

Journal of University of Medicine and Pharmacy at Ho Chi Minh City homepage: http://www.medpharmres.vn/ and http://www.medpharmres.com/



Original article

1edph Armres

Acceptance and willingness to pay for COVID-19 vaccines available in Vietnam: an online study during the fourth epidemic wave

Lan Thi Phuong Nguyen^{a*}, Dung Tien Nguyen^a, Hoang The Tran^a, Nam Minh Hoang^a, Hanh Thi Hong Hoa^a, Khuong Ba Cao^a, Manh Duc Than^a, Hoai Thu Nguyen^a, Huyen Thi Le^a, Pamela Wright^b

^aFaculty of Public Health, Thai Nguyen University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Thai Nguyen, Vietnam; ^bGuelph International Health Consulting, De Boelelaan 1085, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Received March 25, 2022: Revised May 23, 2022: Accepted June 14, 2022

Abstract: COVID-19 vaccines available in Vietnam have different prices, efficacies, and side effects. We studied acceptance and willingness to pay (WTP) for COVID-19 vaccines in Vietnam, using a self-designed online questionnaire. Respondents were 2093 unvaccinated adults. Multiple regression analyses identified factors associated with vaccine acceptance and WTP. Acceptance of free vaccines was around 90% for the three available in Vietnam (Astra Zeneca, SPUTNIK V, and Pfizer-BioNTech). WTP for the same vaccines was about 70%. Vaccine acceptance was associated with being female and/or chronically ill or undergoing COVID-19-related job changes. WTP was associated variously with family economic status, occupational changes due to COVID-19, chronic disease, and perceived risk of infection. Most respondents were willing to be vaccinated and many were willing to pay for it, depending on personal and family circumstances. Vietnam should budget for free vaccines to support those unable to pay.

Keywords: COVID-19; willingness to pay; acceptance; vaccine; vaccination.

1. INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has become a global health crisis, which has increased the burden of morbidity and mortality and affects societies and economies worldwide (1-3). Control measures aim at reducing transmission include social distancing, hand washing, wearing a face mask, and isolation to avoid infection (4), but it is agreed that the most effective way to control the spread of COVID-19 is vaccination (5, 6).

COVID-19 vaccines have been produced and deployed in many countries. Recent evidence suggests that vaccination has brought very positive effects in controlling the pandemic (6, 7). Scientific and media reporting on COVID-19 has covered effectiveness, side effects, and possible

*Address correspondence to Lan Thi Phuong Nguyen at the Faculty of Public Health, Thai Nguyen University of Medicine and Pharmacy, 248 Luong Ngoc Quyen Street, Thai Nguyen, Vietnam; E-mail: nguyenthiphuonglan@tnmc.edu.vn DOI: 10.32895/UMP.MPR.7.1.10 complications (8, 9), which may affect the level of acceptance of vaccination. A global survey found that 71.5% of participants would be very or somewhat likely to accept a COVID-19 vaccine (10). Vaccine acceptance is influenced by many factors, including age, sex, underlying medical conditions or morbid obesity, side effects, effectiveness, and safety of the vaccine (11, 12). The acceptance rate can also be affected by whether the vaccine is provided free of charge or has to be paid for, and by income level (13, 14).

Vietnam has had relatively good success in controlling the COVID-19 pandemic by quick and relevant responses focusing on identification and isolation of cases, strict quarantine, contact tracing, and targeted lockdowns (4), but now they are facing the fourth wave of coronavirus infection outbreaks that is much more serious than the previous waves.

© 2023 MedPharmRes

COVID-19 vaccines have become available, and the Vietnamese government has developed a policy on imported vaccines and a plan for vaccine distribution (15). A previous study assumed that a vaccine pricing policy may be deployed in Vietnam, which might affect the acceptance and willingness to pay (WTP) for the COVID-19 vaccines (16). Currently, there are no data on acceptance and WTP for actual COVID-19 vaccine products to guide Vietnamese policymakers. The aim of this study is to provide evidence on the rate of acceptance, the WTP, and the predictors of both, for the COVID-19 vaccine products actually available in the setting of Vietnam, which may also be similar in other countries with similar situations.

2. MATERIALS AND METHOD

2.1. Study design and population

A cross-sectional study was conducted from May 17-23, 2021 in Vietnam. Participants who are able to access the internet and are18 years old or above were invited to complete an online questionnaire. Individuals already vaccinated against COVID-19 were excluded. A snowball technique was applied; we started with friends and colleagues via social media (such as Facebook or Zalo) and asked them to share with others. The due date for sharing the link was May 23, 2021.

2.2. Variables

The following independent variables were collected: (1) demographic information including urban or rural residence. age, sex, ethnicity, occupation, education, marital status, family size, family economic status, and occupational changes or income reduction due to COVID-19; (2) chronic diseases such as hypertension, coronary heart disease, diabetes, asthma, cancer, or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease as well as allergy history; (3) information about being affected by the pandemic, including occupation changes (e.g. changed the number of hours, changed position, lost job), income reduction, and potential exposure of participants at all four levels (F0 is defined as confirmed COVID-19 cases, F1 are people in contact with F0, F2 are those in contact with F1 and similarly for F3 and F4); (4) perceptions of COVID-19 pandemic: a feeling of being at risk of COVID-19 infection in the near future; and (5) any side effects of COVID-19 vaccine that they are aware of.

Dependent variables included: (1) acceptance of vaccination in general; (2) acceptance to be vaccinated with any of the three specific vaccines planned to be made available in Vietnam, free or paid; (3) WTP for any of these vaccines.



Figure 1. The bidding game technique for WTPs of vaccines

Previous studies were conducted based on assumptions of efficacy, safety, and price. However, the Vietnamese government plans to import vaccines selected from those with global availability considering price and efficacy, so we studied those being considered, with different reported efficacy and price, with the intention of providing evidence that may guide policymakers to make informed decisions. Information on the name of the vaccine, name of the company producing it, efficacy, and side effects of each vaccine (AstraZeneca, Sputnik V, and Pfizer-BioNTech, which the Vietnamese government plans to import) (17) were given and respondents were asked whether they would accept them, as free or paid vaccines. If they agreed to pay from their pocket, we suggested four possible prices and asked which they would agree to pay. The prices we proposed were based on data on the website (17) and added 30% for management and distribution (18) to get the first price, then doubled that and doubled it again. We also asked whether the respondent would

pay half of those prices to share the payment with the government. The highest price chosen by each respondent was defined as the level of WTP. If the participant said "no" to all four prices, we concluded that they were unwilling to pay. The bidding game technique for WTP was summarized in Figure 1.

2.3. Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were performed to describe variables including frequency, and percentage. Chi-square test was utilized to determine associations between types of vaccine and willingness to pay for paid/ free vaccines. Univariate and multivariate logistic regressions were employed to identify predictors of acceptance to be vaccinated and WTP (yes/no WTP) for each vaccine. Independent variables were age, gender, education level, marital status, family size, family economic status, allergy, residence, occupation, chronic diseases, occupation change, and income reduction due to COVID-19. Significant factors from univariate analysis were included in multivariate analysis. We also run additional models which included all variables for each vaccine in multivariate analysis. Data was analyzed by using SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 23.0.

2.4. Ethical considerations

Those invited to complete the questionnaire online were provided with a brief description of the study and its objectives. By deciding to complete the survey they gave their consent to participate and for the data provided to be used. No identifying information was collected. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Thai Nguyen University of Medicine and Pharmacy (No 606/ ĐHYD-HĐĐĐ).

3. RESULTS

Finally, the data from 2093 respondents who completed the survey were included in the analysis (we had to eliminate 93 respondents because of incomplete or incorrect responses such as under 18 years old, or not clear year of birth); their baseline characteristics are presented in Table 1. The majority of the respondents were female (71.0%) and aged from 18 to 29 (57.1%); more than half were from urban areas (59.1%). Most of the respondents had a college/university education level (79.5%). The participants were mainly students (38.9%), government staff (22.1%), health staff (18.8%), and others.

The proportion of respondents reporting occupation changes and income reduction due to the COVID-19 pandemic were 26.2% and 37.2%, respectively. Most (90.0%) reported not having had potential exposure to COVID-19 cases during the previous waves of the pandemic and 84.9% reported having had no contact with COVID-19 cases in the current wave.

Table 1.	Characteristics	of res	pondents
----------	-----------------	--------	----------

	Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Residence			
	Urban area	1236	59.1
	Rural area	857	40.9
Age (years)			
	From 18 to 29	1195	57.1
	From 30 to 39	539	25.8
	From 40 to 49	279	13.3
	50 and above	80	3.8

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	1495	71.0
Female	1485	/1.0
Ethnicity	008	29.0
Kinh	1665	79.6
Other	428	20.4
Occupation	420	20.4
Health staff	394	18.8
Other governmental staff	463	22.1
Worker	101	4.8
Student	814	38.9
Own business	73	3.5
Other	248	11.9
Education		
High school or	120	20.5
lower	430	20.5
Above	1663	79.5
Marital status		
Single	1106	52.8
Married	924	44.1
Divorced/ Widowed	63	3.0
Family size		
One	73	3.5
Two	91	4.3
3 to 4 people	608	29.0
Five or more	1321	63.1
Family economic status		
Poor, near poor	101	4.8
Others (average, high	1992	95.2
income)	1772	<i>)3.2</i>
~		
Chronic diseases	101	-
Yes	124	5.9
No	1969	94.1
Allergy	502	20.2
Yes	595	28.3
NO	1251	59.8
Do not know/remember	249	11.9
Voc	548	26.2
I es No	1545	20.2 73.8
Income reduction due to COVID-19	1545	75.0
Ves	778	37.2
No	1315	62.8
Current contact level*	1515	02.0
F1 F2	78	37
F3, F4	238	11.4
None	1777	84.9
Previous three waves contact (F1 to F	74)*	
Yes	´ 199	9.5
No	1894	90.5
Feeling of being at risk of COVID-19	infection in th	e near future
Yes	527	25.2
No	443	21.2
Do not know	1123	53.7

*Classifications of COVID-19 cases and exposures: F0 is defined as confirmed COVID-19 cases, F1 is defined as people in contact with F0, F2 is defined as people in contact with F1, and similarly for F3, F4

The majority of the respondents would like to be vaccinated against COVID-19 infection (89.3%). Approximately 90% of the respondents were willing to accept any of the three potentially available COVID-19 vaccines (Astra Zeneca, SPUTNIK V, and Pfizer-BioNTech) if they were provided for free. However, only 70% were willing to pay, and this rate similar for all three types of vaccine. There was no significant difference among the three vaccines, as to the acceptability of either free or paid vaccine application (Table 2).

Among the group willing to pay, the mean (SD) amounts of money the respondents were prepared to pay for each vaccine were: 902,438±401,904 for Astra Zeneca, 1,429,147±860,195 for Sputnik V, and 2,302,438±1,697,315 (VND) for Pfizer-BioNTech. It should be noted that we applied a snowballing sampling technique so these results may not representative for whole Vietnamese population.

The results of the multivariate analysis revealed factors associated with willingness to have COVID-19 vaccination (Table 3). Females were 1.75 times less likely to be willing compared to males (aOR=0.57, 95%CI 0.4-0.81). Respondents from rural areas were 1.44 times more likely to

be willing than those from urban areas (aOR=1.44, 95%CI 1.06-1.96). Having an underlying health condition was significantly associated with willingness to get the vaccine. people without chronic diseases were 2.42 times more willing to get the vaccine (aOR=2.42, 95% CI 1.51-3.89). The proportion of those willing to get the vaccine among respondents who reported occupational changes due to COVID-19 was less than those without any job-related changes (aOR=1.55, 95%CI 1.14-2.1). The respondents' occupation showed significant association with willingness to get the COVID-19 vaccine: health staffs were significantly, and about 2.5 times, more willing to be vaccinated compared to all other groups.

	•		1 .		0	•	1		C	C	• 1	•
Obb		A cooolotiono	bottuoon	trinoc	Δt	110001100	ond	11/1 10000	and tor	troo	01 1010	110001000
гаше	4.	ASSOCIATIONS	Derween	IVDES	()	vaceme	анс	winnight	-88 101	ILEE.	OF DAIG	vaccines
1 4010		1 IDDOCIMIOID	000000000000000000000000000000000000000		U 1	, accinc	and	********	200 101	1100	or para	, accinco

Vaccines	Willing	g	Not willi	р	
	n	%	n	%	
1. Willingness to get vaccine if free					
Astra Zeneca	1848	88.3	245	11.7	0.509
Sputnik V	1839	87.9	254	12.1	0.398
Pfizer-BioNTech	1860	88.9	233	11.1	
2.Willingness to get vaccine if have to pay					
Astra Zeneca	1456	69.6	637	30.4	0.264
Sputnik V	1465	70.0	628	30.0	0.204
Pfizer-BioNTech	1419	67.8	674	32.2	

Table 3. Factors associated with willingness to accept vaccination

Variables	Willing to get vaccine	aOR* (95%CI)	p-value
Residence			
Urban area	1083 (87.6)	Ref	
Rural area	786 (91.7)	1.44 (1.06 - 1.96)	0.022
Sex			
Male	562 (92.4)	Ref	
Female	1307 (88.0)	0.57 (0.40 - 0.81)	0.002
Occupation			
Health staff	372 (94.4)	Ref	
Worker	89 (88.1)	0.37 (0.18 - 0.79)	0.01
Other governmental staff	400 (86.4)	0.4 (0.24 - 0.67)	0.001
Student	739 (90.8)	0.6 (0.37 - 0.99)	0.048
Own business	60 (82.2)	0.32 (0.15 - 0.68)	0.003
Others	209 (84.3)	0.36 (0.21 - 0.63)	0.000
Chronic diseases			
Yes	98 (79.0)	Ref	
No	1771 (89.9)	2.42 (1.51 - 3.89)	0.000
Occupational changes due to COVID-19			
Yes	470 (85.8)	Ref	
No	1399 (90.6)	1.55 (1.14 - 2.1)	0.005

Results from the multivariate analysis revealed the factors significantly associated with yes or no WTP for all three vaccines (details are presented in Appendices 1, 2, and 3). Health staffs were more willing than others for any of the three vaccines. Family economic status was also associated with WTP for all three vaccines; respondents of average economic status and above were 1.59 (aOR=1.59, 95%CI 1.05-2.44) times more likely to pay for Astra Zeneca; 1.67 (aOR=1.67, 95%CI 1.1-2.54) times more likely to pay for Sputnik V, and 1.52 (aOR=1.52, 95%CI 1.0-2.31) times more likely to pay for the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine than were those in poor/near-poor families. Occupational changes due to COVID-19 was

one factor associated with WTP; those reporting no occupational changes were 1.64 (aOR=1.64, 95% CI 1.28-2.09) times more likely to pay for Astra Zeneca; 1.44 (aOR=1.44, 95% CI 1.13-1.83) times more likely to pay for Sputnik V, and 1.55 (aOR=1.55, 95% CI 1.22-1.98) times more likely to pay for the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine than were those with occupational changes. In addition, respondents who perceived that they would quite possibly get infected with COVID-19 were more likely to be willing to pay for the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine.

In the additional models which included all variables for each vaccine in the multivariate analysis, we could not find any additional independent variable significant within a multivariate regression model (Appendix 4,5,6).

4. DISCUSSION

This is one of the few studies on acceptance and WTP since a range of COVID-19 vaccines became available, with different reported levels of efficacy, prices, and side effects. It was conducted in the light of the current plans of the Ministry of Health in Vietnam to import vaccines. However, in the context of limited resources, it may be useful to consider the acceptance rate and WTP (share from out-of-pocket payments) for the vaccines being considered. There is an urgent need for evidence to inform policymakers, which should be based on the demand from society. Overall, 89.3% of respondents stated that they would accept to be vaccinated against COVID-19. The acceptance rate decreased, however, 20% of respondents would have to make out-of-pocket payments for any of the three vaccines. Rural or urban residence, sex, job, job changes (time, position, loss) due to the pandemic, and health status (with/without chronic diseases) were predictors of vaccine acceptance. The mean amounts respondents were willing to pay were US\$39.19 for Astra Zeneca, US\$62.06 for Sputnik V, and US\$99.98 for Pfizer-BioNTech vaccines.

The overall vaccine acceptance in Vietnam appeared to be higher than that reported for many other countries in a global survey where, on average, 71.5% of participants reported that they would be very or somewhat likely to accept a COVID-19 vaccine (10) but similar to the response in China (79.41%) (19). It should be noted that the global survey was conducted in 2020 when the COVID-19 vaccines were still in clinical trials, and people may not have been aware of their real efficacy, safety, and side effects. Since that time there is much more evidence accumulating from actual vaccine administration in several countries (20, 21). At the time of this survey, the pandemic in Vietnam was becoming more serious than it had been in the first year. We assume that with increased general awareness about the disease and about the vaccines, acceptance would also have increased to the current high level. On the other hand, in many countries such as the USA and the United Kingdom, coverage of other vaccines is not so high despite the availability of vaccination services (22, 23) and new foci of anti-vaccine activities have developed recently (24). All of these issues may affect the acceptance of a COVID19 vaccine in these countries.

The acceptance rate was similar for the three vaccines mentioned in the survey, and for all of them, the high acceptance rate of nearly 90% if offered without charge decreased to just under 70% if the out-of-pocket payment had to cover all the costs. However, even with whole or partial payment, the acceptance rate we found was higher than reported in the USA, where overall acceptance was 69% and dropped to 58% if payment was demanded (25). At the time of that survey, respondents would have known that their government was already providing the vaccines for free, which may have affected them (26). Our results were similar to those reported from China, where acceptance was 80% for free vaccines and 66.6% for paid ones (27). Our result showing a drop in acceptance rate if payment is required suggested that to maximize vaccine coverage, the government should cover the costs. However, their budget is also limited,

so they may ask for out-of-pocket payment or shared payment, to which nearly 70% agreed. This result is in line with the acceptance of other vaccines in Vietnam. Most people are willing to have most vaccines, which are mostly provided by the government for free but may also involve payment. For example, in 2019, coverage of the rubella vaccine among children under 5 in high-risk regions was 95.9%, which is similar to routine childhood vaccines (28). It is also similar to the results of a previous study on the acceptance of a dengue vaccine which found that 77.3% of patients with dengue were willing to pay on average US\$ 67.4 for a vaccine (29). This context no doubt contributed to the high acceptance of COVID-19 vaccination in Vietnam.

We named three existing and likely to be available vaccines in the survey, but we did not find any significant differences in vaccine acceptance rates among the three, whether for free distribution or with out-of-pocket payment. Other studies may only have used assumptions of differences in the vaccine efficacy rates and/or duration of protection and/or free/not free vaccines (30). For example, in China, for free vaccines: 50% efficacy would give 75.6% acceptance to be vaccinated, while 80% efficacy gave 80.6% acceptance; at market price: 50% efficacy gave 53.5% acceptance to be vaccinated but if efficacy was increased to 80%, acceptance increased to 66.6% (27). The results in our study could be due to the current context in Vietnam, where Covid19 vaccines are still very scarce. The government has a priority list for highrisk groups including health care workers, most of whom are still not vaccinated. Most reported that they would be pleased to be vaccinated and showed no preference for one vaccine over another.

Those residing in rural areas were more likely to want the vaccine than their urban counterparts. This result is similar to findings in India from October 2020; people living in semiurban areas were more likely to accept vaccines than those in urban areas (31). In our case, because we recruited participants online, the respondents giving their residence as a rural area may in fact be in a smaller rural town, as opposed to a major city. The difference with regard to urban/rural residence is therefore difficult to interpret.

Willingness to vaccinate in females was less than among males. The same phenomenon was described in the USA, where females were slightly but significantly less willing than males to accept a vaccine (32), and in Russia (11). According to Tran et al. (2021), males were more willing than females because of the high reported rates of COVID-19-related morbidity and mortality among males; males may also have a better perception of the vaccine. In the global study, which collected data randomly from 19 countries, however, males were slightly less willing than females (10). It also be noted that our sample characteristics may be different with these studies, therefore the results of generated from the multivariate analysis model can be different with regard to gender.

Health status (with/without chronic diseases) was another factor that influenced vaccine acceptance. People without chronic diseases were more willing to get vaccinated than those with conditions. A USA study that considered people with underlying medical conditions or morbid obesity found similar results (32). In contrast, in an Indian study, people without chronic diseases were less likely to want a vaccine (31). In Vietnam, this effect may have been influenced by the media reporting negatively about vaccine trials and vaccine programs, suggesting that people with the chronic disease might be at higher risk for complications. In the government planning, however, those with chronic diseases are given high priority for vaccination.

Perhaps not surprisingly, health staffs were more ready to be vaccinated than people with other jobs. Health staff should have a better awareness of the disease and the benefits of vaccination, and would also be at higher risk of contracting COVID-19 infection. This is in line with a previous study in Asia-Pacific, in which 95% of healthcare workers were willing to be vaccinated, depending on vaccine safety, recommendation, and availability (33).

Respondents were willing to pay for the vaccine, in two doses, US\$39.19 for Astra Zeneca, US\$62.06 for Sputnik V, and US\$99.98 for the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine. These proposed prices seemed appropriate in current Vietnam context as several reasons, such as we must be based on the original price of producers; it was acceptable in comparison with prices of other vaccines in Vietnam and the GDP per capita (in year 2020, GDP per capital was US\$ 2,655). A previous study in Vietnam suggested that the average amount would be US\$ 85.92 \pm 69.01 (16), but that study was conducted before the vaccines actually became available and had to make assumptions of 95% effectiveness and proposed prices at US\$12.5, 25, 50, 100 or 200. In other Asian countries, people were willing to pay varying amounts: in China, an average of US\$ 19.2 per dose (19), in Indonesia: 78.3% were willing to pay for a COVID-19 vaccine at US\$ 57.20 (34), and in Malaysia, US 30.66 ± 18.12 per dose (35). Expected prices were higher in Western countries: one USA study found that people would pay US\$318.76 for a vaccine with 95% efficacy and a 3-year protection, but only US\$236.85 for one with 50% efficacy and one year of protection (26). A population in Chile was willing to pay up to US\$232 per vaccine (36). Again, however, these studies were conducted based on assumptions before the vaccines actually became available. The different studies are also difficult to compare as the prices proposed to the participants varied greatly as do the incomes.

Occupation, family economic status, and job changes due to the COVID-19 were predictors of being willing to make out-of-pocket payments for COVID-19 vaccine. These results are in line with previous studies (31, 35), however with the caution that different sample characteristics among these studies. Those factors implied that a good and sustainable income is the most important contributor to WTP for vaccines. although the proposed prices are quite high in comparison with other available vaccines in Vietnam and with GDP per capita. Therefore, it should be noted for the government if considering a cost-sharing policy for the COVID-19 vaccine, that the groups with these characteristics may need to be subsidized.

Strengths and limitations

This is the first study in Vietnam and one of very few studies in the world looking at vaccine acceptance and WTP that was implemented since COVID-19 vaccines became available. It meant that we could ask the respondents questions based on real and current information on the three vaccines, not on theoretical scenarios based on assumptions about the vaccines and costs.

Our survey was conducted online and therefore was only a closed questionnaire, we could not probe for further answers or explanations. We also could not reach people who are unable to access the Internet, but our respondents did come from 63 of the 65 provinces in the country. There was no doubt some bias due to the recruitment strategy adopted. The majority of the respondents were under 50 years old, many were students and health staff, relatively well-educated people with normal economic status. These characteristics may have contributed to the high rates of both vaccine acceptance and willingness to pay. However, these people are also perhaps most likely to become infected, living in the urban centers, traveling, and meeting friends and family for social interactions so the high rate is still encouraging. To have a more complete picture of vaccine acceptance, we suggest that it would be interesting to do a survey in a very rural area with interviewers to find out what the people know about COVID-19 and about the vaccine, and whether they would be vaccinated.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we found that, in spite of the relatively low risk of contracting COVID-19 infection in Vietnam up to now, the rate of willingness to be vaccinated against Covid-19 was high, either with or without whole or partial payment out-of-pocket, for all three vaccines that are expected to be available. Due to a limited budget, a policy of cost-sharing may be applied. To maximize the rate of vaccination coverage, certain groups will probably need government subsidies. Sex, occupation, having a chronic condition, and job change due to COVID-19 were predictors of vaccine acceptance. The mean value of WTP was (US\$39.19), (US\$62.06), and (US\$99.98) for AstraZeneca, SputnikV, and Pfizer-BioNTech vaccines, respectively. Predictors of yes or no WTP included occupation, family economic status, and occupational changes, and these identifiers can be used to focus resources in an effort to strengthen vaccine coverage if cost-sharing is going to be applied. These results are very relevant for this sample and it should be careful when generating to the wider Vietnamese population. These findings may be influenced by the context of Vietnam but are also useful for comparison with other countries in the region and elsewhere.

FUNDING

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

ORCID ID

Lan Thi Phuong Nguyen Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0001-5266-1765 Dung Tien Nguyen Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0001-7085-0164 Hoang The Tran Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0001-7545-9770 Nam Minh Hoang Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0002-7995-1735 Hanh Thi Hong Hoa Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0002-9781-6975 Khuong Ba Cao Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0001-9184-9330 Manh Duc Than Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0001-8336-2346 Hoai Thu Nguyen Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0003-1455-2888 Huyen Thi Le Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0001-9827-0137 Pamela Wright Dhttps://orcid.org/0000-0002-2001-0877

REFERENCES

- Kaye AD, Okeagu CN, Pham AD, Silva RA, Hurley JJ, Arron BL, et al. Economic impact of COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare facilities and systems: International perspectives. Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol. 2021;35(3):293-306. Epub 2020/11/17. doi: 10.1016/j.bpa.2020.11.009. PubMed PMID: 34511220.
- CDC. Estimated disease burden of COVID-19 2021 [May 25, 2021]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/casesupdates/burden.html.
- Gebru AA, Birhanu T, Wendimu E, Ayalew AF, Mulat S, Abasimel HZ, et al. Global burden of COVID-19: Situational analyis and review. Hum Antibodies. 2021;29(2):139-48. Epub 2020/08/18. doi: 10.3233/hab-200420. PubMed PMID: 32804122.
- Le T-AT, Vodden K, Wu J, Atiwesh G. Policy Responses to the COVID-19 Pandemic in Vietnam. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(2):559. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18020559. PubMed PMID: 33440841.
- CDC. Benefits Of Getting a COVID-19 Vaccine 2021 [May 25, 2021]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019ncov/vaccines/vaccine-benefits.html.
- Bartsch SM, O'Shea KJ, Ferguson MC, Bottazzi ME, Wedlock PT, Strych U, et al. Vaccine Efficacy Needed for a COVID-19 Coronavirus Vaccine to Prevent or Stop an Epidemic as the Sole Intervention. Am J Prev Med. 2020;59(4):493-503. Epub 2020/08/12. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2020.06.011. PubMed PMID: 32778354; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7361120.
- Leshem E, Lopman BA. Population immunity and vaccine protection against infection. The Lancet. 2021;397(10286):1685-7. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00870-9.
- Xing K, Tu XY, Liu M, Liang ZW, Chen JN, Li JJ, et al. Efficacy and safety of COVID-19 vaccines: a systematic review. Zhongguo Dang Dai Er Ke Za Zhi. 2021;23(3):221-8. Epub 2021/03/12. doi: 10.7499/j.issn.1008-8830.2101133. PubMed PMID: 33691913; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7969187.
- Menni C, Klaser K, May A, Polidori L, Capdevila J, Louca P, et al. Vaccine side-effects and SARS-CoV-2 infection after vaccination in users of the COVID Symptom Study app in the UK: a prospective observational study. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2021;21(7):939-49. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00224-3.
- Lazarus JV, Ratzan SC, Palayew A, Gostin LO, Larson HJ, Rabin K, et al. A global survey of potential acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine. Nature Medicine. 2021;27(2):225-8. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-1124-9.
- Tran VD, Pak TV, Gribkova EI, Galkina GA, Loskutova EE, Dorofeeva VV, et al. Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in a high infection-rate country: a cross-sectional study in Russia. Pharm Pract (Granada). 2021;19(1):2276. Epub 2021/04/09. doi: 10.18549/PharmPract.2021.1.2276. PubMed PMID: 33828622; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8005327.
- Kaplan RM, Milstein A. Influence of a COVID-19 vaccine's effectiveness and safety profile on vaccination acceptance. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2021;118(10). Epub 2021/02/24. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2021726118. PubMed PMID: 33619178; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7958192.
- Liu R, Zhang Y, Nicholas S, Leng A, Maitland E, Wang J. COVID-19 Vaccination Willingness among Chinese Adults under the Free Vaccination Policy. Vaccines (Basel). 2021;9(3). Epub 2021/04/04. doi: 10.3390/vaccines9030292. PubMed PMID: 33801136; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8004171.
- Alobaidi S. Predictors of Intent to Receive the COVID-19 Vaccination Among the Population in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: A Survey Study. Journal of multidisciplinary healthcare. 2021;14:1119-28. doi: 10.2147/JMDH.S306654. PubMed PMID: 34040382.
- Ministry of Health. Decision Approving Conditional Application for Urgent Request in COVID-19 Epidemic Prevention and Control, (2021). Available from: https://luatvietnam.vn/y-te/quyet-dinh-983-qd-byt-pheduyet-co-dieu-kien-vac-xin-covid-19-198440-d1.html
- Vo NX, Huyen Nguyen TT, Van Nguyen P, Tran QV, Vo TQ. Using Contingent Valuation Method to Estimate Adults' Willingness to Pay for a Future Coronavirus 2019 Vaccination. Value Health Reg Issues. 2021;24:240-6. Epub 2021/04/26. doi: 10.1016/j.vhri.2021.01.002. PubMed PMID: 33895642; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8062218.

- 17. Terry M. UPDATED Comparing COVID-19 Vaccines: Timelines, Types and Prices | BioSpace 2021 [June 6, 2021]. Available from: https://www.biospace.com/article/comparing-covid-19-vaccines-pfizerbiontech-moderna-astrazeneca-oxford-j-and-j-russia-s-sputnik-v/.
- Nguyen TP, Wright EP, Nguyen TT, Schuiling-Veninga CC, Bijlsma MJ, Nguyen TB, et al. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Screening for and Managing Identified Hypertension for Cardiovascular Disease Prevention in Vietnam. PLoS One. 2016;11(5):e0155699. Epub 2016/05/19. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0155699. PubMed PMID: 27192051; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4871542 contribution and content of this manuscript to report.
- Qin W, Wang E, Ni Z. Chinese consumers' willingness to get a COVID-19 vaccine and willingness to pay for it. PLOS ONE. 2021;16(5):e0250112. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0250112.
- 20. CDC. COVID-19 Vaccines and Vaccination May 27, 2021 [June 6, 2021]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019ncov/science/science-briefs/fully-vaccinated-people.html#ref13.
- 21. Craven J. COVID-19 vaccine tracker | RAPS June 3, 2021 [June 6, 2021]. Available from: https://www.raps.org/news-and-articles/newsarticles/2020/3/covid-19-vaccine-tracker.
- 22. Olive JK, Hotez PJ, Damania A, Nolan MS. The state of the antivaccine movement in the United States: A focused examination of nonmedical exemptions in states and counties. PLOS Medicine. 2018;15(6):e1002578. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002578.
- The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health. Vaccine hesitancy: a generation at risk. The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health. 2019;3(5):281. doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(19)30092-6.
- 24. Hotez PJ, Cooney RE, Benjamin RM, Brewer NT, Buttenheim AM, Callaghan T, et al. Announcing the Lancet Commission on Vaccine Refusal, Acceptance, and Demand in the USA. The Lancet. 2021;397(10280):1165-7. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00372-X.
- Reiter PL, Pennell ML, Katz ML. Acceptability of a COVID-19 vaccine among adults in the United States: How many people would get vaccinated? Vaccine. 2020;38(42):6500-7. Epub 2020/08/31. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.08.043. PubMed PMID: 32863069; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7440153.
- Catma S, Varol S. Willingness to Pay for a Hypothetical COVID-19 Vaccine in the United States: A Contingent Valuation Approach. Vaccines. 2021;9(4):318. PubMed PMID: doi:10.3390/vaccines9040318.
- Zhang KC, Fang Y, Cao H, Chen H, Hu T, Chen Y, et al. Behavioral Intention to Receive a COVID-19 Vaccination Among Chinese Factory Workers: Cross-sectional Online Survey. J Med Internet Res. 2021;23(3):e24673. Epub 2021/03/02. doi: 10.2196/24673. PubMed PMID: 33646966; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7945977.
- Ministry of Health. National Expanded Program on Immunization 2019 (in Vietnamese). 2020.
- Nguyen LH, Tran BX, Do CD, Hoang CL, Nguyen TP, Dang TT, et al. Feasibility and willingness to pay for dengue vaccine in the threat of dengue fever outbreaks in Vietnam. Patient Prefer Adherence. 2018;12:1917-26. Epub 2018/10/06. doi: 10.2147/ppa.S178444. PubMed PMID: 30288032; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6163003.
- Berghea F, Berghea C, Abobului M, Vlad V. Willingness to Pay for a for a Potential Vaccine Against SARS-CoV-2 / COVID-19 Among Adult Persons2020.
- 31. Goruntla N, Chintamani S, Bhanu P, Samyuktha S, Veerabhadrappa K, Bhupalam P, et al. Predictors of acceptance and willingness to pay for the COVID-19 vaccine in the general public of India: A health belief model approach. Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Medicine. 2021;14(4):165-75. doi: 10.4103/1995-7645.312512.
- 32. Kelly B, Southwell B, McCormack L, Bann C, MacDonald P, Frasier A, et al. Predictors of willingness to get a COVID-19 vaccine in the U.S. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2021;21. doi: 10.1186/s12879-021-06023-9.
- 33. Chew NWS, Cheong C, Kong G, Phua K, Ngiam JN, Tan BYQ, et al. An Asia-Pacific study on healthcare workers' perceptions of, and willingness to receive, the COVID-19 vaccination. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2021;106:52-60. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2021.03.069.
- 34. Harapan H, Wagner AL, Yufika A, Winardi W, Anwar S, Gan AK, et al. Willingness-to-pay for a COVID-19 vaccine and its associated determinants in Indonesia. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2020;16(12):3074-80. Epub 2020/09/30. doi: 10.1080/21645515.2020.1819741. PubMed PMID: 32991230; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8641577.
- 35. Wong LP, Alias H, Wong PF, Lee HY, AbuBakar S. The use of the health belief model to assess predictors of intent to receive the COVID-19 vaccine and willingness to pay. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2020;16(9):2204-14. Epub 2020/07/31. doi:

10.1080/21645515.2020.1790279. PubMed PMID: 32730103; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7553708.

 Cerda AA, García LY. Willingness to Pay for a COVID-19 Vaccine. Applied Health Economics and Health Policy. 2021;19(3):343-51. doi: 10.1007/s40258-021-00644-6.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

A	nnendix '	1. Multivaria	te logistic	regression	demonstrating	factors	associated wi	th willingnes	s to pay	for a	Astra Zeneca
	pponom.	L. ITAILITAILIA	te logiotie	regression	actionation	, incloid	abboolated mi	the willing ne.	b to pu	101 1	. Ibula Delleea

	Willing to pay for		_
Variables	Astra Zeneca	aOR* (95%Cl)	p-value
Age (year)	vaccine		
From 18 to 29	798 (66.8)	Ref	
From 30 to 39	388 (72)	0.97 (0.67 - 1.39)	0.856
From 40 to 49	209 (74.9)	1.15 (0.73 - 1.82)	0.536
50 and above	61 (76.2)	1.24 (0.66 - 2.34)	0.498
Sex			
Male	448 (73.7)	Ref	
Female	1008 (67.9)	0.8 (0.64 - 1.002)	0.052
Occupation			
Health staff	320 (81.2)	Ref	
Worker	66 (65.3)	0.45 (0.27 - 0.75)	0.002
Other governmental staff	325 (70.2)	0.49 (0.35 - 0.69)	0.000
Student	541 (66.5)	0.61 (0.42 - 0.89)	0.012
Own business	50 (68.5)	0.65 (0.36 - 1.17)	0.149
Others	154 (62.1)	0.45 (0.31 - 0.67)	0.000
Education			
High school or lower	275 (64.0)	Ref	
Above	1181 (71.0)	1.14 (0.89 - 1.47)	0.295
Marital status			
Single	730 (66.0)	Ref	
Married	682 (73.8)	1.16 (0.79 - 1.68)	0.447
Divorced/ Widowed	44 (69.8)	1.11 (0.58 - 2.11)	0.757
Family size			
One	45 (61.6)	Ref	
Two	55 (60.4)	0.95 (0.49 - 1.83)	0.879
From three people	1356 (70.3)	1.43 (0.86 - 2.38)	0.173
Family economic status			
Poor/near poor	55 (54.5)	Ref	
Others (average, high income)	1401 (70.3)	1.59 (1.05 - 2.44)	0.030
Alleray			
And gy Ves	386 (65 1)	Ref	
No	907 (72 5)	13(105 - 162)	0.016
Do not know/remember	163 (65 5)	1.08(0.78 - 1.48)	0.655
Occupational changes due to COVID-19	105 (05.5)	1.00 (0.70 1.40)	0.055
Ves	326 (59 5)	Ref	
No	1130(73.1)	1 64 (1 28 - 2 09)	0.000
Income reduction due to COVID-19	1100 (10.1)	1.01 (1.20 2.07)	0.000
Yes	507 (65 2)	Ref	
No	949 (72 2)	1.07(0.85 - 1.35)	0 554
) (<i>12</i> .2)	1.07 (0.05 1.55)	0.551

	1.	•	N / T		· . 1	1		•	1		c ,	• / 1	• . 1	.11.			C	a	1 17
AI	mendr	x Z	IVI111	fivar	nate I	logist	IC TE	egression	dem	onstrating	tactors	associated	w/ifh	w/1111n	oness t	o nav	<i>i</i> for	Sputni	κv
	penui	/ .	1 I UI	uvu	iute i	iogist.	0 10	Sicosion	acin	onstructing	Incloib	associated	** 1111	*********	Succes (o pu	101	Spann	17 4

Variables	Willing to pay for Sputnik V vaccine	aOR* (95%CI)	p-value	
Occupation	-			
- Health staff	307 (77.9)	Ref		
Worker	68 (67.3)	0.63 (0.39 - 1.03)	0.063	
Other governmental staff	325 (70.2)	0.64 (0.47 - 0.88)	0.005	
Student	564 (69.3)	0.69 (0.52 - 0.92)	0.011	
Own business	50 (68.5)	0.74 (0.43 - 1.29)	0.294	
Others	151 (60.9)	0.48 (0.34 - 0.68)	0.000	
Family economic status				
Poor/near poor	56 (55.4)	Ref		
Other (average, high income)	1409 (70.7)	1.67 (1.1 - 2.54)	0.016	
Occupational changes due to COVID-19				
Yes	339 (61.9)	Ref		
No	1126 (72.9)	1.44 (1.13 - 1.83)	0.003	
Income reduction due to COVID-19				
Yes	508 (65.3)	Ref		
No	957 (72.8)	1.16 (0.93 - 1.46)	0.189	
* a O.D. A division of O.d.d. Datio				

Appendix 3. Multivariate logistic regression demonstrating factors associated with willingness to pay for Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine

	Willing to pay for		
Variables	Pfizer-BioNTech	aOR* (95%CI)	p-value
	vaccine	. ,	-
Age (vear)			
		D (
From 18 to 29	//0 (64.4)	Ref	0.077
From 30 to 39	393 (72.9)	1.18 (0.82 - 1.69)	0.377
From 40 to 49	200 (71.7)	1.19 (0.77 - 1.84)	0.441
50 and above	56 (70.0)	1.23 (0.66 - 2.28)	0.514
Occupation	20((77.7)	D.C	
Health Staff	306 (77.7)	Kei	0.049
worker	65 (64.4) 221 (71.5)	0.61 (0.37 - 0.99)	0.048
Other governmental staff	331 (71.5)	0.72 (0.52 - 0.99)	0.048
Student	508 (62.4)	0.57 (0.39 - 0.82)	0.003
Own business	54 (74.0)	1.04 (0.57 - 1.89)	0.894
Others	155 (62.5)	0.56 (0.39 - 0.82)	0.003
Education			
High school or lower	265 (61.6)	Ref	
Above	1154 (69.4)	1.12 (0.87 - 1.43)	0.370
Marital status			
Single	714 (64.6)	Ref	
Married	661 (71.5)	0.85 (0.59 - 1.22)	0.370
Divorced/ Widowed	44 (69.8)	0.85 (0.45 - 1.62)	0.629
Family economic status			
Poor/near poor	53 (52.5)	Ref	
Other (average, high income)	1366 (68.6)	1.52 (1.0 - 2.31)	0.049
Chronic diseases			
Yes	74 (59.7)	Ref	
No	1345 (68.3)	1.65 (1.11 - 2.47)	0.014
Allergy			
Yes	378 (63.7)	Ref	
No	887 (70.9)	1.31 (1.06- 1.62)	0.014
Do not know/remember	154 (61.8)	0.99 (0.72 - 1.35)	0.934
Occupational changes due to COVID-19			
Yes	319 (58.2)	Ref	
No	1100 (71.2)	1.55 (1.22 - 1.98)	0.000
Income reduction due to COVID-19			
Yes	491 (63.1)	Ref	
No	928 (70.6)	1.11 (0.89 - 1.39)	0.358
Feeling of being at risk of COVID-19 infection in the			
near future			
Yes	386 (73.2)	Ref	
No	285 (64.3)	0.69 (0.51 – 0.91)	0.01
Do not know	748 (66.6)	0.78 (0.62 - 0.99)	0.045

Appendix 4. Multivariate logistic regression demonstrating factors associated with willingness to pay for Astra Zeneca (included all independent variables)

Variables	Willing to pay for Astra	aOR* (95%CI)	p-value	
v ar indicis	Zeneca vaccine			
Residence				
Urban area	857 (69.3)			
Rural area	599 (69.9)	1.033 (0.839 - 1.272)	0.761	
Age (year)				
From 18 to 29	798 (66.8)	Ref	0.7.7	
From 30 to 39	388 (72.0)	0.946 (0.653 - 1.369)	0.767	
From 40 to 49	209 (74.9)	1.144 (0.724 - 1.807)	0.566	
50 and above	61 (76.2)	1.236 (0.641 - 2.383)	0.526	
Ethnicity				
Kinh	1147 (68.9)	Ref		
Other	309 (72.2)	1.170 (0.910 - 1.504)	0.221	
Sex				
Male	448 (73.7)	Ref		
Female	1008 (67.9)	0.800 (0.638 - 1.003)	0.053	
Occupation				
Health staff	320 (81.2)	Ref		
Worker	66 (65.3)	0.475 (0.281 - 0.802)	0.005	
Other governmental staff	325 (70.2)	0.505 (0.359 - 0.712)	0.000	
Student	541 (66.5)	0.615 (0.419 - 0.902)	0.013	
Own business	50 (68.5)	0.652 (0.362 - 1.172)	0.153	
Others	154 (62.1)	0.472 (0.320 - 0.697)	0.000	
Education				
High school or lower	275 (64.0)	Ref		
Above	1181 (71.0)	1.144 (0.887 - 1.475)	0.300	
Marital status				
Single	730 (66.0)	Ref		
Married	682 (73.8)	1.152 (0.792 - 1.676)	0.460	
Divorced/ Widowed	44 (69.8)	1.091 (0.570 - 2.088)	0.793	
		``````````````````````````````````````		
Family size				
One	45 (61.6)	Ref		
Two	55 (60.4)	0.937 (0.485 - 1.810)	0.846	
From three people	1356 (70.3)	1.426 (0.850 - 2.394)	0.179	
Family economic status		``````````````````````````````````````		
Poor/near poor	55 (54.5)	Ref		
Others (average, high income)	1401 (70.3)	1.636 (1.062 - 2.518)	0.025	
Chronic disease	× ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
No	1371 (69.6)			
Yes	85 (68.5)	0.816 (0.535 - 1.244)	0.344	
Allergy				
Yes	386 (65.1)	Ref		
No	907 (72.5)	1.309 (1.052 - 1.629)	0.016	
Do not know/remember	163 (65 5)	1 090 (0 790 - 1 505)	0 599	
Occupational changes due to COVID-19	100 (00.0)	1.676 (0.776 1.565)	0.077	
Ves	326 (59 5)	Ref		
No	1130(73.1)	1 626 (1 273 - 2 077)	0.000	
Income reduction due to COVID-19	1156 (75.1)	1.020 (1.273 2.077)	0.000	
	507 (65 2)	Ref		
No	949 (72 2)	1.073(0.852 - 1.351)	0 552	
F Current contact level*	) (12.2)	1.075 (0.052 - 1.551)	0.552	
	47 (60 3)	Dof		
$\Gamma 1, \Gamma 2$ E2 E4	47 (00.3) 160 (67 2)	1 035 (0 597 1 927)	0.005	
гэ, г4 М	100(07.2) 1240(70.2)	1.035(0.307 - 1.027) 1.245(0.752 - 2.050)	0.202	
INORe Drovious three ways contact (E1 to E4)*	1249 (70.3)	1.243 (0.733 - 2.039)	0.393	
r revious three waves contact (F1 to F4)*	125 (67 0)	Daf		
res	155 (07.8)	Kel		

Variables	Willing to pay for Astra Zeneca vaccine	aOR* (95%CI)	p-value
No	1321 (69.7)	1.057 (0.761 - 1.467)	0.743
Feeling of being at risk of COVID-19 infection in the near future			
Yes	385 (73.1)	Ref	
No	302 (68.2)	0.827 (0.616 - 1.112)	0.209
Do not know	769 (68.5)	0.867 (0.680 - 1.105)	0.249
*aOR: Adjusted Odd Ratio			

Appendix 5. Multivariate logistic regression demonstrating factors associated with willingness to pay for Sputnik V (included all independent variables)

Variables	Willing to pay for Sputnik V	oOP* (05%CI)	p-value
v al lables	vaccine	aUK ⁺ (95/0CI)	
Residence			
Urban area	857 (69.3)		
Rural area	608 (70.9)	1.066 (0.867 - 1.312)	0.544
Age (year)			
From 18 to 29	821 (68.7)		
From 30 to 39	388 (72.0)	0.922 (0.638 - 1.332)	0.666
From 40 to 49	197 (70.6)	0.893 (0.570 - 1.397)	0.619
50 and above	59 (73.8)	1.116 (0.588 - 2.118)	0.736
Ethnicity			
Kinh	1157 (69.5)		
Other	308 (72.0)	1.103 (0.861 - 1.414)	0.437
Sex			
Male	440 (72.4)		
Female	1025 (69.0)	0.867 (0.694 - 1.083)	0.208
Occupation			
Health staff	307 (77.9)		
Worker	68 (67.3)	0.646 (0.385 - 1.086)	0.099
Other governmental staff	325 (70.2)	0.668 (0.481 - 0.929)	0.016
Student	564 (69.3)	0.846 (0.583 - 1.229)	0.381
Own business	50 (68.5)	0.812 (0.456 - 1.448)	0.481
Others	151 (60.9)	0.550 (0.377 - 0.801)	0.002
Education		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
High school or lower	289 (67.2)		
Above	1176 (70.7)	1.029 (0.796 - 1.332)	0.825
Marital status		,	
Single	751 (67.9)		
Married	669 (72.4)	1.272 (0.875 - 1.848)	0.208
Divorced/ Widowed	45 (71.4)	1.318 (0.686 - 2.533)	0.408
Family size			
One	49 (67.1)		
Two	60 (65.9)	0.922 (0.470 - 1.808)	0.812
From three people	1356 (70.3)	1.089(0.642 - 1.848)	0.751
Family economic status		1.000 (0.0.12 1.0.10)	01101
Poor/near poor	56 (55 4)		
Others (average, high income)	1409 (70.7)	1.689 (1.099 - 2.596)	0.017
Chronic disease		1.003 (1.033) 2.030)	01017
No.	1384 (70.3)		
Yes	81 (65 3)	0 716 (0 476 - 1 079)	0.110
Allergy	01 (00.5)	0.710 (0.170 1.077)	0.110
Vec	405 (68 3)		
No.	898 (71 8)	1 117 (0 897 - 1 392)	0 323
Do not know/remember	162 (65 1)	0.910(0.659 - 1.256)	0.525
Occupational changes due to COVID-10	102 (03.1)	0.710 (0.037 - 1.230)	0.505
Voc	330 (61.0)		
	1126 (72.0)	1/16(1100 1808)	0.005
Income reduction due to COVID-19	1120 (12.7)	1. 110 (1.107 - 1.000)	0.005

Variables	Willing to pay for Sputnik V vaccine	aOR* (95%CI)	p-value
Yes	508 (65.3)		
No	957 (72.8)	1.189 (0.946 - 1.494)	0.137
F Current contact level*			
F1, F2	49 (62.8)		
F3, F4	168 (70.6)	1.144 (0.646 - 2.027)	0.644
None	1248 (70.2)	1.143 (0.690 - 1.893)	0.604
Previous three waves contact (F1 to F4)*			
Yes	139 (69.8)		
No	1326 (70.0)	1.016 (0.730 - 1.414)	0.927
Feeling of being at risk of COVID-19 infection in		· · · · ·	
the near future			
Yes	385 (73.1)		
No	304 (68.6)	0.809 (0.603 - 1.085)	0.156
Do not know	776 (69.1)	0.873 (0.686 - 1.112)	0.272

*aOR: Adjusted Odd Ratio

Appendix 6. Multivariate logistic regression demonstrating factors associated with willingness to pay for Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine (included all independent variables)

Variab	les	Willing to pay for Pfizer- BioNTech vaccine	aOR* (95%CI)	p-value
Residence				
	Urban area	857 (69.3)		
	Rural area	608 (70.9)	0.995 (0.812 - 1.220)	0.962
Age (year)				
	From 18 to 29	821 (68.7)		
	From 30 to 39	388 (72.0)	1.176 (0.816 - 1.695)	0.384
	From 40 to 49	197 (70.6)	1.169 (0.749 - 1.824)	0.492
	50 and above	59 (73.8)	1.241 (0.664 - 2.317)	0.498
Ethnicity				
	Kinh	1157 (69.5)		
	Other	308 (72.0)	0.867 (0.683 - 1.101)	0.242
Sex			· · · · ·	
	Male	440 (72.4)		
	Female	1025 (69.0)	0.964 (0.775 - 1.199)	0.743
Occupation				
•	Health staff	307 (77.9)		
	Worker	68 (67.3)	0.578 (0.347 - 0.964)	0.036
	Other governmental staff	325 (70.2)	0.709 (0.509 - 0.988)	0.042
	Student	564 (69.3)	0.561 (0.386 - 0.816)	0.002
	Own business	50 (68.5)	1.057 (0.576 - 1.939)	0.857
	Others	151 (60.9)	0.547 (0.374 - 0.800)	0.002
Education				
	High school or lower	289 (67.2)		
	Above	1176 (70.7)	1.121 (0.872 - 1.440)	0.373
Marital status				
	Single	751 (67.9)		
	Married	669 (72.4)	0.824 (0.568 - 1.196)	0.309
	Divorced/ Widowed	45 (71.4)	0.899 (0.471 - 1.716)	0.747
Family size				
·	One	49 (67.1)		
	Two	60 (65.9)	0.700 (0.359 - 1.365)	0.295
	From three people	1356 (70.3)	1.116 (0.658 - 1.894)	0.684
Family economic status	1 1	× ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	Poor/near poor	56 (55.4)		
	Others (average. high		1 451 (0 044 - 0 000)	0.000
	income)	1409 (70.7)	1.451 (0.944 - 2.232)	0.090
Chronic disease	/			
	No	1384 (70.3)		

Variables	Willing to pay for Pfizer- BioNTech vaccine	aOR* (95%CI)	p-value
Yes	81 (65.3)	0.602 (0.403 - 0.901)	0.014
Allergy			
Yes	405 (68.3)		
No	898 (71.8)	1.295 (1.043 - 1.607)	0.019
Do not know/remember	162 (65.1)	0.967 (0.705 - 1.328)	0.838
Occupational changes due to COVID-19			
Yes	339 (61.9)		
No	1126 (72.9)	1.570 (1.232 - 2.001)	0.000
ncome reduction due to COVID-19			
Yes	508 (65.3)		
No	957 (72.8)	1.110 (0.885 - 1.392)	0.367
F Current contact level*	× ,		
F1. F2	49 (62.8)		
F3. F4	168 (70.6)	1.038 (0.582 - 1.852)	0.900
None	1248 (70.2)	0.926 (0.555 - 1.544)	0.767
Previous three waves contact (F1 to F4)*		````	
Yes	139 (69.8)		
No	1326 (70.0)	0.961 (0.691 - 1.337)	0.813
Feeling of being at risk of COVID-19 infection in the near future			
Yes	385 (73.1)		
No	304 (68.6)	0.684 (0.512 - 0.915)	0.010
Do not know	776 (69.1)	0.782 (0.614 - 0.995)	0.046
		(	