609113

17. Pazzanese C. Battling the "pandemic of misinformation." *The Harvard Gazette*. May 8, 2020. Accessed June 16, 2020. https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2020/05/social-media-used-to-spread-create-covid-19-falsehoods/

18. European External Action Service (EEAS). EEAS special report update: short assessment of narratives and disinformation around the COVID-19/coronavirus pandemic (updated 2- 22 April). EEAS website. Published April 27, 2020. Accessed June 16, 2020. https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/77996/eeas-special-report-update-short-assessment-narratives-and-disinformation-around-covid_ko

19. Gidengil CA, Parker AM, Zikmund-Fisher BJ. Trends in risk perceptions and vaccine intentions: a longitudinal study of the first year of the H1N1 pandemic. *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102:672-679. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300407

20. MacDonald NE; SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. Vaccine hesitancy: definition, scope and determinants. *Vaccine*. 2015;33(34):4161-4164. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.036

21. Larson HJ, Jarrett C, Eckersberger E, Smith DM, Paterson P. Understanding vaccine hesitancy around vaccines and vaccination from a global perspective: a systematic review of published literature, 2007-2012. *Vaccine*. 2014;32(19):2150-2159. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.01.081

22. Larson HJ, Jarrett C, Schulz WS, et al. Measuring vaccine hesitancy: the development of a survey tool. *Vaccine*. 2015;33(34):4165-4175. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.037

23. Nandy R. *Vaccine Access and Creating Demand*. Virtual meeting on improving vaccine uptake - issues of access and hesitancy. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine website. Published May 28, 2020. Accessed June 15, 2020. https://www.nationalacademies.org/event/05-28-2020/the-critical-public-health-value-of-vaccines-tackling-issues-of-access-and-hesitancy-a-zoom-meeting

24. Schoch-Spana M, Brunson E, Chandler H, et al. Recommendations on how to manage anticipated communication dilemmas involving medical countermeasures in an emergency. *Public Health Rep*. 2018;133(4):366-378. doi:10.1177/0033354918773069

25. Institute of Medicine. *The 2009 H1N1 Influenza Vaccination Campaign: Summary of a Workshop Series*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2010.

26. Uscher-Pines L, Maurer J, Harris KM. Racial and ethnic disparities in uptake and location of vaccination for 2009-H1N1 and seasonal influenza. *Am J Public Health*. 2011;101(7):1252-1255. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300133

27. Quinn SC, Jamison A, Freimuth VS, An J, Hancock GR, Musa D. Exploring racial influences on flu vaccine attitudes and behavior: results of a national survey of White and African American adults. *Vaccine*. 2017;35(8):1167-1174. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.12.046

28. Lin L, Savoia E, Agboola F, Viswanath K. What have we learned about communication inequalities during the H1N1 pandemic: a systematic review of the literature. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14:484. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-484

29. Lemon S, Hamburg HA, Sparling F, Choffnes E, Mack A. *Ethical and Legal Considerations in Mitigating Pandemic Disease: Workshop Summary*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2007.

30. Gostin L. Pandemic influenza: public health preparedness for the next global health emergency. *J Law Med Ethics*. 2004;32(4):565-573. doi:10.1111/j.1748-720x.2004.tb01962.x

31. University of Toronto Joint Centre for Bioethics Pandemic Influenza Working Group. *Stand on Guard for Thee: Ethical Considerations in Preparedness Planning for Pandemic Influenza*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto; 2005. Accessed June 6, 2020. http://www.jcb.utoronto.ca/people/documents/upshur_stand_guard.pdf

32. Kinlaw K, Barrett D, Levine R. Ethical guidelines in pandemic influenza: recommendations of the Ethics Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee of the Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2009;3(suppl 2):S185-S192. doi: 10.1097/dmp.0b013e3181ac194f

33. Amon J, Bond KC, Brahmbhatt MN, Buchanan A. The Bellagio meeting on social justice and influenza. Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics website. Accessed June 17, 2020. http://www.bioethicsinstitute.org/research/global-bioethics/flu-pandemic-the-bellagio-meeting

34. World Health Organization (WHO). *Ethical Considerations in Developing a Public Health Response to Pandemic Influenza*. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2007. Accessed June 17, 2020. https://www.who.int/csr/resources/publications/WHO_CDS_EPR_GIP_2007_2c.pdf

35. National Ethics Advisory Committee. *Getting Through Together: Ethical Values for a Pandemic*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Health; 2007. Accessed June 15, 2020. http://www.moh.govt.nz/notebook/nbbooks.nsf/8b635a98811e8aed85256ca8006d4e51/4a5665fa075fac7ecc257332006eba40/$FILE/getting-through-together-jul07.pdf

36. Harrison EA, Wu JW. Vaccine confidence in the time of COVID-19. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2020;35(4):325-330. doi:10.1007/s10654-020-00634-3

37. DeRoo SS, Pudalov NJ, Fu LY. Planning for a COVID-19 vaccination program. *JAMA*. 2020 May 18. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8711

38. World Health Organization (WHO). *Working Together: An Integration Resource Guide for Immunization Services Throughout the Life Course*. Geneva: WHO; 2018. Accessed June 17, 2020. https://www.who.int/immunization/documents/ISBN_9789241514736/en/

39. Atun R, de Jongh T, Secci F, Ohiri K, Adeyi O. A systematic review of the evidence on integration of targeted health interventions into health systems. *Health Policy Plan*. 2010;25(1):1-14. doi:10.1093/heapol/czp053

40. Brewer NT, Chapman GB, Rothman AJ, Leask J, Kempe A. Increasing vaccination: putting psychological science into action. *Psychol Sci Public Interest*. 2017;18(3):149-207. doi:10.1177/1529100618760521

41. World Health Organization (WHO). Improving vaccination demand and addressing hesitancy. WHO website. Accessed June 17, 2020. https://www.who.int/immunization/programmes_systems/vaccine_hesitancy/en/

42. Schoch-Spana M, Bouri N, Rambhia KJ, Norwood A. Stigma, health disparities, and the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic: how to protect Latino farmworkers in future health emergencies. *Biosecur Bioterror*. 2010;8(3):243-254. doi:10.1089/bsp.2010.0021

43. Paterson P, Meurice F, Stanberry LR, Glismann S, Rosenthal SL, Larson HJ. Vaccine hesitancy and healthcare providers. *Vaccine*. 2016;34(52):6700-6706. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.10.042

44. Dubé E. Addressing vaccine hesitancy: the crucial role of healthcare providers. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2017;23(5):279-280. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2016.11.007

45. Karafillakis E, Dinca I, Apfel F, et al. Vaccine hesitancy among healthcare workers in Europe: a qualitative study. *Vaccine*. 2016;34(41):5013-5020. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.08.029

46. Stroud C, Nadig L, Altevogt BM, et al. *The 2009 H1N1 Influenza Vaccination Campaign: Summary of a Workshop Series*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2010.

47. Schoch-Spana M, Gronvall GK, Brunson E, Sell TK, Ravi S, Shearer M, Collins H. *How to Steward Medical Countermeasures and Public Trust in an Emergency: A Communication Casebook for FDA and Its Public Health Partners*. Baltimore, MD: UPMC Center for Health Security; 2016. Accessed June 17, 2020. https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/our-work/events/2016%20FDA%20MCM/FDA_Casebook.pdf

48. Quinn SC, Thomas T, Kumar S. The anthrax vaccine and research: reactions from postal workers and public health professionals. *Biosecur Bioterror*. 2008;6(4):321-333. doi:10.1089/bsp.2007.0064

49. Plough A, Bristow B, Fielding J, Caldwell S, Khan S. Pandemics and health equity: lessons learned from the H1N1 response in Los Angeles County. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. 2011;17(1):20-27. doi:10.1097/PHH.0b013e3181ff2ad7

50. Williams DR, Lawrence JA, Davis BA. Racism and health: evidence and needed research. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2019;40:105-125. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040218-043750

51. Institute of Medicine. *Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2003.

52. Washington HA. *Medical Apartheid: The Dark History of Medical Experimentation on Black Americans from Colonial Times to the Present*. New York: Random House, Inc; 2006.

53. Guidry JP, Carlyle K, Messner M, Jin Y. On pins and needles: how vaccines are portrayed on Pinterest. *Vaccine*. 2015;33(39):5051-5056. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.08.064

54. Kata A. Anti-vaccine activists, Web 2.0, and the postmodern paradigm—an overview of tactics and tropes used online by the anti-vaccination movement. *Vaccine*. 2012;30(25):3778-3789. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.11.112

55. Poland GA, Jacobson RM, Ovsyannikova IG. Trends affecting the future of vaccine development and delivery: the role of demographics, regulatory science, the anti-vaccine movement, and vaccinomics. *Vaccine*. 2009;27(25-26):3240-3244. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2009.01.069

56. Witteman HO, Zikmund-Fisher BJ. The defining characteristics of Web 2.0 and their potential influence in the online vaccination debate. *Vaccine*. 2012;30(25):3734-3740. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.12.039

57. Fu LY, Haimowitz R, Thompson D. Community members trusted by African American parents for vaccine advice. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*. 2019;15(7-8):1715-1722. doi:10.1080/21645515.2019.1581553

58. Hornsey MJ, Harris EA, Fielding KS. The psychological roots of anti-vaccination attitudes: a 24-nation investigation. *Health Psychol*. 2018;37(4):307-315. doi:10.1037/hea0000586

59. Browne M. Epistemic divides and ontological confusions: the psychology of vaccine scepticism. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*. 2018;14(10):2540-2542. doi:10.1080/21645515.2018.1480244

60. Rutjens BT, Sutton RM, van der Lee R. Not all skepticism is equal: exploring the ideological antecedents of science acceptance and rejection. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*. 2018;44(3):384-405. doi:10.1177/0146167217741314