

Rapid summary

Question:

How might expectations be managed among groups not prioritised for early vaccination?

The Vaccine Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation recommendations published in June 2020 identify the following priority groups for COVID-19 vaccination [available here]:

- 1. frontline health and social care workers;
- 2. those at increased risk of serious disease and death from COVID-19 infection stratified according to age and risk factors.

The Committee is currently reviewing evidence relevant to the UK to determine greater granularity within the second priority grouping.

Despite extensive searching of databases and grey literature no UK sources or recent sources were identified. One qualitative focus group study was identified which was conducted in Canada.¹

The following key points were identified from the source:

Clearly communicate the reasons why different groups have been prioritised for vaccination to help increase public support.

Ensure vaccination priorities are strictly observed to avoid bad sentiment amongst non-priority groups.

Method

A search of databases and grey literature and screening (details available on request) identified one source relevant to the question. Screening was undertaken independently by two reviewers. Data extraction was undertaken by one reviewer and checked by a second. No critical appraisal of the included source was undertaken. Only sources from OECD countries were included.

Table 1 below includes details and a summary of the content of the source used.

Limitations

This summary may provide some information on the topic, however the included source has not been assessed for quality.



Gwasanaeth Tystiolaeth Evidence Service

© 2020 Public Health Wales NHS Trust.

Material contained in this document may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Government Licence (OGL)

www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/

provided it is done so accurately and is not used in a misleading context.

Acknowledgement to Public Health Wales NHS Trust to be stated.

Copyright in the typographical arrangement, design and layout belongs to Public Health Wales NHS Trust.



Table 1. Data extraction:

The table below gives the reference of the paper, access to the paper where freely available, key relevant findings, any considerations that arise and any caveats to bear in mind about the quality or limitations of the included articles.

Reference	Relevant findings	Limitations / considerations
1. Masse R, Desy M. Lay people's interpretation of ethical values related to mass vaccination; the case of A(H1N1) vaccination campaign in the province of Quebec (French Canada). <i>Health Expectations</i> . 2014; 17(6): 876-887. DOI: 10.1111/hex.12005. Available here.	Study of 100 participants split into 10 groups aimed at analysing the receptiveness of the French-speaking Quebec population to certain ethnical principles promoted by public health authorities during the H1N1 influenza vaccination campaign. Participants were asked five questions, including one specifically related to prioritisation: "Some subgroups in the Canadian population were prioritized for vaccination owing to their high level of vulnerability. Did you view this as a form of injustice towards those who did not have access to the vaccine?"	Limited information on methods and no discussion of potential study limitations. Note: originally published 2012 as e-pub ahead of print.
Qualitative focus group study. Canada	Some participants reported feeling slighted by the prioritisation of groups. They felt it breached the principles of equality and universal access in the name of the greater "risk" faced by these groups. The authors note that the epidemiological data informing prioritisation was not clearly communicated to the general public. This led to concerns about unjustified priority access (for prisoners and some famous people) and the perception of unfair treatment and failures in vaccination processes.	