

# International Journal of Pharmacology

ISSN 1811-7775





## International Journal of Pharmacology

ISSN 1811-7775 DOI: 10.3923/ijp.2024.318.331



# Research Article Immunization Awareness in Geriatric Age Group: Missed Opportunities

<sup>1</sup>Selda Aslan, <sup>1</sup>Ahmet Şahin, <sup>2</sup>Ibrahim Halil Türkbeyler, <sup>3</sup>Mehmet Göl and <sup>4</sup>Hüseyin Gürbüz

<sup>1</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases and Clinical Microbiology, Dr. Ersin Arslan Training and Research Hospital, Gaziantep, Türkiye <sup>2</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Faculty of Medical, Gaziantep Islam Science and Technology University, Dr. Ersin Arslan Training and Research Hospital, Division of Geriatrics Gaziantep, Türkiye

<sup>3</sup>Department of Physiology, Faculty of Medical, Gaziantep Islam Science and Technology University, Gaziantep, Türkiye <sup>4</sup>Department of Emergency Medicine, Dr. Ersin Arslan Training and Research Hospital, Gaziantep, Türkiye

# Abstract

**Background and Objective:** Due to low adult immunization rates, Vaccine-Preventable Diseases (VPDs) are a major health problem, especially among older people. In this study, it was aimed to shed light on future solutions by determining the vaccination rates related to immunization over 65 years of age, determining the factors affecting vaccination in the elderly and analyzing the determinants of vaccine hesitancy/refusal. **Materials and Methods:** A total of 459 elderly people over 65 years of age were included in the study. This study was conducted as a cross-sectional study between May, 1 and August, 31, 2022. A sum of 24 questions were put by the physicians in the questionnaire and those questions were asked in a face-to-face manner. Frequency and percentage distributions of categorical data were determined by Chi-square and Likelihood Ratio tests. **Results:** The mean age was 75.35±7.84 years. The 34.0% had received influenza vaccine, 29.2% had received tetanus vaccine, 27.9% had received only childhood vaccines and 14.6% had received hepatitis B vaccine. The 48.84% (215) of the elderly had received none dose of the hepatitis B, influenza, pneumococcal, herpes zoster, meningococcal or tetanus vaccines. When the distribution of the groups was analyzed, the vaccination rate was higher in those elderly who were in the age range of 65-74. The most common reason for not having been vaccinated was declared by the elders that they had not known they should be vaccinated (51.6%). **Conclusion:** While making arrangements to increase national immunization rates, systematic mechanisms for vaccination should be developed by making separate evaluations according to age groups, marital status, gender, educational status, social security status, occupation, place of residence and comorbid diseases. To reduce the reasons for vaccine hesitancy, the use of effective information channels, follow-up and national regulations are recommended.

Key words: Elderly population, hepatitis B vaccine, hesitancy, influenza vaccine, meningococcal vaccine, pneumococcal vaccine, refusal

Citation: Aslan, S., A. Şahin, I.H. Türkbeyler, M. Göl and H Gürbüz, 2024. Immunization awareness in geriatric age group: Missed opportunities. Int. J. Pharmacol., 20: 318-331.

Corresponding Author: Selda Aslan, Infectioous Disease and Clinical Microbiology, Dr. Ersin Arslan Training and Research Hospital, Gaziantep, Türkiye

Copyright: © 2024 Selda Aslan *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the creative commons attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Competing Interest: The authors have declared that no competing interest exists.

Data Availability: All relevant data are within the paper and its supporting information files.

#### INTRODUCTION

Vaccines are an important public health tool that reduces the rate of the spread of infectious diseases<sup>1-3</sup>. Vaccine interventions reduce mortality rates and prolong the life expectancy of the global population<sup>4</sup>. The life expectancy of the average person is sixty years or older. By 2030, it is estimated that one out of every six people in the world will be 60 years of age or older. Globally, it is estimated that the number of people over the age of 60 will double by 2050 and the population aged 80 and over will reach 426 million<sup>5</sup>. According to population data projections for Turkey, it is estimated that the proportion of elderly population will be 12.9% in 2030 and will nearly double by 2060<sup>6</sup>.

The immune system is aging as the human life span increases. With aging, changes occur in the distribution and activity of immune cells. With the loss of acquired immunity and the acquisition of non-specific innate immunity, elderly individuals become susceptible and vulnerable to infection<sup>7</sup>. These age-related changes lead to lower responses after vaccination. As a result, vaccination effectiveness decreases, susceptibility to disease increases and morbidity and mortality increase in the elderly<sup>8-10</sup>.

Vaccination is one of the most cost-effective ways of medical protection against infectious diseases for children, adults and the elderly. In line with the recommendation of the World Health Organization's Expanded Immunization Program, many infectious diseases have reached the point of elimination<sup>5</sup>. Especially with vaccination programs for the pediatric population, the vaccination rate has reached over 90% in many countries. However, the success of adult vaccination programs remains low<sup>4,11</sup>. Due to low adult immunization rates, Vaccine-Preventable Diseases (VPDs) are a major health problem, especially among older people, leading to increased global costs. For this reason, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) included influenza virus vaccine, Streptococcus pneumoniae (pneumococcal) vaccine, tetanus-diphtheria toxoid, chickenpox, shingles, hepatitis B, hepatitis A, meningococcal and Haemophilus influenzae type b vaccines in the adult vaccination program<sup>12</sup>. Although, heartbreaking efforts have been gone through for decades in order to reach most favourable vaccination ratios in all age groups, infections of influenza and herpes zoster (HZ) viruses and Streptococcus pneumoniae still seriously remain to result in morbidities and deaths<sup>13-16</sup>.

Although, studies (guidelines/recommendations and establishment and/or implementation of vaccination programs) have been carried out on vaccination in adults, the

vaccination rate in adults has not reached the desired levels. In this study, it was aimed to shed light on future solutions by determining the vaccination rates related to immunization over 65 years of age, determining the factors affecting vaccination in the elderly and analyzing the determinants of vaccine hesitancy/refusal to prevent VPDs in the population aged 65 years and over.

#### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Study area:** This study was conducted as a cross-sectional study between May 1 and August 31, 2022.

**Ethical consideration:** Ethics committee approval was obtained from the ethics committee of Gaziantep Islamic Science and Technology University (protocol no: 2022/123, decision no: 123.17.13).

Study design: Despite we calculated a required sample size of 195 while using the vaccination rate of 46% with  $\alpha = 0.05$ , power = 0.80 and deviation of 10%, a sum of 459 elderly people over 65 years of age were included in the study. Patients over 65 years of age who applied to the outpatient clinics and home health unit of Dr. Ersin Arslan Training and Research Hospital and who gave informed consent were included in the study. Patients with a diagnosis of dementia and any condition that prevented healthy communication as a result of comprehensive geriatric evaluation were excluded from the study. The questions in the questionnaire forms prepared for the participants were recorded by the physicians conducting the study by asking them face-to-face. Before the survey, the participants were asked questions about their demographic data and vaccination status, determination of vaccination rates, determination of factors affecting vaccination in the elderly and determinants related to knowledge, attitude and practice, taking into account patient privacy without informing them about the survey questions and without asking for their identity information.

**Study questionnaire:** In this study, a total of 24 questions were asked to the participants. In the first 7 questions, participants were asked about their demographic characteristics (age, gender, marital status, occupation and employment status, educational status, social security and place of residence) to evaluate the variable affecting their attitudes toward vaccines. In questions 8 and 9, participants were questioned about comorbid diseases and tobacco product use. Questions 10-13 evaluated the presence of

hepatitis B disease in the family and hepatitis B vaccination status. In questions 14-21, it was asked whether they had been vaccinated with influenza vaccine in the current year, conjugated pneumococcal vaccine in any period of life, polysaccharide pneumococcal vaccine in the last five years, DBT vaccine in the last 10 years, herpes zoster vaccine in any period of life, meningococcal vaccine in any period of life and whether they had any related diseases that can be prevented by vaccination. Questions 22-24 aimed to learn about the groups recommending vaccination, factors contributing to vaccination and reasons for vaccine hesitancy/refusal.

**Statistical analysis:** Statistical analyses were analyzed with the SPSS 27.0 program. Frequency and percentage distributions of categorical data were determined. The relationships of categorical were determined by Chi-square (X<sup>2</sup>) and Likelihood Ratio (LR) tests. Results with a p-value below 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

#### RESULTS

A total of 459 elderly people over 65 years of age participated in the study. The mean age of the participants was  $75.35\pm7.84$  years (median: 74.0, minimum: 65.0 and maximum: 102.0). The 52.3% were between 65-74 years of age, 57.5% were female and 53.6% were married. The 92.8% lived in a house owned by their families and 72.3% had primary school education. Of the participants, 53.2% were housewives and 91.3% had social security. The 74.3% were non-smokers and 86.7% had known comorbid diseases (Table 1).

There were 398 individuals with comorbid diseases and a total of 789 diagnoses were identified. The distribution of comorbid diseases was as follows: Hypertension (21.8%), diabetes mellitus (20.0%), chronic neurological diseases (10.6%), chronic cardiovascular diseases (8.7%) and chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases (7.8%), aspirin usage (5.8%), chronic kidney diseases (4.7%), morbid obesity (4.0%), vascular diseases (2.4%), chronic liver disease (1.9%), hyperlipidemia (1.8%), blood diseases (1.6%), malignancy (0.6%), alcohol abuse (0.5%), immunosuppression (0.4%) and HIV/AIDS (0.2%). Those without comorbid diseases were 7.2%.

Of the 459 elderly people who participated in the study, 34.0% had received influenza vaccine, 29.2% had received tetanus vaccine, 27.9% had received only childhood vaccines, 14.6% had received hepatitis B vaccine, 8.5% had received meningococcal vaccine, 8.3% had received pneumococcal vaccine and 2.2% had received herpes zoster vaccine. Meningococcal vaccine was most frequently administered for pilgrimage (84.6%).

Participants were divided into two groups: Those who had received at least one of the six vaccines and those who had received none of the six vaccines. Among the elderly, 53.16% (n = 244) had received at least one vaccine for hepatitis B, influenza, pneumococcal, herpes zoster, meningococcal, or tetanus, while 48.84% (n = 215) had not received any of these vaccines. There were statistically significant associations between vaccination status and age groups ( $X^2 = 10.641$  and p<0.001), gender ( $X^2 = 4.605$  and p = 0.032), marital status (X<sup>2</sup> = 23.359 and p<0.001), occupation ( $X^2 = 13.441$  and p = 0.009) and educational status  $(X^2 = 19.900 \text{ and } p = 0.001)$ . When the distribution of the groups was analyzed, the vaccination rate was higher in those elderly who were in the age range of 65-74, in comparison to the others who were 75 years or older. And, it was also higher among male gender, married, retired civil servant, high school and higher educated elderly. Statistically significant associations were also found between COPD ( $X^2 = 17.117$  and p < 0.001), vascular disease (X<sup>2</sup> = 4.006 and p = 0.045), hyperlipidemia ( $X^2 = 4.487$  and p = 0.034), blood diseases  $(X^2 = 12.724 \text{ and } p < 0.001)$ , aspirin usage  $(X^2 = 13.107 \text{ and } p < 0.001)$ p<0.001) and alcohol abuse (X<sup>2</sup> = 5.086 and p = 0.024). They were found to affect the vaccination rate (Table 2).

In addition, 31.41% (n = 49) of those who received influenza vaccine had influenza and 4.08% (n = 2) were hospitalized. Among those who received pneumococcal vaccine, 13.6% (n = 5) had pneumonia and none of them were hospitalized.

The 55.8% of the participants stated that they would get vaccinated by a doctor, 17.4% by other healthcare professionals, 15.5% by neighbors or friends, 7.2% by pharmacists and 4.1% by social media recommendations. There was a statistically significant relationship between the groups recommending vaccination and educational status  $(X^2 = 30.813 \text{ and } p = 0.014)$ , the presence of social security  $(X^2 = 18.731 \text{ and } p = 0.001)$  and the presence of comorbid diseases ( $X^2 = 26.936$  and p<0.001). Among comorbid diseases, statistically significant associations were found between COPD ( $X^2 = 23.754$  and p<0.001), vascular diseases  $(X^2 = 10.619 \text{ and } p = 0.025)$ , hyperlipidemia  $(X^2 = 9.673 \text{ and } p = 0.025)$ p = 0.046), malignancy (X<sup>2</sup> = 10.293 and p = 0.036) and aspirin usage ( $X^2 = 14.328$  and p = 0.006) (Table 3). The distribution of the groups was analyzed. In all education groups, doctor's recommendation was most effective. Other healthcare professionals were most effective in those without social security and physician recommendations were most effective in those with social security. In those with comorbid diseases, the doctor's recommendation was most effective, while in those without comorbid diseases, recommendations from neighbors or friends were effective.

# Int. J. Pharmacol., 20 (3): 318-331, 2024

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of participants (n = 459)

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of participants (n = 459)	
Variable	N (%)
Age (year)	
Mean±SD	75.35±7.84
65-74 years	240 (52.3%)
75 years and over	219 (47.7%)
Gender	
Male	195 (42.5%)
Female	264 (57.5%)
Education	
Primary school	332 (72.3%)
Secondary education	73 (15.9%)
High school	41 (8.9%)
University degree	13 (2.8%)
Marital status	
Married	246 (53.6%)
Single	94 (20.5%)
Divorced and widowed	119 (25.9%)
Insurance	
Insured	419 (91.3%)
Not insured	40 (8.7%)
Occupation	
Retired	159 (34.6%)
Housewives	244 (53.2%)
Others	56 (12.2%)
Place of residence	
Elderly nursing home	33 (7.2%)
Own home	426 (92.8%)
Types of comorbidities	
Hypertension	186 (21.8%)
Diabetes mellitus	170 (20.0%)
Neurological disease	90 (10.6%)
Cardiovascular disease	74 (8.7%)
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	67 (7.8%)

Table 2: Relationships of categorical variable according to vaccination status

			Vaccir	ation status		
Variable		Total n (%)	Vaccinated n (%)	Not vaccinated n (%)	X <sup>2</sup> /LR	р
Age group	75 and over	219 (47.71)	99 (45.21)	120 (54.79)	10.641*	0.001
	65-74 years	240 (52.29)	145 (60.42)	95 (39.58)		
Gender	Male	195 (42.48)	115 (58.97)	80 (41.03)	4.605*	0.032
	Female	264 (57.52)	129 (48.86)	135 (51.14)		
Marital status	Married	246 (53.59)	153 (62.2)	93 (37.8)	23.359*	< 0.001
	Single	94 (20.48)	49 (52.13)	45 (47.87)		
	Divorced	119 (25.93)	42 (35.29)	77 (64.71)		
Occupation	Civil servant	34 (7.41)	27 (79.41)	7 (20.59)	13.441*	0.009
(Retirement category)	Laborer	44 (9.59)	25 (56.82)	19 (43.18)		
	Private sector	81 (17.65)	46 (56.79)	35 (43.21)		
	Housewife	244 (53.16)	122 (50)	122 (50)		
	Others	56 (12.2)	24 (42.86)	32 (57.14)		
Education status	Illiterate	207 (45.1)	98 (47.34)	109 (52.66)	19.900*	0.001
	Primary school	125 (27.23)	59 (47.2)	66 (52.8)		
	Secondary school	73 (15.9)	48 (65.75)	25 (34.25)		
	High school	41 (8.93)	27 (65.85)	14 (34.15)		
	University	13 (2.83)	12 (92.31)	1 (7.69)		
Insurance	No	40 (8.71)	26 (65)	14 (35)	2.467*	0.116
	Yes	419 (91.29)	218 (52.03)	201 (47.97)		
Place of residence	Elderly nursing home	33 (7.19)	19 (57.58)	14 (42.42)	0.279*	0.598
	Own home	426 (92.81)	225 (52.82)	201 (47.18)		
Smoking	No	341 (74.29)	178 (52.2)	163 (47.8)	0.491*	0.484
-	Yes	118 (25.71)	66 (55.93)	52 (44.07)		

#### Table 2: Continued

			Vaccina			
Variable		Total n (%)	Vaccinated n (%)	Not vaccinated n (%)	X²/LR	р
Presence of comorbid disease	Yes	396 (86.27)	205 (51.77)	191 (48.23)	2.243*	0.134
	No	63 (13.73)	39 (61.9)	24 (38.1)		
COPD	No	392 (85.4)	224 (57.14)	168 (42.86)	17.117*	< 0.001
	Yes	67 (14.6)	20 (29.85)	47 (70.15)		
Cardiovascular disease	No	385 (83.88)	201 (52.21)	184 (47.79)	0.868*	0.352
	Yes	74 (16.12)	43 (58.11)	31 (41.89)		
Chronic kidney disease	No	419 (91.29)	219 (52.27)	200 (47.73)	1.535*	0.215
	Yes	40 (8.71)	25 (62.5)	15 (37.5)		
Diabetes mellitus	No	289 (62.96)	151 (52.25)	138 (47.75)	0.259*	0.610
	Yes	170 (37.04)	93 (54.71)	77 (45.29)		
Vascular disease	No	439 (95.64)	229 (52.16)	210 (47.84)	4.006*	0.045
	Yes	20 (4.36)	15 (75)	5 (25)		
Hypertension	No	273 (59.48)	142 (52.01)	131 (47.99)	0.354*	0.552
	Yes	186 (40.52)	102 (54.84)	84 (45.16)		
Chronic liver disease	No	443 (96.51)	234 (52.82)	209 (47.18)	0.581*	0.446
	Yes	16 (3.49)	10 (62.5)	6 (37.5)		
Hyperlipidemia	No	444 (96.73)	232 (52.25)	212 (47.75)	4.487	0.034
	Yes	15 (3.27)	12 (80)	3 (20)		
Immunosuppression	No	456 (99.35)	242 (53.07)	214 (46.93)	0.227**	0.638
	Yes	3 (0.65)	2 (66.67)	1 (33.33)		
Malignancy	No	454 (98.91)	240 (52.86)	214 (47.14)	1.584**	0.208
	Yes	5 (1.09)	4 (80)	1 (20)		
Morbid obesity	No	425 (92.59)	224 (52.71)	201 (47.29)	0.473*	0.492
	Yes	34 (7.41)	20 (58.82)	14 (41.18)		
Neurological disease	No	367 (79.96)	203 (55.31)	164 (44.69)	3.413*	0.065
	Yes	92 (20.04)	41 (45.56)	51 (54.44)		
Aspirin usage	No	410 (89.32)	206 (50.24)	204 (49.76)	13.107*	< 0.001
	Yes	49 (10.68)	38 (77.55)	11 (22.45)		
HIV/AIDS	No	457 (99.56)	242 (52.95)	215 (47.05)	2.535**	0.111
	Yes	2 (0.44)	2 (100)	0 (0)		
Alcohol abuse	No	455 (99.13)	240 (52.75)	215 (47.25)	5.086**	0.024
	Yes	4 (0.87)	4 (100)	0 (0)		
Blood disease	No	445 (96.95)	230 (51.69)	215 (48.31)	12.724*	< 0.001
	Yes	14 (3.05)	14 (100)	0 (0)		

n: Number, %: Percentage distribution, X<sup>2</sup>\*: Chi-Square test, LR<sup>\*\*</sup>: Likelihood ratio and p: Significance (p<0.05)

This study analyzed that what should be done to encourage vaccination and reduce vaccine hesitancy/refusal in the elderly. The most influential factor was found to be the explanation of the indications for vaccination by the physician and providing information to the patient (51.6%). In addition, the follow-up of vaccination records (29.8%), vaccination being covered by social security (15.5%) and intermittent immunization titer follow-up (3.1%) were also found to be influential groups motivating participants to be vaccinated were analyzed. Statistically significant associations were found between motivating groups and marital status ( $X^2 = 30.015$ and p<0.001), educational status ( $X^2 = 55.500$  and p<0.001) and place of residence ( $X^2 = 24.527$  and p<0.001). There was a statistically significant association between the motivating groups and the presence of cardiovascular diseases, chronic liver diseases, malignancy and morbid obesity (Table 4). Analysis of the distribution of marital status, educational status and place of residence groups revealed that physician's explanation and providing information to the patient were effective in all of them. Explanation and providing information to the patient were effective in those with and without cardiovascular diseases, while keeping vaccination records was most effective in those with chronic liver diseases and physician's explanation and providing information to the patient were effective in those without chronic liver diseases. In the presence of malignancy, the fact that the vaccine was covered by social security was effective, while in the absence of malignancy, the physician's explanation and providing information to the patient was effective and in the presence and absence of morbid obesity, the physician's explanation and providing information to the patient was effective.

In this study, the elderly were asked the reasons for vaccine hesitancy/refusal. It was found that the most common reason for not vaccinating was not knowing that they should be vaccinated (51.6%). The most common reasons were not recommending vaccination (18.7%), fear of vaccine side

Int. J. Pharmacol., 2	0 (3): 318-331, 2024
-----------------------	----------------------

# Table 3: Associations of categorical variable according to groups recommending vaccination

			Groups recommending vaccination						
Variable		Total n (%)	Doctor n (%)	Other healthcare workers n (%)	Pharmacist n (%)	Friends/neighbors n (%)	Social media n (%)	X²/LR	р
Age group	75 and over	219 (47.71)	126 (57.53)	35 (15.98)	19 (8.68)	28 (12.79)	11 (5.02)	4.762*	0.313
	65-74 years	240 (52.29)	130 (54.17)	45 (18.75)	14 (5.83)	43 (17.92)	8 (3.33)		
Gender	Male	195 (42.48)	105 (53.85)	32 (16.41)	14 (7.18)	34 (17.44)	10 (5.13)	2.077*	0.722
	Female	264 (57.52)	151 (57.2)	48 (18.18)	19 (7.2)	37 (14.02)	9 (3.41)		
Aarital status	Married	246 (53.59)	137 (55.69)	45 (18.29)	12 (4.88)	43 (17.48)	9 (3.66)	10.037*	0.262
	Single	94 (20.48)	51 (54.26)	12 (12.77)	9 (9.57)	16 (17.02)	6 (6.38)		
	Divorced	119 (25.93)	68 (57.14)	23 (19.33)	12 (10.08)	12 (10.08)	4 (3.36)		
Occupation	Civil servant	34 (7.41)	14 (41.18)	7 (20.59)	0 (0)	10 (29.41)	3 (8.82)	26.319**	0.051
retirement	Laborer	44 (9.59)	30 (68.18)	2 (4.55)	2 (4.55)	7 (15.91)	3 (6.82)		
ategory)	Private sector	81 (17.65)	45 (55.56)	16 (19.75)	8 (9.88)	7 (8.64)	5 (6.17)		
	Housewife	244 (53.16)	136 (55.74)	45 (18.44)	19 (7.79)	38 (15.57)	6 (2.46)		
	Others	56 (12.2)	31 (55.36)	10 (17.86)	4 (7.14)	9 (16.07)	2 (3.57)		
ducation status	Illiterate	207 (45.1)	117 (56.52)		21 (10.14)	33 (15.94)	6 (2.9)	30.813**	0.01/
	Primary school							50.015	0.014
	Secondary school	125 (27.23)	79 (63.2)	24 (19.2)	6 (4.8)	13 (10.4)	3 (2.4)		
	,	73 (15.9)	40 (54.79)	15 (20.55)	3 (4.11)	11 (15.07)	4 (5.48)		
	High school	41 (8.93)	14 (34.15)	8 (19.51)	1 (2.44)	12 (29.27)	6 (14.63)		
	University	13 (2.83)	6 (46.15)	3 (23.08)	2 (15.38)	2 (15.38)	0 (0)		
nsurance	No	40 (8.71)	12 (30)	13 (32.5)	3 (7.5)	12 (30)	0 (0)	18.731*	0.001
	Yes	419 (91.29)	244 (58.23)	67 (15.99)	30 (7.16)	59 (14.08)	19 (4.53)		
lace of residence	Elderly nursing home	33 (7.19)	12 (36.36)	9 (27.27)	2 (6.06)	8 (24.24)	2 (6.06)	6.528*	0.163
	Own home	426 (92.81)	244 (57.28)	71 (16.67)	31 (7.28)	63 (14.79)	17 (3.99)		
moking	No	341 (74.29)	187 (54.84)	68 (19.94)	22 (6.45)	50 (14.66)	14 (4.11)	6.576*	0.160
	Yes	118 (25.71)	69 (58.47)	12 (10.17)	11 (9.32)	21 (17.8)	5 (4.24)		
resence of	Yes	396 (86.27)	234 (59.09)	68 (17.17)	29 (7.32)	48 (12.12)	17 (4.29)	26.936*	<0.00
omorbid disease	No	63 (13.73)	22 (34.92)	12 (19.05)	4 (6.35)	23 (36.51)	2 (3.17)		
COPD	No	392 (85.4)	203 (51.79)	77 (19.64)	28 (7.14)	69 (17.6)	15 (3.83)	23.754*	< 0.00
Cardiovascular	Yes	67 (14.6)	53 (79.1)	3 (4.48)	5 (7.46)	2 (2.99)	4 (5.97)	23.751	-0.00
lisease	No	85 (83.88)	212 (55.06)		26 (6.75)	64 (16.62)	17 (4.42)	3.459*	0.484
lisease	Yes		44 (59.46)		20 (0.73) 7 (9.46)		2 (2.7)	3.439	0.404
'h		74 (16.12)		14 (18.92)		7 (9.46)		C 000*	0 107
Chronic kidney	No	419 (91.29)	232 (55.37)	74 (17.66)	27 (6.44)	68 (16.23)	18 (4.3)	6.090*	0.193
lisease	Yes	40 (8.71)	24 (60)	6 (15)	6 (15)	3 (7.5)	1 (2.5)		
Diabetes mellitus	No	289 (62.96)	157 (54.33)		22 (7.61)	52 (17.99)	10 (3.46)	4.874*	0.301
	Yes	170 (37.04)	99 (58.24)	32 (18.82)	11 (6.47)	19 (11.18)	9 (5.29)		
ascular disease	No	439 (95.64)	248 (56.49)	72 (16.4)	30 (6.83)	70 (15.95)	19 (4.33)	10.619**	0.025
	Yes	20 (4.36)	8 (40)	8 (40)	3 (15)	1 (5)	0 (0)		
lypertension	No	273 (59.48)	155 (56.78)	46 (16.85)	16 (5.86)	46 (16.85)	10 (3.66)	3.106*	0.540
	Yes	186 (40.52)	101 (54.3)	34 (18.28)	17 (9.14)	25 (13.44)	9 (4.84)		
Chronic liver	No	443 (96.51)	247 (55.76)	77 (17.38)	32 (7.22)	69 (15.58)	18 (4.06)	0.294**	0.990
disease	Yes	16 (3.49)	9 (56.25)	3 (18.75)	1 (6.25)	2 (12.5)	1 (6.25)		
lyperlipidemia	No	444 (96.73)	244 (54.95)	77 (17.34)	33 (7.43)	71 (15.99)	19 (4.28)	9.673**	0.046
,	Yes	15 (3.27)	12 (80)	3 (20)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
mmunosuppressior		456 (99.35)	253 (55.48)	80 (17.54)	33 (7.24)	71 (15.57)	19 (4.17)	3.519**	0.475
	Yes	3 (0.65)	3 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
Aalignancy	No	454 (98.91)	255 (56.17)	76 (16.74)	33 (7.27)71		19 (4.19)	10.293**	0.036
nanghancy	Yes	5 (1.09)	1 (20)	4 (80)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10.275	0.050
Aorbid obesity	No	425 (92.59)	239 (56.24)	71 (16.71)	28 (6.59)	68 (16)	0 (0) 19 (4.47)	7.395*	0.116
norbid obesity								1.595	0.110
	Yes	34 (7.41)	17 (50)	9 (26.47)	5 (14.71)3	(8.82)	0 (0)	1 462*	0.000
leurological	No	367 (79.96)	202 (55.04)	66 (17.98)	28 (7.63)	57 (15.53)	14 (3.81)	1.463*	0.833
isease	Yes	92 (20.04)	54 (58.70)	14 (15.22)	5 (5.43)	14 (15.22)	5 (5.43)		
spirin usage	No	410 (89.32)	235 (57.32)	63 (15.37)	31 (7.56)	62 (15.12)	19 (4.63)	14.328*	0.006
	Yes	49 (10.68)	21 (42.86)	17 (34.69)	2 (4.08)	9 (18.37)	0 (0)		
IIV/AIDS	No	457 (99.56)	256 (56.02)	78 (17.07)	33 (7.22)	71 (15.54)	19 (4.16)	7.030**	0.134
	Yes	2 (0.44)	0 (0)	2 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
lcohol abuse	No	455 (99.13)	252 (55.38)	80 (17.58)	33 (7.25)	71 (15.6)	19 (4.18)	4.699**	0.320
	Yes	4 (0.87)	4 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
lood disease	No	445 (96.95)	248 (55.73)		31 (6.97)	71 (15.96)	19 (4.27)	7.237**	0.124
	Yes	14 (3.05)	8 (57.14)	4 (28.57)	2 (14.29)	0 (0)	0 (0)		

n: Number, %: Percentage distribution, X<sup>2</sup>\*: Chi-Square test, LR\*\*: Likelihood ratio and p: Significance (p<0.05)

# Int. J. Pharmacol., 20 (3): 318-331, 2024

# Table 4: Relationships of categorical variables according to groups motivating vaccination

High sc Universion No Yes Place of residence Smoking No COPD COPD CoPD Cardiovascular disease Chronic kidney disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes No	ears 240 (52.29) 195 (42.48) 264 (57.52) 246 (53.59) 94 (20.48) d 119 (25.93) vant 34 (7.41) 44 (9.59) sector 81 (17.65) vife 244 (53.16) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) me 33 (7.19)	Doctor information n (%) 117 (53.42) 120 (50) 99 (50.77) 138 (52.27) 126 (51.22) 46 (48.94) 65 (54.62) 16 (47.06) 19 (43.18) 44 (54.32) 128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27) 17 (51.52)	Follow-up of vaccination records n (%) 62 (28.31) 75 (31.25) 59 (30.26) 78 (29.55) 85 (34.55) 17 (18.09) 35 (29.41) 8 (23.53) 17 (38.64) 21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	Vaccination covered by social security n (%) 32 (14.61) 39 (16.25) 35 (17.95) 36 (13.64) 28 (11.38) 30 (31.91) 13 (10.92) 10 (29.41) 7 (15.91) 16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	n (%) 8 (3.65) 6 (2.5) 2 (1.03) 12 (4.55) 7 (2.85) 1 (1.06) 6 (5.04) 0 (0) 1 (2.27) 0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	X <sup>2</sup> /LR 1.289 5.972* 30.015* 15.995* 55.500**	0.113 <0.001
Age group75 and 65-74 y 65-74 yGenderMaleFemaleMarital statusMarried SingleDivorceOccupationCivil ser (retirement category)Laborer PrivateEducation statusIlliterate Primary Second High sc UniversInsuranceNo YesPlace of residenceElderly Own hcSmokingNo YesPresence of comorbid disease YesYesCOPDNo YesCardiovascular disease Diabetes mellitusNo YesDiabetes mellitusNo YesHypertensionNo	over     219 (47.71)       ears     240 (52.29)       195 (42.48)     264 (57.52)       246 (53.59)     94 (20.48)       d     119 (25.93)       vant     34 (7.41)       44 (9.59)     56 (12.2)       e     207 (45.1)       school     125 (27.23)       ary school     73 (15.9)       hool     41 (8.93)       ity     13 (2.83)       40 (8.71)     419 (91.29)       nursing home     33 (7.19)	117 (53.42) 120 (50) 99 (50.77) 138 (52.27) 126 (51.22) 46 (48.94) 65 (54.62) 16 (47.06) 19 (43.18) 44 (54.32) 128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	62 (28.31) 75 (31.25) 59 (30.26) 78 (29.55) 85 (34.55) 17 (18.09) 35 (29.41) 8 (23.53) 17 (38.64) 21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	32 (14.61) 39 (16.25) 35 (17.95) 36 (13.64) 28 (11.38) 30 (31.91) 13 (10.92) 10 (29.41) 7 (15.91) 16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	8 (3.65) 6 (2.5) 2 (1.03) 12 (4.55) 7 (2.85) 1 (1.06) 6 (5.04) 0 (0) 1 (2.27) 0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	1.289 5.972* 30.015* 15.995*	0.732 0.113 <0.001 0.191
65-74 y Gender Male Female Marital status Married Single Divorce Occupation Civil ser (retirement category) Laborer Private Housew Others Education status Illiterate Primary Second High sc Univers Insurance No Yes Place of residence Elderly Own ho Smoking No Yes Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No Yes Cordiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Vascular disease No Yes Vascular disease No Yes Yes	ears 240 (52.29) 195 (42.48) 264 (57.52) 246 (53.59) 94 (20.48) d 119 (25.93) vant 34 (7.41) 44 (9.59) sector 81 (17.65) vife 244 (53.16) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) me 33 (7.19)	$\begin{array}{c} 120 \ (50) \\ 99 \ (50.77) \\ 138 \ (52.27) \\ 126 \ (51.22) \\ 46 \ (48.94) \\ 65 \ (54.62) \\ 16 \ (47.06) \\ 19 \ (43.18) \\ 44 \ (54.32) \\ 128 \ (52.46) \\ 30 \ (53.57) \\ 112 \ (54.11) \\ 70 \ (56) \\ 37 \ (50.68) \\ 18 \ (43.9) \\ 0 \ (0) \\ 18 \ (45) \\ 219 \ (52.27) \end{array}$	75 (31.25) 59 (30.26) 78 (29.55) 85 (34.55) 17 (18.09) 35 (29.41) 8 (23.53) 17 (38.64) 21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	39 (16.25) 35 (17.95) 36 (13.64) 28 (11.38) 30 (31.91) 13 (10.92) 10 (29.41) 7 (15.91) 16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	6 (2.5) 2 (1.03) 12 (4.55) 7 (2.85) 1 (1.06) 6 (5.04) 0 (0) 1 (2.27) 0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	5.972* 30.015* 15.995*	0.113 <0.001 0.191
Gender Male Female Marital status Married Single Divorce Occupation Civil ser (retirement category) Laborer Private Housew Others Education status Illiterate Primary Second High sc Univers Insurance No Yes Place of residence Elderly Own ho Smoking No Yes Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Vascular disease No Yes Hypertension No	195 (42.48)     264 (57.52)     246 (53.59)     94 (20.48)     d   119 (25.93)     vant   34 (7.41)     44 (9.59)     sector   81 (17.65)     vife   244 (53.16)     56 (12.2)     e   207 (45.1)     school   125 (27.23)     ary school   73 (15.9)     hool   41 (8.93)     ity   13 (2.83)     40 (8.71)   49 (91.29)     nursing home   33 (7.19)	99 (50.77) 138 (52.27) 126 (51.22) 46 (48.94) 65 (54.62) 16 (47.06) 19 (43.18) 44 (54.32) 128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	59 (30.26) 78 (29.55) 85 (34.55) 17 (18.09) 35 (29.41) 8 (23.53) 17 (38.64) 21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	35 (17.95) 36 (13.64) 28 (11.38) 30 (31.91) 13 (10.92) 10 (29.41) 7 (15.91) 16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	2 (1.03) 12 (4.55) 7 (2.85) 1 (1.06) 6 (5.04) 0 (0) 1 (2.27) 0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	30.015* 15.995*	<0.001 0.191
FemaleMarital statusMarriedSingleDivorceOccupationCivil ser(retirement category)LaborerPrivateHousewOthersPrivateEducation statusIlliteratePrimarySecondHigh scUniversInsuranceNoPlace of residenceElderlySmokingNoPresence of comorbid diseaseYesCOPDNoCordiovascular diseaseNoClabetes mellitusNoVascular diseaseNoYesYesDiabetes mellitusNoYesYesHypertensionNo	264 (57.52) 246 (53.59) 94 (20.48) d 119 (25.93) vant 34 (7.41) 44 (9.59) sector 81 (17.65) vife 244 (53.16) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) school 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) mursing home 33 (7.19)	138 (52.27) 126 (51.22) 46 (48.94) 65 (54.62) 16 (47.06) 19 (43.18) 44 (54.32) 128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	78 (29.55) 85 (34.55) 17 (18.09) 35 (29.41) 8 (23.53) 17 (38.64) 21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	36 (13.64) 28 (11.38) 30 (31.91) 13 (10.92) 10 (29.41) 7 (15.91) 16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	12 (4.55) 7 (2.85) 1 (1.06) 6 (5.04) 0 (0) 1 (2.27) 0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	30.015* 15.995*	<0.001 0.191
Marital status Married Single Divorce Occupation Civil ser (retirement category) Laborer Private Housew Others Education status Illiterate Primary Second High sc Univers Insurance No Yes Place of residence Elderly Own ho Smoking No Yes Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes No Copp Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes	246 (53.59) 94 (20.48) 94 (20.48) 119 (25.93) vant 34 (7.41) 44 (9.59) sector 81 (17.65) vife 244 (53.16) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) school 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) me	126 (51.22) 46 (48.94) 65 (54.62) 16 (47.06) 19 (43.18) 44 (54.32) 128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	85 (34.55) 17 (18.09) 35 (29.41) 8 (23.53) 17 (38.64) 21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	28 (11.38) 30 (31.91) 13 (10.92) 10 (29.41) 7 (15.91) 16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	7 (2.85) 1 (1.06) 6 (5.04) 0 (0) 1 (2.27) 0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	15.995*	0.191
Single Divorce (retirement category) Education status Education status Edu	94 (20.48) d 119 (25.93) vant 34 (7.41) 44 (9.59) sector 81 (17.65) vife 244 (53.16) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) school 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19)	46 (48.94) 65 (54.62) 16 (47.06) 19 (43.18) 44 (54.32) 128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	17 (18.09) 35 (29.41) 8 (23.53) 17 (38.64) 21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	30 (31.91) 13 (10.92) 10 (29.41) 7 (15.91) 16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	1 (1.06) 6 (5.04) 0 (0) 1 (2.27) 0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	15.995*	0.191
Divorce Divorce Divorce Divorce Divorce Divorce Divorce Civil ser Private Housew Others Diliterate Primary Second High sc Univers Primary Second High sc Univers Primary Second High sc Univers Primary Second High sc Univers Primary Second High sc Univers Primary Second High sc Univers Primary Second High sc Univers Primary Second High sc Univers Presence of residence Smoking No Yes Presence of comorbid disease No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Hypertension No	d 119 (25.93) vant 34 (7.41) 44 (9.59) sector 81 (17.65) vife 244 (53.16) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) school 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19)	65 (54.62) 16 (47.06) 19 (43.18) 44 (54.32) 128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	35 (29.41) 8 (23.53) 17 (38.64) 21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	13 (10.92) 10 (29.41) 7 (15.91) 16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	6 (5.04) 0 (0) 1 (2.27) 0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)		
DecupationCivil serretirement category)LaborerPrivateHousewOthersOthersEducation statusIlliteratePrimarySecondHigh scUniversDrace of residenceElderlyOwn hcYesPresence of comorbid diseaseYesCoPDNoCoPDYesCardiovascular diseaseNoCardiovascular diseaseNoYesYesDiabetes mellitusNoYesYesVascular diseaseNoYesYesVascular diseaseNoYesYesNoYes	vant 34 (7.41) 44 (9.59) sector 81 (17.65) vife 244 (53.16) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) school 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19)	16 (47.06) 19 (43.18) 44 (54.32) 128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	8 (23.53) 17 (38.64) 21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	10 (29.41) 7 (15.91) 16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	0 (0) 1 (2.27) 0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)		
retirement category) Laborer Private Housew Others Education status Education status Education status Education status Illiterate Primary Second High sc Univers No Yes Place of residence Elderly Own ho Smoking No Yes Presence of comorbid disease No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes	44 (9.59) sector 81 (17.65) vife 244 (53.16) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) school 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) me	19 (43.18) 44 (54.32) 128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	17 (38.64) 21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	7 (15.91) 16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	1 (2.27) 0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)		
Private Housew Others Illiterate Primary Second High sc Univers nsurance No Yes Place of residence Elderly Own ho Smoking No Yes Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Vascular disease No Yes No	sector 81 (17.65) vife 244 (53.16) 56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) school 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) me 426 (92.81)	44 (54.32) 128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	21 (25.93) 72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	16 (19.75) 33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	0 (0) 11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	55.500**	<0.001
Housew Others Illiterate Primary Second High sc Univers nsurance No Pace of residence Elderly Own ho Smoking No Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No COPD No COPD No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes No Yes	vife 244 (53.16)   56 (12.2)   207 (45.1)   school 125 (27.23)   ary school 73 (15.9)   hool 41 (8.93)   ity 13 (2.83)   40 (8.71) 419 (91.29)   nursing home 33 (7.19)   me 426 (92.81)	128 (52.46) 30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	72 (29.51) 19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	33 (13.52) 5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	11 (4.51) 2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	55.500**	<0.001
OthersEducation statusIlliteratePrimarySecondHigh scUniversInsuranceNoPlace of residenceElderlyOwn hoYesSmokingNoPresence of comorbid diseaseYesCOPDNoCOPDNoCordiovascular diseaseNoChronic kidney diseaseNoDiabetes mellitusNoVascular diseaseNoYesYesVascular diseaseNoYesYesNo	56 (12.2) 207 (45.1) 207 (45.1) 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) me 426 (92.81)	30 (53.57) 112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	19 (33.93) 48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	5 (8.93) 37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	2 (3.57) 10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	55.500**	<0.001
Education status Illiterate Primary Second High sc Univers nsurance No Pace of residence Elderly Own ho Smoking No Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No ECOPD No COPD No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes No Yes	207 (45.1) school 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) me 426 (92.81)	112 (54.11) 70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	48 (23.19) 36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	37 (17.87) 18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	10 (4.83) 1 (0.8) 0 (0)	55.500**	<0.001
Primary Second High sc Univers No Yes Place of residence Smoking Presence of comorbid disease Presence of comorbid disease Presence of comorbid disease No COPD COPD Corpo Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Vascular disease No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes	school 125 (27.23) ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) me 426 (92.81)	70 (56) 37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	36 (28.8) 26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	18 (14.4) 10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	1 (0.8) 0 (0)		
Second High sc Univers No Yes Place of residence Smoking No CorpD COPD CorpD Cardiovascular disease Chronic kidney disease Chronic kidney disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes	ary school 73 (15.9) hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) me 426 (92.81)	37 (50.68) 18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	26 (35.62) 20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	10 (13.7) 0 (0) 6 (46.15)	0 (0)		
High sc Universions Place of residence Elderly Own ho Smoking No Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No COPD No COPD No COPD No Cordiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes	hool 41 (8.93) ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) me 426 (92.81)	18 (43.9) 0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	20 (48.78) 7 (53.85) 12 (30)	0 (0) 6 (46.15)			
Universing Universions No Yes Place of residence Elderly Own ho Smoking No Yes Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Vascular disease No Yes Vascular d	ity 13 (2.83) 40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) me 426 (92.81)	0 (0) 18 (45) 219 (52.27)	7 (53.85) 12 (30)	6 (46.15)	3 (7.32)		
nsurance No Yes Valace of residence Elderly own ho moking No Yes resence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No COPD No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Vasular disease No Yes Vasular disease No Yes Vasular disease No Yes No Yes	40 (8.71) 419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) me 426 (92.81)	18 (45) 219 (52.27)	12 (30)		0 (0)		
Yes Place of residence moking Presence of comorbid disease Presence of comorbid disease COPD COPD Cord Cord Cord Cord Cord Cord Cord Cord	419 (91.29) nursing home 33 (7.19) pme 426 (92.81)	219 (52.27)		10 (25)	0 (0)	4.284*	0.232
Place of residence Elderly Smoking No Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No COPD No Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Vascular disease No Yes No Yes	nursing home 33 (7.19) ome 426 (92.81)		125 (29.83)	61 (14.56)	14 (3.34)		
Own ho smoking No Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Ascular disease No Yes Yes	ome 426 (92.81)	1/12/2/	2 (6.06)	14 (42.42)	0 (0)	24.527*	<0.001
Smoking No Yes Presence of comorbid disease Yes No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Ascular disease No Yes	, ,	220 (51.64)	135 (31.69)	57 (13.38)	14 (3.29)	2.1027	
Yes Presence of comorbid disease No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Ascular disease No Yes	341 (74.29)	170 (49.85)	109 (31.96)	51 (14.96)	11 (3.23)	3.166*	0.367
Presence of comorbid disease No No COPD No Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Ascular disease No Yes	118 (25.71)	67 (56.78)	28 (23.73)	20 (16.95)	3 (2.54)	5.100	0.507
No COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes (ascular disease No Yes No Yes	396 (86.27)	206 (52.02)	120 (30.3)	56 (14.14)	14 (3.54)	5.769*	0.122
COPD No Yes Cardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes (ascular disease No Yes	63 (13.73)	31 (49.21)	17 (26.98)	15 (23.81)	0 (0)	5.705	0.122
Yes Ardiovascular disease No Yes Chronic kidney disease No Yes Viabetes mellitus No Yes Yes Yes Iypertension No	392 (85.4)	194 (49.49)	122 (31.12)	63 (16.07)	13 (3.32)	5.109*	0.164
ardiovascular disease No Yes hronic kidney disease No Yes biabetes mellitus No Yes ascular disease No Yes Jypertension No	67 (14.6)	43 (64.18)	15 (22.39)	8 (11.94)	1 (1.49)	5.105	0.104
Yes Chronic kidney disease Diabetes mellitus Ves Vascular disease No Yes Yes No Yes No No No	385 (83.88)	192 (49.87)	125 (32.47)	56 (14.55)	12 (3.12)	8.281*	0.041
Thronic kidney disease No Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes (ascular disease No Yes Hypertension No	74 (16.12)	45 (60.81)	12 (16.22)	15 (20.27)	2 (2.7)	0.201	0.041
Yes Diabetes mellitus No Yes Yascular disease No Yes Hypertension No	419 (91.29)	213 (50.84)	124 (29.59)	68 (16.23)	14 (3.34)	) 3.832*	0.28
Diabetes mellitus No Yes /ascular disease No Yes Hypertension No	40 (8.71)	24 (60)	13 (32.5)	3 (7.5)	0 (0)	5.052	0.20
Yes /ascular disease No Yes lypertension No	289 (62.96)	159 (55.02)	80 (27.68)	43 (14.88)	7 (2.42)	4.140*	0.247
/ascular disease No Yes Iypertension No	170 (37.04)	78 (45.88)	57 (33.53)	28 (16.47)	7 (4.12)	1.140	0.247
Yes Hypertension No	439 (95.64)	228 (51.94)	130 (29.61)	67 (15.26)	14 (3.19)	1.280*	0.734
Hypertension No	20 (4.36)	9 (45)	7 (35)	4 (20)	0 (0)	1.200	0.754
	273 (59.48)	149 (54.58)	70 (25.64)	46 (16.85)	8 (2.93)	5.988*	0.112
Yes	186 (40.52)	88 (47.31)	67 (36.02)	25 (13.44)	6 (3.23)	5.900	0.112
Chronic liver disease No	443 (96.51)	230 (51.92)	128 (28.89)	71 (16.03)	14 (3.16)	9.336**	0.025
Yes	16 (3.49)	7 (43.75)	9 (56.25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2.550	0.025
lyperlipidemia No	444 (96.73)	229 (51.58)	131 (29.5)	71 (15.99)	13 (2.93)	5.713**	0.126
Yes	15 (3.27)	8 (53.33)	6 (40)	0 (0)	1 (6.67)	5.715	0.120
mmunosuppression No	456 (99.35)	234 (51.32)	137 (30.04)	71 (15.57)	14 (3.07)	3.984**	0.263
Yes	3 (0.65)	3 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5.704	0.205
Malignancy No	454 (98.91)	236 (51.98)	137 (30.18)	67 (14.76)	14 (3.08)	11.428**	0.01
Yes	5 (1.09)	1 (20)	0 (0)	4 (80)	0 (0)	11.420	0.01
Aorbid obesity No	425 (92.59)	220 (51.76)	134 (31.53)	60 (14.12)	11 (2.59)	16.237*	0.001
Yes	34 (7.41)	17 (50)	3 (8.82)	11 (32.35)	3 (8.82)	10.237	0.001
leurological disease No	367 (79.96)	189 (51.5)	3 (8.82) 104 (28.34)	64 (17.44)	10 (2.72)	6.635*	0.084
5	92 (20.04)	48 (52.17)		7 (7.61)		0.035	0.004
Yes No.	,	48 (52.17) 209 (50.98)	33 (35.87) 121 (29.51)	. ,	4 (4.35) 13 (3 17)	2.543*	0.468
spirin usage No	410 (89.32)		121 (29.51)	67 (16.34)	13 (3.17)	2.343"	0.408
Yes	49 (10.68)	28 (57.14)	16 (32.65)	4 (8.16)	1 (2.04)	2 (52**	0.440
IIV/AIDS No	457 (99.56)	235 (51.42)	137 (29.98)	71 (15.54)	14 (3.06)	2.652**	0.448
Yes	2 (0.44)	2 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0(0)	4 (00**	0.000
Alcohol abuse No	455 (99.13)	235 (51.65)	137 (30.11)	69 (15.16)	14 (3.08)	4.603**	0.203
Yes		2 (50)	0(0)	2 (50)	0(0)	2 6 6 4 4 4	c
Blood disease No Yes	4 (0.87) 445 (96.95)	229 (51.46) 8 (57.14)	135 (30.34) 2 (14.29)	67 (15.06) 4 (28.57)	14 (3.15) 0 (0)	3.684**	0.298

n: Number; %: Percentage distribution; X<sup>2\*</sup>: Chi-Square test, LR\*\*: Likelihood ratio and p: Significance (p<0.05)

## Int. J. Pharmacol., 20 (3): 318-331, 2024

#### Table 5: Relationships of categorical variables according to reasons for vaccine hesitancy/refusal

			Reasons for vaccine hesitancy/refusal							
			l didn't know l had to get it	recommended	I'm afraid of side	It does not prevent	I didn't vaccinate because it was	Other reasons		
Variable	76	Total (%)	done n (%)	n (%)	effects n (%)	disease n (%)	overdue n (%)	n (%)	X <sup>2</sup> /LR	р
Age group	75 and over	219 (47.71)	128 (58.45)	24 (10.96)	16 (7.31)	21 (9.59)	20 (9.13)	10 (4.57)	21.347*	0.001
Gender	65-74 years	240 (52.29)	109 (45.42)	62 (25.83)	27 (11.25)	17 (7.08)	15 (6.25)	10 (4.17)	6 206*	0.279
Gender	Male	195 (42.48)	90 (46.15)	43 (22.05)	23 (11.79)	15 (7.69)	15 (7.69)	9 (4.62)	6.286*	0.279
An side of second second	Female	264 (57.52)	147 (55.68)	43 (16.29)	20 (7.58)	23 (8.71)	20 (7.58)	11 (4.17)	72 (()	-0.001
Marital status	Married	246 (53.59)	120 (48.78)	52 (21.14)	26 (10.57)	16 (6.5)	23 (9.35)	9 (3.66)	72.664	<0.001
	Single	94 (20.48)	25 (26.6)	22 (23.4)	12 (12.77)	17 (18.09)	7 (7.45)	11 (11.7)		
Source	Divorced Civil servant	119 (25.93)	92 (77.31)	12 (10.08)	5 (4.2) 7 (20 F0)	5 (4.2)	5 (4.2)	0 (0)	66.492**	<0.001
Occupation		34 (7.41)	11 (32.35)	7 (20.59)	7 (20.59)	3 (8.82)	6 (17.65) 10 (22.73)	0 (0)	00.492	< 0.001
etirement category)	Laborer Drivata costar	44 (9.59)	16 (36.36)	8 (18.18)	4 (9.09)	3 (6.82) 12 (14.81)		3 (6.82)		
	Private sector Housewife	81 (17.65)	28 (34.57) 137 (56.15)	20 (24.69)	11 (13.58) 20 (8.2)		6 (7.41)	4 (4.94)		
		244 (53.16)		44 (18.03)		20 (8.2)	12 (4.92)	11 (4.51)		
ducation status	Others	56 (12.2)	45 (80.36)	7 (12.5)	1 (1.79)	0 (0)	1 (1.79)	2 (3.57)	20 007**	0.000
ducation status	Illiterate	207 (45.1)	109 (52.66)	35 (16.91)	19 (9.18)	17 (8.21)	17 (8.21)	10 (4.83)	38.087**	0.009
	Primary School	125 (27.23)	68 (54.4)	20 (16)	13 (10.4)	7 (5.6)	10 (8)	7 (5.6)		
	Secondary School	73 (15.9)	44 (60.27)	14 (19.18)	6 (8.22)	8 (10.96)	1 (1.37)	0(0)		
	High School	41 (8.93)	15 (36.59)	14 (34.15)	3 (7.32)	3 (7.32)	5 (12.2)	1 (2.44)		
	University	13 (2.83)	1 (7.69)	3 (23.08)	2 (15.38)	3 (23.08)	2 (15.38)	2 (15.38)	16 222**	0.001
isurance	No	40 (8.71)	13 (32.5)	6 (15)	7 (17.5)	6 (15)	2 (5)	6 (15)	16.233**	0.001
	Yes	419 (91.29)	224 (53.46)	80 (19.09)	36 (8.59)	32 (7.64)	33 (7.88)	14 (3.34)	40 422**	0.001
lace of residence	Elderly	33 (7.19)	7 (21.21)	0 (0)	10 (30.3)	10 (30.3)	2 (6.06)	4 (12.12)	48.423**	<0.001
10	nursing home Own home		230 (53.99)	86 (20.19)	33 (7.75)	28 (6.57)	33 (7.75)	16 (3.76)	2045 06	0.000
moking	No	341 (74.29)	178 (52.2)	61 (17.89)	29 (8.5)	31 (9.09)	26 (7.62)	16 (4.69)	3.045	0.693
<i>c</i>	Yes	118 (25.71)	59 (50)	25 (21.19)	14 (11.86)	7 (5.93)	9 (7.63)	4 (3.39)	50 0000	
resence of comorbid	Yes	396 (86.27)	228 (57.58)	71 (17.93)	25 (6.31)	32 (8.08)	26 (6.57)	14 (3.54)	58.333*	<0.001
sease	No	63 (13.73)	9 (14.29)	15 (23.81)	18 (28.57)	6 (9.52)	9 (14.29)	6 (9.52)	= 200×	
OPD	No	392 (85.4)	200 (51.02)	71 (18.11)	39 (9.95)	35 (8.93)	28 (7.14)	19 (4.85)	5.388*	0.37
	Yes	67 (14.6)	37 (55.22)	15 (22.39)	4 (5.97)	3 (4.48)	7 (10.45)	1 (1.49)		
ardiovascular disease	No	385 (83.88)	202 (52.47)	68 (17.66)	39 (10.13)	30 (7.79)	32 (8.31)	14 (3.64)	8.278*	0.142
	Yes	74 (16.12)	35 (47.3)	18 (24.32)	4 (5.41)	8 (10.81)	3 (4.05)	6 (8.11)		
hronic kidney disease	No	419 (91.29)	218 (52.03)	77 (18.38)	37 (8.83)	35 (8.35)	32 (7.64)	20 (4.77)	5.418**	0.367
	Yes	40 (8.71)	19 (47.5)	9 (22.5)	6 (15)	3 (7.5)	3 (7.5)	0 (0)		
iabetes mellitus	No	289 (62.96)	148 (51.21)	45 (15.57)	35 (12.11)	23 (7.96)	23 (7.96)	15 (5.19)	11.918*	0.036
	Yes	170 (37.04)	89 (52.35)	41 (24.12)	8 (4.71)	15 (8.82)	12 (7.06)	5 (2.94)		
ascular disease	No	439 (95.64)	222 (50.57)	81 (18.45)	43 (9.79)	38 (8.66)	35 (7.97)	20 (4.56)	14.465**	0.013
	Yes	20 (4.36)	15 (75)	5 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
lypertension	No	273 (59.48)	138 (50.55)	50 (18.32)	31 (11.36)	20 (7.33)	20 (7.33)	14 (5.13)	4.794*	0.442
	Yes	186 (40.52)	99 (53.23)	36 (19.35)	12 (6.45)	18 (9.68)	15 (8.06)	6 (3.23)		
hronic liver disease	No	443 (96.51)	229 (51.69)	80 (18.06)	43 (9.71)	36 (8.13)	35 (7.9)	20 (4.51)	9.705**	0.084
	Yes	16 (3.49)	8 (50)	6 (37.5)	0 (0)	2 (12.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
yperlipidemia	No	444 (96.73)	232 (52.25)	78 (17.57)	42 (9.46)	37 (8.33)	35 (7.88)	20 (4.5)	9.677**	0.102
	Yes	15 (3.27)	5 (33.33)	8 (53.33)	1 (6.67)	1 (6.67)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
nmunosuppression	No	456 (99.35)	234 (51.32)	86 (18.86)	43 (9.43)	38 (8.33)	35 (7.68)	20 (4.39)	3.984**	0.552
	Yes	3 (0.65)	3 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
lalignancy	No	454 (98.91)	235 (51.76)	83 (18.28)	43 (9.47)	38 (8.37)	35 (7.71)	20 (4.41)	6.030**	0.303
	Yes	5 (1.09)	2 (40)	3 (60)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
lorbid obesity	No	425 (92.59)	222 (52.24)	77 (18.12)	41 (9.65)	35 (8.24)	32 (7.53)	18 (4.24)	2.271**	0.811
	Yes	34 (7.41)	15 (44.12)	9 (26.47)	2 (5.88)	3 (8.82)	3 (8.82)	2 (5.88)		
eurological disease	No	367 (79.96)	173 (47.14)	73 (19.89)	37 (10.08)	35 (9.54)	30 (8.17)	19 (5.18)	16.511*	0.006
	Yes	92 (20.04)	64 (69.57)	13 (14.13)	6 (6.52)	3 (3.26)	5 (5.43)	1 (1.09)		
spirin usage	No	410 (89.32)	218 (53.17)	71 (17.32)	42 (10.24)	32 (7.8)	33 (8.05)	14 (3.41)	17.469**	0.004
	Yes	49 (10.68)	19 (38.78)	15 (30.61)	1 (2.04)	6 (12.24)	2 (4.08)	6 (12.24)		
IIV/AIDS	No	457 (99.56)	237 (51.86)	84 (18.38)	43 (9.41)	38 (8.32)	35 (7.66)	20 (4.38)	6.737**	0.241
	Yes	2 (0.44)	0 (0)	2 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
Icohol abuse	No	455 (99.13)	235 (51.65)	86 (18.9)	43 (9.45)	38 (8.35)	33 (7.25)	20 (4.4)	7.492**	0.187
	Yes	4 (0.87)	2 (50)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (50)	0 (0)		
Blood disease	No	445 (96.95)	231 (51.91)	84 (18.88)	39 (8.76)	36 (8.09)	35 (7.87)	20 (4.49)	8.042**	0.154
	Yes	14 (3.05)	6 (42.86)	2 (14.29)	4 (28.57)	2 (14.29)	0 (0)	0 (0)		

n: Number; %: Percentage distribution; X<sup>2\*</sup>: Chi-Square test, LR<sup>\*\*</sup>: Likelihood ratio and p: Significance (p<0.05)

effects (9.4%), feeling that vaccination did not protect them from diseases (8.3%) and thinking that their vaccination date had passed (7.6%), respectively. Refusal of vaccination due to the presence of comorbid disease (1.5%), belief that vaccination was not effective (1.3%), refusal due to financial difficulties (0.9%), fear of injection (0.7%) and refusal due to religious belief (0.0%) were rare reasons and were combined under the other tab in the table to determine the statistical relationship. Statistically significant associations were found between participants' reasons for vaccine hesitancy/refusal and age groups ( $X^2 = 21.347$  and p = 0.001), marital status ( $X^2 = 72.664$  and p<0.001), educational status ( $X^2 = 38.087$  and p = 0.009), presence of social security ( $X^2 = 16.233$  and p = 0.001), place of residence ( $X^2 = 48.423$  and p<0.001)

and presence of comorbid diseases ( $X^2 = 58.333$  and p<0.001). A statistically significant relationship was found between the reasons for vaccine hesitancy/refusal and diabetes mellitus, vascular diseases, neurologic diseases and aspirin usage (Table 5).

Analysis of the distribution of age groups, marital status, social security status and place of residence revealed that all groups stated that they did not vaccinate because they did not know that they should be vaccinated. When analyzed according to place of residence, those living in a nursing home stated that they did not get vaccinated mostly because they were afraid of side effects/not effective in disease prevention, while those living in their own homes stated that they did not get vaccinated mostly because they did not should get vaccinated.

In the presence of comorbid diseases, the most common reason for not vaccinating was that they did not know that they should be vaccinated, while those without comorbid diseases did not vaccinate mostly because they were afraid of side effects. When the distribution of diabetes mellitus, vascular diseases, neurological diseases and aspirin usage groups were analyzed, it was observed that the most common reason for not vaccinating was that they did not know that they should be vaccinated.

#### DISCUSSION

Vaccination is one of the most cost-effective medical interventions against infectious diseases. Providing access to vaccines at all ages has been included in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal to achieve vaccination targets<sup>17</sup>. The VPDs are seen at serious rates in the elderly population. Therefore, within the framework of global strategies and policies, especially adults and older adults have been included among the target groups for vaccination. In addition, since the elderly are particularly susceptible to infections, treatment and vaccination programs have become mandatory. Antimicrobial resistance is observed in the elderly due to inappropriate use of antimicrobials, difficulties in accessing drugs and vaccines and lack of awareness. Antimicrobial resistance can be reduced with vaccination and the cost of health services can be reduced by preventing infectious diseases<sup>18</sup>. Functional capacity is also affected after VPD in the elderly. It has been shown that patients hospitalized due to influenza lose their daily life activity capacity and need care and assistance after discharge<sup>19</sup>. In another study, deficiencies in physical, social and psychological functioning were observed in the elderly after postherpetic neuralgia<sup>20</sup>. Therefore, it is particularly important to increase vaccination rates in older adults<sup>21</sup>.

The vaccination rates of the elderly in our study were influenza vaccine (34.0%), tetanus vaccine (29.2%), childhood vaccines only (27.9%), hepatitis B vaccine (14.6%), meningococcal vaccine (8.5%), pneumococcal vaccine (8.3%) and herpes zoster (2.2%), respectively. In a study conducted with patients who applied to the Geriatrics Outpatient Clinic, influenza vaccination rate was found to be 18%, pneumococcal vaccination rate 6% and DPT vaccination rate 5%<sup>22</sup>. According to one of previous studies, only 45.6% of geriatrics are able to be vaccinated and most commonly applied influenza (41.3%), pneumococcal and tetanus (5.5%), respectively<sup>23</sup>. In the elderly over 65 years of age, the vaccination rates were influenza vaccine (72.2%), pneumococcal vaccine (69.0%) and tetanus vaccine (58.9%), respectively<sup>24</sup>. In a study conducted in Greece, the vaccination rates of the elderly were influenza vaccine (83%), conjugated pneumococcal vaccine (49.5%), pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine (23.5%), herpes zoster vaccine (20%), hepatitis B vaccine (0.3%) and tetanus vaccine (0.30%), respectively<sup>25</sup>. Similar to previous studies, influenza vaccination was found to be the most common vaccine in our study and the rate of vaccination every year was 11.1%. Korkmaz et al.26 found the rate of influenza vaccination every year to be 19% in a study conducted with participants over the age of 65. In a study involving four countries, most of the participants were vaccinated with influenza and tetanus vaccine, while the rate of pneumococcal and herpes zoster vaccination was very low<sup>27</sup>. Similarly, herpes zoster vaccination rate was very low in our study. In a study conducted in the USA, the herpes zoster vaccination rate was 33.3% (range: 17.8%-48.8%) and varied between states<sup>28</sup>. Vaccination rates varied from country to country in the studies. In the elderly, systems should be adjusted according to countries when making health policies and planning.

In a previous study, 53.7% of the elderly had received at least one of the influenza, pneumococcal, herpes zoster, or tetanus vaccines, while 46.3% had not received any of these vaccines<sup>29</sup>. Similarly, in this study, 53.16% had received at least one vaccine and 48.84% had not received any of the vaccines. Comorbid diseases were found to be cardiovascular system diseases (52.6%), endocrine system diseases (23.7%), respiratory system diseases (10.2%) and urogenital system diseases (9.2%), respectively<sup>29</sup>. In the study by Bal and Börekçi<sup>30</sup> cardiovascular system diseases (82.6%), endocrine

system diseases (46.3%), respiratory system diseases (10.9%) and musculoskeletal system diseases (10.0%) were found as comorbid diseases. In this study, hypertension (21.8%) was most common in the elderly, followed by diabetes mellitus (20.0%), chronic neurological diseases (10.6%), chronic cardiovascular diseases (8.7%) and chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases (7.8%). Those without comorbid diseases were 7.2%. It was thought that the difference in the distribution of comorbid diseases between the studies may be due to the diversity of the sample group.

In addition, statistically significant correlations were found between the vaccine group and age groups (p<0.001), gender (p = 0.032), marital status (p < 0.001), occupation (p = 0.009) and educational status (p = 0.001). In this study, no statistically significant relationship was found for the presence of chronic disease (p = 0.134). However, when subgroups were analyzed, statistically significant associations were found between COPD (p < 0.001), vascular diseases (p = 0.045), hyperlipidemia (p = 0.034), blood diseases (p<0.001), aspirin usage (p<0.001) and alcohol abuse (p = 0.024). In current study, the lower vaccination rates in individuals aged 75 years and older compared to the 65-74 age group may be related to the fact that this age group is less likely to apply for healthcare services due to their increasing bed dependency with age. In addition, the vaccination rate was higher in married people and male gender. Similar to the study by Gürsoy et al.23 higher vaccination rates were found in those with high school education and above in this study.

In the literature review, it was observed that most studies on influenza vaccination were conducted. For this reason, the current study is one of the rare studies conducted with more than one vaccine group. In a study conducted in Poland with elderly people diagnosed with diabetes mellitus, a relationship was found between the number of comorbidities and influenza [odds ratio (OR) = 1.351 and p = 0.004] and pneumococcal vaccination (OR = 2.778 and p =  $0.000)^{31}$ . Factors affecting influenza vaccination were found to be being over 65 years of age, educational status, living in an urban center and the presence of COPD and cardiovascular disease. In addition, the presence of comorbid diseases increased vaccination<sup>26</sup>. In China, the factors affecting influenza vaccination were age, marital status and education level and a positive correlation was found between these factors and vaccination. The rate of influenza vaccination in patients with comorbid diseases was 4.8%<sup>32</sup>.

In our study, 31.41% (n = 49) of those who received influenza vaccine had influenza and 4.08% (n = 2) were hospitalized. Among those who received the pneumococcal vaccine, 13.6% (n = 5) had pneumonia and none of them were

hospitalized. Similar to our study, it was found that as the influenza vaccination rate increased, influenza cases decreased and hospitalization could be prevented. It was observed that a 5% increase in the vaccination rate led to a decrease of 785,000 in the number of illnesses and 11,000 in hospitalizations<sup>33</sup>. A decrease in community-acquired pneumonia and invasive pulmonary diseases was observed with pneumococcal vaccination and pneumococcal vaccination program in the elderly, hospitalization time, mortality rates and medical expenditures could be reduced<sup>35</sup>. Especially influenza and pneumococcal vaccination can provide effective cost savings in health services<sup>36</sup>.

The current study examined the effect of people/groups recommending vaccination on vaccination uptake. The influence rates were physicians (55.8%), other healthcare professionals (17.4%), neighbors or friends (15.5%), pharmacists (7.2%) and social media (4.1%), respectively. The highest increase in vaccination requests was due to physician recommendations. Similar to our study, participants' acceptance of vaccination was influenced by work/work environment, family members, media and friends' vaccination experiences. The preferred sources of information were general practitioners, specialists, pharmacists and other health professionals, respectively. It was also found that general practitioners provided the most information about vaccines and influenced the vaccination rate<sup>27</sup>. The sources of information affecting influenza vaccination were television (53.4%), physicians (43.9%), nurses (6.8%), newspapers (5.5%) and internet sources (4.3%), respectively<sup>32</sup>. It was found that the rate of vaccination increased especially when pharmacists directed the elderly to the physician and provided information<sup>37</sup>. In another study, 27.0% of the participants reported that they received the influenza vaccine because the physician recommended it<sup>38</sup>. In addition, it was observed that the rate of pneumococcal vaccination increased by 18.7% with direct mail notification to the participants<sup>39</sup>. As observed, different methods should be used to increase vaccination rates in the elderly. It is thought that more effective results will be obtained by organizing information at the national level. In addition, in this study, there was a statistically significant relationship between educational status, social security, COPD, vascular disease, hyperlipidemia, malignancy and aspirin usage and the person/groups who recommended vaccination. The effect of the presence of comorbid diseases should not be ignored while increasing vaccination rates.

In our study, when asked about the factors that encourage vaccination and reduce vaccine hesitancy/refusal

in the elderly, the most influential factor was the physician explanation of the indications for vaccination and providing information to the patient (51.6%). In addition, the follow-up of vaccination records (29.8%), vaccination being covered by social security (15.5%) and intermittent immunization titer follow-up (3.1%) were also found to be effective. A statistically significant relationship was found between the factors affecting vaccination and marital status, educational status, place of residence and presence of comorbid diseases. Among comorbid diseases, a statistically significant relationship was found especially between cardiovascular diseases, chronic liver diseases, malignancy and morbid obesity. In the literature review, similar to our study, it was observed that participants who received information from physicians were more motivated to receive influenza vaccine<sup>26</sup>. In addition, a relationship was found between vaccination motivation and the presence of social security. A low rate of vaccination was observed in the absence of health insurance<sup>27,28</sup>. Similar to our study, visiting health centers, evaluating the vaccination status at the patient's application, making recommendations for vaccination with regular physician information, recording and monitoring the vaccines administered in the system will help increase the vaccination rate<sup>27,40</sup>. In addition, the presence of comorbid diseases affects vaccination. In the presence of cardiovascular risk factors, there is a risk of heart attack and stroke after influenza. The rate of influenza vaccination has increased with physician information on this subject<sup>41</sup>. Current study findings were consistent with the literature.

When the reasons for not vaccinating/vaccine hesitancy were asked, the most common reason given by the elderly in our study was not knowing that they should be vaccinated. Other factors were not being recommended by anyone (18.7%), fear of vaccine side effects (9.4%), thinking that vaccination did not prevent their diseases (8.3%), thinking that the vaccination dates had passed (7.6%), refusing vaccination due to comorbid diseases (1.5%), thinking that vaccination was not effective (1.3%), refusing vaccination due to financial difficulties (0.9%) and fear of injection (0.7%), respectively. It was found that religious belief did not affect vaccine hesitancy/refusal. In this study, there was a statistically significant relationship between the age groups, marital status, educational status, social security, place of residence and presence of comorbid diseases and the reasons for vaccine hesitancy/refusal.

In the literature review, it was observed that the reasons for vaccine hesitancy/refusal were generally investigated based on vaccine type<sup>42-44</sup>. It has been observed that participants did not receive vaccination because they were healthy or did not know that they should be vaccinated<sup>32</sup>. In the study conducted by Uzuner et al.45 47.1% of the participants stated that they were not informed about vaccination and 43.2% stated that they did not believe that vaccination was necessary. Similar to previous studies, the most common reason for vaccine hesitancy/refusal in our study was not knowing that vaccination was necessary. All these responses indicate that people do not know that they should be vaccinated and do not sufficiently understand the importance of vaccination. In the current study, there was a statistically significant relationship between place of residence and reasons for vaccine hesitancy and the rate of influenza vaccination was lower in those living alone<sup>46</sup>. In addition, low awareness of the recommendation of vaccines<sup>47,48</sup>, poor perception of the importance of diseases<sup>49,50</sup> and attitudes towards previous vaccination<sup>51</sup> were found to be associated with vaccination rates. In addition, factors such as lack of information about vaccination, whether there is a certain age limit, side effects, vaccine cost, vaccine recommendation and belief in the efficacy of the vaccine have also been demonstrated to affect the rates of vaccine hesitancy/refusal<sup>27</sup>. It has been recommended to increase vaccination rates by investigating the reasons for the lack of a vaccination program, lack of information and vaccine hesitancy. The reasons for non-vaccination/vaccine hesitancy among the elderly in our study were similar to the studies. In addition, it has been recommended to increase vaccination rates by investigating the reasons for the lack of a vaccination program and vaccine hesitancy<sup>52</sup>. The reasons for vaccine hesitancy/refusal among the elderly in this study were similar to the studies.

Finally, this study had some limitations. The limiting aspect of this study was that it was conducted on patients admitted to the hospital. Although the participants were selected after geriatric evaluation, the evaluation of vaccination status is based on the memory factor. In addition, this study was single-centered and multicenter studies are needed to make national guidelines.

#### CONCLUSION

This is one of the rare studies analyzing the effects of demographic data and comorbid diseases on more than one vaccine type. While making arrangements to increase national immunization rates, systematic mechanisms for vaccination should be developed by making separate evaluations according to demographic data such as age groups, marital status, gender, educational status, social security status, occupation, place of residence and comorbid diseases. To reduce the reasons for vaccine hesitancy, the use of effective information channels, follow-up and national regulations are recommended.

# SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

Due to low vaccination rate among elderly, preventable infectious diseases bear high risk of mortality and co-morbidities and also result in higher health care expenditures. We aimed at discovering the most striking reasons of low vaccination rate among the elderly over 65 years old. In this study, 51.6% of the elderly were determined not to have been informed satisfactorily before about the essentialness of the vaccination. We think that our study will be an important source of data regarding the vaccination rates of the elderly population in Turkey. Moreover, the results of our study clearly confirm that in order to achieve the desired vaccination rates in the elderly population, we need health system approaches specific to this age group.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Burke, M. and T. Rowe, 2018. Vaccinations in older adults. Clin. Geriatric Med., 34: 131-143.
- Lahariya, C. and P. Bhardwaj, 2020. Adult vaccination in India: Status and the way forward. Hum. Vaccines Immunother., 16: 1508-1510.
- Tan, L., 2015. Adult vaccination: Now is the time to realize an unfulfilled potential. Hum. Vaccines Immunother., 11: 2158-2166.
- 4. Doherty, T.M., G.D. Giudice and S. Maggi, 2019. Adult vaccination as part of a healthy lifestyle: Moving from medical intervention to health promotion. Ann. Med., 51: 128-140.
- Jarzebski, M.P., T. Elmqvist, A. Gasparatos, K. Fukushi and S. Eckersten *et al.*, 2021. Ageing and population shrinking: Implications for sustainability in the urban century. npj Urban Sustainability, Vol. 1. 10.1038/s42949-021-00023-z.
- 6. Saygili, T., S.O. Yalçin and H. Özsari, 2021. Advanced age and disabled health tourism concept, problems and solution suggestions. Int. J. Health Manage. Tourism, 6: 492-514.
- 7. Whiting, C.C., J. Siebert, A.M. Newman, H.W. Du and A.A. Alizadeh *et al.*, 2015. Large-scale and comprehensive immune profiling and functional analysis of normal human aging. PLoS ONE, Vol. 10. 10.1371/journal.pone.0133627.
- 8. Kennedy, B.K., S.L. Berger, A. Brunet, J. Campisi and A.M. Cuervo *et al.*, 2014. Geroscience: Linking aging to chronic disease. Cell, 159: 709-713.

- Sauver, J.L.S., C.M. Boyd, B.R. Grossardt, W.V. Bobo and L.J.F. Rutten *et al.*, 2015. Risk of developing multimorbidity across all ages in an historical cohort study: Differences by sex and ethnicity. BMJ Open, Vol. 5. 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006413.
- 10. de Gomensoro, E., G.D. Giudice and T.M. Doherty, 2018. Challenges in adult vaccination. Ann. Med., 50: 181-192.
- Swanson, K.A., H.J. Schmitt, K.U. Jansen and A.S. Anderson, 2015. Adult vaccination: Current recommendations and future prospects. Hum. Vaccines Immunother., 11: 150-155.
- 12. Freedman, M.S., H. Bernstein and K.A. Ault, 2021. Recommended adult immunization schedule, United States, 2021. Ann. Intern. Med., 174: 374-384.
- Troeger, C.E., B.F. Blacker, I.A. Khalil, S.R.M. Zimsen and S.B. Albertson *et al.*, 2019. Mortality, morbidity, and hospitalisations due to influenza lower respiratory tract infections, 2017: An analysis for the global burden of disease study 2017. Lancet Respir. Med., 7: 69-89.
- Torres, A., C. Cillóniz, F. Blasi, J.D. Chalmers and J. Gaillat *et al.*, 2018. Burden of pneumococcal community-acquired pneumonia in adults across Europe: A literature review. Respir. Med., 137: 6-13.
- Bricout, H., M. Haugh, O. Olatunde and R.G. Prieto, 2015. Herpes zoster-associated mortality in Europe: A systematic review. BMC Public Health, Vol. 15. 10.1186/s12889-015-1753-y.
- Pinchinat, S., A.M. Cebrián-Cuenca, H. Bricout and R.W. Johnson, 2013. Similar herpes zoster incidence across Europe: Results from a systematic literature review. BMC Infect. Dis., Vol. 13. 10.1186/1471-2334-13-170.
- Decouttere, C., K. de Boeck and N. Vandaele, 2021. Advancing sustainable development goals through immunization: A literature review. Globalization Health, Vol. 17. 10.1186/s12992-021-00745-w.
- Aguado, M.T., J. Barratt, J.R. Beard, B.B. Blomberg and W.H. Chen *et al.*, 2018. Report on WHO meeting on immunization in older adults: Geneva, Switzerland, 22–23 March 2017. Vaccine, 36: 921-931.
- Andrew, M.K., S.K. Bowles, G. Pawelec, L. Haynes, G.A. Kuchel, S.A. McNeil and J.E. McElhaney, 2019. Influenza vaccination in older adults: Recent innovations and practical applications. Drugs Aging, 36: 29-37.
- Johnson, R.W., D. Bouhassira, G. Kassianos, A. Leplège, K.E. Schmader and T. Weinke, 2010. The impact of herpes zoster and post-herpetic neuralgia on quality-of-life. BMC Med., Vol. 8. 10.1186/1741-7015-8-37.
- 21. van Buynder, P. and M. Woodward, 2019. Importance and challenges of vaccination in older people. Med. Today, 20: 2-5.

- 22. Yürüyen, M., G. Ayan, F. Demirdağ, Z. Kara and S. Avcı *et al.*, 2018. Why is vaccination frequency low in elderly patients? J. Clin. Anal. Med., 9: 138-142.
- 23. Gürsoy, M.Y., G. Tanrıverdi, G. Özsezer and F.C. Mechmet, 2022. Vaccination coverage and related factors among the elderly: A cross-sectional study from Turkey. Public Health Nurs., 39: 390-397.
- Lu, P.J., M.C. Hung, A. Srivastav, L.A. Grohskopf and M. Kobayashi *et al.*, 2021. Surveillance of vaccination coverage among adult populations-United States, 2018. MMWR Surveillance Summaries, Vol. 70. 10.15585/mmwr.ss7003a1.
- 25. Papagiannis, D., G. Rachiotis, A. Mariolis, E. Zafiriou and K.I. Gourgoulianis, 2020. Vaccination coverage of the elderly in Greece: A cross-sectional nationwide study. Can. J. Infect. Dis. Med. Microbiol., Vol. 2020. 10.1155/2020/5459793.
- 26. Korkmaz, P., T.P. Kilit, K. Onbaşi, D.M. Ozatag and O. Toka, 2019. Influenza vaccination prevalence among the elderly and individuals with chronic disease, and factors affecting vaccination uptake. Cent. Eur. J. Public Health, 27: 44-49.
- 27. Wennekes, M.D., R. Eilers, A. Caputo, A. Gagneux-Brunon and R. Gavioli *et al.*, 2023. Focus group study on perceptions and information needs regarding vaccines targeting the older population: A cross-country comparison in four European countries. GeroScience, 45: 871-887.
- Williams, W.W., P.J. Lu, A. O'Halloran, D.K. Kim and L.A. Grohskopf *et al.*, 2017. Surveillance of vaccination coverage among adult populations-United States, 2015. MMWR Surveillance Summaries, Vol. 66. 10.15585/mmwr.ss6611a1.
- 29. Medetalibeyoğlu, A. and E. Ezirmik, 2020. A study on determining the level of knowledge about influenza, pneumococcal, herpes zoster, and tetanus vaccines among the vaccines recommended by the world health organization and the level of vaccination in individuals sixty-five years old and over. Med. Bull. Haseki, 58: 414-421.
- Bal, H. and G. Börekçi, 2016. Investigation of the adult vaccination status and influencing factors in people aged 65 years and over registered in a family health center in Mersin City. Istanbul Med. J., 17: 121-130.
- Gorska-Ciebiada, M., M. Saryusz-Wolska, M. Ciebiada and J. Loba, 2015. Pneumococcal and seasonal influenza vaccination among elderly patients with diabetes. Adv. Hyg. Exp. Med., 69: 1182-1189.
- Chen, H., Q. Li, M. Zhang, Z. Gu and X. Zhou *et al.*, 2022. Factors associated with influenza vaccination coverage and willingness in the elderly with chronic diseases in Shenzhen, China. Hum. Vaccines Immunother., Vol. 18. 10.1080/21645515.2022.2133912.
- Hughes, M.M., C. Reed, B. Flannery, S. Garg, J.A. Singleton, A.M. Fry and M.A. Rolfes, 2020. Projected population benefit of increased effectiveness and coverage of influenza vaccination on influenza burden in the United States. Clin. Infect. Dis., 70: 2496-2502.

- Dirmesropian, S., J.G. Wood, C.R. MacIntyre and A.T. Newall, 2015. A review of economic evaluations of 13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine (PCV13) in adults and the elderly. Hum. Vaccines Immunother., 11: 818-825.
- 35. Naito, T., M. Suzuki, A. Kanazawa, H. Takahashi and K. Fujibayashi *et al.*, 2020. Pneumococcal vaccination reduces in-hospital mortality, length of stay and medical expenditure in hospitalized elderly patients. J. Infect. Chemother., 26: 715-721.
- 36. Storch, J., C. Fleischmann-Struzek, N. Rose, T. Lehmann and A. Mikolajetz *et al.*, 2022. The effect of influenza and pneumococcal vaccination in the elderly on health service utilisation and costs: A claims data-based cohort study. Eur. J. Health Econ., 23: 67-80.
- 37. Abu-Rish, E.Y. and N.A. Barakat, 2021. The impact of pharmacist-led educational intervention on pneumococcal vaccine awareness and acceptance among elderly in Jordan. Hum. Vaccines Immunother., 17: 1181-1189.
- Kajikawa, N., Y. Kataoka, R. Goto, T. Maeno and S. Yokoya *et al.*, 2019. Factors associated with influenza vaccination in Japanese elderly outpatients. Infect. Dis. Health, 24: 212-221.
- Murakami, Y., S. Kanazu, T. Petigara, M.S. Oba, Y. Nishiwaki and A. Watanabe, 2019. Factors associated with PPSV23 coverage among older adults in Japan: A nationwide community-based survey. BMJ Open, Vol. 9. 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030197.
- 40. Orenstein, W.A., B.G. Gellin, R.H. Beigi, S. Despres and P.S. LaRussa *et al.*, 2014. Recommendations from the national vaccine advisory committee: Standards for adult immunization practice. Public Health Rep., 129: 115-123.
- 41. Schattner, A., 2020. Cardiovascular-targeted patient education and uptake of influenza vaccination in elderly patients. Patient Educ. Couns., 103: 1052-1054.
- 42. Vogelsang, E.M. and A.N. Polonijo, 2022. Social determinants of shingles vaccination in the United States. J. Gerontology: Ser. B, 77: 407-412.
- 43. Roller-Wirnsberger, R., S. Lindner, L. Kolosovski, E. Platzer and P. Dovjak *et al.*, 2021. The role of health determinants in the influenza vaccination uptake among older adults (65+): A scope review. Aging Clin. Exp. Res., 33: 2123-2132.
- Shuvo, S., T. Hagemann, K. Hohmeier, C.Y. Chiu, S. Ramachandran and J. Gatwood, 2021. The role of social determinants in timely herpes zoster vaccination among older American adults. Hum. Vaccines Immunother., 17: 2043-2049.
- 45. Uzuner, A., Ş. Arabaci, A.I. Yüceel, A.C. Kocatürk, E. Kaynar and A. Khan, 2018. Knowledge, attitude and behaviors of adults about adulthood immunization. Turk. J. Fam. Med. Primary Care, 12: 215-225.
- 46. Lau, D.T. and J.B. Kirby, 2009. The relationship between living arrangement and preventive care use among community-dwelling elderly persons. Am. J. Public Health, 99: 1315-1321.

- Böhmer, M.M., D. Walter, G. Krause, S. Müters, A. Gößwald and O. Wichmann, 2011. Determinants of tetanus and seasonal influenza vaccine uptake in adults living in Germany. Hum. Vaccines, 7: 1317-1325.
- Mieczkowski, T.A. and S.A. Wilson, 2002. Adult pneumococcal vaccination: A review of physician and patient barriers. Vaccine, 20: 1383-1392.
- Böhmer, M.M., D. Walter, G. Falkenhorst, S. Müters, G. Krause and O. Wichmann, 2012. Barriers to pandemic influenza vaccination and uptake of seasonal influenza vaccine in the post-pandemic season in Germany. BMC Public Health, Vol. 12. 10.1186/1471-2458-12-938.
- Santibanez, T.A., M.P. Nowalk, R.K. Zimmerman, I.K. Jewell, I.J. Bardella, S.A. Wilson and M.A. Terry, 2002. Knowledge and beliefs about influenza, pneumococcal disease, and immunizations among older people. J. Am. Geriatrics Soc., 50: 1711-1716.
- 51. Nowalk, M.P., R.K. Zimmerman, M. Tabbarah, M. Raymund and I.K. Jewell, 2006. Determinants of adult vaccination at inner-city health centers: A descriptive study. BMC Fam. Pract., Vol. 7. 10.1186/1471-2296-7-2.
- Dash, R., A. Agrawal, V. Nagvekar, J. Lele, A. di Pasquale, S. Kolhapure and R. Parikh, 2020. Towards adult vaccination in India: A narrative literature review. Hum. Vaccines Immunother., 16: 991-1001.