Table A – So	earch syntax.	
Databases	Searches	Citations
PubMed	((((flu[Title/Abstract] OR influenza[Title/Abstract])) AND (vaccine[Title/Abstract] OR vaccines[Title/Abstract]	436,
	OR vaccination[Title/Abstract] OR immunization[Title/Abstract] OR immunisation[Title/Abstract] OR	2016/03/09
	inoculation[Title/Abstract] OR shot[Title/Abstract] OR shots[Title/Abstract])) AND ('old people'[Title/Abstract]	
	OR 'old adults' [Title/Abstract] OR elder [Title/Abstract] OR elderly [Title/Abstract] OR 'older	
	people'[Title/Abstract] OR 'older adults'[Title/Abstract] OR senior[Title/Abstract] OR seniors[Title/Abstract] OR	
	geriatric[Title/Abstract])) AND (knowledge OR attitude OR attitudes OR uptake OR acceptance OR intention OR	
	intentions OR perception OR perceptions)	
Embase	flu:ab,ti OR influenza:ab,ti AND (vaccine:ab,ti OR vaccines:ab,ti OR vaccination:ab,ti OR immunization:ab,ti	476,
	OR immunisation:ab,ti OR inoculation:ab,ti OR shot:ab,ti OR shots:ab,ti) AND ('old people':ab,ti OR 'old	2016/03/09

CINAHL TI-AB (flu OR influenza) AND TI-AB (vaccine OR vaccines OR vaccination OR immunization OR 110, immunisation OR inoculation OR shot OR shots) AND TI-AB ('old people' OR 'old adults' OR elder OR elderly 2016/03/09 OR 'older people' OR 'older adults' OR senior OR seniors OR geriatric) AND TX (knowledge OR attitude OR attitudes OR uptake OR acceptance OR intention OR intentions OR perception OR perceptions)

Table B – St	Table B – Summary of included studies.					
Reference	Design and sample	Instruments and data collection	Key findings	Comments		
Frank,	273 elderly patients	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 39.9%.	Total		
1985,	from one community	questionnaire: demographic data,	Reminder letter led to improved vaccination rate (43%/17%).	population/		
Canada	clinic	accessibility to influenza clinic,	Higher vaccination rate was associated with prior vaccination	census		
	(RR not clear).	previous influenza/ vaccination	(P<0.001) and belief in vaccine efficacy $(P<0.0001)$ .	sample based		
		history, and attitudes towards	Lower vaccination rate was linked to having reported	in a single		
		influenza and vaccination.	'reaction' (P=0.001) and heard negative comments (P=0.028).	site.		
Pearson,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 75% (well) and 85% (ill).	Medium size		
1994, USA	Mail/telephone	questionnaire: previous influenza	Provider recruitment letter ( <i>P</i> <0.001, <i>P</i> =0.05) and exposure to	random		
	survey.	vaccination, exposure to	vaccination information ( <i>P</i> <0.01, ill) were associated with	sample drawn		
	Four groups with 325	campaign activities, attitudes and	vaccination.	in a state.		
	seniors randomly	knowledge about influenza	Vaccine compliance was positively associated with previous	High		

	sampled from a health	vaccine, vaccination intentions,	vaccination (OR=504.5) and belief of doctor's	response rate.
	service system	health status, healthcare	recommendation (OR=22.7), and negatively associated with	
	(RR 74.8%).	utilization and demographic	fear of adverse reaction (OR=0.275) and belief that vaccine is	
		information.	ineffective (OR=0.056).	
Honkanen,	Mail survey.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 47.9%.	Medium size
1996,	497 old people living	questionnaire: vaccination status,	Factors linked with higher vaccination rate were perceived	random
Finland	outside institutions	awareness of vaccination	need of vaccination (RR 2.7-7.9), beliefs in effectiveness (RR	sample drawn
	randomly sampled	campaign, chronic illness,	2.1–6.1), information from health visitors (RR 1.8–2.6),	from three
	from three districts	previous experience, and beliefs	presence of chronic diseases (RR 1.0-1.5) and previous	districts.
	(RR 83.3%).	regarding influenza vaccine.	vaccination (RR 1.6–2.2).	High
			Beliefs in adverse effects were associated with low	response rate.
			vaccination rate (RR 0.2–0.6).	
			Occurrence of adverse effects was not associated with	

			vaccination (RR 0.7–1.5).	
			Information received from health visitors was associated with	
			more positive beliefs (RR 1.1–1.3).	
Essen,	Mail survey.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rates: 84%.	Small sample
1997,	81 non-compliant and	questionnaire based on HBM:	Age was the only personal characteristics related to	based in one
Netherlands	127 randomly	family characteristics,	non-compliance of vaccination, people aged <75 years were	geographic
	sampled compliant	self-perceived health status,	less compliant (aOR 1.0–2.7 for non-compliance).	area.
	people from seven	perceived threat of influenza,	Predictors for non-compliance were concerns about side	High
	family practices	perceived benefits and costs.	effects (aOR 16.2-2883) and self-appraised good health (aOR	response rate.
	(RR 77% vs 91%).		4.4–770).	
			Belief of not being susceptible to influenza was the most	
			common reason for being unvaccinated, and mail cue from a	
			GP was the most common reason for being vaccinated.	

		vaccinated or not, sent 1 year later.	vaccine (OR 0.85–0.94) and living in a nursing home or sheltered housing (OR 0.02–0.44).	
		Questionnaire II asked whether	Predictors of vaccine refusal were perceived barriers to	response rate.
		vaccination in preceding year;	Copenhagen (OR 3.2–11.90).	Moderate
	(RR 58%).	health, drug consumption and	influenza seasons (OR 11.72–54.01) and living in	country.
	from all counties	Control Theory and also included	1.97–5.96), age (OR 1.00–1.07), vaccinated in previous	whole
	randomly sampled	Multi-dimensional Locus of	another person (OR 1.03–2.48), advised by GP (OR	from the
Denmark	2147 old people	based on HBM and	1.31–2.03), perceived severity (OR 1.07–1.15), living with	sample drawn
1998,	Mail survey.	questionnaires: Questionnaire I	Predictors of vaccination were perceived benefits (OR	random
Nexøe,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 51% (high risk), 29% (low risk).	Large

1999, Italy	survey.	personal characteristics,	Non-vaccination behaviour was related to beliefs that vaccine	random
	941 old people	modalities and procedures of	was not efficacious (OR 1.91-10.29)/would cause adverse	sample drawn
	randomly sampled	offers of influenza vaccination,	reactions (OR 1.27–193.73), and previous vaccination history	from three
	from three regions in	opinions on this approach, health	(97.4% vs 2.6%, 82% vs 18.2%).	regions.
	Italy	status, degree of self-sufficiency,	Lack of information about vaccination efficacy and safety was	Moderate or
	(RR 59–89%).	and scale of activities of daily	the main reason for non-vaccination (51.6–67%).	high response
		living.		rate.
Abramson,	Telephone survey.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 68.1%.	Large
2000, Israel	795 elderly patients	questionnaire: vaccination history,	Reason for immunization: physician's recommendation	random
	randomly sampled	reasons for immunization or	(50.6%).	sample based
	from a primary care	non-immunization, influence of a	Reason for non-immunization: not suffering from influenza	in a single
	clinic	nurse or physician	(17.0%), fear of side effects (15.0%) and non-belief in vaccine	site.
	(RR 78.7%).	recommendation, knowledge and	efficacy (15.0%).	High

		attitude, self-appraised health,	Immunization was associated with the identity of primary	response rate.
		chronic disease and demographic	physician (OR 1.28–3.27) and having visited physician during	Non-standard
		information.	previous 3 months (OR 1.51–4.78).	questionnaire
			Immunization was more likely among persons who wrongly	development.
			believed it provides complete protection (OR 6.45–34.56),	
			and did not believe it can cause influenza (OR 2.02–5.16).	
Armstrong,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 62.5%.	Large
2001, USA	Telephone survey.	questionnaire based on HBM:	Factors of vaccine receipt: each component of HBM, mistrust	random
	659 old people	vaccination behaviour and	in vaccine contents (OR 0.26–0.91), belief that immunization	sample based
	randomly sampled	intention, demographic	is inconvenient (OR 0.05–0.36), belief that immunization is	in a single
	from a primary care	information, history of side effects	painful (OR 0.08-0.54), history of prior side effects (OR	site.
	site	from immunization, concern	0.18–0.60), physician recommendation (OR 1.76–5.93), prior	High
	(RR 73.8%).	about undisclosed contents of	immunization (OR 2.69-7.08) and prior immunization refusal	response rate.

		influenza vaccine, health beliefs	(OR 0.30–0.56).	
		and cues from HBM constructs.		
Santibanez,	Cross-sectional study.	Multi-disciplinary team designed	Vaccination rate: 78.1%.	Large
2002, USA	Telephone survey.	questionnaire based on TRA:	A higher percentage of unvaccinated subjects reported that	random
	1234 elderly patients	facilitating conditions,	they did not know the symptoms of influenza compared with	sample drawn
	randomly sampled	behavioural habits, value of	the vaccinated subjects ( <i>P</i> <0.001).	from diverse
	from 65 primary care	perceived consequence of the	Influenza vaccination was associated with the belief that	group of
	clinics	activity, social influence and	vaccination was the best way to prevent influenza ( $P$ <0.001),	practices.
	(RR 82%).	attitude to the activity.	smoking status ( $P$ =0.01) and colon screening ( $P$ <0.001).	High
			Reason for non-vaccination: low susceptibility (19%),	response rate.
			vaccines would cause influenza (14%), and previous adverse	
			reactions (13%).	
Evans,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate (1998–1999 season): 53.5%.	Large

2003, UK	Mail survey.	questionnaire: personal	Predictors of vaccination included age ( $P \le 0.01$ ), perceived	random
	2600 old people	characteristics, knowledge of	poor health ( $P \le 0.05$ ), chronic diseases ( $P \le 0.02$ ), advice from	sample based
	randomly stratified	influenza symptoms, severity and	doctor/nurse (OR 1.6–3.4), advice from friends (OR 0.2–0.7)	in one
	sample from a health	risk of catching infection, views	and views on vaccine efficacy ( <i>P</i> <0.001).	geographic
	authority	on safety and efficacy of influenza	Vaccination intention of those never immunized: perceived	area.
	(RR 57.5%).	vaccine and sources of	likelihood of getting influenza (OR 1.1–4.0), belief that every	Moderate
		information, vaccination status,	elderly person should be vaccinated (OR 16.1-363.8), and	response rate.
		vaccination history, chronic	belief that vaccine side effects were less risky than influenza	
		illness, hospitalization history,	(OR 2.3–10.8).	
		self-perceived health status.		
Madhavan,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 81.5%.	Large
2003, USA	Mail survey.	questionnaire: demographic	Predictors associated with vaccination included: knowing	random
	1968 old people	information, access to	someone with influenza (OR 4.997, <i>P</i> =0.010), believing	sample drawn

	randomly sampled	immunization paragivad	veccine is haneficial (OP 0.207, P=0.012), perceived	from eight
	randomly sampled	immunization, perceived	vaccine is beneficial (OR 0.397, <i>P</i> =0.012), perceived	from eight
	from eight counties	susceptibility to disease,	susceptibility (OR 1.447, <i>P</i> =0.022), and perceived harm from	counties.
	(RR 25.3%).	perceived benefit of	immunizations (OR 0.655, <i>P</i> =0.002).	Low response
		immunization, perceived harm	Access was not a predictor, which is not consistent with other	rate.
		from immunization and perceived	surveys.	Assessed
		ease of getting immunization.		non-response
				bias.
Chi, 2004,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-revised questionnaire:	Vaccination rate: 79%.	Large total
USA	Mail survey.	demographic background, health	Variables not associated with vaccination: sociodemographic	sample of a
	661 elderly patients	status, previous experiences, and	variables, a history of influenza-like illness (P=0.49), and	single site.
	sampled from a senior	beliefs about influenza and	perception of being healthy ( <i>P</i> =0.44).	Moderate
	centre clinic	vaccine.	Predictors of vaccination: perceived severity (weakly	response rate.
	(RR 57%).		associated, $P$ =0.07, 0.015), perceived efficacy ( $P$ =0.003) and	

			provider recommendation ( <i>P</i> <0.001).	
			History of side effects linked to non-vaccination ( <i>P</i> <0.001).	
			Provider recommendation seemed to overcome negative	
			beliefs about influenza vaccines.	
Zimmerma	71 clinicians and 925	Physician questionnaire based on	Practices with express vaccination clinics had higher	Large
n, 2004,	elderly patients	PRECEDE-PROCEED model:	vaccination rates than those without such programmes (87%	random
USA	randomly sampled	predisposing factors; reinforcing	vs 76%, <i>P</i> =0.01).	sample drawn
	from various practices	factors; enabling factors and	Multi-variate model results indicated that patient factors	from various
	(physician RR 85%).	environmental factors.	linked to influenza vaccination status included: vaccination	practices.
		Patient questionnaire based on	intention (P<0.001), belief that those who are not vaccinated	High
		TRA: facilitating conditions,	will contract influenza ( $P$ =0.049), and history of being	response rate.
		behavioural habits, social	screened for colon cancer ( <i>P</i> =0.023).	
		influences, consequence value of	Physician factors included awareness of recommendation to	

		activity, and attitude about	vaccinate asthmatics ( $P$ =0.024) and agreement with these	
		activity.	recommendations ( <i>P</i> =0.004).	
Bardenheier	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Unvaccinated seniors were classified into four clusters:	Large sample
, 2006,	Telephone survey.	questionnaire based on HBM:	potentials, fearful uninformeds, doubters and misinformeds.	from five
USA	11,126 old people	demographic variables, doctor	Clusters varied significantly by site ( <i>P</i> <0.001), race/ethnicity	sites.
	sampled from five	visits, beliefs and attitudes toward	(P<0.001) and sex $(P<0.05)$ , but not by age $(P>0.05)$ or	Moderate
	sites	influenza vaccine.	education ( <i>P</i> >0.05).	response rate.
	(RR 52.4%).		Previous receipt of influenza vaccination varied significantly	Cluster
			by cluster ( <i>P</i> <0.001).	analysis.
			Less than half of unvaccinated seniors had received	
			doctor/nurse recommendation for vaccination.	
Gallagher,	193 old people	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 46% (continually for 4 years).	Small
2006, UK	recruited by	questionnaire based on TPB:	Multi-variate regression analysis revealed that subjective	convenience

	snowballing sampling	demographics, previous 4-year	norms ( $P$ <0.001), past behaviour ( $P$ <0.001) and anticipated	sample based
	from three community	vaccination status and TPB	regret ( <i>P</i> <0.001) were positively related to vaccination	in one
	centres.	constructs (including anticipated	intention.	geographic
		regret).	TPB accounted for 72.6% of vaccination intentions.	area.
Mangtani,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 85% (men), 75% (women).	Large
2006, UK	Mail survey.	questionnaire: vaccination history,	Vaccine recipients were more likely to be male than female	random
	1206 elderly patients	reasons for having/not having	(RR 1.03-1.22).	sample drawn
	randomly sampled	influenza vaccination, future	Influenza vaccine uptake was not related to self-perceived	from two
	from two medical	vaccination attention,	health ( $P$ =0.16) or inactivity ( $P$ =0.07).	sites.
	projects	self-perceived health status and	Reasons for vaccination: positive behavioural beliefs (87.1%),	Moderate
	(RR 75%).	activity.	and a recommendation from healthcare workers (82.8%).	response rate.
			Reasons for non-uptake are that they did not get ill (44.4%),	
			never had it before (30.2%) and perception that vaccine makes	

			them ill (25.4%).	
Winston,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Predictors of vaccination were: provider recommendation (RR	Large
2006, USA	Telephone survey.	questionnaire: demographic	1.31, 1.25-1.38) and doctor's visit (RR 1.34, 1.19-1.52).	random
	4577 old people	variables, doctor visiting,	Those who believed that they had become sick from a prior	sample drawn
	randomly sampled	vaccination (pneumococcal and	influenza vaccination were less likely to be vaccinated	from five
	from five states	influenza vaccines) status,	( <i>P</i> <0.001).	states.
	(RR 61.0%).	vaccination awareness, provider	People who did not plan to get vaccinated next year were	High
		recommendation, vaccination	more common among those who had not been vaccinated last	response rate.
		intention, side effect experience.	year (29.0±2.1%) and those never vaccinated (50.2±2.6%).	
Lau, 2007,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 48.1%.	Large
Hong Kong	Telephone survey.	questionnaire based on HBM:	Sex ( <i>P</i> <0.01), health professionals' recommendation (OR	random
	1103 old people	background information,	5.63-15.5), visited community centres ( <i>P</i> <0.01) and perceived	sample.
	randomly sampled	influenza history, vaccination	side effects ( <i>P</i> <0.01) were related to vaccination history.	High

	from telephone	history, vaccination intention,	Age ( <i>P</i> <0.05), health professionals' recommendation	response rate.
	directories (RR	perceived susceptibility, perceived	( $P$ <0.01), living with family ( $P$ <0.01), medical decision	
	84.5%).	severity, perceived benefits,	influenced by family ( $P$ <0.05) and perceived side effects	
		perceived barriers, and worries	( <i>P</i> <0.01) were related to vaccination in last 6 months.	
		about contracting SARS.	Vaccination intention was predicted by living with family	
			members ( $P$ <0.01), perceived efficacy ( $P$ <0.01), perceived	
			severity ( $P$ <0.01), knowledge ( $P$ <0.05) and receiving	
			financial allowance ( $P$ <0.05).	
Kwong,	Retrospective study.	Champion's HBM scale:	Vaccination rate: 64.47%.	Small
2008, Hong	Face-to-face survey.	perceived susceptibility, perceived	Patients' vaccine uptake was associated with three items in	convenience
Kong	197 elderly patients	severity, perceived benefits,	perceived benefits ( <i>P</i> <0.001, <i>P</i> =0.001, <i>P</i> =0.004), perceived	sample based
	conveniently sampled	perceived barriers, activating cues	barriers (side effects, <i>P</i> <0.001; painful, <i>P</i> =0.001; scared of	in one
	from five general	and sociodemographic	needles, <i>P</i> =0.007), doctors' recommendation ( <i>P</i> <0.001) and	geographic

	outpatient clinics.	characteristics.	families' recommendation ( <i>P</i> =0.019) (RR=88.3%).	area.
Kwong,	Descriptive study.	Researcher-developed	Old people who have refused vaccination believe that	Small
2008, Hong	Face-to-face survey.	questionnaire: a screening list, a	vaccination is useful and perceived few barriers to receiving	convenience
Kong	70 elderly patients	sociodemographic form and	vaccination. Refusal reasons included good health status,	sample based
	conveniently sampled	Champion's HBM scale.	perceived effectiveness of other prevention measures, low	in one
	from five general		perceived susceptibility and low perceived severity.	geographic
	outpatient clinics.			area.
Lau, 2008,	Cross-sectional and	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 31.1%; first-time vaccination: 13%.	Large
Hong Kong	follow-up longitudinal	questionnaire based on HBM:	Cross-sectional factors of vaccination history: age (aOR	random
	study.	background information,	1.77-6.48), perceptions of no side effects (aOR 5.11-46.75),	sample drawn
	Telephone survey.	influenza history, vaccination	perceived duration of effectiveness (aOR 1.07–4.01),	from more
	886 old people	history, vaccination intention,	perceived barriers (aOR 0.11-0.39) and vaccination intention	than one site.
	randomly sampled	perceived susceptibility, perceived	(aOR 2.74–11.42).	High

	from telephone	severity, perceived benefits,	Cross-sectional predictors of vaccination intention: living with	response rate.
	directories and 483	perceived barriers, and worries	spouse (aOR 1.02-2.27), belief that influenza vaccine had no	Longitudinal
	included in the	about contracting SARS.	side effects (aOR 2.42–21.93), worried about contracting	study.
	follow-up study		SARS (aOR 1.31–3.42) and prior vaccination (aOR	
	(RR about 80%).		2.08–5.41).	
			Longitudinal factors of first-time vaccination: visiting social	
			centre during follow-up period (OR 1.39–5.39).	
Lau, 2009,	Cross-sectional	Researcher-developed	Vaccination coverage: 62.4%.	Large
Hong Kong	survey.	questionnaire based on literature	Correlates of vaccination: vaccination intention (aOR 7.877;	convenience
	1015 old people	review: demographic	<i>P</i> <0.001), free vaccination (aOR 3.024; <i>P</i> =0.002), perceived	sample drawn
	conveniently sampled	characteristics, self-perceived	need to receive vaccination following SARS and avian	from more
	from 15 elderly social	health status, chronic illness	influenza (aOR 2.413; <i>P</i> =0.001), received advice from	than one site.
	centres.	history, hospitalization history,	nursing staff (aOR 7.161; <i>P</i> < 0.001), received advice from	High

	(RR 80.4%).	information source, knowledge	other medical staff (aOR 3.771; P<0.001), and received	response rate.
		and perceptions of influenza and	advice from family members/friends (aOR 3.023; <i>P</i> =0.001).	
		vaccines, vaccination experience.		
Avelino-Sil	Cross-sectional	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 67.1%.	Small
va, 2011,	survey.	questionnaire: demographic and	Vaccinated elderly patients had a higher rate of receiving	convenience
Brazil	134 elderly patients	clinical variables, reasons for	medication for chronic illness ( $P$ <0.05) and having been	sample based
	conveniently sampled	compliance or non-compliance.	vaccinated in previous year ( $P$ <0.05).	in a single
	from four outpatient		Physician recommendation (OR 2.7, 1.29–5.6) was associated	site.
	clinics in a hospital		with vaccination.	
	(RR not clear).		Compliance reasons: annual nationwide campaign (52.2%),	
			belief in vaccine efficacy (37.7%) and physician	
			recommendation (35.5%).	
			Non-compliance reasons: belief that vaccine could induce	

			influenza (36.4%), other side effects (16%) and rarely	
			contracted influenza (16%).	
Matsuiet,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 51–52%.	Large
2011, Japan	Mail survey.	questionnaire based on HBM:	Vaccination was associated with information from medical	random
	858 old people	sex, age, influenza history,	facilities (OR 2.42-15.7), town office (OR 2.26-13.8) and	sample based
	randomly sampled	information source, smoking	family (OR 1.01-10.6); perceived efficacy (OR 8.28-48.0);	in one
	from a rural town	history and HBM constructs.	perceived severity (OR 2.47–18.8); often suffered from upper	geographic
	(RR 44.4%).		respiratory tract infection (OR 1.02-4.03); perceived	area.
			vulnerable to influenza (OR 2.36–28.6); and family members	Moderate
			were vaccinated (OR 2.50-5.55).	response rate.
			Non-vaccination was associated with information from	
			newspapers/magazines (OR 0.15-0.76), believed in potential	
			adverse effects (OR 0.15–0.78), barriers or inconvenience	

			(OR 0.05–0.31) and current smokers (OR 0.11–0.61).	
Yu, 2014,	Descriptive	Chinese version of Hämmig's	Vaccination rate: 58.5%.	Moderate
Hong Kong	correlational study.	HBM questionnaire and	Multi-morbidity (OR 2.27, <i>P</i> =0.03), perceived susceptibility	convenience
	336 old people	researcher-developed data	(OR 1.14-1.78) and post-vaccination discomfort (OR	sample based
	conveniently sampled	collection sheet: demographic	0.006–0.63) were predictors of vaccination intention.	in one
	from three general	data, clinical profile, perceived		geographic
	outpatient clinics	health, vaccination status,		area.
	(RR 91.1%).	post-vaccination discomfort.		High
				response rate.
Boggavarap	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 45.7%.	Small
u, 2014,	Face-to-face survey.	questionnaire based on theoretical	Vaccination uptake was associated with trust in health	random
USA	221 old people	models: sociodemographic	providers' recommendation without discrimination experience	sample.
	randomly sampled	factors, attitudes toward	(aOR 3.68–59.83) and belief in vaccine-induced influenza	High

	from six churches	vaccination, perceived	(aOR 0.05–0.23).	response rate.
	(RR 94.1%).	discrimination and safety,		
		perceived quality of relationship		
		with primary healthcare provider,		
		access to transportation,		
		spirituality, immunization history		
		and health information sources.		
Bödeker,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 50.0% (2012/13); 49.4% (2013/14).	Large
2015,	Telephone survey.	questionnaire based on previous	Vaccination uptake was independently associated with age,	random
Germany	807 old people	studies: sociodemographic factors,	underlying chronic diseases (OR 1.39–3.09), perceived	sample drawn
	underlying chronic	behaviour and attitude about	severity of influenza (aOR 1.31–1.52), perceived vaccination	from the
	diseases randomly	seasonal influenza vaccination	effectiveness (aOR 1.24–1.62), perceived likelihood of	whole nation.
	sampled from the	and influenza diseases.	vaccination side effects (aOR 0.61-0.80) and recent advice	Low response

	whole nation		through physician consultation (aOR 1.44–4.84).	rate.
	(RR 16.2%).		The most commonly stated reasons for not being immunized	
			were mistrust of the vaccination (22%) and the perception that	
			influenza is not dangerous (21%).	
Mo, 2015,	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 48.5%.	Large
Hong Kong	Telephone survey.	questionnaire based on HBM:	Female sex (aOR 1.27–2.94), having chronic disease (aOR	random
	1101 old people	background information,	1.49–3.41), knowledge of the fact that influenza vaccine is	sample.
	randomly sampled	knowledge, vaccination history,	required every year (aOR 2.66.49-8.88), price of influenza	High
	from telephone	vaccination intention, perceived	vaccine lower than HK\$150 (aOR 1.97-4.65),	response rate.
	directories (RR 81%).	susceptibility, perceived severity,	recommendations from healthcare providers (aOR 2.81–7.01),	
		perceived benefits, perceived	lower perceived side effects (aOR 0.07-0.19) and	
		barriers, cues to action,	participating in community activities (aOR 1.11–3.79) were	
		facilitating conditions.	significantly associated with previous influenza vaccination.	

Klett-Tam	Cross-sectional study.	Researcher-developed	Vaccination rate: 47.9% (annually), 51.4% (in past 5 years),	Large
men, 2016,	Telephone survey.	questionnaire based on KAP:	66.8% (ever).	random
Germany	1223 old people	sociodemographic factors;	Vaccination uptake was associated with attitude variable, i.e.	sample drawn
	randomly sampled	knowledge-, attitude- and	perceived importance of vaccine (aOR 14.9-35.5); knowledge	from the
	from telephone	practice-related factors.	score (aOR 1.0–1.6); having received other vaccines.	whole nation.
	directories.			
Cornford,	Qualitative study.	Researcher-revised semi-structure	Although they acknowledged their medical diseases, the	Random
1999, UK	Semi-structured	interview guide: self-perceived	patients regarded themselves as healthy in the sense of being	sample in
	interview.	health status, meaning of health,	independent and active.	three
	50 elderly patients	ways to keep healthy, and beliefs	They recognized influenza could be fatal for particular groups	practices.
	randomly sampled	about influenza vaccination.	of people but not for themselves.	
	from three practices		Both vaccinated and unvaccinated groups had experienced	
	(RR 86%, 69%).		side effects, but their interpretations were different.	

			Vaccination decision based more on consideration whether	
			vaccines would reduce or cause influenza-like illness.	
Telford,	Qualitative study.	Researcher-developed interview	Participants were concerned about maintaining their health,	Purposive
2003, UK	Semi-structured	guide: background variables,	and had a good understanding of influenza and vaccines.	sample drawn
	interview.	general health, knowledge about	Vaccination decision was influenced by trust or mistrust of	from a city
	10 vaccinated and 10	influenza and vaccine, and	modern medicine, prior experience of vaccination and	practice.
	unvaccinated old	vaccination uptake.	perceived risk from influenza.	
	people purposively		Newly acquired lay experience and personal perceived risk	
	selected from a		from influenza seemed to be more important catalysts for	
	general practice.		change in vaccination uptake than professional	
			recommendation or advertising.	
Evans,	Qualitative study.	Researcher-developed interview	Many old people did not feel vulnerable to influenza,	Purposeful
2007, UK	Narrative interview.	guide: risk of catching influenza,	regardless of their age.	sample from

	54 old people in four	severity of influenza, efficacy and	Both refusers and defaulters overstated adverse effects from	urban,
	categories	safety of influenza vaccine,	influenza vaccine, and more likely to describe previous	semi-urban
	purposefully sampled	self-assessment of health status,	negative experiences and express skepticism about its	and rural
	from communities in	and process of getting immunized,	efficacy.	communities.
	three cities.	including role of prompts from	Several expressed a need for more information about	
		family, friends and health	influenza and vaccine.	
		workers.	Individual prompts, particularly from GPs, seemed to be the	
			most significant motivator to vaccination.	
Cameron,	Qualitative study.	Researcher-designed	Perceived susceptibility influenced by self-perceived health	Samples
2009, USA	Focus group study.	semi-structure protocol based on	status, different beliefs about age, and perceptions of the	drawn from a
	48 African American	EPPM: knowledge and attitudes	prevalence and contagion of influenza.	city.
	seniors in six focus	about influenza and vaccine, past	Past experiences tended to influence perceived severity.	
	groups recruited from	experiences, reasons for choosing	Participants were more likely to be vaccinated when	

	an urban city.	to receive or forgo the vaccine,	vaccination was made available or offered at little or no cost.	
		and barriers and facilitators to	Response efficacy was related to perception of vaccine	
		vaccination.	efficacy, concerns about side effects, recommendation of	
			health providers, and prior experiences.	
Payaprom,	Qualitative study.	Researcher-designed	Most participants had insufficient knowledge about influenza	Random
2009,	In-depth interview.	semi-structure schedule:	and vaccination.	sample from
Thailand	11 old people and nine	participants' understandings of	Vaccination decisions were based on several factors,	a single site.
	adult patients with	influenza and vaccination, factors	including salience of risk, self-perceived health status,	
	chronic illness	influencing decision-making	influence of others, perception of the need for preventive	
	randomly selected	about vaccination.	health care and financial barriers.	
	from a health centre.			
Kwong,	Qualitative study.	Researcher-developed pre-focus	Participants' vaccine preferences were determined by their	Purposive
2010, nine	Focus group study.	group questionnaire:	behavioural beliefs in vaccination, which were based on their	sample

countries	208 old people in 26	sociodemographic data,	probability calculation of susceptibility to and severity of	selected from
	focused groups	vaccination awareness, and	influenza and vaccine effectiveness, and their utility	nine
	purposively selected	vaccination status.	calculation of vaccine, healthcare and social costs.	countries.
	from nine countries.	Researcher-designed	Action cues prompting vaccination and vaccine access further	
		semi-structure interview guide	affected the vaccine uptake of participants with vaccine	
		based on HBM.	preferences.	
			Vaccination coverage was likely to be higher in the countries	
			where normative beliefs in favour of vaccination had formed.	
Dixon-Woo	Follow-up trial survey.	Researcher-designed	A one-off home visit did not result in sustained changes in	Quota
ds, 2004,	1865 old people	semi-structure interview guide:	vaccination behaviour (66.4% vs 66.3%).	sampling
UK	sampled from a large	views and experiences of	Older people can be classified into four groups basing on	drawn from a
	general practices	influenza and vaccination, views	content analysis: 'faithful', 'converts', 'easy-going' and	former trial.
	(RR not clear).	on different vaccination strategies	'sceptics' groups.	

Qualitative study	and perception of vulnerability to	Sceptics perceived vaccines to be ineffective or to be
followed 25	influenza.	irrelevant to them as they were invulnerable to influenza.
participants using		Non-sceptics tended to believe in vaccination efficacy, and
quota sampling		were more likely to emphasize their susceptibility.

RR, response rate; HBM, Health Belief Model; TRA, Theory of Reasoned Action; TPB, Theory of Planned Behaviour; EPPM, extended parallel process model; OR, odds ratio; aOR, adjusted odds ratio; GP, general practitioner; SARS, severe acute respiratory syndrome.

Table C – Quality assessment of included quantitative studies.									
Reference	Sample size	Whether random	Sample sites	Response rate	Instrument	Statistics	Rating		
Frank, 1985, Canada	Small	-	Low	Not clear	Low	Moderate	Low		
Pearson, 1994, USA	Medium	Yes	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate		
Honkanen, 1996, Finland	Medium	Yes	Moderate	High	Low	Low	Moderate		
Essen, 1997, Netherlands	Small	Yes	Moderate	High	Moderate	High	Moderate		
Nexøe, 1998, Denmark	Large	Yes	High	Moderate	High	High	High		
Pregliasco, 1999, Italy	Large	Yes	High	Moderate~high	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate		
Abramson, 2000, Israel	Large	Yes	Low	High	Moderate	High	Moderate		
Armstrong, 2001, USA	Large	Yes	Low	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate		
Santibanez, 2002, USA	Large	Yes	High	High	High	Moderate	High		
Evans, 2003, UK	Large	Yes	Moderate	Moderate	High	High	Moderate		
Madhavan, 2003, USA	Large	Yes	High	Low	High	High	High		

Chi, 2004, USA	Large	-	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Zimmerman, 2004, USA	Large	Yes	High	High	High	Moderate	High
Bardenheier, 2006, USA	Large	No	High	Moderate	Moderate	High	Moderate
Gallagher, 2006, UK	Small	No	Moderate	Not clear	High	High	Moderate
Mangtani, 2006, UK	Large	Yes	High	High	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Winston, 2006, USA	Large	Yes	High	High	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Lau, 2007, Hong Kong	Large	Yes	High	High	High	High	High
Kwong, 2008, Hong Kong	Small	No	Moderate	Not clear	High	High	Moderate
Kwong, 2008, Hong Kong	Small	No	Moderate	Not clear	Low	High	Low
Lau, 2008, Hong Kong	Large	Yes	High	High	Moderate	High	High
Lau, 2009, Hong Kong	Large	No	High	High	Moderate	High	Moderate
Avelino-Silva, 2011,	Small	No	Low	Not clear	Low	High	Low
Brazil							

Matsuiet, 2011, Japan	Large	Yes	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	High	Moderate
Yu, 2014, Hong Kong	Medium	No	Moderate	High	High	High	Moderate
Boggavarapu, 2014, USA	Small	Yes	Moderate	High	Moderate	High	Moderate
Bödeker, 2015, Germany	Large	Yes	High	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate
Mo, 2015, Hong Kong	Large	Yes	High	High	High	High	High
Klett-Tammen, 2016,	Large	Yes	High	Not clear	High	High	High
Germany							

Table D – Quality assessment of included qualitative studies.									
Reference	Method to recruit	Method to	Whether state data	Whether consider	Method to	Result	Rating		
	participants	collect data	saturation	researchers' impact	analyse data	presenting			
Cornford, 1999, UK	Low	High	No	No	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate		
Telford, 2003, UK	High	Moderate	Yes	No	High	High	Moderate		

I	Evans, 2007, UK	High	High	Yes	No	High	High	High
(	Cameron, 2009, USA	High	High	Yes	No	High	High	High
I	Payaprom, 2009, Thailand	Low	Moderate	No	No	Moderate	High	Moderate
ŀ	Kwong, 2010, nine	Moderate	High	No	No	High	High	Moderate
C	countries							