

Preferences of Dutch parents and expectant parents for respiratory syncytial virus prevention strategies: A discrete choice experiment

Annefleur C. Langedijk ^a, Floris van den Dungen ^a, Lisette Harteveld ^b, Lisanne van Leeuwen ^b, Lucy Smit ^c, Jennie van den Boer ^d, Diana Mendes ^e, Marie Claire Verhage ^f, Elise Kocks ^f, Marlies van Houten ^b

^a Pfizer B.V., Capelle aan den IJssel, the Netherlands

^b Department of Paediatrics and of Vaccine, Infection and Immunology, Spaarne Gasthuis Hospital, Haarlem, the Netherlands

^c Youth Health Care Centre, Jeugdgezondheidszorg Kennemerland, Velsbroek, the Netherlands

^d Midwives Amsterdam Zuid, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

^e Pfizer Ltd, Tadworth, UK

^f SKIM, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

Corresponding author: Dr Annefleur C. Langedijk; email: annefleurchristel.langedijk@pfizer.com

Supplementary Table S1 The participant groups identified in the latent class analysis

		Latent group 1 N=35	Latent group 2 N=21	Latent group 3 N=94
DCE	Importance of costs	Very High	Low	Medium
	Importance of timing and recipient of the injection	Maternal vaccination or infant immunisation (all ages) or no immunisation	Maternal vaccination or no immunisation	Maternal vaccination or infant immunisation >1 month
	Overall likelihood of immunisation	Medium	Low	Very High
	Importance of an HCP recommendation for RSVpreF maternal vaccine	Low	Low	Medium
Demo-graphics	Having first child	34%	29%	53%
	Reason to not immunise infant: I don't know enough about this virus/immunisation	31%	76%	23%
	Received a vaccine (e.g., for influenza, COVID-19) in the past 5 years	83%	57%	89%
	High education	54%	81%	66%
	High income	57%	62%	67%

High education referred to higher vocational education and research-oriented higher education. High income referred to annual household income before tax >€45,000. Abbreviations: *COVID-19* coronavirus disease 2019, *DCE* discrete choice experiment, *HCP* healthcare provider, *RSVpreF* respiratory syncytial virus prefusion F.