International Journal of
Health Systems and Medical Sciences

ISSN: 2833-7433
Volume 2 | No 4 | April -2023

The Significance of Factors in Forming Attitude to Immunophrophylaxis and the Problems of Immunophrophylaxis

Bakhromjon Mamatkulov [1], Ilmira Urazaliyeva [2], Gulkhayo Tolipova [3], Oltinoy Musayeva [4]

[1] DSc, professor, director of school of public health, Tashkent medical academy

[2] PhD, associate professor of school of public health, Tashkent medical academy

[3] PhD candidate of school of public health, Tashkent medical academy

[4] Assistant of Samarkand state medical university

Abstract: The article presents an investigation of information on immunoproflictics from diverse nations and ponders the variables affecting the arrangement of states of mind towards inoculation among the populace, as well as information on the issues of uncertainty with respect to inoculation among the populace and therapeutic specialists. The information of ponders conducted among therapeutic experts with respect to immunization amid the COVID-19 widespread are displayed.

Keywords: immunoprophylaxis, vaccination, risk factors of immunoprophylaxis, attitude to immunization, vaccine, immunization.

Irresistible infections right now stay one of the most causes of tall dismalness of the populace, in spite of the utilize of a wide run of restorative and preventive advances to combat them, and the foremost viable preventive degree is immunization, which is recognized as one of the most prominent accomplishments of mankind within the field of medication. [39, 41, 43, 45].

Inoculation is one of the foremost cost-effective and successful public wellbeing mediations within the history of mankind [3].

Concurring to WHO, much obliged to inoculation programs conveyed around the world, 6 million children's lives are spared yearly and 750 thousand children are avoided from being debilitated. Immunization yearly gives humankind 400 million extra a long time of life [38, 43, 47].

The advanced advancement of immunoprophylaxis within the world has illustrated victory in decreasing the dismalness and mortality of the child populace from inoculated contaminations [40, 46]. Much appreciated to the creation of immunizations, it got to be conceivable to avoid numerous irresistible illnesses and dispense with such a genuine infection as smallpox. Immunizations are prescribed for everybody, beginning from the primary days of life, when the safe system is fair starting to make [40].

An imperative perspective of immunoprophylaxis is the utilize of immunizations not as it were in childhood, but too in adulthood, which within the future will altogether move forward the quality of

life and dynamic life span of more seasoned individuals and decrease the dangers of complications from irresistible illnesses [38, 41, 42, 26, 29].

“The larger part of unvaccinated children lives within the poorest nations and excessively in unsteady or conflict-affected States. Nearly half of the unvaccinated children are in fair 16 nations — Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Majority rule Republic of the Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, Haiti, Iraq, Mali, Niger, Pakistan, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria and Yemen.” [13].

As we know, non—communicable infections involve the most four places among the burden of infections within the world, one of them is oncological infections [1]. The current state of immunoprophylaxis as of now permits us to conversation around the utilize of immunization for the avoidance of oncological maladies. Such an immunization is considered to be an immunization against viral hepatitis B and human papillomavirus [52].

Be that as it may, there's a developing negative demeanor towards dynamic immunization of children within the world, in spite of the nearness of a clear therapeutic and social viability of inoculation. The talk about approximately the side impacts of immunizations, which delude guardians and make them accept that antibodies can be hurtful, is based on wrong data from questionable Web sources, interviews with prevalent but regularly bumbling individuals, media materials that transparently misshape the comes about of logical inquire about. A few guardians accept in elective ways of anticipating irresistible infections, whereas utilizing strategies that are distant from pharmaceutical [46].

Claims that immunizations cause side impacts must be upheld by substantial and solid logical information. In any case, the prove itself that immunizations are secure and compelling does not continuously persuade guardians to immunize their children. In expansion to giving vital information on immunization security, this paper examines the vital part of communication, particularly discourse, in building open certainty in inoculation with the extreme objective of expanding inoculation scope and avoiding future episodes of preventable infections through inoculation [3].

Investigate pointed at way better understanding the variables that decide the presentation of antibodies presently incorporates more investigate on the flow of person decision-making and the impact of peers and social systems. The selection of an antibody is decided by a number of components, extending from basic supply issues, costs and get to administrations. The term "antibody uncertainty" is progressively utilized within the ponder of request determinants, moving from a more polarized see of professional- and anti-vaccination bunches to acknowledgment of the significance of understanding and including those who delay immunization, take as it were a few antibodies or who have not however chosen, in spite of the accessibility of inoculation administrations [17, 22].

The Working Gather inspected the relationship between hesitation with respect to immunization and request for antibodies, request and hesitation don't precisely coincide. An individual or community can completely acknowledge immunization without delay, but may not require immunization or a particular antibody [8].

Assent to inoculation may be a behavior coming about from a complex decision-making prepare that can possibly be impacted by a wide run of variables. When creating the definition, the working gather in 2012 considered a number of conceptual models for gathering variables deciding hesitation with respect to immunization [17, 34, 35].

Agreeing to the writing, it is conceivable to recognize the most variables impacting the arrangement of a negative or ambivalent demeanor to immunization and, as a result, refusal of immunization [49, 50,51, 11,19, 20,21, 27, 33]:

The Working Gather distinguished three caterogies (“3 Cs” demonstrate, WHO EURO Immunization Communications Working Bunch): complacency, comfort and certainty. Within the “3 Cs” show, certainty is characterized as believe in (i) the viability and security of immunizations; (ii) the framework that supplies them, counting the unwavering quality and competence of wellbeing

administrations and therapeutic experts; and (iii) the inspiration of arrangement producers who make choices approximately the fundamental antibodies [34].

Complacency approximately a specific antibody or immunization in common is affected by numerous variables, counting other life and wellbeing duties that will appear more critical at this point in time. Self-efficacy (an individual's perceived or real capacity to require activity for inoculation) too influences the degree to which complacency decides uncertainty.

The comfort of immunization is a vital figure when physical availability, tall fetched and readiness to pay, geological availability, the capacity to get it (dialect and restorative proficiency) and the allure of immunization administrations influence scope. The quality of benefit (genuine and/or seen) and the degree to which immunization administrations are given at a helpful time and put and in a social setting.

The Working Bunch moreover distinguished a few components impacting hesitation with respect to inoculation. These incorporate: verifiable, socio-cultural (pioneers against or in back of immunization, religion, culture, sexual orientation), natural, systemic, financial or political (nation approach and discernment of the pharmaceutical industry) wellbeing components.

They too distinguished person and bunch impacts on the recognition of the antibody: individual encounter of the family or community, convictions and avoidance, knowledge/awareness, wellbeing framework and benefit suppliers (believe), individual involvement, chance or advantage, immunization as a social shape.

The taking after determinants concerned issues specifically related to the antibody: risk/benefit related to epidemiological and logical information, presentation of a modern immunization or a unused proposal for an existing immunization, strategies of organization, advancement of a inoculation program/delivery (for illustration, a schedule program or mass immunization), unwavering quality and/or source of supply of the antibody (or hardware), costs, the quality of proposals and/or information base, and/or the state of mind of restorative laborers [34].

And there have moreover been other ponders, for case, in a precise audit of vaccination-related thinks about, a few ponders of the determinants of immunization hesitation were analyzed [30]. There was a ponder in which a country-specific characteristics outline was compiled with respect to immunization hesitation [6].

During the COVID-19 pandemic, many studies were done on diagnosis, treatment, social-hygienic and medical-preventive risk factors that affect the incidence were studied, and there were also studies that studied the attitude of doctors and the population in COVID-19 vaccination. The study gave conflicting data on the results of 30 studies that met the criteria. Review studies on COVID-19 vaccine acceptance rates were conducted in 33 different countries. Among adults representing the general public, the highest rates of acceptance of the COVID-19 vaccine were found in Ecuador (97.0%), Malaysia (94.3%), Indonesia (93.3%) and China (91.3%). On the other hand, the lowest rates of acceptance of the COVID-19 vaccine were found in Kuwait (23.6%), Jordan (28.4%), Italy (53.7), Russia (54.9%), Poland (56.3%), the USA (56.9%) and France (58.9%). Only eight surveys were conducted among health workers (doctors, nurses), while the rates of vaccine acceptance ranged from 27.7% in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to 78.1% in Israel. In most studies conducted among population in COVID vaccination was studied-19 [2, 5, 15, 23, 37].

A prospective cohort study examined the ethnic aspects of the indecision of vaccination with SARS-CoV-2, which was conducted among medical workers in the UK [15].

The following longitudinal cohort study analyzed the data on the ratio of medical workers vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2. [5].

Indecision about vaccination was more likely among certain ethnic minority groups and was associated with lower trust in health organizations using vaccines and in the vaccines themselves. Hesitant health care workers also noted that they are concerned about the safety of the vaccine and

side effects, especially given the speed of development and implementation of the vaccine, and expressed a desire to postpone vaccination until more people are vaccinated.

In some areas of England, 15% of health workers were not vaccinated due to uncertainty about the vaccine [38]. Health care workers who reported that they trusted information about vaccines received from their employer (aOR 0.69, CI 0.50 – 0.95), government/NHS advertising (0.68, 0.50 – 0.92), official websites (0.56, 0.41 – 0.76 [Government Website], 0.47, 0.31 - 0.72 [NHS/WHO website]) and their own GP/HCW (0.69, 0.51 – 0.93) were less likely to remain indecisive than those who did not trust these sources. Those who were advised by their family not to take the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine were more likely to remain indecisive than those who did not (1.71, 1.15 – 2.54). Health care workers who indicated that they agreed with statements about the importance of vaccines to protect themselves (0.30, 0.19 – 0.48), their families (0.31, 0.19 – 0.49) and patients in their care (0.26, 0.16 – 0.43) were less likely to remain indecisive than those who indicated that they did not agree with these statements. Those who indicated that they felt well informed about vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 were also less likely to remain undecided (0.45, 0.32 – 0.63) than those who did not report that they felt well informed [25].

In Calgary, Canada, access to the papilloma virus vaccine was banned in Catholic schools in 2008, but the citizens' demand successfully lifted this ban in 2013 and supported access to HPV vaccination in schools, since previously it was only available in non-Catholic public schools [9].

The study was conducted by scientists from South Korea, where the vaccination coverage of urban and rural children aged 2-3 years was studied, only more than 50% of the children studied received the fourth dose of the DPT vaccine. The authors also believe that the level of timely immunization coverage can be increased by introducing a vaccination reminder service, using computerized demographic databases in which information about vaccination of the population would be collected and consolidated [16].

In Uttar Pradesh, India, a community has demanded public access to the Japanese encephalitis vaccine through the courts in order to curb the annual outbreaks of the disease associated with high morbidity and mortality among their children [30].

In Brazil, a study was conducted that examined the risk factors associated with the non-vaccination of children against measles at the prescribed time. The results showed that the decision on vaccination is influenced by age, region of residence, marital status and education. It has been established that children receive a measles vaccination late, as their parents often forget about the due date of vaccination or decide to postpone vaccination on their own. It is possible to solve this problem by using several sources of information for parents when reminding them about the date of vaccination [28].

Thus, there are groups of factors affecting vaccination in children and adults, these are historical, socio-cultural, environmental, systemic, economic or political factors, as well as indecision. These barrier factors exist in the immunization system in all age groups of non–settlement.

Preventive work should be carried out to form a positive attitude to immunoprophylaxis mainly in groups of parents in which there is a high diagnostic coefficient of negative influence on the formation of attitudes to vaccination.

In order to achieve high individual and public demand for vaccines, it is necessary to develop strategies focused on specific conditions, communities and vaccines, in addition to those aimed at eliminating indecision.

List of literature:

1. Adilova Z. U., Adilov Sh. K A Group of Risk Factors Affecting the Occurrence of Oncological Diseases/ WEB OF SYNERGY: International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, Volume 2 Issue 2, Year 2023 ISSN: 2835-3013 (Accepted: January 05, 2023) pp 1-5.
2. Bakhrom M. Mamatkulov, Abdurashid A. Nematov, Bakhora V. Urinova, The Role of Social-Hygienic and Medical-Biological Factors in the Spread of Coronavirus Infection (SARS-CoV-2)

Among the Population, American Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences 2022, 12(9): 943-947 DOI: 10.5923/j.ajmms.20221209.20

3. Burnett RJ, Larson HJ, Moloi MH, Tshatsinde EA, Meheus A, Paterson P, François G. Addressing public questioning and concerns about vaccination in South Africa: a guide for healthcare workers. Vaccine. 2012 Sep 7;30 Suppl 3:C72-8. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.03.037. PMID: 22939026
4. C. Laberge, M. Guay, P. Clement, E. Dube, R. Roy, J. Bettinger Workshop on the cultural and religious roots of vaccine hesitancy. Explanation and implications for Canadian healthcare, Longueuil, Quebec, Canada, December 2012 (2015) http://www.usherbrooke.ca/dep-sciences-sante-communautaire/fileadmin/sites/dep-sciences-sante-communautaire/documents/HesitationVaccination/AffricheMG-anglais.pdf
5. Christopher A. Martin, Katherine Woolf, Luke Bryant, Sue Carr, Laura J. Gray, Amit Gupta, Anna L. Guyatt, Catherine John, Carl Melbourne, I. Chris McManus, Joshua Nazareth, Laura B. Nellums, Martin D. Tobin, Daniel Pan, Kamlesh Khunti, Manish Pareek Persistent hesitancy for SARS-CoV-2 vaccines among healthcare workers in the United Kingdom: analysis of longitudinal data from the UK-REACH cohort study, The Lancet Regional Health - Europe, Volume 13, February 2022, Pages 100299
6. Dube E., Gagnon D., Nickels E., Jeram S., M. Schuster, Mapping vaccine hesitancy-country-specific characteristics of a global phenomenon Vaccine, 32 (November (49)) (2014), pp. 6649-6654
7. Dilorom, U., Gulhayo, T., & Ilmira, U. (2017). The prevalence of iodine deficiency disorders in children of the Republic of Uzbekistan. *International scientific review*, (1 (32)), 98-99.
8. Global Vaccine Action Plan 201–2020. http://www.who.int/immunization/global_vaccine_action_plan/GVAP_doc_2011_2020/en/ [accessed 02.02.15].
9. Guichon J.R., Mitchell I., Buffler P., Caplan A. Citizen intervention in a religious ban on in-school HPV vaccine administration in Calgary, Canada Prev Med, 57 (November (5)) (2013), pp. 409-413
10. H.J. Larson, C. Jarrett, E. Eckersberger, D.M. Smith, P. Paterson Understanding vaccine hesitancy around vaccines and vaccination from a global perspective: a systematic review of published literature, 2007–2012 Vaccine, 32 (April (19)) (2014), pp. 2150-2159
11. Heidi, J. Global insights through a 67-country survey. The State of Vaccine Confidence 2016/ J. Heidi, A. Figueiredo, X. Zhao [et al.] // EbioMedicine. – 2016. – № 12. P. 295 – 301.
12. Hinman, A. R. Vaccine shortages: history, impact, and prospects for the future / A. R. Hinman, W. A. Orenstein, J. M. Santoli [et al.] // Annu Rev Public Health. – 2006. – № 27. – P. 235–259.;
13. Immunization Supply Chain Interventions to Enable Coverage and Equity in Urban Poor, Remote Rural and Conflict Settings, UNICEF 2020, p44.
14. Kata, A. A postmodern Pandora's box: Anti-vaccination misinformation on the Internet / Anna Kata // Vaccine. – 2010. № - 28. – P. 1709–1716.
15. Katherine Woolfa, *, I Chris McManusa, *, Christopher A Martinb,c, *, Laura B Nellumsd, *, Anna L Guyatte , Carl Melbournee , Luke Bryantb , Mayuri Gogoib , Fatimah Wobib , Amani Al-Oraibid , Osama Hassand , Amit Guptaf , Catherine Johne , Martin D Tobine , Sue Carrg,h , Sandra Simpsoni , Bindu Gregaryj , Avinash Aujayebk , Stephen Zingwel , Rubina Rezam, Laura J Graye , Kamlesh Khuntin , Manish Pareekb,c, **, On behalf of the UK-REACH Study Collaborative Group 1Ethnic differences in SARS-CoV-2 vaccine hesitancy in United Kingdom healthcare workers: Results from the UK-REACH prospective nationwide cohort study, The Lancet Regional Health - Europe, Volume 9, October 2021, 100180, ISSN 2666-7762, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100180.

16. Kim, E. Y. Related Factors of Age-Appropriate Immunization among Urban-Rural Children Aged 24-35 Months in a 2005 Population-Based Survey in Non-san, Korea / E. Y. Kim, M. S. Lee // Yonsei Med J. – 2011. – V. 52. – № 1. – P. 104–112.
17. Larson H.J., Jarrett C., Eckersberger E., D.M. Smith, P. Paterson Understanding vaccine hesitancy around vaccines and vaccination from a global perspective: a systematic review of published literature, 2007–2012 Vaccine, 32 (April (19)) (2014), pp. 2150-2159
18. Larson HJ. Negotiating vaccine acceptance in an era of reluctance. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2013 Aug; 9(8):1779-81. doi: 10.4161/hv.25932. Epub 2013 Jul 29. PMID: 23896582; PMCID: PMC3906281
19. Leask, J. Should we do battle with antivaccination activists? / J. Leask // Public Health Res Pract. – 2015. – V. 25. – № 2.
20. Leask, J. The big picture in addressing vaccine hesitancy / J. Leask, H. W. Willaby, J. Kaufman // Hum Vaccin Immunother. – 2014. – V. 10. – № 9.
21. Lim, T. A. Measles outbreak in Bulgaria: poor maternal educational attainment as a risk factor for medical complications / T.A. Lim, L. Marinova, M. Kojouharova [et al.] // Eur. J. Public Health. – 2013. – V. 23. – № 4. – P. 663–669.
22. MacDonald N. E.; SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. Vaccine hesitancy: Definition, scope and determinants. Vaccine. 2015 Aug 14; 33(34):4161-4. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.036. Epub 2015 Apr 17. PMID: 25896383.
23. Malik Sallam , COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy worldwide: a systematic review of vaccine acceptance rates, medRxiv 2020.12.28.20248950; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.28.20248950
24. Miyahara, R. Barriers to timely administration of birth dose vaccines in The Gambia, West Africa / R. Miyahara, M. Jasseh, P. Gomez [et al.] // Vaccine. – 2016. – V. 34. – № 29. – P. 3335–3341.
25. NHS England COVID-19 weekly announced vaccinations 04 November 2021. 2021. https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statisticalwork-areas/covid-19-vaccinations/ (accessed 9th November 2021)].
26. Nyhan, B. Effective messages in vaccine promotion: a randomized trial / B. Nyhan, J. Reifler, S. Richey [et al.] // Pediatrics. – 2014. – V. 133. – № 4. – P. 835–842.
27. Oraby, T. The influence of social norms on the dynam-ics of vaccinating behav-iour for paediatric infectious diseases. / T. Oraby, V. Thampi, C. T. Bauch // Proc Biol Sci. – 2014. – V. 281. – № 1780.
28. Patricia, L. Factors affecting compliance with the measles vaccination schedule in a Brazilian city / L. Patricia, H. B. Carvalho, R. Saconi [et al.] // Sao Paulo Med J. – 2008. – V. 126. – № 3. – P. 166–171.
29. Philip, R. K. Health Care Professionals' Perspectives on Life-Course Immunization: A Qualitative Survey from a European Conference / R. K. Philip, D. A. Pasquale // Vaccines (Basel). – 2020. – V. 8. – № 2. – P. 185
30. Rajesh Kumar Srivastava versus Shri A.P.Verma and Others. High Court of Judicature at Allahabad. http://www.rishabhdara.com/sc/view.php?case=100927 [accessed 02.02.15]
31. Ramanova D. et al. The importance of family and family values in the formation of a healthy lifestyle //Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy. – 2020. – Т. 11. – №. 12. – С. 607-614.
32. Wheelock, A. Trust and adult vaccination: what matters most? / A. Wheelock, A. Thomson, B. Rigole [et al.] // Eur J Public Health. – 2014. – V. 24. – № 2.

33. WHO EURO Working Group on Vaccine Communications. Istanbul, Turkey October 13–14. 2011.,
34. World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. 2013. The Guide for Tailoring Immunization Programs. Increasing coverage of infant and child vaccination in the WHO European Region. http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/187347/The-Guide-to-Tailoring-Immunization-Programmes-TIP.pdf [accessed 02.02.15].,
35. Wu B. (2020). Social isolation and loneliness among older adults in the context of COVID-19: a global challenge. Glob. Health Res. Policy 5 1–3. 10.1080/01634372.2021.1958115 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
36. Xiaoyu Fang,*, Shen Li,*, Hao Yu,*, Penghao Wang,*, Yao Zhang, Zheng Chen, Yang Li, Liqing Cheng, Wenbin Li, Hong Jia, #, Xiangyu Ma, /Epidemiological, comorbidity factors with severity and prognosis of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis AGING 2020, Vol. 12, No. 13.
37. Байбусинова А. Ж. Отношение, барьеры и проблемы вакцинопрофилактики в современном мире: обзор литературы / А. Ж. Байбусинова, А. К. Мусаханова, Г. М. Шалгумбаева // Наука и Здравоохранение. – 2016. – Т. 3. – С. 123–134
38. Баранов, А. А. Научное обоснование вакцинации детей с отклонениями в состоянии здоровья / А. А. Баранов, Л. С. Намазова-Баранова, В. К. Таточенко В. К. // Педиатрическая фармакология. – 2010. – Т. 7. – № 2. – С. 6–24.
39. Бекмухан Г.С., Зикриярова С.М., Жаканбаева А.М., Попова Т.В. , Медико-социальные проблемы иммунопрофилактики детей (Обзор литературы) Вестник КазНМУ №1-2017, с.506-508
40. Брико, Н. И. Иммунопрофилактика инфекционных болезней в России: состояние и перспективы совершенствования / Н. И. Брико, И. В. Фельдблюм // Эпидемиология и вакцинопрофилактика. –2017. -Т. 93. – № 2. – С. 4–9.
41. Брико, Н. Н. Цапкова, Л. Р. Батыршина [и др.] // Эпидемиология и вакцино -профилактика. – 2018. – Т. 17. – № 2. – С. 4–15
42. Вакцинация для всех: простые ответы на непростые вопросы: Руководство для врачей / С. В. Ильина, Л. С. Намазова-Баранова, А. А. Баранова. – Москва : ПедиатрЪ, 2016. – 199 с.
43. Вакцины и иммунопрофилактика в современном мире: руководство для врачей / под ред. Л. С. Намазовой-Барановой, Н. И. Брико, И. В. Фельдб-люм. – Москва : ПедиатрЪ, 2021. – 612 с.
44. Ерофеев, Ю. В. Вакцинация – приоритетное направление профилактики (опыт Омской области по организации иммунизации против ветряной оспы) / Ю. В. Ерофеев, М. Б. Костенко, О. В. Мигунова [и др.] // Эпидемиология и вакцинопрофилактика. – 2012. – Т. 64. – № 3. – С. 45–47
45. Иммунология, Ройт А., Бростофф Дж., Мейл Д., Москва, Издательство “Мир”, 2000, 593с.
46. Иммунопрофилактика–2014: справочник. / В. К. Таточенко, Н. А. Озерецковский, А. М. Федоров. – Москва: Педиатр, 2014. – 199 с.
47. Халилова, Б. Р., О. Т. Мусаева, and Г. К. Толипова. "ВЛИЯНИЕ ОДОНТОГЕННОЙ ИНФЕКЦИИ НА ОРГАНИЗМ БЕРЕМЕННЫХ ЖЕНЩИНЫ." Scientific progress 4.2 (2023): 245-251.
48. Костинов, М. П. Медико-социальные аспекты отношения родителей к плановой вакцинопрофилактике / М. П. Костинов, К. В. Машилов // Педиатрия. – 2019. – Т. 98. – № 1. – С. 129–135.
49. Моисеева, К. Е. Основные причины отказов от вакцинации / К. Е. Моисеева, А. А. Алексеева // Социальные аспекты здоровья населения. – 2019. – Т. 65. – №5. – С. 9.

50. Солондаев, В. К. Психологические факторы принятия решения о вакцинации / В. К. Солондаев, Е. В. Конева, Н. Л. Черная // Сибирский психологический журнал. – 2016. – № 59. С. 125–136.

51. Шамшева, О. В. Вакцинация и здоровье человека / О. В. Шамшева // Детские инфекции. – 2015. – № 4. – С. 6–12.