



**Characteristics of five year olds who catch-up with MMR:
findings from the UK Millennium Cohort Study**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-003152
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-May-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Pearce, Anna; UCL Institute of Child Health, Mindlin, Miranda; Kent, Surrey, Sussex Public Health England Centre, Cortina Borja, Mario; UCL, Institute of Child Health Bedford, Helen; UCL, Institute of Child Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health policy, Infectious diseases
Keywords:	Socio-economic factors, immunisation, measles-mumps-rubella vaccine, measles, child health services

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer review only

Characteristics of five year olds who catch-up with MMR: findings from the UK Millennium Cohort

Study

Anna Pearce (Research Fellow)¹; Miranda Mindlin (Consultant in Communicable Disease Control)^{2,1};

Mario Cortina-Borja (Senior Lecturer)¹; Helen Bedford (Senior Lecturer)^{1*}

¹MRC Centre of Epidemiology for Child Health, UCL Institute of Child Health, 30 Guilford Street, London, WC1N 1EH, UK

² Kent, Surrey, Sussex Public Health England Centre, County Hall North, Chart Way, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1XA, UK

*corresponding author and guarantor to the paper. h.bedford@ucl.ac.uk. T 0207 905 2333; F 020 7905 2793

Key words:

Socio-economic factors, immunisation, measles, measles-mumps-rubella vaccine, child health services

Word count: 2999

Abstract

Objectives

To examine predictors of partial and full MMR catch-up between three and five years

Design

Secondary data analysis of the nationally representative Millennium Cohort Study (MCS)

Setting

Children born in the UK, 2000-2

Participants

751 MCS children who were unimmunised against measles, mumps and rubella at age three, with immunisation information at age five

Main outcome measures

Catch-up status: unimmunised (received no MMR), partial catch-up (received one MMR), or full catch-up (received two MMRs)

Results

At age five, 60.3% ($n=440$) children remained unvaccinated, 16.1% ($n=127$) had partially, and 23.6% ($n=184$) had fully caught-up. Children from families who did not speak English at home were five times as likely to partially catch-up than children living in homes where only English was spoken (risk ratio: 4.68 [95% CI, 3.63-6.03]). Full catch-up was also significantly more likely in those did not speak English at home (adjusted risk ratio: 1.90 [1.08-3.32]). In addition, those from Pakistani /Bangladeshi (2.40 [1.38-4.18]) or 'other' ethnicities (such as Chinese) (1.88 [1.08-3.29]) were more likely to fully catch-up than White British. Those living in socially rented (1.86 [1.34-2.56]) or 'Other' (2.52 [1.23-5.18]) accommodations were more likely to fully catch-up than home owners, and families were more likely to catch-up if they lived outside London (1.95 [1.32-2.89]). Full catch-up was less likely if parents reported medical reasons (0.43 [0.25-0.74]), a conscious decision (0.33

1
2
3 [0.23-0.48]), or 'other' reasons (0.46 [0.29-0.73]) for not immunising at age three (compared to
4
5 'practical' reasons).
6

7 *Conclusions*

8
9
10 Parents who partially or fully catch-up with MMR experience practical barriers and tend to come
11
12 from disadvantaged or ethnic minority groups. Families who continue to reject MMR tend to have
13
14 more advantaged backgrounds and make a conscious decision to not immunise early on. Health
15
16 professionals should consider these findings in light of the characteristics of their local populations.
17
18
19
20

21 **Article summary:**

22 **Article focus**

- 23
24
25
26 • Areas of the UK are currently experiencing measles outbreaks, and a MMR national catch-up
27
28 programme has just been launched
- 29
30
31 • Individual-level predictors of MMR catch-up are unknown
- 32
33
34 • We explore a range of risk factors for partial and full catch-up between age three and five years
35
36 in the nationally representative UK Millennium Cohort Study

37 **Key messages**

- 38
39
40 • Of 751 children who were unimmunised at age three, 60% remained unimmunised at age five,
41
42 16% had partially caught-up, and 24% had fully caught-up
 - 43
44
45 • Two distinct groups of parents emerged:
 - 46
47
48 ○ those who experienced practical barriers and were from more disadvantaged groups –
49
50 these groups eventually caught-up
 - 51
52
53 ○ those who consciously rejected MMR and were from more advantaged circumstances –
54
55 these groups tended to remain unimmunised
- 56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 • Health professionals should consider these findings in light of the characteristics of their local
4
5 populations when designing programmes to increase and maintain uptake
6
7

8 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

9

- 10 • This is the first study to examine individual level characteristics of MMR catch-up in the UK; we
11 do this using data from a cohort of children who were born at the height of the MMR scare and
12 are currently being targeted by the national catch-up programme
13
14
15
16
17 • We were unable to investigate exact timing of vaccination; therefore our analyses focus on
18 children who were unimmunised at age three (so approximately 2 years after the
19 recommended age of administration), and we were unable to detect how long children who had
20 partially or fully caught-up by age five had been left susceptible
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 • Our analyses refer to predictors of catch-up during a period when the incidence of measles was
28 relatively low; during times of measles outbreaks the perceived risk-benefit balance of the
29 vaccine shifts, particularly for advantaged families.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

The combined measles, mumps and rubella vaccination (MMR) has been used routinely in the UK since 1988. Coverage at 2 years of age peaked in 1995¹ at 92%. A two-dose schedule was introduced in 1996, the first dose recommended at soon after the age of 12/13 months² (affording 90% protection), with a second at three years four months² (99% protection). In 1998, a Lancet article³ was widely interpreted as suggesting MMR was linked with autism and bowel problems. Although the paper was eventually discredited and retracted by the Lancet in 2010⁴, widespread adverse media coverage in the intervening years led to a dramatic fall in MMR uptake, to a low of 79% (of the first dose by age two) in 2003⁵. By 2006-7, 85% of two year olds had received at least one MMR, although only 73% had received the recommended two doses by age five, and levels were particularly low in some geographical areas, such as London⁶. As a result, the Health Protection Agency announced that in 2008 measles was again endemic in England and Wales.

Although coverage has continued to rise (in 2011-12, 91.2% of two year olds had received one and 86% of five year olds two doses of MMR⁷), levels remain below those needed for herd immunity, particularly in some geographical areas and in children who were born in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Consequently, measles outbreaks are currently occurring across some areas of the UK, and young teenagers are being disproportionately affected (one quarter of measles cases in 2011-12 were in 10-14 year olds⁸). In response to this, Public Health England, NHS England and the Department of Health announced a national MMR catch-up programme to vaccinate as many partially or unimmunised 10-16 year olds as possible by the start of the next school year (September 2013)⁹. This lays out aims to strengthen current routine immunisation strategies and in particular to target hard to reach populations; GPs and schools will play a central role. A better understanding of the social and demographic characteristics associated with catching-up (or not),

1
2
3 and the reasons reported by parents for their child's immunisation status, is essential if the aims of
4
5 the new framework are to be achieved and maintained. Cross-sectional evidence indicates that, at
6
7 age three, being unimmunised against MMR, or receiving the single antigen vaccines, was socially
8
9 distributed¹⁰. However little is known about the factors which influence the propensity of families
10
11 with unimmunised children to catch-up. We examine the social correlates of partial and full catch-
12
13 up with MMR between the age of three and five years, in a nationally representative cohort of
14
15 children born at the height of the MMR scare.
16
17
18
19

20 **Methods**

21 *Participants*

22
23
24 We analysed data from the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS), a longitudinal study of children eligible
25
26 for Child Benefit and born in the UK between September 2000 and January 2002. The sample was
27
28 derived from a random sample of electoral wards which were disproportionately stratified to
29
30 ensure an adequate representation of all four UK countries, deprived areas and, in the case of
31
32 England, areas with high proportions of families from ethnic minority groups¹¹. At the first
33
34 contact, when the MCS children were aged 9 months, data were collected on 18,296 singleton
35
36 babies (72% of those approached); with subsequent data collections at three and five years. 71% of
37
38 the initial cohort responded to all three sweeps ($n= 12,989$). Participants in the second and third
39
40 sweeps were less likely to be from ethnic or deprived wards^{12 13}, although due to the sampling
41
42 design these proportions remained higher than the general population.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Our analyses focus on the subsample of MCS singleton children who were unimmunised against
53
54 measles, mumps or rubella at age three years. Of the 804 children who were unimmunised at age
55
56 three, 777 (96.6%) had a recorded MMR outcome at five years, and 26 (3.3%) of them were
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 excluded because they were reported to have received at least one single antigen vaccine by age
4
5 five, leaving 751 eligible participants in our analyses.
6
7

8 9 10 *Measures*

11
12 Measures were reported by the main respondent (usually the mother) during survey interviews,
13
14 which were carried out by trained interviewers in the home.
15
16

17
18 Outcome measure: MMR status at age five was classified as unimmunised (received no combined
19
20 MMR vaccines), partially caught-up (received one combined MMR), or fully caught-up (received
21
22 two combined MMRs).
23
24
25

26
27
28 Covariates: We explored socio-economic and demographic factors that were found to be associated
29
30 with immunisation status in earlier sweeps of the MCS^{10 14 15}, or that were pertinent to
31
32 immunisation policy. We examined social class (based on National Statistics Socio-economic
33
34 Classification (NS-SEC)), ethnicity, maternal age at birth (in five-year age bands), maternal
35
36 education, and child gender. These measures were all captured at age nine months because they
37
38 were unlikely to have changed in later sweeps. In addition, we explored the following time-variant
39
40 measures, captured at age three (the beginning of the potential catch-up period): UK country of
41
42 residence, ward type ('advantaged', 'disadvantaged', 'ethnic'), number of children in the
43
44 household, maternal employment status, lone parenthood, household income, housing tenure,
45
46 whether resident in London, whether the family had changed residential address since age three,
47
48 and whether the parents reported the child having natural measles infection. Income data were
49
50 missing for 14% (122) children at age three; we supplemented this with information captured at
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 age nine months, reducing the level of missingness to 24. Missing data were very low for all other
4
5 measures (listed at the foot of Table 1).
6
7

8
9
10 We also investigated reasons given for not having had MMR at age three, classified in a previous
11
12 analysis¹⁰ as 'practical' (such as missing an appointment), 'medical' (e.g. child had asthma),
13
14 'conscious decision' (including fear of links with autism) or 'other' (which included don't know). The
15
16 mean age of the MCS children at the third survey was 61 months, with a range between 52 and 72
17
18 months, meaning that some children had more time to catch-up than others. We therefore
19
20 explored age as a potential confounder, but as it was not found to be associated with immunisation
21
22 status ($p=0.28$) we did not include it in our models. There were no *a priori* hypotheses for
23
24 interactions so none were explored.
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 *Analysis*

32
33 We estimated the prevalence of MMR status (unimmunised, partially caught-up, and fully caught-
34
35 up) at age five, overall and according to the potential explanatory factors. We then fitted Poisson
36
37 regression models to estimate risk ratios (RRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for partial and full
38
39 catch-up (in two separate models, because previous research indicates that the social correlates of
40
41 partial and full immunisation are likely to differ¹⁴). The models were built as follows: first we
42
43 explored univariable associations between the outcome and each of the explanatory variables.
44
45 Variables, which were associated with the outcome ($p<0.10$) using Wald tests for trend, were
46
47 entered into a multivariable model using a forward stepwise model selection strategy. Residence in
48
49 London was forced into the multivariable models, due to its potential significance for policy. Only
50
51 measures which remained significantly associated with the outcome after adjustment were
52
53 retained.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Data were downloaded from the UK Data Archive, University of Essex in May 2010. Analyses were carried out in Stata 12 (Stata Corporation, TX) using survey and response weights to allow for the sample design and attrition between sweeps^{12 16}.

Results

Of the 751 MCS children who were unimmunised at age three, 60.3% (440) remained unvaccinated, 16.1% (127) had partially caught-up, and 23.6% (184) had fully caught-up. Table 1 presents the proportion of children who were partially, fully, or unimmunised, according to the various predictor measures.

Table 1: Weighted percentage (n) of children who remained unimmunised or who partially for fully caught-up with MMR, according to social, demographic and other characteristics

	Total	Full catch-up	Partial catch-up	Unimmunised
Language spoken at home				
English only	91.6 (658)	20.4 (130)	15.8 (11.5)	67.8 (413)
English and other language(s)	5.7 (64)	53.0 (29)	15.0 (9)	32.0 (26)
No - other language(s) only	2.7 (29)	70.2 (25)	27.7 (3)	2.1 (1)
Ward type				
Advantaged	56.5 (290)	20.3 (60)	13.6 (43)	66.1 (187)
Disadvantaged	38.5 (5.0)	24.1 (79)	20.1 (73)	55.8 (227)
Ethnic	5.0 (82)	57.6 (45)	13.3 (11)	29.2 (26)
Ethnicity				
British white	87.5 (644)	20.3 (126)	15.8 (111)	63.9 (407)
Other white	2.2 (13)	10.3 (2)	15.6 (2)	74.1 (9)
Mixed	1.4 (10)	33.5 (3)	15.1 (2)	51.4 (5)
Indian	1.0 (12)	76.9 (9)	5.5 (1)	17.5 (2)
Pakistani or Bangladeshi	3.8 (39)	74.7 (28)	9.8 (3)	15.5 (8)
Black or Black British	2.7 (18)	24.7 (7)	35.1 (5)	40.2 (6)
Other	1.4 (14)	65.2 (9)	19.6 (2)	15.2 (3)
Lone parent/carer				
Two parents/carers	79.2 (597)	21.9 (142)	15.3 (97)	62.9
One parent/carer	20.8 (154)	30.2 (42)	19.3 (30)	50.5 (82)
Maternal age at birth of cohort child				
14 - 19y	8.1 (60)	37.7 (21)	21.8 (14)	40.6 (25)
20-24y	15.9 (130)	34.3 (40)	19.4 (27)	46.3 (63)

25-29y	23.5 (174)	25.8 (52)	18.2 (27)	55.9 (95)
30-34y	27.6 (205)	17.0 (36)	13.0 (30)	70.0 (13.9)
35-39y	20.4 (145)	15.8 (25)	14.3 (24)	70.0 (96)
40plus	4.5 (36)	24.2 (9)	10.6 (5)	65.1 (22)
Maternal education				
Degree	20.8 (152)	18.8 (32)	10.4 (15)	70.7 (105)
Diploma	8.9 (64)	13.9 (9)	14.9 (9)	71.1 (46)
A or AS levels	11.3 (85)	22.7 (19)	17.0 (20)	60.2 (46)
GCSE A*-C	32.2 (238)	20.4 (48)	19.6 (50)	60.0 (140)
GCSE D-G	8.4 (64)	18.1 (13)	23.9 (16)	58.0 (35)
Other	1.9 (15)	25.1 (6)	7.7 (1)	67.2 (8)
None	16.4 (133)	44.5 (57)	13.4 (16)	42.1 (60)
Housing tenure age 3				
Owned	58.7 (451)	18.1 (92)	15.6 (77)	66.3 (282)
Privately rented	9.8 (71)	29.8 (18)	11.5 (8)	58.6 (45)
Socially rented	27.7 (199)	30.4 (65)	19.8 (37)	49.8 (16)
Other	3.8 (30)	43.4 (9)	8.1 (5)	48.6 (16)
Household income (£ pa)				
0-11000	23.7 (186)	32.1 (57)	18.7 (34)	49.2 (95)
11 000-22 000	30.4 (228)	23.4 (56)	18.2 (41)	58.4 (131)
22 000-33 000	19.9 (142)	12.6 (21)	18.3 (34)	69.1 (87)
33 000-55 000	17.4 (123)	20.6 (28)	6.8 (8)	72.6 (87)
55 000+	8.9 (48)	23.5 (11)	15.9 (8)	60.6 (29)
Social class (9 months)				
Managerial & professional	30.2 (222)	20.8 (42)	12.7 (34)	66.5 (14.6)
Intermediate	16.7 (119)	17.5 (22)	17.6 (18)	65.0 (79)
Small employer/self-employed	8.0 (53)	10.1 (10)	11.9 (8)	78.0 (35)
Lower supervisory & technical	4.0 (33)	33.4 (10)	9.6 (4)	57.1 (19)
Semi-routine & routine	32.0 (248)	24.4 (61)	20.6 (53)	54.9 (134)
Never worked/unemployed	9.2 (73)	47.8 (37)	15.6 (10)	36.6 (26)
Number of children in household (age 3)				
One child	22.5 (180)	26.2 (43)	20.0 (38)	53.8 (99)
Two or three children	63.1 (459)	21.3 (104)	15.5 (73)	63.2 (282)
Four or more children	14.4 (112)	29.9 (37)	12.6 (16)	57.6 (59)
Maternal employment (age 3)				
FT	11.2 (93)	23.8 (21)	11.5 (17)	64.7 (55)
PT	25.2 (191)	22.1 (41)	19.6 (37)	58.3 (113)
On leave	3.9 (28)	26.8 (8)	3.9 (1)	69.4 (19)
Self employed	9.3 (60)	17.1 (13)	13.0 (10)	69.9 (37)
Not employed/student	50.4 (379)	25.3 (101)	16.9 (62)	57.8 (216)
Sex of child				
Male	55.1 (404)	20.6 (95)	17.7 (70)	61.7 (239)
Female	44.9 (347)	27.3 (89)	14.1 (57)	58.6 (201)
Parental report of measles disease by age 3				
Yes	3.5 (22)	19.2 (5)	13.2 (3)	67.6 (14)
No	96.5 (721)	23.7 (176)	16.1 (123)	60.2 (422)
Residence in London				
London	16.2 (102)	17.7 (23)	20.0 (19)	62.3 (60)
Not London	83.8 (649)	24.8 (161)	15.3 (108)	60.0 (380)
Country of residence				
England	58.6 (462)	23.3 (122)	15.7 (74)	61.0 (266)

Wales	21.6 (160)	22.1 (31)	20.1 (31)	57.7 (98)
Scotland	12.9 (87)	26.7 (21)	15.6 (14)	57.5 (52)
Northern Ireland	6.9 (42)	25.3 (10)	17.8 (8)	60.0 (24)
Smoked during pregnancy				
No	63.2 (465)	23.4 (121)	15.1 (76)	61.6 (268)
Yes	36.8 (283)	23.8 (62)	18.0 (51)	58.2 (170)
Changed address since 3				
No	85.6 (647)	23.8 (161)	16.6 (112)	59.6 (374)
Yes	14.4 (104)	22.4 (23)	13.1 (15)	64.5 (66)
Reasons given for not having had MMR (aged 3)				
Practical	6.2 (51)	54.5 (30)	15.3 (7)	30.3 (14)
Medical	15.2 (107)	17.9 (82)	25.5 (26)	56.7 (57)
Conscious decision	66.7 (486)	17.8 (82)	16.0 (85)	66.2 (31.9)
Other	11.7 (76)	35.3 (26)	9.9 (9)	54.9 (41)

Missing: Social class 3, smoked during pregnancy 3, income 24, ethnicity 1, reason 31, age at birth 1.

Partial catch-up (compared to remaining unimmunised)

Table 2 (column A) shows unadjusted RRs for partial catch-up, according to each of the predictor measures. Partial catch-up was more likely in families who spoke a language other than English at home (particularly if English was not spoken at home at all), compared to those who only spoke English at home, and in those who lived in a ward classified as 'disadvantaged' or 'ethnic', compared to advantaged wards. No significant associations were seen with any of the other measures. When language, ward type and London residence (due to its policy significance) were entered into the multivariable model, only language remained significantly associated with the likelihood of being partially immunised, with an RR of 4.68 (3.63 to 6.03) in families who did not speak English at home (Table 2, Column B).

Table 2: Unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios (ORs) for partial catch-up with the combined MMR vaccine (baseline unimmunised) by age five

	Partial catch-up		Full catch-up	
	A: uRR (95% CI)	B: aRR (95% CI)	C: uRR (95% CI)	D: aRR (95% CI)
Language spoken at home				
English only	1	1	1	1
English and other language(s)	1.61 (0.96, 2.70)	1.61 (0.96, 2.70)	2.57 (2.00, 3.32)*	1.54 (0.91, 2.63)
Other language(s) only	4.68 (3.63, 6.03)*	4.68 (3.63, 6.03)*	4.00 (3.37, 4.76)*	1.90 (1.08, 3.32)*

<i>p</i> -value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.0811
Ward type				
Advantaged	1		1	
Disadvantaged	1.55 (1.05, 2.27)*		1.29 (0.92, 1.80)	
Ethnic	1.83 (1.18, 2.83)*		2.83 (2.19, 3.65)*	
<i>p</i> -value	0.0146		<0.001	
Ethnicity				
British white	1		1	1
Other white	0.88 (0.22, 3.54)		0.51 (0.13, 2.06)	0.37 (0.10, 1.34)
Mixed	1.15 (0.29, 4.59)		1.64 (0.57, 4.74)	1.83 (0.65, 5.17)
Indian	1.21 (0.19, 7.82)		3.38 (2.40, 4.76)*	2.01 (0.75, 5.41)
Pakistani or Bangladeshi	1.96 (0.84, 4.54)		3.44 (2.79, 4.23)*	2.40 (1.38, 4.18)*
Black or Black British	2.35 (0.99, 5.57)		1.58 (0.73, 3.43)	1.12 (0.35, 3.63)
Other	2.84 (1.12, 7.22)*		3.36 (2.42, 4.67)*	1.88 (1.08, 3.29)*
<i>p</i> -value	0.0126		<0.001	0.0950
Lone parent/carer				
Two parents/carers	1		1	
One parent/carer	1.42 (0.92, 2.17)		1.45 (1.06, 1.99)*	
<i>p</i> -value	0.1110		0.0208	
Maternal age at birth of cohort child				
14 - 19y	1.42 (0.80, 2.51)		1.52 (0.98, 2.37)	
20-24y	1.20 (0.68, 2.12)		1.35 (0.89, 2.03)	
25-29y	1		1	
30-34y	0.63 (0.37, 1.08)		0.62 (0.40, 0.97)*	
35-39y	0.69 (0.40, 1.20)		0.58 (0.37, 0.92)*	
40plus	0.57 (0.23, 1.43)		0.86 (0.42, 1.74)	
<i>p</i> -value	0.0259		<0.001	
Maternal education				
Degree	1		1	
Diploma	1.35 (0.54, 3.36)		0.78 (0.35, 1.72)	
A or AS levels	1.72 (0.79, 3.74)		1.30 (0.71, 2.38)	
Gcse a*-c	1.91 (1.05, 3.49)*		1.21 (0.75, 1.96)	
Gcse d-g	2.27 (1.07, 4.80)*		1.13 (0.55, 2.34)	
Other	0.80 (0.11, 5.93)		1.29 (0.49, 3.39)	
None	1.88 (0.87, 4.03)		2.44 (1.63, 3.66)*	
<i>p</i> -value	0.2420		<0.001	
Housing tenure age 3				
Owned	1		1	1
Privately rented	0.86 (0.32, 2.34)		1.57 (0.96, 2.59)	1.51 (0.91, 2.48)
Socially rented	1.49 (0.96, 2.32)		1.77 (1.29, 2.43)*	1.86 (1.34, 2.56)*
Other	0.75 (0.27, 2.09)		2.20 (1.27, 3.79)*	2.52 (1.23, 5.18)*
<i>p</i> -value	0.0936		0.0014	<0.001
Household income (£ pa)				
0-11000	1		1	
11 000-22 000	0.86 (0.53, 1.41)		0.72 (0.52, 1.02)	
22 000-33 000	0.76 (0.44, 1.31)		0.39 (0.23, 0.66)	
33 000-55 000	0.31 (0.14, 0.70)*		0.56 (0.36, 0.87)	
55 000+	0.76 (0.36, 1.61)		0.71 (0.39, 1.29)	
<i>p</i> -value	0.0816		0.0028	
Social class (9 months)				
Managerial & professional	1		1	

Intermediate	1.33 (0.73, 2.42)		0.89 (0.52, 1.53)	
Small employer/self-employed	0.83 (0.38, 1.79)		0.48 (0.20, 1.16)	
Lower supervisory & technical	0.90 (0.30, 2.67)		1.55 (0.80, 3.00)	
Semi-routine & routine	1.71 (1.11, 2.64)*		1.29 (0.87, 1.92)	
Never worked/unemployed	1.87 (0.96, 3.64)		2.38 (1.62, 3.49)*	
p-value	0.0989		<0.001	
Number of children in household (age 3)				
One child	1		1	
Two or three children	0.73 (0.47, 1.12)		0.77 (0.52, 1.14)	
Four or more children	0.66 (0.34, 1.29)		1.04 (0.67, 1.63)	
p-value	0.2807		0.1832	
Maternal employment (age 3)				
Full-time	1		1	
Part-time	1.67 (0.84, 3.33)		1.02 (0.58, 1.79)	
On leave	0.35 (0.05, 2.48)		1.04 (0.46, 2.33)	
Self employed	1.04 (0.41, 2.66)		0.73 (0.37, 1.45)	
Not employed/student	1.50 (0.88, 2.57)		1.13 (0.71, 1.80)	
p-value	0.1836		0.6517	
Sex of child				
Male	1		1	
Female	0.87 (0.60, 1.27)		1.27 (0.94, 1.71)	
p-value	0.4755		0.1171	
Parental report of measles disease by age 3				
Yes	1		1	
No	1.29 (0.48, 3.49)		1.28 (0.52, 3.16)	
p-value	0.6163		0.5970	
Residence in London				
London	1		1	1
Not London	0.84 (0.50, 1.41)		1.32 (0.86, 2.02)	1.95 (1.32, 2.89)*
p-value	0.5078		0.2012	<0.001
Country of residence				
England	1		1	
Wales	1.26 (0.86, 1.84)		1.00 (0.69, 1.46)	
Scotland	1.04 (0.60, 1.83)		1.16 (0.71, 1.88)	
Northern Ireland	1.16 (0.55, 2.44)		1.11 (0.66, 1.88)	
p-value	0.6802		0.9272	
Smoked during pregnancy				
No	1		1	
Yes	1.20 (0.73, 1.74)		0.05 (0.76, 1.46)	
p-value	0.3202		0.7481	
Changed address since 3				
No	1			
Yes	0.90 (0.62, 1.32)		0.77 (0.42, 1.43)	
p-value	0.6031		0.4112	
Reasons given for not having had MMR (aged 3)				
Practical	1		1	
Medical	0.93 (0.44, 1.93)		0.37 (0.20, 0.68)*	0.43 (0.25, 0.74)*
Conscious decision	0.58 (0.27, 1.22)		0.33 (0.23, 0.47)*	0.33 (0.23, 0.48)*
Other	0.45 (0.16, 1.30)		0.61 (0.40, 0.93)*	0.46 (0.29, 0.73)*
p-value	0.1357		<0.001	<0.001

1
2
3 *Full catch-up (compared to remaining unimmunised)*
4

5 Table 2 also presents unadjusted and adjusted RRs for fully catching up. In the univariable analysis
6 (Column C), children whose parents spoke a language other than English in the home (as opposed
7 to only speaking English), who were from ethnic minority groups (compared to White British), or
8 living in 'ethnic' wards (compared to 'advantaged' wards) were more likely to fully catch-up. Catch-
9 up was also significantly more likely in children who mother had no educational qualifications
10 (compared to a degree), in lone parent families (compared to two parent families), and in those
11 living in 'socially rented' or 'other' tenure types (compared to own/mortgage). Catch-up was
12 significantly less likely in children with a mother in her thirties (compared to 24-29 years), and in
13 children living in higher income households. Children whose parents had reported a non-practical
14 reason ('medical', 'conscious decision', or 'other') for not having their child immunised with the
15 combined MMR at age three were also less likely to have fully caught-up than those reporting
16 practical reasons. Living in London was not associated with immunisation status, although due to
17 its policy significance was included in the multivariable model reported below.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 In the multivariable analysis (Column D), full catch-up remained significantly more likely in those
39 who only spoke a non-English language at home (1.90 [1.08 to 3.32]), when compared to those who
40 only spoke English. Those from Pakistani or Bangladeshi (2.40 [1.38 to 4.18]), and 'Other' (1.88
41 [1.08 to 3.29]) ethnic groups were more likely to have caught-up than White British groups, as were
42 those living in 'socially rented' (1.86 [1.34 to 2.56]) or 'other' (2.52 [1.23 to 5.18]) tenure types
43 (compared to own/mortgage). Full catch-up was also more likely in families living outside London
44 (1.95 [1.32 to 2.89]). Compared to those reporting practical reasons for not having been
45 immunised at age three, children whose parents reported medical reasons (0.43 [0.25 to 0.74]), a
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 conscious decision (0.33 [0.23 to 0.48]), or 'other' reasons (0.46 [0.29 to 0.73]) were considerably
4
5 less likely to have fully caught-up.
6
7

8 9 **Discussion**

10
11 Just over 40% of children who were unimmunised with MMR vaccine at age three had either
12
13 partially or fully caught-up by age five (of which more than caught-up fully). The likelihood of
14
15 catching-up varied markedly with a number of social factors, and more so for full than partial catch-
16
17 up. Some families, particularly those from ethnic minority groups, appear to have difficulty
18
19 accessing the vaccination schedule in a timely fashion. Advantaged families and those citing non-
20
21 practical reasons for non-vaccination at age three are more likely to persist in not immunising their
22
23 child against MMR.
24
25
26
27

28
29
30 We used sample and response weights to account for the survey design and attrition between the
31
32 first, second, and third sweeps. However the non-response weights are unlikely to have entirely
33
34 accounted for differential response; for example 95.7% children who were included in the age three
35
36 and five surveys were fully immunised with the primary vaccines (at age 9 months) compared to
37
38 92.7% in children who did not take part in both of the later surveys ($p<0.001$). Information bias may
39
40 occur when using parental report to measure immunisation status, however there is no gold
41
42 standard measure and studies have found disagreement between parental report and health
43
44 records to be low¹⁷ and not socially distributed¹⁸. Parents were given the opportunity to consult the
45
46 Personal Child Health Record (or 'red book'). Of the 751 families included in our analysis, 19% (137)
47
48 consulted the book and found the relevant information, 1% (11) checked the book and did not find
49
50 the relevant information, and 79% (603) chose not to consult the book. There was no association
51
52 between catch-up status and whether the parent consulted the red book ($p=0.18$), and the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 associations reported in this paper remained the same when analyses were repeated excluding
4
5 children where the parent had looked but not found information (data not shown). A small number
6
7 (26) of children who were unimmunised at age three had received at least one single antigen
8
9 vaccine by age five. Due to low numbers we were unable to explore the characteristics of this
10
11 group.
12
13

14
15
16
17 The intense negative media attention around MMR vaccine peaked in 2002/3 when the MCS
18
19 children were toddlers. These findings therefore provide important information on the barriers to
20
21 catch-up, in a cohort of children who are currently experiencing measles outbreaks throughout the
22
23 UK⁸, and are a central focus of the newly launched national catch-up programme. We measured
24
25 catch-up across the period 2003/5 to 2006/7, when the incidence of measles was low, although
26
27 beginning to increase. It is likely that some of the barriers we report for more advantaged families
28
29 are reduced during times of measles outbreaks, as the perceived risk-benefit balance of the vaccine
30
31 shifts. Nonetheless, this paper provides important information on the barriers experienced by
32
33 advantaged families during times of no outbreak to improve and sustain the current MMR
34
35 programme, which is also a central aim of the catch-up programme. The recommended age of the
36
37 first dose of MMR is 12/13 months; however information on uptake was not collected in the MCS
38
39 until the children were age three years. Our analysis is unable to address those children who were
40
41 immunised by age three but who had not been immunised on time. Similarly, we were unable to
42
43 investigate the timing of catch-up between the age of three and five, and therefore how long
44
45 children who partially or fully caught-up were left susceptible.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54 Before the scare, MMR uptake was generally lower in more deprived areas and households^{19 20}.

55
56 Since 1998, rates declined faster in more advantaged areas^{21 22} and more slowly in areas with lower
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 proportions of highly educated residents²¹ and in minority ethnic groups²³. Earlier cross-sectional
4
5 findings from the MCS demonstrated that the likelihood of being unimmunised against measles,
6
7 mumps and rubella tended to be greater in more disadvantaged families, while children living in
8
9 more affluent households were more likely to receive single antigen vaccines (indicating conscious
10
11 rejection of combined MMR)¹⁰. However there is a dearth of longitudinal research exploring the
12
13 social correlates of catch-up with MMR. The only study, to our knowledge, which has explored the
14
15 social correlates of MMR catch-up was an ecological study of one million children born between
16
17 1987 and 2004 in Scotland. The authors found that children living in more affluent areas were
18
19 either immunised with MMR on time or not at all, whereas children living in deprived areas were
20
21 more likely to be immunised late²². Our findings not only reflect this, but add to the evidence base
22
23 by demonstrating that individual-level predictors of catch-up are strongly related to catch-up. We
24
25 have also found that remaining unvaccinated with MMR at age five was associated with non-
26
27 practical reasons for not immunising with MMR at three, reflecting other research which has shown
28
29 that more affluent families are more likely to consciously reject MMR^{22,24}.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Outbreaks of measles are currently being experienced across the UK, leading to the launch of a
39
40 national catch-programme in April 2013. Approaches to optimise uptake of MMR will need to be
41
42 tailored to the needs of local populations, both now and into the future. Our study has identified
43
44 two distinct groups of families that do not immunise their child with MMR in a timely fashion
45
46 (during periods of low measles incidence). The first comprises those who partially or fully catch-up,
47
48 amounting to 40% of those who were unimmunised at age three. These families tend to experience
49
50 practical barriers to immunisation, and are socially disadvantaged or from ethnic minority groups.
51
52
53
54 The second group, which continues to reject MMR and makes up the remaining 60%, consists of
55
56 parents who consciously reject MMR from the start, and are from more advantaged backgrounds.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Steps are required to minimise time to uptake in those families who do eventually catch-up,
6
7 through the reduction of practical barriers. NICE guidance outlines actions to reduce inequalities in
8
9 immunisation²⁵, including provision of information in multiple languages, offering immunisation
10
11 checks and administration in alternative settings, and sending out reminder invitations from GPs²⁶.
12
13 In addition, alleviating any lingering fears and concerns of families who consciously reject MMR is
14
15 essential. This should include discussion of concerns about 'medical' reasons for not giving MMR, as
16
17 there are very few true contraindications for MMR vaccination. NICE recommends offering parents
18
19 opportunities to discuss their concerns with health professionals; receiving such information from
20
21 health professionals has been found to be the decisive factor for parents who have changed their
22
23 minds about previously rejected or delayed vaccines²⁷. In addition training is recommended for
24
25 health care professionals to equip them with the skills and information needed to communicate
26
27 effectively with parents about immunisation. Finally, joint working between the health sector and
28
29 childcare providers, nurseries, and schools is essential²⁵.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Conclusions

40 Children born at the height of the MMR scare are being disproportionately affected by current
41
42 measles outbreaks and are the target of a newly launched national catch-up programme. Our
43
44 findings refer to children of this age and have identified the characteristics of two distinct groups of
45
46 parents who do not immunise their children with MMR on time. Health professionals should
47
48 consider their local populations in light of our findings, and tailor the local roll-out of the catch-up
49
50 programme accordingly.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The new national immunisation framework not only aims to facilitate catch-up but also to
4
5 strengthen routine approaches to immunisation⁹. Findings from this study should be used to inform
6
7 longer-term local and national planning to improve and maintain timely uptake. While uptake of
8
9 the first dose of MMR in younger age groups has increased, levels remains below those required for
10
11 herd immunity and uptake of the second dose is lower. Measles outbreaks remain a risk,
12
13 particularly in areas of the country with low uptake.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Acknowledgements**

21
22 We would like to thank all the Millennium Cohort families for their participation, and the director of
23
24 the Millennium Cohort Study and colleagues in the management team at the Centre for
25
26 Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education, University of London. We would also like to thank the
27
28 MCS user group at the MRC Centre of Epidemiology for Child Health: Catherine Law, Carol
29
30 Dezateux, Lucy Griffiths, Tim Cole, Phillippa Cumberland, Jamie Fagg, Francesco Sera, Steven Hope,
31
32 Hannah Lewis and Marco Geraci; also David Elliman, for his advice early on in the project.
33
34
35

36 **Funding**

37
38 The Centre for Paediatric Epidemiology and Biostatistics is supported in part by the Medical
39
40 Research Council in its capacity as the MRC Centre of Epidemiology for Child Health (Grant
41
42 reference G0400546). Research at the UCL Institute of Child Health and Great Ormond Street
43
44 Hospital for Children receives a proportion of the funding from the Department of Health's National
45
46 Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centres funding scheme. All researchers were
47
48 independent of the funders and the funders played no part in the study design, analysis or
49
50 interpretation of the data, writing of the report or the decision to submit for publication.
51
52
53

54
55 **Contributors:** MM and HB contributed to the study conception. All authors contributed to the
56
57 design of the analysis. AP, MM and MC-B carried out the analyses. AP and MM drafted the paper.
58
59
60

1
2
3 All authors revised the paper. All authors had full access to the data and take responsibility for the
4
5 integrity of the data and accuracy of the data analysis.
6

7 **Ethics approval:** Research ethics approval was not required for this study as it was a secondary data
8
9 analysis of the UK Millennium Cohort Study. The first sweep of the Millennium Cohort Study
10
11 received ethics approval from National Health Service Ethical Authority in February 2001
12
13 (MREC/01/6/19), and the second and third received approval from the London Multi-Centre
14
15 Research Ethics Committee in September 2004 (MREC/03/2/022) and December 2005
16
17 (05/MRE02/46).
18
19
20

21 **Data sharing:** The Millennium Cohort Study is available at:

22
23 <http://www.esds.ac.uk/findingData/mcs.asp>
24
25

26 **Competing interests**

27
28 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [ww.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf)
29
30 and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; MCB has received research
31
32 grants from the Health Protection Agency; no other relationships or activities that could appear to
33
34 have influenced the submitted work.
35
36

37 **Copyright/licence for publication**

38
39 I, Helen Bedford, the Corresponding Author of this article contained within the original manuscript
40
41 which includes any diagrams & photographs, other illustrative material, video, film or any other
42
43 material howsoever submitted by the Contributor(s) at any time and related to the Contribution
44
45 (“the Contribution”) have the right to grant on behalf of all authors and do grant on behalf of all
46
47 authors, a licence to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and its licensees, to permit this Contribution (if
48
49 accepted) to be published in BMJ Open and any other BMJ Group products and to exploit all
50
51 subsidiary rights, as set out in the licence at: [http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-](http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-for-authors/BMJOpen_licence.pdf)
52
53 [for-authors/BMJOpen_licence.pdf](http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-for-authors/BMJOpen_licence.pdf)
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reference List

1. Communicable Disease Surveillance Centre. COVER/Korner July to September 1995. *CDR weekly* 1995;5:301.
2. Salisbury D, Ramsay M, Noakes K. Immunisation against infectious disease: the green book. In: England PH, editor, 2013.
3. Wakefield AJ, Murch SH, Anthony A, Linnell J, Casson DM, Malik M, et al. Ileal-lymphoid-nodular hyperplasia, non-specific colitis, and pervasive developmental disorder in children. *Lancet* 1998;351 (9103):637-41.
4. Lancet. Retraction--Ileal-lymphoid-nodular hyperplasia, non-specific colitis, and pervasive developmental disorder in children. 2010 Feb *Lancet*. 2010;375(9713):445.
5. Health Protection Agency. COVER programme: January to March 2003. *CDR weekly* 2003;91(6):465-68.
6. The Information Centre. NHS Immunisation Statistics: England 2006-07, 2007.
7. The Health and Social Care Information Centre Screening and Immunisations team. NHS Immunisation Statistics, England: 2011-12 In: Centre TI, editor, 2012.
8. Health Protection Agency. Confirmed cases of measles by region and age: 1996-2012. http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAweb&HPAwebStandard/HPAweb_C/1195733778332: Public Health England, 2013.
9. Public Health England. MMR catch-up programme 2013. . <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/MMR-catch-up-programme-2013#publications>: GOV.UK, 2013.
10. Pearce A, Law C, Elliman D, Cole TJ, Bedford H, the Millennium Cohort Study Child Health G. 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. *British Medical Journal* 2008;336:754-60.
11. Centre for Longitudinal Studies. Millennium Cohort Study: Survey design: Institute of Education, 2007.
12. Plewis I, Ketende S. Millennium Cohort Study: technical report on response. 1st ed. London Centre for Longitudinal Studies, 2006.
13. Hansen K, Joshi H. Millennium Cohort Study Third Survey: A User's Guide to Initial Findings. London: Institute of Education 2008.
14. Samad L, Bedford H, Tate AR, Dezateux C, Peckham C, Butler N, et al. Differences in risk factors for partial and no immunisation in the first year of life. *British Medical Journal* 2006;332 1312-13.
15. Pearce A, Elliman D, Bedford H, Law C. Residential mobility and uptake of childhood immunisations: findings from the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Vaccine* 2008;26:1675-80.
16. Plewis I. Millennium Cohort Study: technical report on sampling. 3rd ed. . London: Centre for Longitudinal Studies, 2004.
17. AbdelSalam HHM, Sokal MM. Accuracy of parental reporting of immunization. *Clinical Pediatrics* 2004;43 (1):83-85.
18. Suarez L, Simpson DM, Smith DR. Errors and correlates in parental recall of child immunizations: effects on vaccination coverage estimates. *Pediatrics* 1997;99 (5):E3.
19. Sharland M, Atkinson P, Maguire H, Begg N. Lone parent families are an independent risk factor for lower rates of childhood immunisation in London. *Communicable Disease Report.CDR Review* 1997;7 (11):R196-R72.

- 1
2
3 20. Li J, Taylor B. Factors affecting uptake of measles, mumps, and rubella immunisation. *British*
4 *Medical Journal* 1993;307 168-71.
5
6 21. Middleton E, Baker D. Comparison of social distribution of immunisation with measles, mumps,
7 and rubella vaccine, England, 1991-2001. *British Medical Journal* 2003;326 854-54.
8
9 22. Friederichs V, Cameron JC, Robertson C. Impact of adverse publicity on MMR vaccine uptake: a
10 population based analysis of vaccine uptake records for one million children, born 1987-
11 2004. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2006;91 465-68.
12
13 23. Hawker J, Olowokure B, Wood A, Wilson R, Johnson R. Widening inequalities in MMR vaccine
14 uptake rates among ethnic groups in an urban area of the UK during a period of vaccine
15 controversy (1994-2000). *Vaccine* 2007;25:7516-9.
16
17 24. MacDonald H, Henderson R, Oates K. Low uptake of immunisation: contributing factors.
18 *Community Practioner* 2004;77 (3):95-100.
19
20 25. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Reducing differences in the uptake of
21 immunisations. *NICE public health guidance 21*, 2009.
22
23 26. Jacobson Vann J, Szilagyi P. Patient reminder and patient recall systems to improve
24 immunization rates. . *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2005;Jul 20(3).
25
26 27. Gust D, Darling N, Kennedy A, Schwartz B. Parents with doubts about vaccines: which vaccines
27 and reasons why. *Pediatrics* 2008;1227(4):18-25.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cohort studies

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	2, 6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	2, 6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	6-7
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7-8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	9, 11
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6-7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7-8, 9
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	9
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	6-7
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6-7
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 2
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 2
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	8
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Table 3
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	Table 2
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	11
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	11-13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	12
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	15

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.



**Characteristics of five year olds who catch-up with MMR:
findings from the UK Millennium Cohort Study**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-003152.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Jun-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Pearce, Anna; UCL Institute of Child Health, Mindlin, Miranda; Kent, Surrey, Sussex Public Health England Centre, Cortina Borja, Mario; UCL, Institute of Child Health Bedford, Helen; UCL, Institute of Child Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Infectious diseases, Health policy
Keywords:	Socio-economic factors, immunisation, measles-mumps-rubella vaccine, measles, child health services

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer Review Only

Characteristics of five year olds who catch-up with MMR: findings from the UK Millennium Cohort

Study

Anna Pearce (Research Fellow)¹; Miranda Mindlin (Consultant in Communicable Disease Control)^{2,1};

Mario Cortina-Borja (Senior Lecturer)¹; Helen Bedford (Senior Lecturer)^{1*}

¹MRC Centre of Epidemiology for Child Health, UCL Institute of Child Health, 30 Guilford Street, London, WC1N 1EH, UK

² Kent, Surrey, Sussex Public Health England Centre, County Hall North, Chart Way, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1XA, UK

*corresponding author and guarantor to the paper. h.bedford@ucl.ac.uk. T 0207 905 2333; F 020 7905 2793

Key words:

Socio-economic factors, immunisation, measles, measles-mumps-rubella vaccine, child health services

Word count: 3441

Abstract

Objectives

To examine predictors of partial and full MMR catch-up between three and five years

Design

Secondary data analysis of the nationally representative Millennium Cohort Study (MCS)

Setting

Children born in the UK, 2000-2

Participants

751 MCS children who were unimmunised against measles, mumps and rubella at age three, with immunisation information at age five

Main outcome measures

Catch-up status: unimmunised (received no MMR), partial catch-up (received one MMR), or full catch-up (received two MMRs)

Results

At age five, 60.3% ($n=440$) children remained unvaccinated, 16.1% ($n=127$) had partially, and 23.6% ($n=184$) had fully caught-up. Children from families who did not speak English at home were five times as likely to partially catch-up than children living in homes where only English was spoken (risk ratio: 4.68 [95% CI, 3.63-6.03]). Full catch-up was also significantly more likely in those did not speak English at home (adjusted risk ratio: 1.90 [1.08-3.32]). In addition, those from Pakistani /Bangladeshi (2.40 [1.38-4.18]) or 'other' ethnicities (such as Chinese) (1.88 [1.08-3.29]) were more likely to fully catch-up than White British. Those living in socially rented (1.86 [1.34-2.56]) or 'Other' (2.52 [1.23-5.18]) accommodations were more likely to fully catch-up than home owners, and families were more likely to catch-up if they lived outside London (1.95 [1.32-2.89]). Full catch-up was less likely if parents reported medical reasons (0.43 [0.25-0.74]), a conscious decision (0.33

1
2
3 [0.23-0.48]), or 'other' reasons (0.46 [0.29-0.73]) for not immunising at age three (compared to
4
5 'practical' reasons).
6

7 *Conclusions*

8
9
10 Parents who partially or fully catch-up with MMR experience practical barriers and tend to come
11
12 from disadvantaged or ethnic minority groups. Families who continue to reject MMR tend to have
13
14 more advantaged backgrounds and make a conscious decision to not immunise early on. Health
15
16 professionals should consider these findings in light of the characteristics of their local populations.
17
18
19
20

21 **Article summary:**

22 **Article focus**

- 23
24
25
26 • Areas of the UK are currently experiencing measles outbreaks, and a MMR national catch-up
27
28 programme has just been launched
- 29
30
31 • Individual-level predictors of MMR catch-up are unknown
- 32
33
34 • We explore a range of risk factors for partial and full catch-up between age three and five years
35
36 in the nationally representative UK Millennium Cohort Study

37 **Key messages**

- 38
39
40 • Of 751 children who were unimmunised at age three, 60% remained unimmunised at age five,
41
42 16% had partially caught-up, and 24% had fully caught-up
- 43
44
45 • Two distinct groups of parents emerged:
46
47
 - 48 ○ those who experienced practical barriers and were from ethnic minority backgrounds –
49
50 these groups eventually caught-up
 - 51
52 ○ those who consciously rejected MMR and were from more advantaged circumstances –
53
54 these groups tended to remain unimmunised
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 • Health professionals should consider these findings in light of the characteristics of their local
4
5 populations when designing programmes to increase and maintain uptake
6
7

8 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

9

- 10 • This is the first study to examine individual-level characteristics of MMR catch-up in the UK; we
11 do this using data from a nationally representative cohort of children who were born at the
12 height of the MMR scare and are currently being targeted by the national catch-up programme
13
14 • Our analyses refer to predictors of catch-up during a period when parental concerns around the
15 safety of the vaccine were relatively high, and the incidence of measles relatively low;
16
17 predictors of catch- up in families with young children today may be different .
18
19 • We were unable to investigate exact timing of vaccination; therefore our analyses focus on
20 children who were unimmunised at age three (so approximately 2 years after the
21 recommended age of administration), and we were unable to detect how long children who had
22 partially or fully caught-up by age five had been left susceptible
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

The combined measles, mumps and rubella vaccination (MMR) has been used routinely in the UK since 1988. Coverage at 2 years of age peaked in England in 1995, at 92%¹. A two-dose schedule was introduced in 1996, the first dose recommended at soon after the age of 12/13 months² (affording 90-95% protection against measles), with a second at three years four months² (99% protection). In 1998, a Lancet article³ was widely interpreted as suggesting MMR was linked with autism and bowel problems. Although the paper was eventually discredited and retracted by the Lancet in 2010⁴, widespread adverse media coverage in the intervening years led to a dramatic fall in MMR uptake, to a low of 80% in England (of the first dose by age two) in 2003¹. By 2006-7, 85% of two year olds had received at least one MMR, although only 73% had received the recommended two doses by age five, and levels were particularly low in some geographical areas, such as London¹. Measles cases started to rise and in 2008 the Health Protection Agency announced that measles was again endemic in England and Wales.

Although coverage has continued to rise (in England in 2011-12, 91% of two year olds had received one and 86% of five year olds two doses of MMR⁵), levels remain below those needed for herd immunity, particularly in some geographical areas and in children who were born in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Consequently, measles outbreaks are currently occurring across some areas of the UK, with young teenagers disproportionately affected (one quarter of measles cases in 2011-12 were in 10-14 year olds⁶). In response to this, Public Health England, NHS England and the Department of Health announced a national MMR catch-up programme to vaccinate as many partially or unimmunised 10-16 year olds as possible by the start of the next school year (September 2013)⁷. The catch-up programme outlines aims to strengthen current routine immunisation strategies and in particular to target hard to reach populations; GPs and schools will

1
2
3 play a central role. A better understanding of the social and demographic characteristics associated
4
5 with catching-up (or not), and the reasons reported by parents for their child's immunisation status,
6
7 is essential if the aims of the new framework are to be achieved and maintained. Cross-sectional
8
9 evidence indicates that, at age three, being unimmunised against MMR, or receiving the single
10
11 antigen vaccines, was socially distributed⁸. However little is known about the factors which
12
13 influence the propensity of families with unimmunised children to catch-up. We examine the social
14
15 correlates of partial and full catch-up with MMR between the age of three and five years, in a
16
17 nationally representative cohort of children born at the height of the MMR scare.
18
19
20
21

22 **Methods**

23 *Participants*

24
25
26 We analysed data from the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS), a longitudinal study of children eligible
27
28 for Child Benefit and born in the UK between September 2000 and January 2002. The sample was
29
30 derived from a random sample of electoral wards which were disproportionately stratified to
31
32 ensure an adequate representation of all four UK countries, deprived areas and, in the case of
33
34 England, areas with high proportions of families from ethnic minority groups⁹. At the first contact,
35
36 when the MCS children were aged 9 months, data were collected on 18,296 singleton babies (72%
37
38 of those approached); with subsequent data collections at three and five years. 71% of the initial
39
40 cohort responded to all three sweeps ($n=12,989$). Participants in the second and third sweeps
41
42 were less likely to be from ethnic or deprived wards^{10;11}, although due to the sampling design these
43
44 proportions remained higher than the general population.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54 Our analyses focus on the subsample of MCS singleton children who were unimmunised against
55
56 measles, mumps or rubella at age three years. Of the 804 children who were unimmunised at age
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 three, 777 (96.6%) had a recorded MMR outcome at five years, and 26 (3.3%) of them were
4
5 excluded because they were reported to have received at least one single antigen vaccine by age
6
7 five, leaving 751 eligible participants in our analyses. Compared to the unimmunised children (who
8
9 are the focus of this analysis), children who had been immunised with MMR at age three were: less
10
11 likely to have a mother with a degree or A-levels, and more likely to have a mother in her twenties
12
13 or early thirties or who did not smoke during pregnancy; they were also less likely to be living in a
14
15 lone parent family and more likely to be an only child. The socio-economic and demographic
16
17 characteristics of children according to MMR status at age three is described in greater detail
18
19 elsewhere⁸.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *Measures*

28
29 Measures were reported by the main respondent (usually the mother) during survey interviews,
30
31 which were carried out by trained interviewers in the home.
32
33
34
35

36 Outcome measure: MMR status at age five was classified as unimmunised (received no combined
37
38 MMR vaccines), partially caught-up (received one combined MMR), or fully caught-up (received
39
40 two combined MMRs).
41
42
43
44

45 Covariates: We explored socio-economic and demographic factors that were found to be associated
46
47 with immunisation status in earlier sweeps of the MCS^{8;12;13}, or that were pertinent to
48
49 immunisation policy. We examined maternal social class (based on National Statistics Socio-
50
51 economic Classification (NS-SEC)), ethnicity, maternal age at birth (in five-year age bands), maternal
52
53 education, and child gender. These measures were all captured at age nine months because they
54
55 were unlikely to have changed in later sweeps. In addition, we explored the following time-variant
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 measures, captured at age three (the beginning of the potential catch-up period): UK country of
4
5 residence, ward type ('advantaged', 'disadvantaged', 'ethnic'), number of children in the
6
7 household, maternal employment status, lone parenthood, household income, housing tenure,
8
9 whether resident in London, whether the family had changed residential address since age three,
10
11 and whether the parents reported the child having natural measles infection. Income data were
12
13 missing for 14% (122) children at age three; we supplemented this with information captured at
14
15 age nine months, reducing the level of missingness to 24. Missing data were very low for all other
16
17 measures (listed at the foot of Table 1).
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 We also investigated reasons given for not having had MMR at age three, classified in a previous
25
26 analysis¹⁰ as 'practical' (such as missing an appointment), 'medical' (e.g. child had asthma),
27
28 'conscious decision' (including fear of links with autism) or 'other' (which included don't know). The
29
30 mean age of the MCS children at the third survey was 61 months, with a range between 52 and 72
31
32 months, meaning that some children had more time to catch-up than others. We therefore
33
34 explored age as a potential confounder, but as it was not found to be associated with immunisation
35
36 status ($p=0.28$) we did not include it in our models. There were no *a priori* hypotheses for
37
38 interactions so none were explored.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Analysis*

46
47 We estimated the prevalence of MMR status (unimmunised, partially caught-up, and fully caught-
48
49 up) at age five, overall and according to the potential explanatory factors. We then fitted Poisson
50
51 regression models to estimate risk ratios (RRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for partial and full
52
53 catch-up (in two separate models, because previous research indicates that the social correlates of
54
55 partial and full immunisation are likely to differ¹²). The models were built as follows: first we
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 explored univariable associations between the outcome and each of the explanatory variables.
4
5 Variables, which were associated with the outcome ($p < 0.10$) using Wald tests for trend, were
6
7 entered into a multivariable model using a forward stepwise model selection strategy. Residence in
8
9 London was forced into the multivariable models, due to its potential significance for policy. Only
10
11 measures which remained significantly associated with the outcome after adjustment were
12
13 retained.
14
15

16
17
18
19 Data were downloaded from the UK Data Archive, University of Essex in May 2010. Analyses were
20
21 carried out in Stata 12 (Stata Corporation, TX) using survey and response weights to allow for the
22
23 sample design and attrition between sweeps^{10;14}.
24
25
26
27
28

29 Results

30
31 Of the 751 MCS children who were unimmunised at age three, 60.3% (440) remained unvaccinated,
32
33 16.1% (127) had partially caught-up, and 23.6% (184) had fully caught-up. Table 1 presents the
34
35 proportion of children who were partially, fully, or unimmunised, according to the various predictor
36
37 measures.
38
39

40
41 **Table 1: Weighted percentage (n) of children who remained unimmunised or who partially for**
42
43 **fully caught-up with MMR, according to social, demographic and other characteristics**
44

	Total	Full catch-up (2 doses)	Partial catch-up (1 dose)	Unimmunised
Language spoken at home				
English only	91.6 (658)	20.4 (130)	15.8 (11.5)	67.8 (413)
English and other language(s)	5.7 (64)	53.0 (29)	15.0 (9)	32.0 (26)
No - other language(s) only	2.7 (29)	70.2 (25)	27.7 (3)	2.1 (1)
Ward type				
Advantaged	56.5 (290)	20.3 (60)	13.6 (43)	66.1 (187)
Disadvantaged	38.5 (5.0)	24.1 (79)	20.1 (73)	55.8 (227)
Ethnic	5.0 (82)	57.6 (45)	13.3 (11)	29.2 (26)
Ethnicity				
British white	87.5 (644)	20.3 (126)	15.8 (111)	63.9 (407)

Other white	2.2 (13)	10.3 (2)	15.6 (2)	74.1 (9)
Mixed	1.4 (10)	33.5 (3)	15.1 (2)	51.4 (5)
Indian	1.0 (12)	76.9 (9)	5.5 (1)	17.5 (2)
Pakistani or Bangladeshi	3.8 (39)	74.7 (28)	9.8 (3)	15.5 (8)
Black or Black British	2.7 (18)	24.7 (7)	35.1 (5)	40.2 (6)
Other	1.4 (14)	65.2 (9)	19.6 (2)	15.2 (3)
Lone parent/carer				
Two parents/carers	79.2 (597)	21.9 (142)	15.3 (97)	62.9
One parent/carer	20.8 (154)	30.2 (42)	19.3 (30)	50.5 (82)
Maternal age at birth of cohort child				
14 - 19y	8.1 (60)	37.7 (21)	21.8 (14)	40.6 (25)
20-24y	15.9 (130)	34.3 (40)	19.4 (27)	46.3 (63)
25-29y	23.5 (174)	25.8 (52)	18.2 (27)	55.9 (95)
30-34y	27.6 (205)	17.0 (36)	13.0 (30)	70.0 (13.9)
35-39y	20.4 (145)	15.8 (25)	14.3 (24)	70.0 (96)
40plus	4.5 (36)	24.2 (9)	10.6 (5)	65.1 (22)
Maternal education				
Degree	20.8 (152)	18.8 (32)	10.4 (15)	70.7 (105)
Diploma	8.9 (64)	13.9 (9)	14.9 (9)	71.1 (46)
A or AS levels	11.3 (85)	22.7 (19)	17.0 (20)	60.2 (46)
GCSE A*-C	32.2 (238)	20.4 (48)	19.6 (50)	60.0 (140)
GCSE D-G	8.4 (64)	18.1 (13)	23.9 (16)	58.0 (35)
Other	1.9 (15)	25.1 (6)	7.7 (1)	67.2 (8)
None	16.4 (133)	44.5 (57)	13.4 (16)	42.1 (60)
Housing tenure age 3				
Owned	58.7 (451)	18.1 (92)	15.6 (77)	66.3 (282)
Privately rented	9.8 (71)	29.8 (18)	11.5 (8)	58.6 (45)
Socially rented	27.7 (199)	30.4 (65)	19.8 (37)	49.8 (16)
Other	3.8 (30)	43.4 (9)	8.1 (5)	48.6 (16)
Household income (£ pa)				
0-11000	23.7 (186)	32.1 (57)	18.7 (34)	49.2 (95)
11 000-22 000	30.4 (228)	23.4 (56)	18.2 (41)	58.4 (131)
22 000-33 000	19.9 (142)	12.6 (21)	18.3 (34)	69.1 (87)
33 000-55 000	17.4 (123)	20.6 (28)	6.8 (8)	72.6 (87)
55 000+	8.9 (48)	23.5 (11)	15.9 (8)	60.6 (29)
Social class (9 months)				
Managerial & professional	30.2 (222)	20.8 (42)	12.7 (34)	66.5 (14.6)
Intermediate	16.7 (119)	17.5 (22)	17.6 (18)	65.0 (79)
Small employer/self-employed	8.0 (53)	10.1 (10)	11.9 (8)	78.0 (35)
Lower supervisory & technical	4.0 (33)	33.4 (10)	9.6 (4)	57.1 (19)
Semi-routine & routine	32.0 (248)	24.4 (61)	20.6 (53)	54.9 (134)
Never worked/unemployed	9.2 (73)	47.8 (37)	15.6 (10)	36.6 (26)
Number of children in household (age 3)				
One child	22.5 (180)	26.2 (43)	20.0 (38)	53.8 (99)
Two or three children	63.1 (459)	21.3 (104)	15.5 (73)	63.2 (282)
Four or more children	14.4 (112)	29.9 (37)	12.6 (16)	57.6 (59)
Maternal employment (age 3)				
FT	11.2 (93)	23.8 (21)	11.5 (17)	64.7 (55)
PT	25.2 (191)	22.1 (41)	19.6 (37)	58.3 (113)
On leave	3.9 (28)	26.8 (8)	3.9 (1)	69.4 (19)
Self employed	9.3 (60)	17.1 (13)	13.0 (10)	69.9 (37)

Not employed/student	50.4 (379)	25.3 (101)	16.9 (62)	57.8 (216)
Sex of child				
Male	55.1 (404)	20.6 (95)	17.7 (70)	61.7 (239)
Female	44.9 (347)	27.3 (89)	14.1 (57)	58.6 (201)
Parental report of measles disease by age 3				
Yes	3.5 (22)	19.2 (5)	13.2 (3)	67.6 (14)
No	96.5 (721)	23.7 (176)	16.1 (123)	60.2 (422)
Residence in London				
London	16.2 (102)	17.7 (23)	20.0 (19)	62.3 (60)
Not London	83.8 (649)	24.8 (161)	15.3 (108)	60.0 (380)
Country of residence				
England	58.6 (462)	23.3 (122)	15.7 (74)	61.0 (266)
Wales	21.6 (160)	22.1 (31)	20.1 (31)	57.7 (98)
Scotland	12.9 (87)	26.7 (21)	15.6 (14)	57.5 (52)
Northern Ireland	6.9 (42)	25.3 (10)	17.8 (8)	60.0 (24)
Smoked during pregnancy				
No	63.2 (465)	23.4 (121)	15.1 (76)	61.6 (268)
Yes	36.8 (283)	23.8 (62)	18.0 (51)	58.2 (170)
Changed address since 3				
No	85.6 (647)	23.8 (161)	16.6 (112)	59.6 (374)
Yes	14.4 (104)	22.4 (23)	13.1 (15)	64.5 (66)
Reasons given for not having had MMR (aged 3)				
Practical	6.2 (51)	54.5 (30)	15.3 (7)	30.3 (14)
Medical	15.2 (107)	17.9 (82)	25.5 (26)	56.7 (57)
Conscious decision	66.7 (486)	17.8 (82)	16.0 (85)	66.2 (31.9)
Other	11.7 (76)	35.3 (26)	9.9 (9)	54.9 (41)

Missing: Social class 3, smoked during pregnancy 3, income 24, ethnicity 1, reason 31, age at birth 1.

Partial catch-up (compared to remaining unimmunised)

Table 2 (column A) shows unadjusted RRs for partial catch-up, according to each of the predictor measures. Partial catch-up was more likely in families who spoke a language other than English at home (particularly if English was not spoken at home at all), compared to those who only spoke English at home, and in those who lived in a ward classified as 'disadvantaged' or 'ethnic', compared to advantaged wards. No significant associations were seen with any of the other variables. When language, ward type and London residence (due to its policy significance) were entered into the multivariable model, only language remained significantly associated with the likelihood of being partially immunised, with an adjusted RR of 4.68 (3.63 to 6.03) in families who did not speak English at home (Table 2, Column B).

Table 2: Unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios (ORs) for partial catch-up with the combined MMR vaccine (baseline unimmunised) by age five

	Partial catch-up (1 dose)		Full catch-up (2 doses)	
	A: uRR (95% CI)	B: aRR (95% CI)	C: uRR (95% CI)	D: aRR (95% CI)
Language spoken at home				
English only	1	1	1	1
English and other language(s)	1.61 (0.96, 2.70)	1.61 (0.96, 2.70)	2.57 (2.00, 3.32)*	1.54 (0.91, 2.63)
Other language(s) only	4.68 (3.63, 6.03)*	4.68 (3.63, 6.03)*	4.00 (3.37, 4.76)*	1.90 (1.08, 3.32)*
<i>p</i> -value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.0811
Ward type				
Advantaged	1		1	
Disadvantaged	1.55 (1.05, 2.27)*		1.29 (0.92, 1.80)	
Ethnic	1.83 (1.18, 2.83)*		2.83 (2.19, 3.65)*	
<i>p</i> -value	0.0146		<0.001	
Ethnicity				
British white	1		1	1
Other white	0.88 (0.22, 3.54)		0.51 (0.13, 2.06)	0.37 (0.10, 1.34)
Mixed	1.15 (0.29, 4.59)		1.64 (0.57, 4.74)	1.83 (0.65, 5.17)
Indian	1.21 (0.19, 7.82)		3.38 (2.40, 4.76)*	2.01 (0.75, 5.41)
Pakistani or Bangladeshi	1.96 (0.84, 4.54)		3.44 (2.79, 4.23)*	2.40 (1.38, 4.18)*
Black or Black British	2.35 (0.99, 5.57)		1.58 (0.73, 3.43)	1.12 (0.35, 3.63)
Other	2.84 (1.12, 7.22)*		3.36 (2.42, 4.67)*	1.88 (1.08, 3.29)*
<i>p</i> -value	0.0126		<0.001	0.0950
Lone parent/carers				
Two parents/carers	1		1	
One parent/carers	1.42 (0.92, 2.17)		1.45 (1.06, 1.99)*	
<i>p</i> -value	0.1110		0.0208	
Maternal age at birth of cohort child				
14 - 19y	1.42 (0.80, 2.51)		1.52 (0.98, 2.37)	
20-24y	1.20 (0.68, 2.12)		1.35 (0.89, 2.03)	
25-29y	1		1	
30-34y	0.63 (0.37, 1.08)		0.62 (0.40, 0.97)*	
35-39y	0.69 (0.40, 1.20)		0.58 (0.37, 0.92)*	
40plus	0.57 (0.23, 1.43)		0.86 (0.42, 1.74)	
<i>p</i> -value	0.0259		<0.001	
Maternal education				
Degree	1		1	
Diploma	1.35 (0.54, 3.36)		0.78 (0.35, 1.72)	
A or AS levels	1.72 (0.79, 3.74)		1.30 (0.71, 2.38)	
GCSE A*-C	1.91 (1.05, 3.49)*		1.21 (0.75, 1.96)	
GCSE D-G	2.27 (1.07, 4.80)*		1.13 (0.55, 2.34)	
Other	0.80 (0.11, 5.93)		1.29 (0.49, 3.39)	
None	1.88 (0.87, 4.03)		2.44 (1.63, 3.66)*	
<i>p</i> -value	0.2420		<0.001	
Housing tenure age 3				
Owned	1		1	1

Privately rented	0.86 (0.32, 2.34)		1.57 (0.96, 2.59)	1.51 (0.91, 2.48)
Socially rented	1.49 (0.96, 2.32)		1.77 (1.29, 2.43)*	1.86 (1.34, 2.56)*
Other	0.75 (0.27, 2.09)		2.20 (1.27, 3.79)*	2.52 (1.23, 5.18)*
p-value	0.0936		0.0014	<0.001
Household income (£ per annum)				
0-11000	1		1	
11 000-22 000	0.86 (0.53, 1.41)		0.72 (0.52, 1.02)	
22 000-33 000	0.76 (0.44, 1.31)		0.39 (0.23, 0.66)	
33 000-55 000	0.31 (0.14, 0.70)*		0.56 (0.36, 0.87)	
55 000+	0.76 (0.36, 1.61)		0.71 (0.39, 1.29)	
p-value	0.0816		0.0028	
Social class (9 months)				
Managerial & professional	1		1	
Intermediate	1.33 (0.73, 2.42)		0.89 (0.52, 1.53)	
Small employer/self-employed	0.83 (0.38, 1.79)		0.48 (0.20, 1.16)	
Lower supervisory & technical	0.90 (0.30, 2.67)		1.55 (0.80, 3.00)	
Semi-routine & routine	1.71 (1.11, 2.64)*		1.29 (0.87, 1.92)	
Never worked/unemployed	1.87 (0.96, 3.64)		2.38 (1.62, 3.49)*	
p-value	0.0989		<0.001	
Number of children in household (age 3)				
One child	1		1	
Two or three children	0.73 (0.47, 1.12)		0.77 (0.52, 1.14)	
Four or more children	0.66 (0.34, 1.29)		1.04 (0.67, 1.63)	
p-value	0.2807		0.1832	
Maternal employment (age 3)				
Full-time	1		1	
Part-time	1.67 (0.84, 3.33)		1.02 (0.58, 1.79)	
On leave	0.35 (0.05, 2.48)		1.04 (0.46, 2.33)	
Self employed	1.04 (0.41, 2.66)		0.73 (0.37, 1.45)	
Not employed/student	1.50 (0.88, 2.57)		1.13 (0.71, 1.80)	
p-value	0.1836		0.6517	
Sex of child				
Male	1		1	
Female	0.87 (0.60, 1.27)		1.27 (0.94, 1.71)	
p-value	0.4755		0.1171	
Parental report of measles disease by age 3				
Yes	1		1	
No	1.29 (0.48, 3.49)		1.28 (0.52, 3.16)	
p-value	0.6163		0.5970	
Residence in London				
London	1		1	1
Not London	0.84 (0.50, 1.41)		1.32 (0.86, 2.02)	1.95 (1.32, 2.89)*
p-value	0.5078		0.2012	<0.001
Country of residence				
England	1		1	
Wales	1.26 (0.86, 1.84)		1.00 (0.69, 1.46)	
Scotland	1.04 (0.60, 1.83)		1.16 (0.71, 1.88)	
Northern Ireland	1.16 (0.55, 2.44)		1.11 (0.66, 1.88)	
p-value	0.6802		0.9272	
Smoked during pregnancy				
No	1		1	

Yes	1.20 (0.73, 1.74)		0.05 (0.76, 1.46)	
<i>p</i> -value	0.3202		0.7481	
Changed address since 3				
No	1			
Yes	0.90 (0.62, 1.32)		0.77 (0.42, 1.43)	
<i>p</i> -value	0.6031		0.4112	
Reasons given for not having had MMR (aged 3)				
Practical	1		1	
Medical	0.93 (0.44, 1.93)		0.37 (0.20, 0.68)*	0.43 (0.25, 0.74)*
Conscious decision	0.58 (0.27, 1.22)		0.33 (0.23, 0.47)*	0.33 (0.23, 0.48)*
Other	0.45 (0.16, 1.30)		0.61 (0.40, 0.93)*	0.46 (0.29, 0.73)*
<i>p</i> -value	0.1357		<0.001	<0.001

uRR = unadjusted risk ratio; aRR = adjusted risk ratio. * $p < 0.05$

Full catch-up (compared to remaining unimmunised)

Table 2 also presents unadjusted and adjusted RRs for fully catching up. In the univariable analyses (Column C), children whose parents spoke a language other than English at home (as opposed to only speaking English), who were from ethnic minority groups (compared to White British), or lived in 'ethnic' wards (compared to 'advantaged' wards) were more likely to fully catch-up. Catch-up was also significantly more likely in children whose mother had no educational qualifications (compared to a degree), in lone parent families (compared to two parent families), and in those living in 'socially rented' or 'other' tenure types (compared to own/mortgage). Catch-up was significantly less likely in children with a mother in her thirties (compared to 24-29 years), and in children living in higher income households. Children whose parents had reported a non-practical reason ('medical', 'conscious decision', or 'other') for not having their child immunised with the combined MMR at age three were also less likely to have fully caught-up than those reporting practical reasons. Living in London was not associated with immunisation status, although due to its policy significance was included in the multivariable model reported below.

In the multivariable analysis (Column D), full catch-up remained significantly more likely in those who only spoke a non-English language at home (1.90 [1.08 to 3.32]), when compared to those who

1
2
3 only spoke English. Those from Pakistani or Bangladeshi (2.40 [1.38 to 4.18]), and 'Other' (1.88
4 [1.08 to 3.29]) ethnic groups were more likely to have caught-up than White British groups, as were
5 those living in 'socially rented' (1.86 [1.34 to 2.56]) or 'other' (2.52 [1.23 to 5.18]) tenure types
6 (compared to own/mortgage). Full catch-up was also more likely in families living outside London
7 (1.95 [1.32 to 2.89]). Compared to those reporting practical reasons for not having been
8 immunised at age three, children whose parents reported medical reasons (0.43 [0.25 to 0.74]), a
9 conscious decision (0.33 [0.23 to 0.48]), or 'other' reasons (0.46 [0.29 to 0.73]) were considerably
10 less likely to have fully caught-up.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Parents from Asian and "other White" backgrounds were 2-3 times more likely to experience
23 practical barriers to immunisation than those from White British, Mixed or Black backgrounds.
24
25

26 Similarly, families who spoke a non-English language in the home were two-three times as likely to
27 experience practical barriers as families who only spoke English at home (data not shown).
28
29
30
31

32 Discussion

33
34 Just over 40% of children who were unimmunised with MMR vaccine at age three had either
35 partially or fully caught-up by age five. The likelihood of catching-up varied markedly with a number
36 of social factors, and more so for full than partial catch-up. Some families, particularly those from
37 ethnic minority groups, appear to have difficulty accessing vaccination in a timely fashion.
38
39
40
41
42

43 Advantaged families and those citing non-practical reasons for non-vaccination at age three are
44 more likely to persist in not immunising their child against MMR.
45
46
47
48

49 We used sample and response weights to account for the survey design and attrition between the
50 first, second, and third sweeps of the MCS. However the non-response weights are unlikely to have
51 entirely accounted for differential response; for example 95.7% children who were included in the
52 age three and five surveys were fully immunised with the primary vaccines (at age 9 months)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 compared to 92.7% in children who did not take part in both of the later surveys ($p < 0.001$). A
4
5 limitation of the study is that we utilised parental report of immunisation status, and it was not
6
7 possible to validate report of immunisation status against health system records. However there is
8
9 no gold standard measure of immunisation status and studies have found disagreement between
10
11 parental report and health records to be low¹⁵ and not socially distributed¹⁶. Parents were given the
12
13 opportunity to consult the Personal Child Health Record (or 'red book'). Of the 751 families
14
15 included in our analysis, 19% (137) consulted the book and found the relevant information, 1% (11)
16
17 checked the book and did not find the relevant information, and 79% (603) chose not to consult the
18
19 book and relied on their memory. There was no association between catch-up status and whether
20
21 the parent consulted the red book ($p = 0.18$), and the associations reported in this paper remained
22
23 the same when analyses were repeated excluding children where the parent had looked but not
24
25 found information (data not shown). A small number (26) of children who were unimmunised at
26
27 age three had received at least one single antigen vaccine by age five. Due to low numbers we were
28
29 unable to explore the characteristics of this group.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The intense negative media attention around the safety of the MMR vaccine peaked in 2002/3
39
40 when the MCS children were toddlers. These findings therefore provide important information on
41
42 the barriers to catch-up, in a cohort of children who are currently experiencing measles outbreaks
43
44 throughout the UK⁶, and are a central focus of the newly launched national catch-up programme.
45
46 However we measured catch-up across the period 2003/5 to 2006/7, when the MMR scare was at
47
48 its height and the incidence of measles was relatively low (although with some indications of a rise).
49
50 Concerns around the safety of the MMR have diminished over recent years and therefore the
51
52 characteristics of families who catch-up with the vaccine today may be different. It is also likely that
53
54 some of the barriers we report for more advantaged families are reduced during times of measles
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 outbreaks, as the perceived risk-benefit balance of the vaccine shifts. Nonetheless, this paper
4
5 provides important information on the barriers experienced by advantaged families during times of
6
7 no outbreak to improve and sustain the current MMR programme, which is also a central aim of the
8
9 catch-up programme. The recommended age of the first dose of MMR is 12/13 months; however
10
11 information on uptake was not collected in the MCS until the children were age three years. Our
12
13 analysis is unable to address those children who were immunised by age three but who had not
14
15 been immunised on time. Similarly, we were unable to investigate the timing of catch-up between
16
17 the age of three and five, and therefore how long children who partially or fully caught-up were left
18
19 susceptible. Finally, the MCS consists only of children who were born in the UK. The barriers
20
21 experienced by families from ethnic minority groups or who speak other may be different and/or
22
23 greater in families where the child was born outside the UK.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Before the scare, MMR uptake was generally lower in more deprived areas and households^{17;18}.
32
33 Since 1998, rates declined faster in more advantaged areas^{19;20} and more slowly in areas with lower
34
35 proportions of highly educated residents²⁰ and in minority ethnic groups²¹. Earlier cross-sectional
36
37 findings from the MCS demonstrated that the likelihood of being unimmunised against measles,
38
39 mumps and rubella tended to be greater in more disadvantaged families, while children living in
40
41 more affluent households were more likely to receive single antigen vaccines (indicating conscious
42
43 rejection of combined MMR)⁸. However there is a dearth of longitudinal research exploring the
44
45 social correlates of catch-up with MMR. The only study, to our knowledge, which has explored the
46
47 social correlates of MMR catch-up was an ecological study of one million children born between
48
49 1987 and 2004 in Scotland. The authors found that children living in more affluent areas were
50
51 either immunised with MMR on time or not at all, whereas children living in deprived areas were
52
53 more likely to be immunised late²⁰. Our findings not only reflect this, but add to the evidence base
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 by demonstrating that individual-level predictors of catch-up are strongly related to catch-up. We
4
5 have also found that remaining unvaccinated with MMR at age five was associated with non-
6
7 practical reasons for not immunising with MMR at three, reflecting other research which has shown
8
9 that more affluent families are more likely to consciously reject MMR^{20;22}.
10
11

12
13
14 Outbreaks of measles are currently being experienced across the UK, leading to the launch of a
15
16 national catch-programme in April 2013. Approaches to optimise uptake of MMR will need to be
17
18 tailored to the needs of local populations, both now and in the future. Our study has identified two
19
20 distinct groups of families that do not immunise their child with MMR in a timely fashion (during
21
22 periods of low measles incidence). The first comprises those who partially or fully catch-up,
23
24 amounting to 40% of those who were unimmunised at age three. These families tend to experience
25
26 practical barriers to immunisation, and are socially disadvantaged or from ethnic minority groups.
27
28 The second group, which continues to reject MMR and makes up the remaining 60%, consists of
29
30 parents who consciously reject MMR from the start, and are from more advantaged backgrounds.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Steps are required to minimise time to uptake in those families who do eventually catch-up,
39
40 through the reduction of practical barriers. NICE guidance outlines actions to reduce inequalities in
41
42 immunisation²³, including provision of information in multiple languages, offering immunisation
43
44 checks and administration in alternative settings, and sending out reminder invitations from GPs²⁴.
45
46
47

48 In addition, alleviating any lingering fears and concerns of families who consciously reject MMR is
49
50 essential. This should include discussion of concerns about 'medical' reasons for not giving MMR.
51
52 Mythical contraindications to MMR have circulated amongst the health professional community
53
54 and parents for some time²⁵ despite there being few true contraindications for MMR vaccination.
55
56

57 'Medical reasons' reported by parent for not immunising in the MCS (at age five) included: "child is
58
59
60

1
2
3 not able to have it for health reasons” and “other medical problems or bad reactions”. It is not
4
5 possible to ascertain whether any of these were true contraindications, although there are very few
6
7 genuine contraindications to MMR² and these tend to be very rare. It was possible to look at
8
9 longstanding illness however, and children who had not been immunised for ‘medical reasons’ had
10
11 a higher prevalence of longstanding illness (38%) than overall prevalence in the cohort (15%).
12
13
14 Conditions reported for children who had not been immunised and who had a long standing illness
15
16 included asthma, epilepsy, dermatitis/eczema and cerebral palsy, and although none appeared to
17
18 be true contraindications, some may have been incorrectly considered to be at that time, either by
19
20 the health professional or the parents themselves. NICE recommends offering parents
21
22 opportunities to discuss their concerns about vaccines or vaccine safety with health professionals;
23
24 receiving such information from health professionals has been found to be the decisive factor for
25
26 parents who have changed their minds about previously rejected or delayed vaccines²⁶. In addition
27
28 training is recommended for health care professionals to equip them with the skills and information
29
30 needed to communicate effectively with parents about immunisation, to allay any fears over the
31
32 safety of the vaccine and any misinformation about medical contraindications. Finally, joint
33
34 working between the health sector and childcare providers, nurseries, and schools is essential²³.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Conclusions**

44
45 Children born at the height of the MMR scare are being disproportionately affected by current
46
47 measles outbreaks and are the target of a newly launched national catch-up programme. Our
48
49 findings refer to children of this age and have identified the characteristics of two distinct groups of
50
51 parents who do not immunise their children with MMR on time. Health professionals should
52
53 consider their local populations in light of our findings, and tailor the local roll-out of the catch-up
54
55 programme accordingly.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 The new national immunisation framework not only aims to facilitate catch-up but also to
6
7 strengthen routine approaches to immunisation⁷. Findings from this study should be used to inform
8
9 longer-term local and national planning to improve and maintain timely uptake. While uptake of
10
11 the first dose of MMR in younger age groups has increased, levels remains below those required for
12
13 herd immunity and uptake of the second dose is lower still. Measles outbreaks remain a risk,
14
15 particularly in areas of the country with low uptake.
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Acknowledgements**

22
23 We would like to thank all the Millennium Cohort families for their participation, and the director of
24
25 the Millennium Cohort Study and colleagues in the management team at the Centre for
26
27 Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education, University of London. We would also like to thank the
28
29 MCS user group at the MRC Centre of Epidemiology for Child Health: Catherine Law, Carol
30
31 Dezateux, Lucy Griffiths, Tim Cole, Phillippa Cumberland, Jamie Fagg, Francesco Sera, Steven Hope,
32
33 Hannah Lewis and Marco Geraci; also David Elliman, for his advice early on in the project.
34
35
36
37

38 **Funding**

39
40 The Centre for Paediatric Epidemiology and Biostatistics is supported in part by the Medical
41
42 Research Council in its capacity as the MRC Centre of Epidemiology for Child Health (Grant
43
44 reference G0400546). Research at the UCL Institute of Child Health and Great Ormond Street
45
46 Hospital for Children receives a proportion of the funding from the Department of Health's National
47
48 Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centres funding scheme. AP is funded by a
49
50 Medical Research Council fellowship (grant reference MR/J012351/1). All researchers were
51
52 independent of the funders and the funders played no part in the study design, analysis or
53
54 interpretation of the data, writing of the report or the decision to submit for publication.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Contributors:** MM and HB contributed to the study conception. All authors contributed to the
4
5 design of the analysis. AP, MM and MC-B carried out the analyses. AP and MM drafted the paper.
6
7 All authors revised the paper. All authors had full access to the data and take responsibility for the
8
9 integrity of the data and accuracy of the data analysis.
10

11
12 **Ethics approval:** Research ethics approval was not required for this study as it was a secondary data
13
14 analysis of the UK Millennium Cohort Study. The first sweep of the Millennium Cohort Study
15
16 received ethics approval from National Health Service Ethical Authority in February 2001
17
18 (MREC/01/6/19), and the second and third received approval from the London Multi-Centre
19
20 Research Ethics Committee in September 2004 (MREC/03/2/022) and December 2005
21
22 (05/MRE02/46).
23

24
25
26 **Data sharing:** The Millennium Cohort Study is available at:

27
28 <http://www.esds.ac.uk/findingData/mcs.asp>
29

30 31 **Competing interests**

32
33 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [ww.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf)
34
35 and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; MCB has received research
36
37 grants from the Health Protection Agency; no other relationships or activities that could appear to
38
39 have influenced the submitted work.
40
41

42 43 **Copyright/licence for publication**

44
45 I, Helen Bedford, the Corresponding Author of this article contained within the original manuscript
46
47 which includes any diagrams & photographs, other illustrative material, video, film or any other
48
49 material howsoever submitted by the Contributor(s) at any time and related to the Contribution
50
51 (“the Contribution”) have the right to grant on behalf of all authors and do grant on behalf of all
52
53 authors, a licence to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and its licensees, to permit this Contribution (if
54
55 accepted) to be published in BMJ Open and any other BMJ Group products and to exploit all
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 subsidiary rights, as set out in the licence at: [http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-](http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-for-authors/BMJOpen_licence.pdf)
4
5 [for-authors/BMJOpen_licence.pdf](http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-for-authors/BMJOpen_licence.pdf)
6
7
8

References

- 11 1. The Information Centre. NHS Immunisation Statistics: England 2006-07, 2007.
- 12 2. Salisbury D, Ramsay M, Noakes K. Immunisation against infectious disease: the green book. In:
13 England PH, editor, 2013. [https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/immunisation-against-infectious-disease-the-green-book)
14 [england/series/immunisation-against-infectious-disease-the-green-book](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/immunisation-against-infectious-disease-the-green-book)
15
- 16 3. Wakefield AJ, Murch SH, Anthony A, Linnell J, Casson DM, Malik M, et al. Ileal-lymphoid-nodular
17 hyperplasia, non-specific colitis, and pervasive developmental disorder in children. *Lancet*
18 1998;351 (9103):637-41.
- 19 4. Lancet. Retraction--Ileal-lymphoid-nodular hyperplasia, non-specific colitis, and
20 pervasive developmental disorder in children. 2010 Feb *Lancet*. 2010;375(9713):445.
- 21 5. The Health and Social Care Information Centre Screening and Immunisations team. NHS
22 Immunisation Statistics, England: 2011-12 In: Centre TI, editor, 2012.
- 23 6. Health Protection Agency. Confirmed cases of measles by region and age: 1996-2012.
24 [http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAweb&HPAwebStandard/HPAweb_C/1195733778332:](http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAweb&HPAwebStandard/HPAweb_C/1195733778332)
25 [http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAweb&HPAwebStandard/HPAweb_C/1195733778332:](http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAweb&HPAwebStandard/HPAweb_C/1195733778332)
26 Public Health England, 2013.
- 27 7. Public Health England. MMR catch-up programme 2013. .
28 [https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/MMR-catch-](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/MMR-catch-up-programme-2013#publications)
29 [up-programme-2013#publications](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/MMR-catch-up-programme-2013#publications): GOV.UK, 2013.
- 30 8. Pearce A, Law C, Elliman D, Cole TJ, Bedford H, the Millennium Cohort Study Child Health G.
31 Factors associated with uptake of measles, mumps and rubella vaccine (MMR) and use of
32 single antigen vaccines in a contemporary UK cohort: prospective cohort study. *British*
33 *Medical Journal* 2008;336:754-60.
- 34 9. Centre for Longitudinal Studies. Millennium Cohort Study: Survey design: Institute of Education,
35 2007.
- 36 10. Plewis I, Ketende S. Millennium Cohort Study: technical report on response. 1st ed. London
37 Centre for Longitudinal Studies, 2006.
- 38 11. Hansen K, Joshi H. Millennium Cohort Study Third Survey: A User's Guide to Initial Findings.
39 London: Institute of Education 2008.
- 40 12. Samad L, Bedford H, Tate AR, Dezateux C, Peckham C, Butler N, et al. Differences in risk factors
41 for partial and no immunisation in the first year of life. *British Medical Journal* 2006;332
42 1312-13.
- 43 13. Pearce A, Elliman D, Bedford H, Law C. Residential mobility and uptake of childhood
44 immunisations: findings from the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Vaccine* 2008;26:1675-80.
- 45 14. Plewis I. Millennium Cohort Study: technical report on sampling. 3rd ed. . London: Centre for
46 Longitudinal Studies, 2004.
- 47 15. AbdelSalam HHM, Sokal MM. Accuracy of parental reporting of immunization. *Clinical Pediatrics*
48 2004;43 (1):83-85.
- 49 16. Suarez L, Simpson DM, Smith DR. Errors and correlates in parental recall of child immunizations:
50 effects on vaccination coverage estimates. *Pediatrics* 1997;99 (5):E3.
- 51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

17. Sharland M, Atkinson P, Maguire H, Begg N. Lone parent families are an independent risk factor for lower rates of childhood immunisation in London. *Communicable Disease Report.CDR Review* 1997;7 (11):R196-R72.
18. Li J, Taylor B. Factors affecting uptake of measles, mumps, and rubella immunisation. *British Medical Journal* 1993;307 168-71.
19. Middleton E, Baker D. Comparison of social distribution of immunisation with measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine, England, 1991-2001. *British Medical Journal* 2003;326 854-54.
20. Friederichs V, Cameron JC, Robertson C. Impact of adverse publicity on MMR vaccine uptake: a population based analysis of vaccine uptake records for one million children, born 1987-2004. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2006;91 465-68.
21. Hawker J, Olowokure B, Wood A, Wilson R, Johnson R. Widening inequalities in MMR vaccine uptake rates among ethnic groups in an urban area of the UK during a period of vaccine controversy (1994-2000). *Vaccine* 2007;25:7516-9.
22. MacDonald H, Henderson R, Oates K. Low uptake of immunisation: contributing factors. *Community Practitioner* 2004;77 (3):95-100.
23. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Reducing differences in the uptake of immunisations. *NICE public health guidance 21*, 2009.
24. Jacobson Vann J, Szilagyi P. Patient reminder and patient recall systems to improve immunization rates. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2005;Jul 20(3).
25. Bedford, H; Elliman, D. Concerns about immunisation. *British Medical Journal* 2000;320;7229: 240.
26. Gust D, Darling N, Kennedy A, Schwartz B. Parents with doubts about vaccines: which vaccines and reasons why. *Pediatrics* 2008;1227(4):18-25.

Characteristics of five year olds who catch-up with MMR: findings from the UK Millennium Cohort

Study

Anna Pearce (Research Fellow)¹; Miranda Mindlin (Consultant in Communicable Disease Control)^{2,1};

Mario Cortina-Borja (Senior Lecturer)¹; Helen Bedford (Senior Lecturer)^{1*}

¹MRC Centre of Epidemiology for Child Health, UCL Institute of Child Health, 30 Guilford Street, London, WC1N 1EH, UK

² Kent, Surrey, Sussex Public Health England Centre, County Hall North, Chart Way, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 1XA, UK

*corresponding author and guarantor to the paper. h.bedford@ucl.ac.uk. T 0207 905 2333; F 020 7905 2793

Key words:

Socio-economic factors, immunisation, measles, measles-mumps-rubella vaccine, child health services

Word count: 3441

Abstract*Objectives*

To examine predictors of partial and full MMR catch-up between three and five years

Design

Secondary data analysis of the nationally representative Millennium Cohort Study (MCS)

Setting

Children born in the UK, 2000-2

Participants

751 MCS children who were unimmunised against measles, mumps and rubella at age three, with immunisation information at age five

Main outcome measures

Catch-up status: unimmunised (received no MMR), partial catch-up (received one MMR), or full catch-up (received two MMRs)

Results

At age five, 60.3% ($n=440$) children remained unvaccinated, 16.1% ($n=127$) had partially, and 23.6% ($n=184$) had fully caught-up. Children from families who did not speak English at home were five times as likely to partially catch-up than children living in homes where only English was spoken (risk ratio: 4.68 [95% CI, 3.63-6.03]). Full catch-up was also significantly more likely in those did not speak English at home (adjusted risk ratio: 1.90 [1.08-3.32]). In addition, those from Pakistani /Bangladeshi (2.40 [1.38-4.18]) or 'other' ethnicities (such as Chinese) (1.88 [1.08-3.29]) were more likely to fully catch-up than White British. Those living in socially rented (1.86 [1.34-2.56]) or 'Other' (2.52 [1.23-5.18]) accommodations were more likely to fully catch-up than home owners, and families were more likely to catch-up if they lived outside London (1.95 [1.32-2.89]). Full catch-up was less likely if parents reported medical reasons (0.43 [0.25-0.74]), a conscious decision (0.33

[0.23-0.48]), or 'other' reasons (0.46 [0.29-0.73]) for not immunising at age three (compared to 'practical' reasons).

Conclusions

Parents who partially or fully catch-up with MMR experience practical barriers and tend to come from disadvantaged or ethnic minority groups. Families who continue to reject MMR tend to have more advantaged backgrounds and make a conscious decision to not immunise early on. Health professionals should consider these findings in light of the characteristics of their local populations.

Article summary:

Article focus

- Areas of the UK are currently experiencing measles outbreaks, and a MMR national catch-up programme has just been launched
- Individual-level predictors of MMR catch-up are unknown
- We explore a range of risk factors for partial and full catch-up between age three and five years in the nationally representative UK Millennium Cohort Study

Key messages

- Of 751 children who were unimmunised at age three, 60% remained unimmunised at age five, 16% had partially caught-up, and 24% had fully caught-up
- Two distinct groups of parents emerged:
 - those who experienced practical barriers and were from **more disadvantaged groups/ethnic minority backgrounds** – these groups eventually caught-up
 - those who consciously rejected MMR and were from more advantaged circumstances – these groups tended to remain unimmunised

- 1
2
3 • Health professionals should consider these findings in light of the characteristics of their local
4
5 populations when designing programmes to increase and maintain uptake
6
7

8 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 9
10 • This is the first study to examine individual-level characteristics of MMR catch-up in the UK; we
11
12 do this using data from a nationally representative cohort of children who were born at the
13
14 height of the MMR scare and are currently being targeted by the national catch-up programme
15
16
17 • Our analyses refer to predictors of catch-up during a period when parental concerns around the
18 safety of the vaccine were relatively high, and the incidence of measles ~~was~~ relatively low;
19
20 predictors of catch- up in families with young children today may be different during times of
21 measles outbreaks the perceived risk-benefit balance of the vaccine shifts, particularly for
22 advantaged families.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 • We were unable to investigate exact timing of vaccination; therefore our analyses focus on
30
31 children who were unimmunised at age three (so approximately 2 years after the
32
33 recommended age of administration), and we were unable to detect how long children who had
34
35 partially or fully caught-up by age five had been left susceptible
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

The combined measles, mumps and rubella vaccination (MMR) has been used routinely in the UK since 1988. Coverage at 2 years of age peaked in England in 1995, at 92%¹. A two-dose schedule was introduced in 1996, the first dose recommended at soon after the age of 12/13 months² (affording 90-95% protection against measles), with a second at three years four months² (99% protection). In 1998, a Lancet article³ was widely interpreted as suggesting MMR was linked with autism and bowel problems. Although the paper was eventually discredited and retracted by the Lancet in 2010⁴, widespread adverse media coverage in the intervening years led to a dramatic fall in MMR uptake, to a low of 80% in England (of the first dose by age two) in 2003¹. By 2006-7, 85% of two year olds had received at least one MMR, although only 73% had received the recommended two doses by age five, and levels were particularly low in some geographical areas, such as London¹. Measles cases started to rise and in 2008 the Health Protection Agency announced that measles was again endemic in England and Wales.

Although coverage has continued to rise (in England in 2011-12, 91% of two year olds had received one and 86% of five year olds two doses of MMR⁵), levels remain below those needed for herd immunity, particularly in some geographical areas and in children who were born in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Consequently, measles outbreaks are currently occurring across some areas of the UK, with young teenagers disproportionately affected (one quarter of measles cases in 2011-12 were in 10-14 year olds⁶). In response to this, Public Health England, NHS England and the Department of Health announced a national MMR catch-up programme to vaccinate as many partially or unimmunised 10-16 year olds as possible by the start of the next school year (September 2013)⁷. The catch-up programme outlines aims to strengthen current routine immunisation strategies and in particular to target hard to reach populations; GPs and schools will

1
2
3 play a central role. A better understanding of the social and demographic characteristics associated
4
5 with catching-up (or not), and the reasons reported by parents for their child's immunisation status,
6
7 is essential if the aims of the new framework are to be achieved and maintained. Cross-sectional
8
9 evidence indicates that, at age three, being unimmunised against MMR, or receiving the single
10
11 antigen vaccines, was socially distributed⁸. However little is known about the factors which
12
13 influence the propensity of families with unimmunised children to catch-up. We examine the social
14
15 correlates of partial and full catch-up with MMR between the age of three and five years, in a
16
17 nationally representative cohort of children born at the height of the MMR scare.
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Methods**

24 *Participants*

25
26 We analysed data from the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS), a longitudinal study of children eligible
27
28 for Child Benefit and born in the UK between September 2000 and January 2002. The sample was
29
30 derived from a random sample of electoral wards which were disproportionately stratified to
31
32 ensure an adequate representation of all four UK countries, deprived areas and, in the case of
33
34 England, areas with high proportions of families from ethnic minority groups⁹. At the first contact,
35
36 when the MCS children were aged 9 months, data were collected on 18,296 singleton babies (72%
37
38 of those approached); with subsequent data collections at three and five years. 71% of the initial
39
40 cohort responded to all three sweeps ($n=12,989$). Participants in the second and third sweeps
41
42 were less likely to be from ethnic or deprived wards^{10;11}, although due to the sampling design these
43
44 proportions remained higher than the general population.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54 Our analyses focus on the subsample of MCS singleton children who were unimmunised against
55
56 measles, mumps or rubella at age three years. Of the 804 children who were unimmunised at age
57
58
59
60

three, 777 (96.6%) had a recorded MMR outcome at five years, and 26 (3.3%) of them were excluded because they were reported to have received at least one single antigen vaccine by age five, leaving 751 eligible participants in our analyses. Compared to the unimmunised children (who are the focus of this analysis), children who had been immunised with MMR at age three were: less likely to have a mother with a degree or A-levels, and more likely to have a mother in her twenties or early thirties or who did not smoke during pregnancy; they were also less likely to be living in a lone parent family and more likely to be an only child. The socio-economic and demographic characteristics of children according to MMR status at age three is described in greater detail elsewhere⁸.

Measures

Measures were reported by the main respondent (usually the mother) during survey interviews, which were carried out by trained interviewers in the home.

Outcome measure: MMR status at age five was classified as unimmunised (received no combined MMR vaccines), partially caught-up (received one combined MMR), or fully caught-up (received two combined MMRs).

Covariates: We explored socio-economic and demographic factors that were found to be associated with immunisation status in earlier sweeps of the MCS^{8;12;13}, or that were pertinent to immunisation policy. We examined maternal social class (based on National Statistics Socio-economic Classification (NS-SEC)), ethnicity, maternal age at birth (in five-year age bands), maternal education, and child gender. These measures were all captured at age nine months because they were unlikely to have changed in later sweeps. In addition, we explored the following time-variant

1
2
3 measures, captured at age three (the beginning of the potential catch-up period): UK country of
4
5 residence, ward type ('advantaged', 'disadvantaged', 'ethnic'), number of children in the
6
7 household, maternal employment status, lone parenthood, household income, housing tenure,
8
9 whether resident in London, whether the family had changed residential address since age three,
10
11 and whether the parents reported the child having natural measles infection. Income data were
12
13 missing for 14% (122) children at age three; we supplemented this with information captured at
14
15 age nine months, reducing the level of missingness to 24. Missing data were very low for all other
16
17 measures (listed at the foot of Table 1).
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 We also investigated reasons given for not having had MMR at age three, classified in a previous
25
26 analysis¹⁰ as 'practical' (such as missing an appointment), 'medical' (e.g. child had asthma),
27
28 'conscious decision' (including fear of links with autism) or 'other' (which included don't know). The
29
30 mean age of the MCS children at the third survey was 61 months, with a range between 52 and 72
31
32 months, meaning that some children had more time to catch-up than others. We therefore
33
34 explored age as a potential confounder, but as it was not found to be associated with immunisation
35
36 status ($p=0.28$) we did not include it in our models. There were no *a priori* hypotheses for
37
38 interactions so none were explored.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Analysis*

46
47 We estimated the prevalence of MMR status (unimmunised, partially caught-up, and fully caught-
48
49 up) at age five, overall and according to the potential explanatory factors. We then fitted Poisson
50
51 regression models to estimate risk ratios (RRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for partial and full
52
53 catch-up (in two separate models, because previous research indicates that the social correlates of
54
55 partial and full immunisation are likely to differ¹²). The models were built as follows: first we
56
57
58
59
60

1 explored univariable associations between the outcome and each of the explanatory variables.
 2
 3 Variables, which were associated with the outcome ($p < 0.10$) using Wald tests for trend, were
 4
 5 entered into a multivariable model using a forward stepwise model selection strategy. Residence in
 6
 7 London was forced into the multivariable models, due to its potential significance for policy. Only
 8
 9 measures which remained significantly associated with the outcome after adjustment were
 10
 11 retained.
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19

20 Data were downloaded from the UK Data Archive, University of Essex in May 2010. Analyses were
 21
 22 carried out in Stata 12 (Stata Corporation, TX) using survey and response weights to allow for the
 23
 24 sample design and attrition between sweeps^{10;14}.
 25
 26
 27
 28

29 Results

30 Of the 751 MCS children who were unimmunised at age three, 60.3% (440) remained unvaccinated,
 31
 32 16.1% (127) had partially caught-up, and 23.6% (184) had fully caught-up. Table 1 presents the
 33
 34 proportion of children who were partially, fully, or unimmunised, according to the various predictor
 35
 36 measures.
 37
 38
 39

40 **Table 1: Weighted percentage (n) of children who remained unimmunised or who partially for**
 41
 42 **fully caught-up with MMR, according to social, demographic and other characteristics**
 43
 44

	Total	Full catch-up (2 doses)	Partial catch-up (1 dose)	Unimmunised
Language spoken at home				
English only	91.6 (658)	20.4 (130)	15.8 (11.5)	67.8 (413)
English and other language(s)	5.7 (64)	53.0 (29)	15.0 (9)	32.0 (26)
No - other language(s) only	2.7 (29)	70.2 (25)	27.7 (3)	2.1 (1)
Ward type				
Advantaged	56.5 (290)	20.3 (60)	13.6 (43)	66.1 (187)
Disadvantaged	38.5 (5.0)	24.1 (79)	20.1 (73)	55.8 (227)
Ethnic	5.0 (82)	57.6 (45)	13.3 (11)	29.2 (26)
Ethnicity				
British white	87.5 (644)	20.3 (126)	15.8 (111)	63.9 (407)

Other white	2.2 (13)	10.3 (2)	15.6 (2)	74.1 (9)
Mixed	1.4 (10)	33.5 (3)	15.1 (2)	51.4 (5)
Indian	1.0 (12)	76.9 (9)	5.5 (1)	17.5 (2)
Pakistani or Bangladeshi	3.8 (39)	74.7 (28)	9.8 (3)	15.5 (8)
Black or Black British	2.7 (18)	24.7 (7)	35.1 (5)	40.2 (6)
Other	1.4 (14)	65.2 (9)	19.6 (2)	15.2 (3)
Lone parent/carer				
Two parents/carers	79.2 (597)	21.9 (142)	15.3 (97)	62.9
One parent/carer	20.8 (154)	30.2 (42)	19.3 (30)	50.5 (82)
Maternal age at birth of cohort child				
14 - 19y	8.1 (60)	37.7 (21)	21.8 (14)	40.6 (25)
20-24y	15.9 (130)	34.3 (40)	19.4 (27)	46.3 (63)
25-29y	23.5 (174)	25.8 (52)	18.2 (27)	55.9 (95)
30-34y	27.6 (205)	17.0 (36)	13.0 (30)	70.0 (13.9)
35-39y	20.4 (145)	15.8 (25)	14.3 (24)	70.0 (96)
40plus	4.5 (36)	24.2 (9)	10.6 (5)	65.1 (22)
Maternal education				
Degree	20.8 (152)	18.8 (32)	10.4 (15)	70.7 (105)
Diploma	8.9 (64)	13.9 (9)	14.9 (9)	71.1 (46)
A or AS levels	11.3 (85)	22.7 (19)	17.0 (20)	60.2 (46)
GCSE A*-C	32.2 (238)	20.4 (48)	19.6 (50)	60.0 (140)
GCSE D-G	8.4 (64)	18.1 (13)	23.9 (16)	58.0 (35)
Other	1.9 (15)	25.1 (6)	7.7 (1)	67.2 (8)
None	16.4 (133)	44.5 (57)	13.4 (16)	42.1 (60)
Housing tenure age 3				
Owned	58.7 (451)	18.1 (92)	15.6 (77)	66.3 (282)
Privately rented	9.8 (71)	29.8 (18)	11.5 (8)	58.6 (45)
Socially rented	27.7 (199)	30.4 (65)	19.8 (37)	49.8 (16)
Other	3.8 (30)	43.4 (9)	8.1 (5)	48.6 (16)
Household income (£ pa)				
0-11000	23.7 (186)	32.1 (57)	18.7 (34)	49.2 (95)
11 000-22 000	30.4 (228)	23.4 (56)	18.2 (41)	58.4 (131)
22 000-33 000	19.9 (142)	12.6 (21)	18.3 (34)	69.1 (87)
33 000-55 000	17.4 (123)	20.6 (28)	6.8 (8)	72.6 (87)
55 000+	8.9 (48)	23.5 (11)	15.9 (8)	60.6 (29)
Social class (9 months)				
Managerial & professional	30.2 (222)	20.8 (42)	12.7 (34)	66.5 (14.6)
Intermediate	16.7 (119)	17.5 (22)	17.6 (18)	65.0 (79)
Small employer/self-employed	8.0 (53)	10.1 (10)	11.9 (8)	78.0 (35)
Lower supervisory & technical	4.0 (33)	33.4 (10)	9.6 (4)	57.1 (19)
Semi-routine & routine	32.0 (248)	24.4 (61)	20.6 (53)	54.9 (134)
Never worked/unemployed	9.2 (73)	47.8 (37)	15.6 (10)	36.6 (26)
Number of children in household (age 3)				
One child	22.5 (180)	26.2 (43)	20.0 (38)	53.8 (99)
Two or three children	63.1 (459)	21.3 (104)	15.5 (73)	63.2 (282)
Four or more children	14.4 (112)	29.9 (37)	12.6 (16)	57.6 (59)
Maternal employment (age 3)				
FT	11.2 (93)	23.8 (21)	11.5 (17)	64.7 (55)
PT	25.2 (191)	22.1 (41)	19.6 (37)	58.3 (113)
On leave	3.9 (28)	26.8 (8)	3.9 (1)	69.4 (19)
Self employed	9.3 (60)	17.1 (13)	13.0 (10)	69.9 (37)

Not employed/student	50.4 (379)	25.3 (101)	16.9 (62)	57.8 (216)
Sex of child				
Male	55.1 (404)	20.6 (95)	17.7 (70)	61.7 (239)
Female	44.9 (347)	27.3 (89)	14.1 (57)	58.6 (201)
Parental report of measles disease by age 3				
Yes	3.5 (22)	19.2 (5)	13.2 (3)	67.6 (14)
No	96.5 (721)	23.7 (176)	16.1 (123)	60.2 (422)
Residence in London				
London	16.2 (102)	17.7 (23)	20.0 (19)	62.3 (60)
Not London	83.8 (649)	24.8 (161)	15.3 (108)	60.0 (380)
Country of residence				
England	58.6 (462)	23.3 (122)	15.7 (74)	61.0 (266)
Wales	21.6 (160)	22.1 (31)	20.1 (31)	57.7 (98)
Scotland	12.9 (87)	26.7 (21)	15.6 (14)	57.5 (52)
Northern Ireland	6.9 (42)	25.3 (10)	17.8 (8)	60.0 (24)
Smoked during pregnancy				
No	63.2 (465)	23.4 (121)	15.1 (76)	61.6 (268)
Yes	36.8 (283)	23.8 (62)	18.0 (51)	58.2 (170)
Changed address since 3				
No	85.6 (647)	23.8 (161)	16.6 (112)	59.6 (374)
Yes	14.4 (104)	22.4 (23)	13.1 (15)	64.5 (66)
Reasons given for not having had MMR (aged 3)				
Practical	6.2 (51)	54.5 (30)	15.3 (7)	30.3 (14)
Medical	15.2 (107)	17.9 (82)	25.5 (26)	56.7 (57)
Conscious decision	66.7 (486)	17.8 (82)	16.0 (85)	66.2 (31.9)
Other	11.7 (76)	35.3 (26)	9.9 (9)	54.9 (41)

Missing: Social class 3, smoked during pregnancy 3, income 24, ethnicity 1, reason 31, age at birth 1.

Partial catch-up (compared to remaining unimmunised)

Table 2 (column A) shows unadjusted RRs for partial catch-up, according to each of the predictor measures. Partial catch-up was more likely in families who spoke a language other than English at home (particularly if English was not spoken at home at all), compared to those who only spoke English at home, and in those who lived in a ward classified as 'disadvantaged' or 'ethnic', compared to advantaged wards. No significant associations were seen with any of the other variables. When language, ward type and London residence (due to its policy significance) were entered into the multivariable model, only language remained significantly associated with the likelihood of being partially immunised, with an adjusted RR of 4.68 (3.63 to 6.03) in families who did not speak English at home (Table 2, Column B).

Table 2: Unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios (ORs) for partial catch-up with the combined MMR vaccine (baseline unimmunised) by age five

	Partial catch-up (1 dose)		Full catch-up (2 doses)	
	A: uRR (95% CI)	B: aRR (95% CI)	C: uRR (95% CI)	D: aRR (95% CI)
Language spoken at home				
English only	1	1	1	1
English and other language(s)	1.61 (0.96, 2.70)	1.61 (0.96, 2.70)	2.57 (2.00, 3.32)*	1.54 (0.91, 2.63)
Other language(s) only	4.68 (3.63, 6.03)*	4.68 (3.63, 6.03)*	4.00 (3.37, 4.76)*	1.90 (1.08, 3.32)*
<i>p</i> -value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.0811
Ward type				
Advantaged	1		1	
Disadvantaged	1.55 (1.05, 2.27)*		1.29 (0.92, 1.80)	
Ethnic	1.83 (1.18, 2.83)*		2.83 (2.19, 3.65)*	
<i>p</i> -value	0.0146		<0.001	
Ethnicity				
British white	1		1	1
Other white	0.88 (0.22, 3.54)		0.51 (0.13, 2.06)	0.37 (0.10, 1.34)
Mixed	1.15 (0.29, 4.59)		1.64 (0.57, 4.74)	1.83 (0.65, 5.17)
Indian	1.21 (0.19, 7.82)		3.38 (2.40, 4.76)*	2.01 (0.75, 5.41)
Pakistani or Bangladeshi	1.96 (0.84, 4.54)		3.44 (2.79, 4.23)*	2.40 (1.38, 4.18)*
Black or Black British	2.35 (0.99, 5.57)		1.58 (0.73, 3.43)	1.12 (0.35, 3.63)
Other	2.84 (1.12, 7.22)*		3.36 (2.42, 4.67)*	1.88 (1.08, 3.29)*
<i>p</i> -value	0.0126		<0.001	0.0950
Lone parent/carers				
Two parents/carers	1		1	
One parent/carers	1.42 (0.92, 2.17)		1.45 (1.06, 1.99)*	
<i>p</i> -value	0.1110		0.0208	
Maternal age at birth of cohort child				
14 - 19y	1.42 (0.80, 2.51)		1.52 (0.98, 2.37)	
20-24y	1.20 (0.68, 2.12)		1.35 (0.89, 2.03)	
25-29y	1		1	
30-34y	0.63 (0.37, 1.08)		0.62 (0.40, 0.97)*	
35-39y	0.69 (0.40, 1.20)		0.58 (0.37, 0.92)*	
40plus	0.57 (0.23, 1.43)		0.86 (0.42, 1.74)	
<i>p</i> -value	0.0259		<0.001	
Maternal education				
Degree	1		1	
Diploma	1.35 (0.54, 3.36)		0.78 (0.35, 1.72)	
A or AS levels	1.72 (0.79, 3.74)		1.30 (0.71, 2.38)	
GCSE A*-C	1.91 (1.05, 3.49)*		1.21 (0.75, 1.96)	
GCSE D-G	2.27 (1.07, 4.80)*		1.13 (0.55, 2.34)	
Other	0.80 (0.11, 5.93)		1.29 (0.49, 3.39)	
None	1.88 (0.87, 4.03)		2.44 (1.63, 3.66)*	
<i>p</i> -value	0.2420		<0.001	
Housing tenure age 3				
Owned	1		1	1

Privately rented	0.86 (0.32, 2.34)		1.57 (0.96, 2.59)	1.51 (0.91, 2.48)
Socially rented	1.49 (0.96, 2.32)		1.77 (1.29, 2.43)*	1.86 (1.34, 2.56)*
Other	0.75 (0.27, 2.09)		2.20 (1.27, 3.79)*	2.52 (1.23, 5.18)*
p-value	0.0936		0.0014	<0.001
Household income (£ per annum)				
0-11000	1		1	
11 000-22 000	0.86 (0.53, 1.41)		0.72 (0.52, 1.02)	
22 000-33 000	0.76 (0.44, 1.31)		0.39 (0.23, 0.66)	
33 000-55 000	0.31 (0.14, 0.70)*		0.56 (0.36, 0.87)	
55 000+	0.76 (0.36, 1.61)		0.71 (0.39, 1.29)	
p-value	0.0816		0.0028	
Social class (9 months)				
Managerial & professional	1		1	
Intermediate	1.33 (0.73, 2.42)		0.89 (0.52, 1.53)	
Small employer/self-employed	0.83 (0.38, 1.79)		0.48 (0.20, 1.16)	
Lower supervisory & technical	0.90 (0.30, 2.67)		1.55 (0.80, 3.00)	
Semi-routine & routine	1.71 (1.11, 2.64)*		1.29 (0.87, 1.92)	
Never worked/unemployed	1.87 (0.96, 3.64)		2.38 (1.62, 3.49)*	
p-value	0.0989		<0.001	
Number of children in household (age 3)				
One child	1		1	
Two or three children	0.73 (0.47, 1.12)		0.77 (0.52, 1.14)	
Four or more children	0.66 (0.34, 1.29)		1.04 (0.67, 1.63)	
p-value	0.2807		0.1832	
Maternal employment (age 3)				
Full-time	1		1	
Part-time	1.67 (0.84, 3.33)		1.02 (0.58, 1.79)	
On leave	0.35 (0.05, 2.48)		1.04 (0.46, 2.33)	
Self employed	1.04 (0.41, 2.66)		0.73 (0.37, 1.45)	
Not employed/student	1.50 (0.88, 2.57)		1.13 (0.71, 1.80)	
p-value	0.1836		0.6517	
Sex of child				
Male	1		1	
Female	0.87 (0.60, 1.27)		1.27 (0.94, 1.71)	
p-value	0.4755		0.1171	
Parental report of measles disease by age 3				
Yes	1		1	
No	1.29 (0.48, 3.49)		1.28 (0.52, 3.16)	
p-value	0.6163		0.5970	
Residence in London				
London	1		1	1
Not London	0.84 (0.50, 1.41)		1.32 (0.86, 2.02)	1.95 (1.32, 2.89)*
p-value	0.5078		0.2012	<0.001
Country of residence				
England	1		1	
Wales	1.26 (0.86, 1.84)		1.00 (0.69, 1.46)	
Scotland	1.04 (0.60, 1.83)		1.16 (0.71, 1.88)	
Northern Ireland	1.16 (0.55, 2.44)		1.11 (0.66, 1.88)	
p-value	0.6802		0.9272	
Smoked during pregnancy				
No	1		1	

Yes	1.20 (0.73, 1.74)		0.05 (0.76, 1.46)	
<i>p</i> -value	0.3202		0.7481	
Changed address since 3				
No	1			
Yes	0.90 (0.62, 1.32)		0.77 (0.42, 1.43)	
<i>p</i> -value	0.6031		0.4112	
Reasons given for not having had MMR (aged 3)				
Practical	1		1	
Medical	0.93 (0.44, 1.93)		0.37 (0.20, 0.68)*	0.43 (0.25, 0.74)*
Conscious decision	0.58 (0.27, 1.22)		0.33 (0.23, 0.47)*	0.33 (0.23, 0.48)*
Other	0.45 (0.16, 1.30)		0.61 (0.40, 0.93)*	0.46 (0.29, 0.73)*
<i>p</i> -value	0.1357		<0.001	<0.001

uRR = unadjusted risk ratio; aRR = adjusted risk ratio. * $p < 0.05$

Full catch-up (compared to remaining unimmunised)

Table 2 also presents unadjusted and adjusted RRs for fully catching up. In the univariable analyses (Column C), children whose parents spoke a language other than English at home (as opposed to only speaking English), who were from ethnic minority groups (compared to White British), or lived in 'ethnic' wards (compared to 'advantaged' wards) were more likely to fully catch-up. Catch-up was also significantly more likely in children whose mother had no educational qualifications (compared to a degree), in lone parent families (compared to two parent families), and in those living in 'socially rented' or 'other' tenure types (compared to own/mortgage). Catch-up was significantly less likely in children with a mother in her thirties (compared to 24-29 years), and in children living in higher income households. Children whose parents had reported a non-practical reason ('medical', 'conscious decision', or 'other') for not having their child immunised with the combined MMR at age three were also less likely to have fully caught-up than those reporting practical reasons. Living in London was not associated with immunisation status, although due to its policy significance was included in the multivariable model reported below.

In the multivariable analysis (Column D), full catch-up remained significantly more likely in those who only spoke a non-English language at home (1.90 [1.08 to 3.32]), when compared to those who

1
2
3 only spoke English. Those from Pakistani or Bangladeshi (2.40 [1.38 to 4.18]), and 'Other' (1.88
4 [1.08 to 3.29]) ethnic groups were more likely to have caught-up than White British groups, as were
5 [1.08 to 3.29]) ethnic groups were more likely to have caught-up than White British groups, as were
6 [1.08 to 3.29]) ethnic groups were more likely to have caught-up than White British groups, as were
7 those living in 'socially rented' (1.86 [1.34 to 2.56]) or 'other' (2.52 [1.23 to 5.18]) tenure types
8 (compared to own/mortgage). Full catch-up was also more likely in families living outside London
9 (1.95 [1.32 to 2.89]). Compared to those reporting practical reasons for not having been
10 immunised at age three, children whose parents reported medical reasons (0.43 [0.25 to 0.74]), a
11 conscious decision (0.33 [0.23 to 0.48]), or 'other' reasons (0.46 [0.29 to 0.73]) were considerably
12 less likely to have fully caught-up.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Parents from Asian and "other White" backgrounds were 2-3 times more likely to experience practical barriers to immunisation than those from White British, Mixed or Black backgrounds.

Similarly, families who spoke a non-English language in the home were two-three times as likely to experience practical barriers as families who only spoke English at home (data not shown).

32 Discussion

33
34 Just over 40% of children who were unimmunised with MMR vaccine at age three had either
35 partially or fully caught-up by age five. The likelihood of catching-up varied markedly with a number
36 of social factors, and more so for full than partial catch-up. Some families, particularly those from
37 ethnic minority groups, appear to have difficulty accessing vaccination in a timely fashion.

38
39 Advantaged families and those citing non-practical reasons for non-vaccination at age three are
40 more likely to persist in not immunising their child against MMR.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 We used sample and response weights to account for the survey design and attrition between the
50 first, second, and third sweeps of the MCS. However the non-response weights are unlikely to have
51 entirely accounted for differential response; for example 95.7% children who were included in the
52 age three and five surveys were fully immunised with the primary vaccines (at age 9 months)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 compared to 92.7% in children who did not take part in both of the later surveys ($p < 0.001$).

4
5 ~~Information bias may occur when~~ A limitation of the study is that we utilised using parental report
6 ~~to measure~~ of immunisation status, and it was not possible to validate report of immunisation
7 status against health system records. However there is no gold standard measure of immunisation
8
9
10 status and studies have found disagreement between parental report and health records to be
11
12 low¹⁵ and not socially distributed¹⁶. Parents were given the opportunity to consult the Personal
13
14 Child Health Record (or 'red book'). Of the 751 families included in our analysis, 19% (137)
15
16 consulted the book and found the relevant information, 1% (11) checked the book and did not find
17
18 the relevant information, and 79% (603) chose not to consult the book and relied on their memory.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
There was no association between catch-up status and whether the parent consulted the red book
($p = 0.18$), and the associations reported in this paper remained the same when analyses were
repeated excluding children where the parent had looked but not found information (data not
shown). A small number (26) of children who were unimmunised at age three had received at least
one single antigen vaccine by age five. Due to low numbers we were unable to explore the
characteristics of this group.

The intense negative media attention around the safety of the MMR vaccine peaked in 2002/3
when the MCS children were toddlers. These findings therefore provide important information on
the barriers to catch-up, in a cohort of children who are currently experiencing measles outbreaks
throughout the UK⁶, and are a central focus of the newly launched national catch-up programme.

~~We~~ However we measured catch-up across the period 2003/5 to 2006/7, when the MMR scare was
at its height and the incidence of measles was relatively low (although with some indications of a
rise). Concerns around the safety of the MMR have diminished over recent years and therefore the
characteristics of families who catch-up with the vaccine today may be different. It is also likely that

1
2
3 some of the barriers we report for more advantaged families are reduced during times of measles
4
5 outbreaks, as the perceived risk-benefit balance of the vaccine shifts. Nonetheless, this paper
6
7 provides important information on the barriers experienced by advantaged families during times of
8
9 no outbreak to improve and sustain the current MMR programme, which is also a central aim of the
10
11 catch-up programme. The recommended age of the first dose of MMR is 12/13 months; however
12
13 information on uptake was not collected in the MCS until the children were age three years. Our
14
15 analysis is unable to address those children who were immunised by age three but who had not
16
17 been immunised on time. Similarly, we were unable to investigate the timing of catch-up between
18
19 the age of three and five, and therefore how long children who partially or fully caught-up were left
20
21 susceptible. Finally, the MCS consists only of children who were born in the UK. The barriers
22
23 experienced by families from ethnic minority groups or who speak other may be different and/or
24
25 greater in families where the child was born outside the UK.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Before the scare, MMR uptake was generally lower in more deprived areas and households^{17;18}.
34
35 Since 1998, rates declined faster in more advantaged areas^{19;20} and more slowly in areas with lower
36
37 proportions of highly educated residents²⁰ and in minority ethnic groups²¹. Earlier cross-sectional
38
39 findings from the MCS demonstrated that the likelihood of being unimmunised against measles,
40
41 mumps and rubella tended to be greater in more disadvantaged families, while children living in
42
43 more affluent households were more likely to receive single antigen vaccines (indicating conscious
44
45 rejection of combined MMR)⁸. However there is a dearth of longitudinal research exploring the
46
47 social correlates of catch-up with MMR. The only study, to our knowledge, which has explored the
48
49 social correlates of MMR catch-up was an ecological study of one million children born between
50
51 1987 and 2004 in Scotland. The authors found that children living in more affluent areas were
52
53 either immunised with MMR on time or not at all, whereas children living in deprived areas were
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 more likely to be immunised late²⁰. Our findings not only reflect this, but add to the evidence base
4
5 by demonstrating that individual-level predictors of catch-up are strongly related to catch-up. We
6
7 have also found that remaining unvaccinated with MMR at age five was associated with non-
8
9 practical reasons for not immunising with MMR at three, reflecting other research which has shown
10
11 that more affluent families are more likely to consciously reject MMR^{20;22}.
12
13
14
15
16

17 Outbreaks of measles are currently being experienced across the UK, leading to the launch of a
18
19 national catch-programme in April 2013. Approaches to optimise uptake of MMR will need to be
20
21 tailored to the needs of local populations, both now and in the future. Our study has identified two
22
23 distinct groups of families that do not immunise their child with MMR in a timely fashion (during
24
25 periods of low measles incidence). The first comprises those who partially or fully catch-up,
26
27 amounting to 40% of those who were unimmunised at age three. These families tend to experience
28
29 practical barriers to immunisation, and are socially disadvantaged or from ethnic minority groups.
30
31 The second group, which continues to reject MMR and makes up the remaining 60%, consists of
32
33 parents who consciously reject MMR from the start, and are from more advantaged backgrounds.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Steps are required to minimise time to uptake in those families who do eventually catch-up,
41
42 through the reduction of practical barriers. NICE guidance outlines actions to reduce inequalities in
43
44 immunisation²³, including provision of information in multiple languages, offering immunisation
45
46 checks and administration in alternative settings, and sending out reminder invitations from GPs²⁴.
47
48
49

50 In addition, alleviating any lingering fears and concerns of families who consciously reject MMR is
51
52 essential. This should include discussion of concerns about 'medical' reasons for not giving MMR.

53 Mythical contraindications to MMR have circulated amongst the health professional community
54
55 and parents for some time²⁵ despite there being ~~there are~~ few true contraindications for MMR
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 vaccination.-'Medical reasons' reported by parent for not immunising in the MCS (at age five)
4 included: "child is not able to have it for health reasons" and "other medical problems or bad
5 reactions". It is not possible to ascertain whether any of these were true contraindications,
6 although there are very few genuine contraindications to MMR² and these tend to be very rare². It
7 was possible to look at longstanding illness however, and children who had not been immunised for
8 'medical reasons' had a higher prevalence of longstanding illness (38%) than overall prevalence in
9 the cohort (15%). Conditions reported for children who had not been immunised and who had a
10 long standing illness included asthma, epilepsy, dermatitis/eczema and cerebral palsy, and although
11 none appeared to be true contraindications, some may have been incorrectly considered to be at
12 that time, either by the health professional or the parents themselves. NICE recommends offering
13 parents opportunities to discuss their concerns about vaccines or vaccine safety with health
14 professionals; receiving such information from health professionals has been found to be the
15 decisive factor for parents who have changed their minds about previously rejected or delayed
16 vaccines²⁶. In addition training is recommended for health care professionals to equip them with
17 the skills and information needed to communicate effectively with parents about immunisation, to
18 allay any fears over the safety of the vaccine and any misinformation about medical
19 contraindications. Finally, joint working between the health sector and childcare providers,
20 nurseries, and schools is essential²³.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Conclusions

49
50 Children born at the height of the MMR scare are being disproportionately affected by current
51 measles outbreaks and are the target of a newly launched national catch-up programme. Our
52 findings refer to children of this age and have identified the characteristics of two distinct groups of
53 parents who do not immunise their children with MMR on time. Health professionals should
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consider their local populations in light of our findings, and tailor the local roll-out of the catch-up
4
5 programme accordingly.
6
7
8
9

10 The new national immunisation framework not only aims to facilitate catch-up but also to
11
12 strengthen routine approaches to immunisation⁷. Findings from this study should be used to inform
13
14 longer-term local and national planning to improve and maintain timely uptake. While uptake of
15
16 the first dose of MMR in younger age groups has increased, levels remains below those required for
17
18 herd immunity and uptake of the second dose is lower still. Measles outbreaks remain a risk,
19
20 particularly in areas of the country with low uptake.
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Acknowledgements**

27
28 We would like to thank all the Millennium Cohort families for their participation, and the director of
29
30 the Millennium Cohort Study and colleagues in the management team at the Centre for
31
32 Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education, University of London. We would also like to thank the
33
34 MCS user group at the MRC Centre of Epidemiology for Child Health: Catherine Law, Carol
35
36 Dezateux, Lucy Griffiths, Tim Cole, Phillippa Cumberland, Jamie Fagg, Francesco Sera, Steven Hope,
37
38 Hannah Lewis and Marco Geraci; also David Elliman, for his advice early on in the project.
39
40
41
42

43 **Funding**

44
45 The Centre for Paediatric Epidemiology and Biostatistics is supported in part by the Medical
46
47 Research Council in its capacity as the MRC Centre of Epidemiology for Child Health (Grant
48
49 reference G0400546). Research at the UCL Institute of Child Health and Great Ormond Street
50
51 Hospital for Children receives a proportion of the funding from the Department of Health's National
52
53 Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centres funding scheme. AP is funded by a
54
55 Medical Research Council fellowship. All researchers were independent of the funders and the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 funders played no part in the study design, analysis or interpretation of the data, writing of the
4
5 report or the decision to submit for publication.
6

7 **Contributors:** MM and HB contributed to the study conception. All authors contributed to the
8
9 design of the analysis. AP, MM and MC-B carried out the analyses. AP and MM drafted the paper.
10
11 All authors revised the paper. All authors had full access to the data and take responsibility for the
12
13 integrity of the data and accuracy of the data analysis.
14
15

16
17 **Ethics approval:** Research ethics approval was not required for this study as it was a secondary data
18
19 analysis of the UK Millennium Cohort Study. The first sweep of the Millennium Cohort Study
20
21 received ethics approval from National Health Service Ethical Authority in February 2001
22
23 (MREC/01/6/19), and the second and third received approval from the London Multi-Centre
24
25 Research Ethics Committee in September 2004 (MREC/03/2/022) and December 2005
26
27 (05/MRE02/46).
28
29

30
31 **Data sharing:** The Millennium Cohort Study is available at:
32

33 <http://www.esds.ac.uk/findingData/mcs.asp>
34
35

36 **Competing interests**

37
38 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [ww.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf)
39
40 and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; MCB has received research
41
42 grants from the Health Protection Agency; no other relationships or activities that could appear to
43
44 have influenced the submitted work.
45
46

47 **Copyright/licence for publication**

48
49 I, Helen Bedford, the Corresponding Author of this article contained within the original manuscript
50
51 which includes any diagrams & photographs, other illustrative material, video, film or any other
52
53 material howsoever submitted by the Contributor(s) at any time and related to the Contribution
54
55 (“the Contribution”) have the right to grant on behalf of all authors and do grant on behalf of all
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 authors, a licence to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and its licensees, to permit this Contribution (if
4
5 accepted) to be published in BMJ Open and any other BMJ Group products and to exploit all
6
7 subsidiary rights, as set out in the licence at: [http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-](http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-for-authors/BMJOpen_licence.pdf)
8
9 [for-authors/BMJOpen_licence.pdf](http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-for-authors/BMJOpen_licence.pdf)
10
11
12
13
14

References

- 15 1. The Information Centre. NHS Immunisation Statistics: England 2006-07, 2007.
- 16 2. Salisbury D, Ramsay M, Noakes K. Immunisation against infectious disease: the green book. In:
17 England PH, editor, 2013. [https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/immunisation-against-infectious-disease-the-green-book)
18 [england/series/immunisation-against-infectious-disease-the-green-book](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/immunisation-against-infectious-disease-the-green-book)
19
- 20 3. Wakefield AJ, Murch SH, Anthony A, Linnell J, Casson DM, Malik M, et al. Ileal-lymphoid-nodular
21 hyperplasia, non-specific colitis, and pervasive developmental disorder in children. *Lancet*
22 1998;351 (9103):637-41.
- 23 4. Lancet. Retraction--Ileal-lymphoid-nodular hyperplasia, non-specific colitis, and
24 pervasive developmental disorder in children. 2010 Feb *Lancet*. 2010;375(9713):445.
- 25 5. The Health and Social Care Information Centre Screening and Immunisations team. NHS
26 Immunisation Statistics, England: 2011-12 In: Centre TI, editor, 2012.
- 27 6. Health Protection Agency. Confirmed cases of measles by region and age: 1996-2012.
28 [http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAweb&HPAwebStandard/HPAweb_C/1195733778332:](http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAweb&HPAwebStandard/HPAweb_C/1195733778332)
29 Public Health England, 2013.
- 30 7. Public Health England. MMR catch-up programme 2013. .
31 [https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/MMR-catch-](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/MMR-catch-up-programme-2013#publications)
32 [up-programme-2013#publications](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england/series/MMR-catch-up-programme-2013#publications): GOV.UK, 2013.
- 33 8. Pearce A, Law C, Elliman D, Cole TJ, Bedford H, the Millennium Cohort Study Child Health G.
34 Factors associated with uptake of measles, mumps and rubella vaccine (MMR) and use of
35 single antigen vaccines in a contemporary UK cohort: prospective cohort study. *British*
36 *Medical Journal* 2008;336:754-60.
- 37 9. Centre for Longitudinal Studies. Millennium Cohort Study: Survey design: Institute of Education,
38 2007.
- 39 10. Plewis I, Ketende S. Millennium Cohort Study: technical report on response. 1st ed. London
40 Centre for Longitudinal Studies, 2006.
- 41 11. Hansen K, Joshi H. Millennium Cohort Study Third Survey: A User's Guide to Initial Findings.
42 London: Institute of Education 2008.
- 43 12. Samad L, Bedford H, Tate AR, Dezateux C, Peckham C, Butler N, et al. Differences in risk factors
44 for partial and no immunisation in the first year of life. *British Medical Journal* 2006;332
45 1312-13.
- 46 13. Pearce A, Elliman D, Bedford H, Law C. Residential mobility and uptake of childhood
47 immunisations: findings from the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Vaccine* 2008;26:1675-80.
- 48 14. Plewis I. Millennium Cohort Study: technical report on sampling. 3rd ed. . London: Centre for
49 Longitudinal Studies, 2004.
- 50 15. AbdelSalam HHM, Sokal MM. Accuracy of parental reporting of immunization. *Clinical Pediatrics*
51 2004;43 (1):83-85.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 16. Suarez L, Simpson DM, Smith DR. Errors and correlates in parental recall of child immunizations:
4 effects on vaccination coverage estimates. *Pediatrics* 1997;99 (5):E3.
5
6 17. Sharland M, Atkinson P, Maguire H, Begg N. Lone parent families are an independent risk factor
7 for lower rates of childhood immunisation in London. *Communicable Disease Report. CDR*
8 *Review* 1997;7 (11):R196-R72.
9
10 18. Li J, Taylor B. Factors affecting uptake of measles, mumps, and rubella immunisation. *British*
11 *Medical Journal* 1993;307 168-71.
12
13 19. Middleton E, Baker D. Comparison of social distribution of immunisation with measles, mumps,
14 and rubella vaccine, England, 1991-2001. *British Medical Journal* 2003;326 854-54.
15
16 20. Friederichs V, Cameron JC, Robertson C. Impact of adverse publicity on MMR vaccine uptake: a
17 population based analysis of vaccine uptake records for one million children, born 1987-
18 2004. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2006;91 465-68.
19
20 21. Hawker J, Olowokure B, Wood A, Wilson R, Johnson R. Widening inequalities in MMR vaccine
21 uptake rates among ethnic groups in an urban area of the UK during a period of vaccine
22 controversy (1994-2000). *Vaccine* 2007;25:7516-9.
23
24 22. MacDonald H, Henderson R, Oates K. Low uptake of immunisation: contributing factors.
25 *Community Practitioner* 2004;77 (3):95-100.
26
27 23. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Reducing differences in the uptake of
28 immunisations. *NICE public health guidance 21*, 2009.
29
30 24. Jacobson Vann J, Szilagyi P. Patient reminder and patient recall systems to improve
31 immunization rates. . *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2005;Jul 20(3).
32
33 25 [Bedford, H; Elliman, D. Concerns about immunisation. *British Medical Journal* 2000;320;7229:
34 240.](#)
35
36 26 [Gust D, Darling N, Kennedy A, Schwartz B. Parents with doubts about vaccines: which vaccines
37 and reasons why. *Pediatrics* 2008;1227\(4\):18-25.](#)
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cohort studies

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	2, 6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	2, 6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	6-7
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7-8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	9, 15-16
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6-7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	9, 15-16
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	9, 15-16
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	6-7
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6-7
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	8
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	9
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Table 2
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	Table 2
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	15-16
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	15
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15-18
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	15
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	20

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.