

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
Centre for Guidelines

Surveillance programme

Surveillance review consultation document

No update proposal for PH21: Immunisations: reducing differences in uptake in under 19s

Background information

Guideline issue date: September 2009

This guideline covers ways to increase immunisation uptake among children and young people aged under 19 years in groups and settings where immunisation coverage is low. It aims to increase timely immunisation and improve access to services. It also aims to ensure babies born to mothers infected with hepatitis B are immunised.

Surveillance proposal for consultation

- We will not update the guideline at this time.
- We will refresh the guideline in line with the previous surveillance recommendations from 2013.

Reason for proposal

Two literature searches were completed using the original search strategies from the previous evidence review. This search did not yield any studies that were considered to impact on the guideline recommendations.

We considered the views of topic experts, including those who were involved in the development of the guideline and other correspondence we had received since the publication of the guideline. It was noted that the guideline should take account of new public sector structures for commissioning and delivery of immunisation services. The guideline will be amended to reflect these changes.

We checked for ongoing and newly published research from NIHR and Cochrane and new policy developments. No new evidence was identified which would invalidate the guideline recommendations.

At the last surveillance review in 2013 it was decided not to update the guidance but to amend it by:

- taking into account the new public sector structures for commissioning and delivery of immunisation services
- including a hyperlink to the online version of “Immunisation against Infectious Disease” – ‘Green Book’
- including a statement noting that Recommendation 6 is consistent with Caldicott principles

These changes were not implemented previously but will be address through this surveillance process.

It has also been noted that [Recommendation 6 ‘hepatitis B immunisation for infants’](#) should link through to Recommendation 9 ‘Effective delivery and auditing of neonatal hepatitis B vaccination’ in PH43 [Hepatitis B and C testing: people at risk of infection](#) and to the [Quality Standard 65 Hepatitis B](#)

Overall decision

After considering the guideline content, the views of internal teams within NICE and external experts, the Surveillance team recommend that Immunisations: reducing differences in uptake in under 19s (PH21) does not require an update at this time.

The guideline is now 8 years old and therefore the terminology and the healthcare and system structures referred to in the guideline require refreshing, as will alignment to relevant NICE guidelines, the ‘Green book’ and Caldicott principles.

For details of the process and update decisions that are available, see [ensuring that published guidelines are current and accurate](#) in ‘Developing NICE guidelines: the manual’

Appendix 1

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
PH21 – 01. Recommendation 1 - immunisation programmes		
<p>New evidence was identified that does not have an impact on the recommendation.</p> <p>An online survey¹ considered whether discussing the benefits of MMR vaccination either to the recipient or to society impacts parents' vaccine intentions. The study looked at 802 parents of infants under 12 months old who were randomly assigned to receive MMR vaccine messages. There were four types of messages. 1) A Vaccine Information Statement (VIS) 2) VIS plus information on benefits to child 3) VIS and information on benefits to society 4) VIS and information on benefits to both child and society. It was found that showing benefits to society did not increase intention to uptake, unless it also mentioned benefits to the child. Messages that gave the benefits to the child gave a mean intention of 91.6 p=0.01 and to child and society was 90.8 p=0.03 compared to the VIS only group (mean intention = 86.3).</p> <p>In an RCT where 660 children² were randomly assigned to either "educational" text messages involving information about the need for a second dose, "conventional" text messages involving second due date and clinic opening hours, and "written reminder-only" arms, those who received educational messages were more likely to receive a second dose (72.7%) compared to</p>	<p>On publication of Flu vaccination: increasing uptake the guideline should be reconsidered to see if any amendments need to be made.</p> <p>No other evidence identified.</p>	<p>None. Recommendation 1 looks at immunisation programmes and interventions that can help to increase timely immunisations among groups with low uptake. One of these interventions involves sending tailored reminder and recall invitations and to follow them up by telephone or text message. The evidence found supports these recommendations.</p>

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
<p>conventional (66.7%) and written reminder only (57.1% P=0.003).</p> <p>Focused groups³ with 41 members of the general population noted that factual, evidence based messages were well received. Health enhancing messages were not well received, the same with messages that aimed to encourage feelings of regret for not getting vaccinated. Risk-reduction messages were seen as credible.</p> <p>In a cluster randomised controlled trial⁴ 22,486 girls were assigned to receive a 3 part clinician focused intervention (family focused, clinician focused and combined compared to none). The details of the intervention are unclear. The combined intervention increased and accelerated vaccination rates. The clinician focused intervention improved HPV initiation and the family focused intervention improved completion. Unfortunately no statistics were provided and no further details were given.</p> <p>One systematic review⁵ of 22 studies of HPV vaccination educational interventions showed that there was no strong evidence to recommend specific educational interventions.</p> <p>A web questionnaire⁶ filled out by 133 local health authorities in Italy noted that 70% coverage was more likely to be reached if invitation letters for HPV vaccinations gave a pre-assigned date (95% CI 1.2-39.8). Factors that</p>		

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
<p>were seen as barriers to vaccination were poor participation at training, population mistrust of the vaccination and insufficient resources.</p> <p>In a randomised intervention study⁷ of 77 parents, the participants either received tailored or untailored educational web pages. Information tailored to address specific concerns gave 58% positive vaccine intentions and the untailored gave 46%. These results were not statistically significant though.</p> <p>A randomised controlled trial⁸ of 811 infants who received reminder postcards to encourage vaccination, and if these failed they were followed by telephone reminders plus postcards and a telephone recall messages, and if these continued to fail to encourage vaccination they received intensive case management and home visitation, showed that infants who received these interventions had significantly fewer days without immunisation coverage compared to those who received care as usual (109 vs 192 days P=0.01).</p> <p>A randomised controlled trial⁹ of 2054 parents of children received either a scheduling appointment plus text message reminders, appointment reminders only or usual care. Those in the scheduling plus appointment text message arm were more likely to arrange a visit for MMR than the other arms (RRR 1.07 95% CI 1.005-1.13). They were also more likely to have</p>		

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
<p>a timely MMR vaccination (RRR 1.11 95% CI 1.01-1.21).</p> <p>A systematic review¹⁰ to look at barriers to uptake of HPV vaccine in the US found 55 relevant articles. Health care professionals noted financial concerns and parental attitudes as barriers. Parents noted they would like more information prior to vaccination. There were concerns around the side effects following vaccination, it was noted that there was a low perceived risk of HPV infection, social influences and irregular preventive care were noted as barriers. Sons were not vaccinated due to a perceived lack of direct benefit.</p> <p>A cluster randomised trial¹¹ of 195 practices in Colorado looked at population based recall compared to practice based recall. In population recall 18.7% of infants became up to date in vaccinations compared to 12.8% in practice based. It was noted that population based recall was more effective and cost effective.</p> <p>A randomised pragmatic trial¹² of primary care practices involving 18,235 children in Colorado looked at the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of collaborative centralised vs practice based reminder/recall approaches. Infants who received at least 1 vaccination were 26.9% for collaborative centralised vs 21.7% for practice based approaches (P=0.001). In the collaborative centralised approach 12.8% of</p>		

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
<p>patients achieved up to date status compared to 9.3% in the practice based approach (P=0.001).</p> <p>In another cluster randomised trial¹³ in Colorado counties centralised reminder/recall approaches were more effective and cost effective than practice-based reminder/recall approaches when it came to increased up to date rates in young children. Centralised reminder recall approaches were more effective if the child's name was included.</p> <p>A randomised controlled trial¹⁴ evaluated the impact of a web based personally controlled health management system to acknowledge the impact on uptake of seasonal influenza vaccine. 742 students either received no care or were introduced to the system. Users of the system were 6.7% (95% CI 1.46-12.30) more likely to receive the vaccination than the control group. It was noted that the more a patient used the system the higher the rate of vaccination became (P=0.001).</p> <p>A cluster randomised trial¹⁵ of 20 primary care practices were either randomly assigned to using a practice improvement toolkit, early delivery of vaccines, in-service staff meetings and publicity compared to standard care. Overall there was a 9.9% increase in vaccination uptake in the intervention group compared to 4.2% in the control.</p>		

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
<p>Parallel randomised controlled trials¹⁶ looked at 178 phone interventions and 191 text interventions compared to 380 controls. Those who received a text reminder increased uptake rates (HR = 2.34 p<0.001) compared to the controls.</p> <p>In a randomised controlled trial¹⁷ 264 students were assigned to receive an electronic intervention reminder and educational message compared to standard care in order to increase HPV vaccine completion and knowledge. There were no significant differences in uptake but there was a difference in the mean knowledge score in the intervention group compared to the control group (P=0.1).</p> <p>A randomised controlled trial¹⁸ assigned 445 parents to either a rhetorical question, a one sided message with information about safety and efficacy of HPV vaccinations or a two sided message acknowledging and alleviating concerns. The rhetorical question intervention increased intention to vaccinate (RR = 1.45 95% CI 1.16-1.81) but did not increase uptake or completion.</p> <p>In one study 195¹⁹ parents of children who needed immunisations received text message reminders and in another study¹⁹ 87 parents received text message and paper mailed reminders compared to no text messages. The children from intervention parents were more</p>		

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
<p>likely to receive their vaccinations in both studies (36.4% vs 18.1% P=0.001 at 24 weeks) and (21.8% vs 9.2% P=0.05) retrospectively.</p> <p>A randomised controlled trial²⁰ of 9213 children's parents received 5 weekly text messages containing educational information and instructions about vaccination availability times. The intervention group were more likely to receive the influenza vaccine (27.1%) compared to the usual care group (22.8%), a difference of 4.3% 95% CI 2.3%-6.3%.</p> <p>A randomised controlled trial²¹ where 4115 participants received a mailed letter, a telephone reminder or nothing at all. Vaccine uptake rates increased for the mailed letter group by 21% (P=0.01 vs control), 17% for the telephone reminder (P=0.05) and 13% for the control group.</p> <p>A randomised controlled trial²² evaluated the impact of electronic health records prompts or staff initiated provider prompts on immunisation rates. There were no significant differences between the groups.</p> <p>A systematic review²³ of 46 studies showed that facilitators of vaccine uptake were: parental reminders; all methods of reminder and recall; educational programmes; and feedback programmes.</p>		

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
<p>A cluster randomised trial²⁴ involving 369 parents of which 55 received the intervention of written and visual information on vaccinations. There was no significant difference between uptake however parents in the intervention group were shown to improve their attitudes about childhood vaccines.</p> <p>A call/recall system²⁵ was used in 32 practices and was viewed positively by parents and staff. After 3 invitations 87.3% of children had responded to the MMR1 vaccination and 92.2% had responded to the pre-school booster.</p> <p>A cross sectional online questionnaire²⁶ across 795 general practices in England showed the following facilitators for influenza vaccinations: having a lead staff member plan the campaign; sending a personal invitation to eligible patients; and having a lead member of staff to identify eligible patients.</p> <p>Out of 259 girls who had not been vaccinated and who completed a survey²⁷, the main barriers for vaccination were lack of perceived need; concerns about safety and lack of parental consent (this was more prevalent from girls with Black backgrounds).</p> <p>In a systematic review²⁸ of qualitative studies 34 papers were included. It was shown that emotions affected decision making in regard to vaccination decisions and it was important for</p>		

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
stakeholders to have trust in the information they received.		
PH21 – 02. Recommendation 2 - information systems		
No evidence identified	No evidence identified	None
PH21 – 03. Recommendation 3 - training		
No evidence identified	No evidence identified	None
PH21 – 04. Recommendation 4 - contribution of nurseries, schools, colleges of further education		
<p>New evidence was identified that does not have an impact on the recommendation.</p> <p>A systematic review²⁹ of 59 studies of school located vaccinations looked at how incentives, education, design of consent form and follow up can increase parental consent for vaccinations and number of returned forms. Minimising out-of-pocket cost; offering both the intramuscular and intranasal vaccination and using reminders increases vaccination rates. Organisation, communication and planning can help. The study showed that school based programmes are effective, however it is not clear from an assessment of the abstract what these were being compared to.</p> <p>A cross-sectional survey³⁰ of vaccine systems in 22 welsh local authorities showed that school settings delivered higher uptakes.</p>	<p>One expert noted that in regard to teenage vaccines there “needs to be more written about school age vaccinations and the role of the school nurse”. The expert gave no other advice or suggestions.</p> <p>On publication of Flu vaccination: increasing uptake the guideline should be reconsidered to see if any amendments need to be made.</p> <p>No other evidence identified</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Recommendation 4 looks at the contribution of nurseries, school, colleges of further education in terms of checking children’s immunisations records once the child joins an educational facility and providing detailed information about why vaccinations are important. The recommendation mentions encouraging schools to become venues for vaccinations. The evidence found supports these recommendations.</p>

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
<p>A cluster-randomised trial³¹ involved 44 elementary schools serving 19776 children. Parents of schools that were offering influenza vaccination were sent information and consent forms via email or flyers. Children in schools that offered vaccinations had higher uptake rates county wide (54.1% vs 47.4% p=0.001).</p>		
<p>PH21 – 05. Recommendation 5 - targeting groups at risk of not being fully immunised</p>		
<p>New evidence was identified that does not have an impact on the recommendation.</p> <p>A three phase qualitative study³² involved interviews with 174 travellers and gypsies from 6 communities, interviews with 39 service providers and workshops involving 51 travellers and gypsies and 25 service providers. Barriers were language, culture, literacy, poor school attendance, poverty, booking appointments, lack of attendance and housing. Trust and continuity of care was important. Interventions discussed were 1) cultural competence training for staff 2) identification of travellers and gypsies in health records 3) having a named person to provide respectful and supportive service 4) flexible systems for booking appointments 5) protected funding for health visitors specialising in traveller and gypsy health.</p>	<p>A topic expert noted that the following: “the guidance talks about the vulnerable and groups at risk of not being immunised and recommends that in these groups more effort is required (language translation, home visit, reminders etc) and it mentions doing a health equity audit - I just wondered if it is possible here to talk about capacity as in some areas of deprivation a lot more time, money and effort may be required to achieve good uptake?”</p> <p>On publication of Flu vaccination: increasing uptake this guideline should be reconsidered to see if any amendments need to be made.</p> <p>No other evidence identified</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Recommendation 5 looks at targeting specific groups that may be at risk of not being fully immunised and specifically mentions new migrants, prisoners and looked after children. There is some evidence to support a specific recommendation around travellers and gypsies, however this was only based on one qualitative study. No evidence was found to support discussion around the amount of resource that is needed to achieve uptake in vulnerable groups and therefore it would not be possible to discuss capacity.</p>

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
PH21 – 06. Recommendation 6 - hepatitis B immunisation for infants		
No evidence identified	No evidence identified	None
Research recommendations		
RR – 01 What are the most effective and cost effective ways of increasing immunisation uptake among looked after children and young people and other population groups at risk of being only partially immunised or not immunised at all?		
No evidence identified	On publication of Flu vaccination: increasing uptake the guideline should be reconsidered to see if any amendments need to be made. No other evidence identified	None
RR – 02 What are the most effective and cost effective ways of modifying services to increase vaccine uptake among children and young people, particularly those at risk of not being immunised, or of being only partially immunised? Does this vary by population subgroups? Examples might include home visits, changes in information provision and the introduction of opportunities to discuss immunisation before vaccines are given.		
New evidence was identified that does not have an impact on the recommendation. A systematic review ²⁹ of 59 studies looking at school based strategies to increase vaccinations uptake noted that offering both the intramuscular and intranasal vaccinations increased vaccination uptake, however no data was given to back up this statement.	On publication of Flu vaccination: increasing uptake the guideline should be reconsidered to see if any amendments need to be made. No other evidence identified	None as there is not sufficient evidence to indicate that a recommendation should be developed in regard to vaccination mode of delivery, however this could be revisited at the next surveillance review.

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
RR – 03 What are the most effective and cost effective ways of providing parents of children and young people with information to encourage timely immunisation? Specifically, what are the most effective and cost effective ways of providing information to reach those who are particularly at risk of not being immunised or only partially immunised?		
None	On publication of Flu vaccination: increasing uptake the guideline should be reconsidered to see if any amendments need to be made. No other evidence identified	None
RR – 04 How effective – and how acceptable to the public – are quasi-mandatory and incentive schemes for immunisation? (Examples of the former are schemes linked to nursery or school entry.) What impact do such schemes have on the timely uptake of vaccinations?		
<p>New evidence was identified that does not have an impact on the recommendation.</p> <p>A randomised controlled trial³³ to assess the impact of financial incentives on uptake and completion of HPV vaccinations looked at 1,000 16-18 year old girls who randomly received either a standard invitation letter or an invitation letter containing the offer of vouchers worth £45 for undergoing the 3 vaccinations. The intervention arm increased uptake of the first vaccination (OR 1.63 95% CI 1.08-2.47) and the third vaccination (OR 2.15 95% CI 1.32-3.5).</p> <p>Also 521 parents and carers of preschool children were involved in a survey³⁴ alongside health and educational professionals. Those involved took part in focus groups and individual interviews and online questionnaires. This</p>	<p>On publication of Flu vaccination: increasing uptake this guideline should be reconsidered to see if any amendments need to be made.</p> <p>No other evidence identified</p>	None. There is currently insufficient evidence available to consider creating a recommendation for quasi-mandatory and incentive schemes for immunisation.

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
<p>study showed that parental financial incentives were not popular. The systematic review showed insufficient evidence that interventions that offer rewards or penalties for vaccinations were effective. Quasi-mandatory interventions were acceptable. No evidence could be found on costs and consequences.</p> <p>A qualitative study³⁵ involved 91 parents and carers of preschool children, 18 health and other professionals and 6 people responsible for developing and commissioning services to understand if financial incentives or quasi-mandatory schemes might be acceptable in increasing vaccination uptake. In terms of financial incentive, parents and professionals felt this was inappropriate. Quasi-mandatory schemes were more positively received stating it felt natural, fair and less likely to create inequality. There were concerns around its implementation and workability though.</p> <p>A systematic review³⁶ of 10 included studies assessed acceptability of financial incentives and quasi-mandatory policies in regard to increasing vaccination uptake. There was insufficient evidence to state whether interventions such as these are effective.</p>		
<p>RR – 05 Does giving incentives to immunisation providers increase immunisation rates in the UK? For example, how does community target setting, or changes in targets or payment systems, affect immunisation coverage?</p>		

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
No evidence identified	<p>On publication of Flu vaccination: increasing uptake this guideline should be reconsidered to see if any amendments need to be made.</p> <p>No other evidence identified</p>	None
Gaps in the evidence		
Gap – 01 - There is a lack of UK evidence on the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of different interventions aimed at increasing immunisation uptake among children and young people aged under 19 years, particularly among those who may not have been immunised or only partially immunised.		
No evidence identified through the surveillance review.	None identified.	None
Gap – 02 There is a lack of UK evidence on the differential effect of universal interventions to increase immunisation uptake across different groups.		
No evidence identified through the surveillance review.	None identified.	None
Gap – 03 There is a lack of UK evidence on the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of interventions aimed at increasing uptake of the school leavers' booster vaccination.		
No evidence identified through the surveillance review.	None identified.	None

Summary of new evidence from 8-year surveillance	Summary of new intelligence from 8-year surveillance (from topic experts or initial internal intelligence gathering)	Impact
<p>Gap – 04 There is a lack of UK evidence to determine whether removal of the barriers to accessing immunisation services increases immunisation uptake among children and young people aged under 19 years. Information is particularly lacking in relation to population subgroups at increased risk of not being immunised or only being partially immunised.</p>		
No evidence identified through the surveillance review.	None identified.	None
<p>Gap – 05 There is a lack of UK evidence to judge whether or not interventions to increase uptake of immunisations in children and young people aged under 19 have any unintended or negative effects. For example, on how repeat reminders to those who do not want their child immunised may affect their relationship with the GP.</p>		
No evidence identified through the surveillance review.	None identified.	None
<p>Gap – 06 There is a lack of evidence on the differential effect of using different professionals (such as nurses, GPs and other practitioners) to increase immunisation uptake among children and young people aged under 19 years. In particular, there is a lack of evidence on how this affects subgroups at increased risk of not being immunised or only being partially immunised.</p>		
No evidence identified through the surveillance review.	None identified.	None

Appendix 2 References

1. Hendrix K S; Finnel S M; Zimet G D; Sturm L A; Lane K A; Downs S M (2014) Vaccine message framing and parents' intent to immunize their infants for MMR *Pediatrics Journal* 1098-4275 p675-83
2. Stockwell M; Hofstetter A; DuRivage N; Barrett A; Fernandex N; Vargas C Y; Camargo S (2015) Text message reminders for second dose of influenza vaccine: a randomised controlled trial *Pediatrics Journal* Volume 135 p83-91
3. Mowbray F; Marcu A; Godinho C; Michie S; Yardley L: Communicating to increase public uptake of pandemic flu vaccination in the UK: Which messages work? (2016) *Vaccine Journal* Volume 34 pp3268-74
4. Fiks A G; Grundmeier R W; Mayne S; Song L; Feemster K: Effectiveness of decision support for families, clinicians, or both on HPV vaccine receipt (2013) *Paediatrics Journal* Volume 131 p1114-21
5. Fu L Y; Bonhomme L A; Cooper S C; Joseph J G; Zimet G D: Educational interventions to increase HPV vaccination acceptance: a systematic review (2014) *Vaccine Journal* Volume 32 pp1901-20.
6. Giambi C; Del Manso M; D'Ancona F; De Mei B: Actions improving HPV vaccination uptake – results from a national survey in Italy (2015) *Vaccine Journal* Volume 33 pp2425-31.
7. Gowda C; Schaffer S; Kopec K; Markel A; Dempsey A: A pilot study on the effects of individually tailored education for MMR vaccine-hesitant parents on MMR vaccination intention (2013) *Human vaccines and Immunotherapeutic Journal* Volume 9 pp437-45
8. Hambidge S; Phibbs S; Chandramouli V; Fairclough D; Steiner J: A stepped intervention increases well-child care and immunisation rates in a disadvantaged population (2009) *Paediatrics Journal* Volume 124 pp455-64
9. Hofstetter A; DuRivage N; Vargas C; Camargo S; Vawdrey D; Fisher A; Stockwell M: Text message reminders for timely routine MMR vaccination: A randomised controlled trial (2015) *Vaccine Journal* Volume 33 pp5741-6
10. Holman D; Benard V; Roland K; Watson M; Liddon N; Stokley S: Barriers to human papillomavirus vaccination among US adolescents: a systematic review of the literature (2014) *JAMA Pediatrics* Volume 168 pp76-82
11. Kempe A; Saville A; Dickinson L; Eisert S; Reynolds J; Herrero D; Beaty B: Population based versus practice based recall for childhood immunisations: a randomised controlled comparative effectiveness trial (2013) *American Journal of Public Health* Volume 103 pp1116-23
12. Kempe A; Saville A; Dickinson L; Beaty B; Eisert S; Garfinkel D; Brewer S: Collaborative centralised reminder/recall notification to increase immunisation rates among young children: a comparative effectiveness trial (2015) *JAMA Paediatrics* Volume 169 pp365-73
13. Kempe A; Saville A; Beaty B; Dickinson L; Gurfinkel D; Eisert S; Roth H; Herrero D; Trefren L: Centralised reminder/recall to increase immunisation rates in young children: How much Bang for the Buck? (2016) *Academic paediatrics* Volume 29 p29
14. Lau A; Sintchenko V; Crimmins J; Magrabi F; Gallego B; Coiera E: Impact of a web-based personally controlled health management system on influenza vaccination and health services utilisation rates: a randomised controlled trial (2012) *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* Volume 19 pp 719-27.
15. Nowalk M; Lin C; Hannibal K; Reis E; Gallik G; Moehling K: Increasing childhood influenza vaccination: a cluster randomised trial (2014) *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* Volume 47 pp435-43
16. Rand C; Vincelli P; Goldstein N; Blumkin A; Szilagyi P: Effects of phone and text message reminders on completion of the human papillomavirus vaccine series (2017) *Journal of Adolescent Health* Volume 60 p113-119.
17. Richman A; Maddy L; Torres E; Goldberg E: A randomised intervention study to evaluate whether electronic messaging can increase human papillomavirus vaccine completion and knowledge among college students (2016) *Journal of American College Health* Volume 64 pp269-78

Surveillance Report Consultation document June 2017

Immunisations: reducing differences in uptake in under 19s (2009) NICE guideline PH21

18. Rickert V; Auslander B; Cox D; Rosenthal S; Rupp R; Zimet G: School based HPV immunisation of young adolescents: effects of two brief health interventions (2015) *Human vaccines and immunotherapeutic* Volume 11 pp315-21
19. Stockwell M; Kharbanda E; Martinez R; Lara M; Vawdrey D; Natarajan K: Text4Health: impact of text message reminder-recalls for paediatric and adolescent immunisations (2012) *American Journal of Public Health* Volume 102 pp15-21
20. Stockwell M; Kharbanda E; Martinez R; Vargas C; Vawdrey D; Camargo S: Effect of text messaging intervention on influenza vaccination in an urban, low-income paediatric and adolescent population: a randomised controlled trial (2012) *Jama Journal* Volume 307 pp1702-8
21. Szilagyi P; Albertin C; Humiston S; Rand C; Schaffer S; Brill H: A randomised trial of the effect of centralised reminder/recall on immunisations and preventive care visits for adolescents (2013) *Academics paediatrics Journal* Volume 13 pp204-13.
22. Szilagyi P; Serwint J; Humiston S; Rand C; Schaffer S; Vincelli P: Effect of provider prompts on adolescent immunisation rates: a randomised trial (2015) *Academic paediatrics* Volume 15 pp149-57.
23. Williams N; Woodward H; Majeed A; Saxena S: Primary care strategies to improve childhood immunisation uptake in developed countries: systematic review (2011) *JRSM Short Reports* Volume 2 p81
24. Williams S; Rothman R; Offit P; Schaffner W; Sullivan M: A randomised trial to increase acceptance of childhood vaccines by vaccine-hesitant parents: a pilot study (2013)
25. Atchison C; Zvoc M; Balakrishnan R: The evaluation of a standardised call/recall system for childhood immunisations in Wandsworth (2013) *Journal of Community Health* Volume 38 pp581-7
26. Dexter L; Teare M; Dexter M; Siriwardena A: Strategies to increase influenza vaccination rates: outcomes of a nationwide cross-sectional survey of UK general practice (2012) *BMJ Open* Volume 2
27. Forster A; Waller J; Bowyer H; Marlow L: Girls' explanations for being unvaccinated or under vaccinated against human papillomavirus: a content analysis of survey responses (2015) *BMC Public Health* Volume 15 p1278
28. Forster A; Rockcliffe L; Chorley A; Marlow L; Bedford H; Smith S: A qualitative systematic review of factors influencing parents' vaccination decision-making in the United Kingdom (2016) *SSM Population Health* Volume 2 pp603-612
29. Cawley J; Hull H F; Rousculp M D (2010) Strategies for implementing school-located influenza vaccination of children: a systematic literature review *Journal of School Health* Volume 80 p167-75
30. Crocker J; Porter-Jones G; McGowan A; Roberts R J; Cottrell S (2012) Teenage booster vaccine: factors affecting uptake *Journal of Public Health* Volume 34 p498-504
31. Szilagyi P, Schaffer S, Rand C, Vincelli P, Eagan A (2016) School-Located Influenza Vaccinations: A Randomized Trial *Pediatrics* Oct 2016, e20161746; DOI: 10.1542/peds.2016-1746
32. Jackson C; Dyson L; Bedford H; Cheater F M; Condon L Understanding uptake of Immunisations in Travelling and Gypsy Communities (UNITING): a qualitative interview study (2016) *Health Technology Assessment* Volume 20 p1-176
33. Mantzari E; Vogt F; Marteau T: Financial Incentives for increasing uptake of HPV vaccinations: a randomised controlled trial (2015) *Health Psychology Journal* Volume 34 pp160-71.
34. Adams J; Bateman B; Becker F; Cresswell T; Flynn D; McNaughton R; Effectiveness and acceptability of parental financial incentives and quasi-mandatory schemes for increasing uptake of vaccinations in preschool children: systematic review, qualitative study and discrete choice experiment (2015) *Health Technology Assessment* Volume 19 p1-176
35. McNaughton R; Adams J; Shucksmith J Acceptability of financial incentives or quasi-mandatory schemes to increase uptake of immunisations in preschool children in the United Kingdom: Qualitative study with parents and service delivery staff (2016) *Vaccine Journal* Volume 34 p2259-66
36. Wigham S; Ternent L; Bryant A; Robalino S; Sniehotta F F; Adams J Parental financial incentives for increasing preschool vaccination uptake: systematic review (2014) *Pediatrics Journal* Volume 134 p1117-28

Surveillance Report Consultation document June 2017

Immunisations: reducing differences in uptake in under 19s (2009) NICE guideline PH21