

Which young women are not being vaccinated against HPV? Cross-sectional analysis of a UK national cohort study

Helen Bedford PhD^{1*}, Nicola Firman MSc^{1,2}, Jo Waller PhD³, Laura Marlow PhD³, Alice Forster PhD⁴, Carol Dezateux MD^{1,2*}

* Joint senior authors

* Joint Corresponding authors: Helen Bedford h.bedford@ucl.ac.uk (+44 (0)20 7905 2333), Carol Dezateux c.dezateux@qmul.ac.uk (+44 (0)20 7882 5878)

¹ Life Course Epidemiology and Biostatistics, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, WC1N 1EH, UK

² Clinical Effectiveness Group, Institute of Population Health Sciences, Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary University London, 58 Turner Street London E1 2AB

³ Cancer Prevention Group, School of Cancer & Pharmaceutical Sciences, King's College London, Guy's Hospital, Great Maze Pond, London SE1 9RT

⁴ Department of Behavioural Science & Health, Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, UCL, 1-19 Torrington Place London WC1E 6BT

1 **Abstract**

2 **Objectives** HPV vaccination is highly effective in preventing HPV-associated disease,
3 including cervical cancer, which disproportionately affects women from disadvantaged and
4 minority ethnic backgrounds. We examined inequalities in initiation of the HPV vaccination
5 schedule among young women in the UK and reasons given by their parents for non-
6 initiation.

7 **Design** Cross sectional analyses of a prospective nationally representative cohort study.

8 **Setting** Four UK countries.

9 **Participants** 5,695 young women (39.9% from households in lowest income households,
10 5.1% ever excluded from school, 0.5% not attending school) whose parents (14.3% from
11 minority ethnic backgrounds; 54.1% with no stated religious faith) took part in interviews
12 conducted when their daughters were 14 years old.

13 **Main outcome measures** Parent-reported initiation of HPV vaccination and reasons for
14 non-initiation. The adjusted odds (aORs) and 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) of initiating HPV
15 vaccination were estimated using logistic regression after mutual adjustment for household
16 income, school exclusion, school attendance and parental ethnic background and religious
17 faith.

18 **Results** 92.3% (5265) had initiated HPV vaccination at time of interview. Initiation was less
19 likely among those living in the poorest households (aOR; 95% CI: 0.44; 0.30 to 0.64 for
20 those in lowest household income quintile), who did not attend school (0.11; 0.04 to 0.33),
21 had ever been excluded from school (0.47; 0.29 to 0.76), or whose parents were from Black
22 African (0.49; 0.26 to 0.95) or Any Other (0.34; 0.17 to 0.66) ethnic backgrounds. A reason
23 consistent with a conscious or practical decision was reported by 53.3% (219) and 24.1%
24 (90) parents respectively.

25 **Conclusions** Although most young women are immunised, marked social inequalities in
26 access to HPV vaccination initiation remain. Practical steps to address this are possible and
27 should be implemented to reduce inequalities in primary prevention of cancers and to
28 ensure equitable access to this important public health intervention.

29

30 **Keywords:** young women; HPV; vaccination; inequalities; disparities; initiation

31

1 Introduction

2 Evidence of the effectiveness of vaccination against human papillomavirus (HPV) in preventing
3 infection, pre-invasive cervical disease, anogenital warts and, potentially, invasive HPV-associated
4 cancers is accumulating. Vaccine programmes with high uptake have also been shown to achieve
5 herd protection.¹ While high income countries have made significant progress in primary prevention
6 of cervical cancer through vaccination, inequalities in HPV vaccine uptake remain.² These are of
7 concern particularly given the greater risk of cervical cancer among women from more
8 disadvantaged and ethnic minority backgrounds who are also less likely to attend cervical screening.
9 ^{2,3} It has been suggested that ethnic inequalities in cervical cancer may widen over the next 20-50
10 years, should ethnic inequalities in screening coverage and HPV vaccine uptake persist.⁴

11 In the UK, HPV vaccination for young women aged 12-13 years- mainly delivered through a school-
12 based programme - was introduced in 2008, initially as a three-dose and – from 2014 – as a two-
13 dose schedule.⁵ In 2019 the HPV vaccine programme was extended to include young men aged 12-
14 13 years. Although 87% to 93% of young women are reported to receive at least one dose of the
15 vaccine, uptake is lower among those living in the most deprived areas.⁶ However, evidence from
16 the UK is limited as most studies are conducted in selected areas only, and are ecological in design,
17 employing area- or school-level measures of socioeconomic disadvantage or ethnicity which
18 precludes adjustment for confounding of these two characteristics at the level of the individual. In
19 addition, with some exceptions,^{7,8} few have examined type of school attended, or uptake among
20 those who are not in mainstream education with little or no information about uptake among young
21 women who are or have been excluded from school.

22 We used data from a contemporary UK-wide cohort with individual level cross-sectional data to
23 examine inequalities in initiation of the HPV vaccination schedule. We hypothesised that HPV
24 vaccine initiation would be lower among young women with parents from ethnic minority
25 backgrounds, and among those living in low income households, not attending or excluded from
26 school. We also examined reasons given by parents for non-initiation.

27 **Methods**

28 *Study design*

29 We used cross-sectional data from the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS), a prospective UK-wide
30 cohort of children born between September 2000 and January 2002 in the UK. A stratified clustered
31 sampling design was employed to over-represent children born in disadvantaged areas, from ethnic
32 minority groups and from Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales.⁹

33 *Study population*

34 When the cohort child was aged nine months, 18,552 (68.1%) of 27,257 families contacted were
35 interviewed at home and demographic, social and health information obtained. At the sixth
36 interview, carried out when the cohort members were aged 14 years, 11,726 (76.3%) of 15,369
37 potentially eligible families were interviewed comprising 11,884 young people (supplementary
38 Figure 1). After excluding 308 twins or triplets and 5,881 boys (hereafter referred to as young men)
39 we included information reported by parents for 5,695 14 year old singleton girls (hereafter referred
40 to as young women) comprising 96.0% of all young women taking part and whose parents were
41 interviewed. These young women were eligible to have received a first dose of HPV vaccine at age
42 12-13 years between 2012 and 2015. Young men were not included as they were not eligible for the
43 vaccine until 2019.

44 *Outcomes*

45 We defined the primary outcome for this study - initiation of HPV vaccination – as an affirmative
46 response by the interviewed parent to the following question: “*Since the last interview when*
47 *[^name] was [^age of cohort member at last interview], has she had the HPV (Human Papilloma*
48 *virus) vaccination?*” The parent interviewed was the natural mother in the majority (92.1%) of
49 interviews.

50 Parents reporting no HPV vaccination initiation were asked: “Why did she not have the HPV
51 vaccination?” Interviewers recorded their responses verbatim. These responses were initially coded
52 into one of 16 reasons by the MCS study team, and subsequently recoded by the authors into three
53 mutually exclusive categories: active decisions; practical reasons; and other reasons based on
54 previous MCS immunisation studies and on evidence for reasons for non uptake of HPV vaccine.^{10, 11}

55 *Explanatory variables*

56 At the age 14 interview, parents were asked to select their own ethnic background from a list of
57 2011 Census categories. For this analysis, we created eight mutually exclusive groups: Any White,
58 Any Mixed, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black Caribbean, Black African, and Any Other ethnic
59 groups (Other Black, Other Asian, Chinese and Other). Parents were also classified as having any
60 religious faith (yes, no) based on self-report.

61 We categorised young women as attending a state-maintained or fee-paying school, or as not
62 attending school (including those not in school at all or home schooled). We classified young women
63 as ever or never permanently or temporarily excluded from school based on parental report. We
64 used household income quintiles created by the MCS study team from parentally reported
65 information at the age 14 interview and using Organisation for Economic Co-operation and
66 Development equivalised household income quintiles, based upon the UK income distribution.¹²

67 *Statistical methods*

68 We described HPV vaccination initiation status for the study population by parental ethnic
69 background and religious faith, school type, and history of school exclusion and reported reasons
70 given for non-initiation. We conducted logistic regression to estimate the log odds and 95%
71 confidence intervals of having initiated HPV vaccination by parental ethnic background, parental
72 religious faith, type of school attended, school exclusion history, and household income for children
73 with complete data. All analyses were adjusted for cohort member's age (in years) at interview.
74 Analyses were weighted to take account of survey design and attrition of the cohort between
75 successive interviews, using the 'svyset' command and were performed using Stata/SE 15 (Stata
76 Corporation, Texas, USA).

77 *Ethics approval*

78 Approval for the sixth MCS interview was granted by the National Research Ethics Service Research
79 Ethics Committee London - Central (ref: 13/LO/1786). No further approval was required for this
80 analysis.

81 **Results**

82 *Characteristics of the sample*

83 Most parents were from any White background, with parents from Pakistani background being the
84 second most frequently reported group (Table 1), with the proportion of parents reporting all other
85 ethnic groups lower than 3%. Over 90% of young women attended a state-maintained school at the
86 time of interview, with a small number (n=23) receiving home schooling or not in school. Parents of
87 197 young women (5.1%) reported that their daughter had ever been temporarily or permanently
88 excluded from school. Under half of parents reported any religious faith (supplementary Table 1). As
89 expected, the sample was distributed evenly across household income quintiles. At the time of
90 interview carried out at a median age of 14 years, most young women (n=5265, 92.3%) were
91 reported to have initiated HPV vaccination.

92 (Table 1).

93 *Associations with initiation of HPV vaccination*

94 In unadjusted analyses, young women living in poorer households or with parents from ethnic
95 minority backgrounds or with parents reporting any religious faith were less likely to have initiated
96 HPV vaccination, as were those not attending school, or with a history of school exclusion (Table 2).
97 Specifically, those whose parents were from Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Black African and 'Any Other'
98 ethnic backgrounds were less likely to have initiated HPV vaccination than those with parents from
99 any White ethnic background, as were those whose parents reported any religious faith. Young
100 women living in households in the lowest two income quintiles were less likely to have initiated HPV
101 vaccination than those in the highest-income quintile, and those not attending school or with a
102 history of ever having been excluded from school, were less likely to have initiated HPV vaccination
103 compared to those attending a state-maintained school.

104 In fully adjusted analyses, socioeconomic status, as assessed by household income, showed a
105 marked and strong gradient with initiation of HPV vaccination, with young women living in the
106 poorest households less likely to have initiated vaccination (Figure 1; Table 2). Young women whose
107 parents were from Black African or Any Other ethnic backgrounds, and those who did not attend
108 school or who had a history of school exclusion were also less likely to have been vaccinated.

109

110

111 ***Reasons for HPV vaccine non-initiation***

112 More than half (n=219; 53.3%) of parents reporting a reason for non-initiation of HPV vaccination in
113 their daughters gave reasons consistent with having made an active decision: most commonly this
114 was either because the young woman, or her parent, did not want to have the vaccination (Table 3).
115 Practical reasons were reported by around one quarter (n=90, 22.6%), predominantly because their
116 daughter had not been at school at the time of vaccination or – to their knowledge - had not
117 received an offer to be vaccinated.

118 **Discussion**

119 *Main findings*

120 Our findings from this large, UK-wide, contemporary cohort confirm that – while most 14-year-old
121 young women had initiated HPV vaccination – significant socio-economic and ethnic inequalities in
122 initiation remain. Notably, those living in the poorest households and with parents from Black
123 African and ‘Other’ ethnic backgrounds were most at risk of being unvaccinated, as were those not
124 attending mainstream school. Our finding that risk of non-initiation is increased among those
125 temporarily or permanently excluded from school has not been previously reported. We found no
126 differences according to whether parents did, or did not, report a religious faith. Of those parents
127 reporting a reason for non-initiation of HPV vaccination, just over half reported a conscious decision,
128 with a significant proportion of the remainder citing practical reasons.

129 These findings are of public health concern given the higher incidence of cervical cancer and the
130 lower use of screening by socially disadvantaged women. They, also have implications for the
131 expanded school HPV vaccination programme given the reported gender and ethnic differences in
132 permanent and fixed period exclusions from schools.¹³

133 *Strengths and Limitations*

134 This is, to our knowledge, the first UK-wide study to examine inequalities in initiation of HPV
135 vaccination using individual-level data on socioeconomic status, parental ethnic background and
136 religious faith, school setting and school exclusion. We were able to use this rich data to mutually
137 adjust for socioeconomic and demographic variables at the individual level and to include young
138 women who were not attending, or were previously or currently excluded from, school. In particular,
139 we avoided some of the limitations of area-based measures of deprivation employed in most other
140 UK studies by using a measure of household poverty, derived from direct parental report. We were
141 also able to examine parental ethnic background using specific ethnic groups selected by parents
142 themselves, rather than broad ethnic categories, or area or school-level measures of ethnic density,
143 and to adjust for parent-reported religious faith. Measures of active religious observance were
144 lacking, the small sample sizes across different faiths did not permit analysis of specific religions, and
145 information on whether the school attended was a faith school was not available. While our finding
146 of lower initiation in young women who were not in school is based on a small sample, it is
147 consistent with findings from a previous regional study reporting lower vaccine uptake among those
148 not in mainstream education.⁷

149 HPV vaccination status was reported by the parent and could not be compared directly with health
150 records; however we have previously found very good agreement between parental report and
151 routine health records for childhood vaccinations in this cohort.¹⁴ While parents were not asked
152 about completion of the HPV vaccine course, similar patterns of inequalities in initiation and
153 completion have been reported.^{15, 16}

154 *Comparison with other studies*

155 Direct comparison with other UK based studies reporting inequalities is limited as these have usually
156 been ecological in design using area- or school-based measures of socioeconomic status and ethnic
157 background. Our findings suggest that, with the exception of parents from Black African or 'Other'
158 backgrounds, associations of lower HPV vaccine initiation with other parental ethnic backgrounds
159 and with parental religious faith reflect socioeconomic disadvantage.

160 Our finding that young women who had been temporarily or permanently excluded from school
161 were at increased risk of being unvaccinated adds significantly to the limited literature on this factor.
162 Fisher et al reported lower HPV vaccine uptake among young women receiving education in non-
163 mainstream settings in the south west of England, however this study did not include those with
164 temporary or permanent exclusions.⁷ Although a relatively small group in our study, this finding is
165 important given concerns about the increasing use of exclusion in UK secondary schools, particularly
166 of young men who are now included in the HPV vaccine programme, and those from ethnic minority
167 backgrounds.¹³

168 In our study, active decision-making played the larger role in reasons given for non-initiation.
169 Although the MCS study design precluded a more in-depth investigation of these reasons, similar
170 findings have been reported from other studies of HPV vaccine acceptance as well as of childhood
171 vaccines more generally, with perceptions of the safety or necessity of vaccination cited.¹⁶⁻¹⁸
172 Importantly, practical reasons, specifically difficulties with access, accounted for one quarter of the
173 reasons for non-initiation. Reasons given for non-initiation in this study are potentially modifiable.
174 There is evidence of the value of a strong recommendation from a health professional for increasing
175 acceptance¹⁹, and GP-endorsement of the vaccine invitation letter might be one way to achieve this
176 in school-based programmes where there is usually no opportunity for a face-to-face conversation
177 prior to giving consent. Health promotion messages should emphasise the importance of timely and
178 complete vaccination for optimal protection against infection with HPV.²⁰ Parents and their
179 daughters need ready access to service providers who are equipped to effectively respond to vaccine
180 questions and concerns (e.g. about safety and side-effects).²¹

181

182 *Implications for policy and practice*

183 Understanding the reasons for non-initiation of HPV vaccination and developing interventions to
184 engage parents and young women from groups at risk of low HPV vaccine uptake is central to
185 reducing inequalities. It is therefore important that policy makers, commissioners and practitioners
186 are aware of these inequalities and the groups at higher risk of non-initiation. In one interview study,
187 school nurses reported that - despite being aware of evidence from population studies – they did
188 not consider ethnic background or social disadvantage to be important factors for not vaccinating,
189 although were aware that non-attendance at school was.²²

190 Practical steps to reduce inequalities include interventions to optimise communications with
191 parents, and alternative approaches to consent. The introduction of a local policy for verbal consent
192 by parents and self-consent by young women shows promise as an effective intervention to reduce
193 social inequalities in uptake.²³ Ensuring equity of access to protection against HPV infection for all
194 requires timely and systematic identification and proactive contact with young women who have not
195 been vaccinated, ensuring that those educated outside mainstream settings are included in the
196 vaccination offer. This could be facilitated with near real-time data sharing between schools and
197 general practitioner or community health services to enable follow up with further offers of
198 discussion and vaccination. Such information sharing would also create an enduring primary care
199 health record of their immunisation status which can be accessed by young women for their future
200 health care, enabling fully informed decisions about cervical cancer screening and awareness of
201 immunisation status throughout the life course.

202 Research among school nurses has reported their efforts to reduce inequalities in HPV vaccine
203 uptake. These include persistently chasing young women to complete the vaccine course,
204 opportunistic vaccination and holding ‘mop-up’ clinics at times and places to suit the convenience of
205 young women, which for those out of education, includes in off-school premises or outside school
206 hours. However, such approaches require extra resource and that staff involved in school
207 vaccination programmes understand the population needs of the local area.

208 *Unanswered questions and future research*

209 Future research is needed to define and test approaches for improving uptake among young women
210 who have not received HPV vaccine, including those who are not being educated in mainstream
211 settings or have been excluded from school. This will also be important in order to minimise
212 inequalities for boys who are now being offered HPV vaccine in the UK. Further work is needed to

213 examine the role of attendance at faith schools given a recent report of lower rates of vaccination
214 among those attending certain faith schools. ⁸

215 *Summary*

216 Although most young women are immunised, marked inequalities in HPV vaccination initiation
217 remain, with those living in poor households, not in mainstream education, or excluded from school
218 at higher risk of being unvaccinated. Practical steps to address this are possible and should be
219 implemented to reduce inequalities in primary prevention of cancers and to ensure equitable access
220 to this important public health intervention.

221 **Table 1 – Characteristics of 5695 young women participating in the age 14 interview**

	n	%⁵ (95% CI⁶)
Age at interview in years		
13	1349	22.7 (21.1,24.3)
14	4346	77.3 (75.7,78.9)
HPV vaccination initiation status¹		
Yes	5265	92.3 (91.2,93.2)
No	399	7.2 (6.4,8.1)
Don't know	26	0.5 (0.3,0.9)
Parental ethnic background²		
Any White background	4736	85.7 (82.4,88.5)
Any Mixed background	56	0.9 (0.7,1.3)
Indian	148	1.8 (1.3,2.7)
Pakistani	311	3.8 (2.3,6.2)
Bangladeshi	135	1.4 (0.8,2.5)
Black Caribbean	65	1.4 (0.9,2.1)
Black African	117	2.4 (1.6,3.7)
Any Other background	119	2.1 (1.5,3.1)
Parental religious faith³		
No religious faith	2643	54.1 (51.2,56.9)
Any Religious faith	3051	45.9 (43.0,48.7)
Household income quintile⁴		
Lowest	958	19.1 (16.8,21.8)
2	998	20.6 (18.9,22.3)
3	1154	20.4 (19.0,21.8)
4	1277	19.3 (17.9,20.8)
Highest	1303	20.6 (18.8,22.6)
History of school exclusion		
No	5498	94.9 (93.9,95.8)
Yes	197	5.1 (4.2,6.1)
School type		
State-maintained school	5299	93.9 (92.4,95.1)
Fee-paying school	373	5.6 (4.4,7.1)
No school	23	0.5 (0.3,0.9)

222 ¹HPV vaccination initiation status missing for 5 young women. ²Ethnic background missing for 8 parents.

223 ³Parental religious faith was missing for one parent. ⁴Household income quintile missing for 5 young women.

224 ⁵Weighted proportions. ⁶95% confidence interval

225 .

Table 2 Unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios for HPV vaccination initiation by age 14 interview (n=5654)

	HPV vaccination initiated N=5265		HPV vaccination not initiated N=399		Unadjusted OR	Adjusted OR ¹
	n	% (95% CI ²)	n	% (95% CI ²)	OR (95% CI ²)	OR (95% CI ²)
Parental ethnic background						
Any White background (ref.)	4438	93.6 (92.5,94.5)	280	6.4 (5.5,7.5)	1	1
Any Mixed background	50	93.2 (83.6,97.3)	6	6.8 (2.7,16.4)	0.94 (0.35,2.51)	1.03 (0.37,2.87)
Indian	136	92.3 (84.2,96.5)	12	7.7 (3.5,15.8)	0.83 (0.36,1.92)	0.87 (0.37,2.04)
Pakistani	269	90.7 (87.4,93.1)	35	9.3 (6.9,12.6)	0.67 (0.45,0.98)	1.09 (0.67,1.75)
Bangladeshi	112	86.1 (80.3,90.4)	21	13.9 (9.6,19.7)	0.42 (0.27,0.67)	0.66 (0.39,1.13)
Black Caribbean	55	85.5 (71.4,93.3)	10	14.5 (6.7,28.6)	0.41 (0.16,1.01)	0.54 (0.20,1.44)
Black African	98	84.9 (75.7,91.0)	18	15.1 (9.0,24.3)	0.39 (0.21,0.72)	0.49 (0.26,0.95)
Any Other background	99	81.0 (70.4,88.4)	17	19.0 (11.6,29.6)	0.29 (0.16,0.55)	0.34 (0.17,0.66)
Missing	8		0			
Parental religious faith						
No religious faith (ref.)	2466	93.6 (92.4,94.7)	165	6.4 (5.3,7.6)	1	1
Any Religious faith	2798	91.7 (90.4,92.9)	234	8.3 (7.1,9.6)	0.76 (0.59,0.97)	0.80 (0.60,1.06)
Missing	1		0			
Household income quintile						
Highest (ref.)	1239	95.5 (93.8,96.7)	106	4.5 (3.3,6.2)	1	1
4	1208	94.9 (93.4,96.1)	95	5.1 (3.9,6.6)	0.89 (0.60,1.33)	0.89 (0.61,1.30)
3	1074	93.6 (91.5,95.2)	71	6.4 (4.8,8.5)	0.70 (0.46,1.06)	0.72 (0.47,1.10)
2	901	90.7 (88.4,92.6)	66	9.3 (7.4,11.6)	0.46 (0.31,0.70)	0.49 (0.33,0.73)
Lowest	841	89.0 (86.4,91.1)	61	11.0 (8.9,13.6)	0.38 (0.27,0.55)	0.44 (0.30,0.64)
Missing	2		0			
History of school exclusion						
No (ref.)	5099	93.2 (92.3,94.0)	368	6.8 (6.0,7.7)	1	1
Yes	166	85.2 (78.9,89.9)	31	14.8 (10.1,21.1)	0.42 (0.27,0.66)	0.47 (0.29,0.76)
School type						
State-maintained (ref.)	4914	93.0 (92.1,93.8)	359	7.0 (6.2,7.9)	1	1
Fee-paying	339	92.0 (88.0,94.8)	33	8.0 (5.2,12.0)	0.87 (0.55,1.37)	0.65 (0.40,1.04)
Not attending school	12	61.1 (32.5,83.7)	7	38.9 (16.3,67.5)	0.12 (0.04,0.39)	0.11 (0.04,0.33)

¹Mutually adjusted for parental ethnic background, parental religious faith, household income quintile, history of school exclusion, school type, and age at interview in whole years. ²95% confidence interval.


Table 3: Reasons given for not initiating HPV vaccination (N=399)

	n ¹	Weighted % ² (95% CI ³)
Conscious decisions	219	53.3 (46.7,59.8)
<i>Young person did not want to have it</i>	39	11.8 (8.2,16.6)
<i>Parent doesn't want young person to vaccinate for unspecified reasons</i>	51	11.1 (8.2,14.9)
<i>Fear of needles/injections/pain⁴</i>	32	10.0 (6.4,15.1)
<i>Doesn't believe in vaccinations</i>	38	7.5 (5.1,10.8)
<i>Concern about side effects</i>	20	4.5 (2.7,7.3)
<i>Considered unnecessary</i>	7	2.1 (0.8,5.2)
<i>Thinks better done when older</i>	10	1.7 (0.8,3.5)
<i>Wanted more info on pros/cons</i>	9	1.7 (0.8,3.7)
<i>Perceived vaccine contraindication</i>	6	1.4 (0.5,3.7)
<i>Religious beliefs</i>	4	1.1 (0.4,2.8)
<i>Refused for unspecified reasons</i>	3	0.5 (0.1,2.3)
Practical reasons	90	24.1 (19.5,29.4)
<i>School awaiting/not give vaccinations</i>	51	12.5 (9.0,17.1)
<i>Away from school that day and missed it</i>	39	11.6 (8.2,16.1)
Other	90	22.6 (17.8,28.2)
<i>Don't know</i>	44	9.8 (6.6,14.2)
<i>Vague irrelevant answer</i>	31	8.0 (5.3,11.9)
<i>Other reason</i>	15	4.8 (2.5,8.9)

¹Total number who had not initiated HPV vaccination at the age 14 interview=399.


²Weighted percentages. ³95% confidence interval. ⁴Two respondents were coded as giving more than one reason for non-initiation of HPV vaccination (fear of needles and young person did not want it; fear of needles and other reason) and these were coded as 'fear of needles, injections and pain'.

Figure 1: Adjusted odds of HPV vaccination initiation



Mutually adjusted for parental ethnic background, parental religious faith, household income quintile, history of school exclusion, school type and young women's age at interview in years.

Supplementary Figure 1: Study sample



¹Due to death, emigration, permanent refusal or sensitive family circumstances. ² 5,953 young men; 5,931 young women. Data for individual young people not available prior to the point of productive interview.

Supplementary Table 1: Self-reported parental religious faith (N=5695)

Parental religious faith	n	Weighted % ¹
Christian	2306	35.9
Muslim	566	7.4
Hindu	93	1.1
Sikh	51	0.7
Jewish	10	0.2
Buddhist	11	0.2
Other	14	0.4
None	2643	54.1

¹Weighted proportions.

References

1. Drolet M, Bénard É, Pérez N, et al. Population-level impact and herd effects following the introduction of human papillomavirus vaccination programmes: updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. 2019.
2. Cohen PA, Jhingran A, Oaknin A, Denny L. Cervical cancer. *The Lancet*. 2019;393(10167):169-82.
3. Massat NJ, Douglas E, Waller J, Wardle J, Duffy SW. Variation in cervical and breast cancer screening coverage in England: a cross-sectional analysis to characterise districts with atypical behaviour. *BMJ open*. 2015;5(7):e007735.
4. Johnson HC, Lafferty EI, Eggo RM, et al. Effect of HPV vaccination and cervical cancer screening in England by ethnicity: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2018;3(1):e44-e51.
5. Public Health England. Changes to the Human Papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine schedule 2014/15. Advice for health professionals. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/414069/PHE_HP_V_AdviceforHP_NewFormat_V2_FINAL_APPROVEDpdf. 2015.
6. NHS Scotland. HPV Immunisation Statistics Scotland 2016/17. <https://www.widscotland.org/Health-Topics/Child-Health/Publications/2017-11-28/2017-11-28-HPV-Reportpdf>. 2017.
7. Fisher H, Audrey S, Mytton JA, Hickman M, Trotter C. Examining inequalities in the uptake of the school-based HPV vaccination programme in England: a retrospective cohort study. *Journal of public health*. 2013;36(1):36-45.
8. Tiley K, White J, Andrews N, Tessier E, Ramsay M, Edelstein M. What school-level and area-level factors influenced HPV and MenACWY vaccine coverage in England in 2016/2017? An ecological study. *BMJ open*. 2019;9(7):e029087.
9. Connelly, R. and Platt, L., 2014. Cohort profile: UK millennium Cohort study (MCS). *International journal of epidemiology*, 43(6), pp.1719-1725.
10. Pearce A, Law C, Elliman D, Cole TJ, Bedford H. Factors associated with uptake of measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine (MMR) and use of single antigen vaccines in a contemporary UK cohort: prospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2008 Apr 3;336(7647):754-7.
11. Ferrer, H.B., Trotter, C., Hickman, M. and Audrey, S., 2014. Barriers and facilitators to HPV vaccination of young women in high-income countries: a qualitative systematic review and evidence synthesis. *BMC public health*, 14(1), pp.1-22.
12. Agalioti-Sgompou V AM, Church D, Johnson J, et al. Millennium Cohort Study MCS6 Derived Variables MCS6 (2015) USER GUIDE Centre for Longitudinal Studies http://doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/8156/mrdoc/pdf/mcs6_derived_variables_user_guide_1sted_2017pdf. 2017.
13. Department for Education. Permanent and Fixed Period Exclusions in England: 2017 to 2018. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/820773/Permanent_and_fixed_period_exclusions_2017_to_2018_-_main_text.pdf
14. Walton S, Cortina-Borja M, Dezateux C, et al. Measuring the timeliness of childhood vaccinations: using cohort data and routine health records to evaluate quality of immunisation services. *Vaccine*. 2017;35(51):7166-73.
15. Fisher H, Trotter CL, Audrey S, MacDonald-Wallis K, Hickman M. Inequalities in the uptake of human papillomavirus vaccination: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International journal of epidemiology*. 2013;42(3):896-908.

16. Fernández de Casadevante V, Gil Cuesta J, Cantarero-Arevalo L. Determinants in the uptake of the human papillomavirus vaccine: a systematic review based on European studies. *Frontiers in oncology*. 2015;5:141.
17. Kessels SJ, Marshall HS, Watson M, Braunack-Mayer AJ, Reuzel R, Tooher RL. Factors associated with HPV vaccine uptake in teenage girls: a systematic review. *Vaccine*. 2012;30(24):3546-56.
18. Larson HJ, Jarrett C, Eckersberger E, Smith DM, Paterson P. Understanding vaccine hesitancy around vaccines and vaccination from a global perspective: a systematic review of published literature, 2007–2012. *Vaccine*. 2014;32(19):2150-9.
19. Gilkey MB, Calo WA, Moss JL, Shah PD, Marciniak MW, Brewer NT. Provider communication and HPV vaccination: The impact of recommendation quality. *Vaccine*. 2016;34(9):1187-92.
20. Batista Ferrer H, Trotter CL, Hickman M, Audrey S. Barriers and facilitators to uptake of the school-based HPV vaccination programme in an ethnically diverse group of young women. *Journal of Public Health*. 2016;38(3):569-77.
21. Paterson P, Mounier-Jack S, Saliba V, et al. Strengthening HPV vaccination delivery: findings from a qualitative service evaluation of the adolescent girls' HPV vaccination programme in England. *Journal of Public Health*. 2019.
22. Boyce T, Holmes A. Addressing health inequalities in the delivery of the human papillomavirus vaccination programme: examining the role of the school nurse. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(9):e43416.
23. Fisher, Harriet, Karen Evans, Rosy Reynolds, Julie Yates, Marion Roderick, Jo Ferrie, John Macleod, Matthew Hickman, and Suzanne Audrey. "Secondary analyses to test the impact on inequalities and uptake of the schools-based human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccination programme by stage of implementation of a new consent policy in the south-west of England." *BMJ open* 11, no. 7 (2021): e044980.
24. Boyce, T.L. and Holmes, A., 2013. Persistence and partnerships: School nurses, inequalities and the HPV vaccination programme. *British Journal of School Nursing*, 8(2), pp.71-77.

