## **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

# Health Literacy and COVID-19 Vaccination among Cancer Patients in Northeastern Thailand: A Cross-Sectional Study

Phichet Dapha<sup>1</sup>, Surachai Phimha<sup>2,3</sup>\*, Nakarin Prasit<sup>2</sup>, Nopparat Senahad<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

**Objective:** This study aimed to explore factors associated with COVID-19 vaccine uptake among patients with cancer in northeastern Thailand. **Methods:** A cross-sectional study was conducted in northeastern Thailand between December 29th, 2022 and January 31st, 2023. A community-based, multistage sampling method was used to select patients with any medically diagnosed cancer. An interview form was developed to assess patient sociodemographic factors, health literacy, and COVID-19 vaccination status. Multivariable logistic regression analysis was used to identify the factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination status. **Results:** Of the 449 participants, 368 (81.96%) had received at least two doses of a COVID-19 vaccine. The multivariable analysis revealed that factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination status (excellent: adjusted odd ratio ( $OR_{Adj}$ ) = 7.23; 95% confidence interval (CI): 2.11–24.71, p = 0.002); sufficient:  $OR_{Adj}$  = 6.03; 95% CI: 2.00–18.24, p = 0.001); problematic:  $OR_{Adj}$  = 3.88; 95% CI:1.37–11.00, p = 0.011); 2) marital status ( $OR_{Adj}$  = 2.90; 95% CI: 1.37–6.14, p = 0.005); 3) cancer treatment at a general hospital ( $OR_{Adj}$  = 2.50; 95% CI: 1.25–5.00, p = 0.010); and 4) history of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 vaccines was health literacy, which enhances healthcare provider awareness of communicable disease prevention and control for patients with cancer as well as counselling and educating to improve their health literacy. It could influent a higher rate of vaccine uptake among patients with cancer.

Keywords: COVID-19- Patients with cancer- Vaccination- Health literacy

Asian Pac J Cancer Prev, 24 (7), 2375-2381

## Introduction

The first case of novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) was detected in December 2019, with the virus spreading rapidly and declared a Public Health Emergency of International Concern by the World Health Organization (WHO) on January 30th, 2020 (WHO, 2020). The WHO aimed to eliminate the global public health emergency of COVID-19 through two strategies (WHO, 2022). The first strategy was to limit and control the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection, which is critical for safeguarding individuals, particularly those who are at risk of serious disease or occupational exposure to the virus. The second strategy was to decrease morbidity, long-term sequelae, and mortality through prevention, timely diagnosis, and effective treatment. Cancer care has been one of the most affected medical fields during the pandemic. Patients may chose or have to delay or discontinue care, leading to delays or a lack of diagnosis and treatment (Yadav et al., 2020). A study of patients with COVID-19 reported that patients with cancer were more likely to have severe symptoms than those without cancer (adjusted odds ratio  $(OR_{Adj}) = 3.61$ ; 95% confidence interval (CI): 2.59–5.40, p = 0.001) and had longer recovery times than those without (mean = 24 days (interquartile range (IQR) = 17–29 days) vs. mean = 21 days (IQR = 15–24 days), respectively; p = 0.045) (Tian et al., 2020). A meta-analysis reported that all vaccine types effectively prevented severe of the COVID-19 illness in patients with cancer (risk ratio = 0.12; 95% CI: 0.040–0.363, p < 0.001) (Huang and Kuan, 2022).

Coronavirus disease presents a serious health challenge for patients with cancer, and full vaccination (two or more doses) helps reduce the severity of the illness and the risk of death. The Ministry of Public Health of Thailand has estimated that there were nearly 87,000 patients with cancer in the 20 provinces of northeastern Thailand (Ministry of Public Health of Thailand, 2022). A study was conducted on SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence among patients with cancer and their household caregivers in a cancer hospital in Bangkok, Thailand, between March 4<sup>th</sup> and May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2021 (Ungtrakul et al., 2022). The study

<sup>1</sup>Master of public health program, Faculty of Public Health, Khon Kaen University, Thailand. <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Public Health, Khon Kaen University, Thailand. <sup>3</sup>ASEAN Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Research Group, Thailand. \*For Correspondence: Suraphi@kku.ac.th

#### Phichet Dapha et al

found that only four of 200 cancer patients had received a COVID-19 vaccination between the end of the second COVID-19 wave and the beginning of the third wave in Thailand. There are few studies in Thailand of the effects of health literacy and sociodemographic on the COVID-19 vaccination status of patients with cancer. Therefore, we explored health literacy and other factors associated with COVID-19 vaccine uptake among patients with cancer in northeastern Thailand.

## **Materials and Methods**

This cross-sectional, questionnaire-based study was conducted in northeastern Thailand from December 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022 to January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2023. The sample population was selected through multistage random sampling, initially classifying 20 northeastern provinces into four health regions. One province was randomly selected from each health region, and five districts were randomly selected from each of the selected provinces. The number of interviews in each district was proportional to the number of cancer patients in that district. Individual participants were selected through simple random sampling of hospital registers, with a goal of 465 completed interviews.

### Participants

The study included 449 patients who met the following inclusion criteria: (1) 18 years of age or older, (2) living in a house registered in the sampled district in northeastern Thailand, (3) being diagnosed with cancer by a doctor, (4) being able to complete the interview form, and (5) agreeing to participate in the study by signing an informed consent form.

#### Instruments

The questionnaire consisted of three parts: (1) sociodemographic information (sex, age, marital status, level of education, average monthly income, residential area, and number of family members); (2) personal medical history (type of cancer, time since cancer diagnosis, ongoing treatments, comorbid diseases, healthcare facilities for cancer treatment, health insurance, and history of laboratory confirmed COVID-19 infection); and (3) health literacy level, assessed by the 47 item European Health Literacy Questionnaire (HLS-EU-Q47). The HLS-EU-Q47 is based on a conceptual model of health literacy and measures four competencies for dealing with healthrelated information (Assessing, understanding, evaluation, and application) in three domains: healthcare, disease prevention, and health promotion (Sørensen et al., 2012). Participants responded to their difficulty with each item on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = very difficult, 2 = difficult, 3 = easy, 4 = very easy). The indices were then standardized to unified metrics ranging from 0 to 50 using the formula: Index (mean - 1) \*(50/3) (Duong, et al., 2017). The four levels were determined as follows: inadequate (0-25), problematic (26-33), sufficient (34-42), and excellent (43–50) health literacy (Sørensen et al., 2015). Participants were initially asked if they had ever received a COVID-19 vaccine, and if so, how many doses. The questionnaire was constructed and evaluated for validity by a panel of three

experts in the fields of health behaviour, epidemiology, and research methodology. The final 71 item questionnaire had an item-objective congruence greater than 0.50. Reliability testing showed a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95.

#### Statistical Analysis

Sociodemographic characteristics and questionnaire responses were categorised and presented as numbers and percentages, respectively. Univariable logistic regression was utilised to investigate the associations between each independent variable (sociodemographic characteristics and health literacy) and the outcome variable (having received at least two doses of a COVID-19 vaccine). Variables with a p-value < 0.25 in the univariable analysis were included in the multivariable logistic regression analysis, using backward elimination. All data were analysed using STATA version 15 (StataCorp., LLC. College Station, TX). A p-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

## Results

Characteristics of participants and COVID-19 vaccinations

A total of 449 patients participated in the study. Of these, 368 had received at least two doses of vaccine, for a vaccination rate of 81.96%. Participants had a mean age of 60.96 years (S.D.  $\pm$  12.12, range 20–97 years), a mean average monthly income of 4,047.68 Thai Bath  $(S.D. \pm 5,788.15, range 600-63,000 Thai Bath)$ , and a mean time since cancer diagnosis of 4.90 years (S.D.  $\pm$  4.02, range 1–25 years). The majority of participants were female (75.72%), married (68.37%), had graduated from primary school (69.49%), and lived in rural areas (79.28%). In terms of healthcare, The most common diagnosis was breast cancer (30.07%), had no comorbid diseases (72.16%), were receiving ongoing cancer treatments (94.21%), were receiving treatment at a general hospital (49.67%), and were covered by Thai Universal Health Care (83.52%). Reported COVID-19 infections were laboratory-confirmed for (26.50%) of patients, and 53.55% had inadequate or problematic health literacy (Table 1).

#### Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination

Univariable regression analysis revealed seven predictors of vaccination status with p-values < 0.25(marital status, number of family members, type of cancer, ongoing treatment, healthcare facilities for cancer treatment, history of laboratory confirmation of COVID-19 infection, and level of health literacy), which were included in multivariable models (Table 2). In the final models, only health literacy level, marital status, healthcare facility, and history of laboratory confirmation of COVID-19 infection remained significant predictors of vaccination status (p = 0.001) (Table 3).

Cancer patients with excellent health literacy had a 7.23-times higher probability of being vaccinated compared to those with inadequate health literacy ( $OR_{Adj}$ = 7.23; 95% CI:2.11–24.71, p-value = 0.002). Participants with sufficient health literacy had a 6.03-times higher

|                            | DOI:10.31557/APJCP.2023.24.7.2375     |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| COVID-19 Vaccination among | Cancer Patients in Northeast Thailand |

| Table 1. Sociodemographic Histories, and Health Literac | Characteristics<br>y Status of Partie | s, Medical<br>cipants |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Factors   | Number (n= 449)                       | Percentage            |
| Sex   |                                       |                       |
| Male  | 109                                   | 24.28                 |
| Female  | 340                                   | 75.72                 |
| Age (years)   |                                       |                       |
| 18–59   | 189                                   | 42.09                 |
| $\geq 60$   | 260                                   | 57.91                 |
| Mean (S.D.)   | 60.96 (12.12)                         |                       |
| Median (Minimum, Maximum)                               | 61 (20, 97)                           |                       |
| Marital status  |                                       |                       |
| Single  | 48                                    | 10.69                 |
| Married   | 307                                   | 68.37                 |
| Divorced / Widowed                                      | 94                                    | 20.94                 |
| Level of Education                                      |                                       |                       |
| Illiterate  | 39                                    | 8.69                  |
| Primary school  | 312                                   | 69.49                 |
| High school   | 67                                    | 14.92                 |
| Diploma / University                                    | 31                                    | 6.90                  |
| Average monthly income (Thai Ba                         | th)                                   |                       |
| ≤ 3,000   | 203                                   | 45.21                 |
| 3,001–9,000   | 210                                   | 46.77                 |
| > 9,000   | 36                                    | 8.02                  |
| Mean (S.D.)   | 4,047.68 (5,7                         | 788.15)               |
| Median (Minimum, Maximum)                               | 3,000.00 (600,                        | 63,000)               |
| Residential area  |                                       |                       |
| Rural   | 356                                   | 79.28                 |
| Suburban  | 83                                    | 18.49                 |
| Urban   | 10                                    | 2.23                  |
| Numbers of Family members                               |                                       |                       |
| 1–2   | 73                                    | 16.26                 |
| 3–4   | 176                                   | 39.20                 |
| $\geq$ 5  | 200                                   | 44.54                 |
| Mean (S.D.)   | 4.08 (1.61)                           |                       |
| Median (Minimum, Maximum)                               | 4.00 (1, 13)                          |                       |
| Type of cancer  |                                       |                       |
| Colorectal cancer                                       | 69                                    | 15.37                 |
| Liver and bile duct cancer                              | 46                                    | 10.24                 |
| Lung cancer   | 17                                    | 3.79                  |
| Breast cancer   | 135                                   | 30.07                 |
| Cervical cancer   | 48                                    | 10.69                 |
| Other types of cancer                                   | 134                                   | 29.84                 |
| Time since the cancer diagnosis (y                      | ears)                                 |                       |
| $\leq 1$  | 79                                    | 17.59                 |
| 2–4   | 137                                   | 30.52                 |
| $\geq$ 5  | 233                                   | 51.89                 |
| Mean (S.D.)   | 4.90 (4.02)                           |                       |
| Median (Minimum, Maximum)                               | 5.00 (1, 25)                          |                       |
| Ongoing treatments                                      |                                       |                       |
| No  | 26                                    | 5.79                  |
| Yes   | 423                                   | 94.21                 |
| Other health insurance                                  | 74                                    | 16.48                 |

| Table 1. Continued                         |                         |            |  |  |  |  |
|--|-------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| Factors                                    | Number (n= 449)         | Percentage |  |  |  |  |
| Healthcare facilities for cancer treatment |                         |            |  |  |  |  |
| Community hospitals                        | 67 14.92                |            |  |  |  |  |
| General hospitals                          | 223                     | 49.67      |  |  |  |  |
| Regional hospital                          | 91                      | 20.27      |  |  |  |  |
| University hospital                        | 22                      | 4.90       |  |  |  |  |
| Other medical facilities                   | 46                      | 10.24      |  |  |  |  |
| Health insurance                           |                         |            |  |  |  |  |
| Universal Health Care                      | 375                     | 83.52      |  |  |  |  |
| Other health insurance                     | 74                      | 16.48      |  |  |  |  |
| History of laboratory confirma             | tion of COVID-19 infect | tion       |  |  |  |  |
| No   | 330                     | 73.50      |  |  |  |  |
| Yes  | 119                     | 26.50      |  |  |  |  |
| Comorbid diseases                          |                         |            |  |  |  |  |
| No   | 324                     | 72.16      |  |  |  |  |
| Yes  | 125                     | 27.84      |  |  |  |  |
| Level of health literacy                   |                         |            |  |  |  |  |
| Inadequate                                 | 19                      | 4.23       |  |  |  |  |
| Problematic                                | 221                     | 49.22      |  |  |  |  |
| Sufficient                                 | 135                     | 30.07      |  |  |  |  |
| Excellent                                  | 74                      | 16.48      |  |  |  |  |
| Prior COVID-19 vaccination (               | at least two doses)     |            |  |  |  |  |
| Unvaccinated                               | 81                      | 18.04      |  |  |  |  |
| Vaccinated                                 | 368                     | 81.96      |  |  |  |  |

probability of having been vaccinated ( $OR_{Adi} = 6.03$ ; 95% CI:2.00-18.24, p-value = 0.001), whereas those with problematic health literacy had a 3.88-times higher probability (OR<sub>Adj</sub> = 3.88; 95% CI:1.37-11.00, p-value = 0.011). Married participants had a 2.90-times higher probability of prior vaccination than those who were single ( $OR_{Adj} = 2.90;95\%$  CI:1.37–6.14, p-value = 0.005). Cancer patients who received cancer treatment at general hospitals had a 2.50-times higher probability of receiving the vaccination than those receiving cancer treatment at community hospitals ( $OR_{Adj} = 2.50;95\%$  CI:1.25–5.00, p-value = 0.010), and those with a history of laboratory confirmation of COVID-19 infection had a 2.37-times higher probability of receiving the vaccination than those with no history of laboratory confirmation of COVID-19 infection (OR<sub>Adi</sub> = 2.37; 95% CI:1.19–4.71, p-value = 0.014) (Table 3).

## Discussion

This study explored rates of COVID-19 vaccination and identified factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination among patients with cancer in northeastern Thailand two years into the pandemic. However, there is a scarcity of reports of vaccination levels specific to cancer patients. This study provides data that may be utilised to assist health authorities in enhancing COVID-19 vaccination strategies among patients with cancer in Thailand.

Compared to other studies conducted among patients with cancer, the vaccination rate of the COVID-19

## Phichet Dapha et al

| Table 2. Univariable Analysis:     | Predictive value | of participants'  | sociodemographic | characteristics, | medical ! | histories, |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|------------|
| and health literacy status for the | eir COVID-19 va  | accination status |                  |                  |           |            |

| Univariate analysis Factors              | All participants $(n = 449)$ | Vaccinated<br>(at least two doses) (%) | Crude OR | 95% CI      | p-value |
|--|------------------------------|--|----------|-------------|---------|
| Sex                                      |                              |  |          |             | 0.704   |
| Male                                     | 109                          | 88 (80.73%)                            | Ref.     |             |         |
| Female                                   | 340                          | 280 (82.35%)                           | 1.11     | 0.64-1.93   | 0.702   |
| Age (years)                              |                              |  |          |             | 0.440   |
| 35–59                                    | 189                          | 158 (83.60%)                           | Ref.     |             |         |
| $\geq 60$                                | 260                          | 210 (80.77%)                           | 0.82     | 0.50-1.35   | 0.442   |
| Marital status                           |                              |  |          |             | 0.023   |
| Single                                   | 48                           | 33 (68.75%)                            | Ref.     |             |         |
| Married                                  | 307                          | 261 (85.02%)                           | 2.58     | 1.30-5.12   | 0.007   |
| Divorced / Widowed                       | 94                           | 74 (78.72%)                            | 1.68     | 0.77-3.69   | 0.194   |
| Level of Education                       |                              |  |          |             | 0.758   |
| Illiterate                               | 39                           | 30 (76.92%)                            | Ref.     |             |         |
| Primary school                           | 312                          | 255 (81.73%)                           | 1.34     | 0.60-2.98   | 0.470   |
| High school                              | 67                           | 57 (85.07%)                            | 1.71     | 0.63-4.66   | 0.295   |
| Diploma / University                     | 31                           | 26 (83.87%)                            | 1.56     | 0.46-5.25   | 0.472   |
| Average monthly income (Thai Bath)       |                              |  |          |             | 0.412   |
| ≤ 3,000                                  | 203                          | 161 (79.31%)                           | Ref.     |             |         |
| 3,001–9,000                              | 210                          | 177 (84.29%)                           | 1.40     | 0.85-2.31   | 0.191   |
| > 9,000                                  | 36                           | 30 (83.33%)                            | 1.30     | 0.51-3.34   | 0.580   |
| Residential area                         |                              |  |          |             | 0.305   |
| Rural                                    | 356                          | 289 (81.18%)                           | Ref.     |             |         |
| Suburban                                 | 83                           | 72 (86.75%)                            | 1.52     | 0.76-3.02   | 0.235   |
| Urban                                    | 10                           | 7 (70.00%)                             | 0.54     | 0.14-2.15   | 0.382   |
| Numbers of Family members                |                              |  |          |             | 0.141   |
| 1–2                                      | 73                           | 63 (86.30%)                            | Ref.     |             |         |
| 3–4                                      | 176                          | 149 (84.66%)                           | 0.88     | 0.40-1.92   | 0.740   |
| ≥5                                       | 200                          | 156 (78.00%)                           | 0.56     | 0.27-1.19   | 0.131   |
| Type of cancer                           |                              |  |          |             | 0.129   |
| Colorectal cancer                        | 69                           | 57 (82.61%)                            | 1.43     | 0.68 - 3.00 | 0.344   |
| Liver and bile duct cancer               | 46                           | 35 (76.09%)                            | 0.96     | 0.44-2.10   | 0.914   |
| Lung cancer                              | 17                           | 13 (76.47%)                            | 0.98     | 0.30-3.22   | 0.971   |
| Breast cancer                            | 135                          | 120 (88.89%)                           | 2.41     | 1.23-4.71   | 0.010   |
| Cervical cancer                          | 48                           | 40 (83.33%)                            | 1.50     | 0.64-3.55   | 0.351   |
| Other types of cancer                    | 134                          | 103 (76.87%)                           | Ref.     |             |         |
| Elapsed time since the cancer diagnosis  | (years)                      |  |          |             | 0.477   |
| ≤ 1                                      | 79                           | 68 (86.08%)                            | Ref.     |             |         |
| 2-4                                      | 137                          | 109 (79.56%)                           | 0.63     | 0.29-1.35   | 0.233   |
| ≥ 5                                      | 233                          | 191 (81.97%)                           | 0.74     | 0.36-1.51   | 0.403   |
| Ongoing treatments                       |                              |  |          |             | 0.248   |
| No                                       | 26                           | 19 (73.08%)                            | Ref.     |             |         |
| Yes                                      | 423                          | 349 (82.51%)                           | 1.74     | 0.70-4.28   | 0.230   |
| Healthcare facility for cancer treatment |                              |  |          |             | 0.025   |
| Community hospital                       | 67                           | 45 (67.16%)                            | Ref.     |             |         |
| General hospital                         | 223                          | 191 (85.65%)                           | 2.92     | 1.55-5.49   | 0.001   |
| Regional hospital                        | 91                           | 76 (83.52%)                            | 2.48     | 1.17-5.26   | 0.018   |
| University hospital                      | 22                           | 19 (86.36%)                            | 3.10     | 0.83-11.59  | 0.093   |
| Other medical facility                   | 46                           | 37 (80.43%)                            | 2.01     | 0.83-4.89   | 0.124   |

DOI:10.31557/APJCP.2023.24.7.2375 COVID-19 Vaccination among Cancer Patients in Northeast Thailand

| Table 2. Continued                    |                              |  |          |            |         |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|----------|------------|---------|
| Univariate analysis Factors           | All participants $(n = 449)$ | Vaccinated<br>(at least two doses) (%) | Crude OR | 95% CI     | p-value |
| Health insurance                      |                              |  |          |            | 0.652   |
| Universal Health Care                 | 375                          | 306 (81.60%)                           | Ref.     |            |         |
| Other medical insurance               | 74                           | 62 (83.78%)                            | 1.17     | 0.60-2.28  | 0.655   |
| History of laboratory confirmation of | of COVID-19 infection        |  |          |            | 0.006   |
| No                                    | 330                          | 261 (79.09%)                           | Ref.     |            |         |
| Yes                                   | 119                          | 107 (89.92%)                           | 2.36     | 1.23-4.53  | 0.010   |
| Comorbid diseases                     |                              |  |          |            | 0.693   |
| No                                    | 324                          | 267 (82.41%)                           | Ref.     |            |         |
| Yes                                   | 125                          | 101 (80.80%)                           | 0.90     | 0.53-1.52  | 0.691   |
| Level of health literacy              |                              |  |          |            | 0.008   |
| Inadequate                            | 19                           | 10 (52.63%)                            | Ref.     |            |         |
| Problematic                           | 221                          | 178 (80.54%)                           | 3.73     | 1.43-9.73  | 0.007   |
| Sufficient                            | 135                          | 115 (85.19%)                           | 5.18     | 1.87-14.32 | 0.002   |
| Excellent                             | 74                           | 65 (87.84%)                            | 6.50     | 2.08-20.30 | 0.001   |

vaccine among the patients in this study was 81.96%. The SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence study in a Bangkok cancer in early 2021 found only four of 200 patients (2.00%) had received a COVID-19 vaccine (Ungtrakul et al., 2022). A study in Korea explored the vaccination rates of hospitalised patients with cancer at high risk of severe COVID-19 between April 18<sup>th</sup> and April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2022 (Nhamet et al., 2022). The percentage of patients who had received a second dose of COVID-19 vaccine was 82.8%. The study also found that vaccination rates were lower among elderly patients.

Cancer patients with excellent health literacy  $(OR_{Adj} = 7.23; 95\% CI:2.11-24.71)$ , sufficient health literacy  $(OR_{Adj} = 6.03; 95\% CI:2.00-18.24)$ , and problematic

health literacy ( $OR_{Adj} = 3.88$ ; 95% CI:1.37–11.00) were more likely to receive COVID-19 vaccine. A study in Bosnia and Herzegovina was conducted on the acceptance of COVID-19 vaccination and its associated factors among patients attending the oncology clinic at a university hospital Mostar (Marijanović et al., 2021). The study found that participants who answered that they had sufficient information about COVID-19 vaccines were more likely to intend to receive the COVID-19 vaccine ( $OR_{Adj} = 3.97$ ; 95%CI:2.43–6.49). The authors also reported that the healthcare information could be effectively provided during medical consultations. It suggested that oncologists should obtain recent guidance published by oncology societies or organizations and

Table 3. Multivariable Analysis: Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination status.

| Predictors                           | All participants ( $n = 449$ ) | Crude OR | <sup>a</sup> Adjusted OR | 95% CI     | p-values |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|------------|----------|
| Level of Health literacy             |                                |          |                          |            |          |
| Inadequate                           | 19                             | Ref.     | Ref.                     |            |          |
| Problematic                          | 221                            | 3.73     | 3.88                     | 1.37-11.00 | 0.011    |
| Sufficient                           | 135                            | 5.18     | 6.03                     | 2.00-18.24 | 0.001    |
| Excellent                            | 74                             | 6.50     | 7.23                     | 2.11-24.71 | 0.002    |
| Marital status                       |                                |          |                          |            |          |
| Single                               | 48                             | Ref.     | Ref.                     |            |          |
| Married                              | 307                            | 2.58     | 2.90                     | 1.37-6.14  | 0.005    |
| Divorced / Widowed                   | 94                             | 1.68     | 2.23                     | 0.92-5.39  | 0.076    |
| Healthcare facilities for cancer tre | atment                         |          |                          |            |          |
| Community hospital                   | 67                             | Ref.     | Ref.                     |            |          |
| General hospital                     | 223                            | 2.92     | 2.50                     | 1.25-5.00  | 0.010    |
| Regional hospital                    | 91                             | 2.48     | 2.19                     | 0.98-4.92  | 0.057    |
| University hospital                  | 22                             | 3.10     | 3.00                     | 0.73-12.37 | 0.128    |
| Other medical facility               | 46                             | 2.01     | 1.92                     | 0.75-4.93  | 0.175    |
| History of laboratory confirmation   |                                |          |                          |            |          |
| No                                   | 330                            | Ref.     | Ref.                     |            |          |
| Yes                                  | 119                            | 2.36     | 2.37                     | 1.19–4.71  | 0.014    |

<sup>a</sup>Adjusted for patient sex, age, residence, ongoing treatment status, and comorbid diseases.

#### Phichet Dapha et al

collated the information to offer further advice so that patients with cancer can receive the best evidenceinformed treatments (Yau et al., 2020).

In our study, married patients were more likely to be vaccinated ( $OR_{Adj} = 2.90;95\%$  CI: 1.37–6.14), possibly because they were supported in information and encouragement by their families. It similar to a study was conducted about the external support associated with COVID-19 vaccination among Chinese breast cancer patients that who received positive support from surrounding people ( $OR_{Adj} = 11.65; 95\%$  CI: 7.57 - 17.91) (Wang et al., 2022).

We found that patients being treated at general hospitals were more likely to have been vaccinated ( $\mathrm{OR}_{\mathrm{Adi}}$ = 2.50; 95% CI:1.25–5.00), possibly because the hospital had a surgeon or oncologist with whom the cancer patients could consult and the distance to the general hospitals may be closer to their residences. A study was conducted about the external support associated with COVID-19 vaccination among Chinese breast cancer patients who had received a recommendation from a surgeon or oncologist (OR<sub>Adj</sub> = 5.52; 95% CI: 3.50–8.71). The findings reveal a strong role of positive doctor suggestions (Wang et al., 2022). One of the few studies on the impact of the COVID pandemic on cancer care found that care was heavily reliant on oncologists' judgment to strike a balance between additional risks of COVID infection and the advantages of in-person treatment (Mandal et al., 2021)

Participants with a history of laboratory confirmation of COVID-19 infection were more likely to receive COVID-19 vaccine ( $OR_{Adj} = 2.37$ ; 95% CI:1.19–4.71). It related with a study in Canada, a study focusing on the factors associated with timely COVID-19 vaccination in patients with cancer reported that those with COVID-19 infections were more likely to accept the vaccine than those without infections ( $OR_{Adj} = 1.12$ ; 95% CI:1.10– 1.15). Furthermore, this study discovered an association between having a COVID-19 infection before first dose and higher rates of complete vaccination (Powis et al., 2023).

The findings of our study will be useful for developing a more comprehensive COVID-19 vaccination implementation strategy for cancer patients in northeastern Thailand during the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on our findings, governments and health-related organisations should pay focus on patients' families and healthcare personnel, as they have additional opportunities to inform and convince patients about the benefits of vaccination.

There are a few limitations of this study. The work was carried out in northeastern Thailand, and the findings may not be generalisable to other areas. Furthermore, because official vaccine policies, vaccine availability, and COVID-19 pandemic conditions have changed over time, the study results may only be representative for the study period.

In conclusion, this study identified several patientlevel factors associated with the COVID-19 vaccination level of patients with cancer patients in northeastern Thailand. The predictors of receiving COVID-19 vaccines were health literacy, being married, having ongoing treatment at the general hospital, and having a history of laboratory confirmation of COVID-19 infection. Therefore, enhancing healthcare provider awareness of these predictors could influent the COVID-19 vaccine uptake among patients with cancer.

### **Author Contribution Statement**

Phichet Dapha developed and led the study, oversaw data collection, analysed the data, and wrote the draft manuscript. Surachai Phimha critically reviewed the study proposal. Nakarin Prasit assisted in interpreting the findings. Nopparat Senahad oversaw data management. All authors provided constructive criticism and contributed to the development of the research, analysis, and manuscript. All authors read the final version of the manuscript and approved its submission..

### Acknowledgements

#### General

The authors express their gratitude to the patients who agreed to participate. Furthermore, we express appreciation to the alumni of Khon Kaen University's Faculty of Public Health, public health professionals, and village health volunteers, who collaborated and supported the process of collecting data.

#### Funding Statement

This study was funded by the Graduate School of the Khon Kaen University.

#### References

- Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health. (2021). Guidelines for COVID-19 vaccination in the 2021 outbreak situation of Thailand, 2nd revision. Target group and vaccination implementation phase. TS Inter-print, Samut Prakan, pp 22-23.
- Duong TV, Aringazina A, Baisunova G, et al (2017). Measuring health literacy in Asia: Validation of the HLS-EU-Q47 survey tool in six Asian countries. *J Epidemiol*, 27, 80–6.
- Hong J, Xu XW, Yang J, et al (2022). Knowledge about, attitude and acceptance towards, and predictors of intention to receive the COVID-19 vaccine among cancer patients in Eastern China: A cross-sectional survey. *J Integr Med*, **20**, 34–44.
- Huang YZ, Kuan CC (2022). Vaccination to reduce severe COVID-19 and mortality in COVID-19 patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci*, 26, 1770–6.
- Mandal A, Singh P, Singh D, et al (2021). Impact of COVID Pandemic on Cancer Care: Cross-sectional Scenario of an Indian State (Bihar). Asian Pac J Cancer Care, 6, 27-33.
- Marijanović I, Kraljević M, Buhovac T, Sokolović E (2021). Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccination and Its Associated Factors Among Cancer Patients Attending the Oncology Clinic of University Clinical Hospital Mostar, Bosnia, and Herzegovina: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Med Sci Monit*, 27, e932788.
- Ministry of Public Health Thailand (2022). Persons with congenital disease (Group 3). Retrieved February 6, 2023, From https://hdcservice.moph.go.th/hdc/main/index.php.
- Nham E, Hyun H, Seong H, et al (2022). Vaccination Rates of

Hospitalized Patients at High Risk of Severe COVID-19: A Single-Center Cross-Sectional Study. *Infect Chemother*, **54**, 787–91.

- Powis M, Sutradhar R, Patrikar A, et al (2023). Factors associated with timely COVID-19 vaccination in a population-based cohort of patients with cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst*, **115**, 146–54.
- Sørensen K, Van den Broucke S, Fullam J, et al (2012). Health literacy and public health: a systematic review and integration of definitions and models. *BMC Public Health*, **12**, 80.
- Sørensen K, Van den Broucke S, Pelikan JM, et al (2013). Measuring health literacy in populations: illuminating the design and development process of the European Health Literacy Survey Questionnaire (HLS-EU-Q). *BMC Public Health*, **13**, 948.
- Sørensen K, Pelikan J M, Röthlin F, et al (2015). Health literacy in Europe: comparative results of the European health literacy survey (HLS-EU). *Eur J Public Health*, 25, 1053–8.
- Tian J, Yuan X, Xiao J, et al (2020). Clinical characteristics and risk factors associated with COVID-19 disease severity in patients with cancer in Wuhan, China: a multicentre, retrospective, cohort study. *Lancet Oncol*, **21**, 893–903.
- Ungtrakul T, Sornsamdang G, Soonklang K, et al (2022). SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence among cancer patients and household caregivers in a cancer hospital: Cross-sectional survey after the second COVID-19 wave in Thailand. *Public Health Pract (Oxf)*, **4**, 100341.
- Wang XY, Liu Q, Zhang WX, et al (2022). External Supports Are Associated With the COVID-19 Vaccination in Chinese Breast Cancer Patients: A Cross-Sectional Survey. *World J* Oncol, 13, 172–84.
- World Health Organization (2020). Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) SITUATION REPORT - 1 21 JANUARY 2020. Retrieved January 21, 2023, From https://www. who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situationreports/20200121-sitrep-1-2019-ncov.pdf.
- World Health Organization Europe (2020). Statement on the second meeting of the International Health Regulations (2005) Emergency Committee regarding the outbreak of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). (2020). Retrieved February 21, 2023, From https://www.who.int/news/item/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncoV).
- World Health Organization (2022). Strategic Preparedness, Readiness and Response Plan to end the global covid-19 emergency in 2022. Retrieved February 21, 2023, From https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-WHE-SPP-2022.1.
- Yadav S, Zain M, Sahai P, Porwal S, Chauhan V (2020). Challenges Encountered in Cancer Care and Management During Covid-19 in South Asian Countries. *Asian Pac J Cancer Care*, 5, 101-7.
- Yau C, Wallbridge I, Shankar A, Saini D, Jee Bharati S (2020). Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Cancer Treatment. *Asian Pac J Cancer Care*, **5**, 247-9.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.