

Supplementary information

	Respondents	Influenza Vaccine Hesitancy Pre-intervention	Influenza Vaccine Hesitancy Post-intervention
	frequencies	frequencies (%)	frequencies (%)
Total	1225	382 (31.2)	360 (29.4)
Indian communicator	624	181 (29.0)	173 (27.7)
Dutch communicator	601	201 (33.4)	187 (31.1)
AD			
Total	266	45 (16.9)	35 (13.2)
FB			
Total	824	307 (37.3)	301 (36.5)
Indian radio station			
Total	135	30 (22.2)	24 (17.8)

Supplementary table 1: Influenza vaccine hesitancy pre- and post-intervention among all participants and divided by different communicators and media outlets.

	All participants			Communicator			P-value	Media outlet						P-value
				Indian		Dutch		Dutch newspaper		FB		Indian radio station		
	(N=1226)			(N=624)		(N=602)		(N=266)		(N=824)		(N=136)		
	Res pond ents	%	Res pond ents	%	Res pond ents	%		Res pond ents	%	Res pond ents	%	Re spo nd ent s	%	
Improve ment of vaccine willingnes s	66 (out of 382)	17.3%	29 (out of 181)	16.0%	37 (out of 201)	18.4%	0.538	20 (out of 45)	44.4%	32 (out of 307)	10.4%	14 (out of 30)	46.7%	<0.001
Questions														
Racial / ethnic tailoring		mean	SD						mean	SD		mean	SD	
'I value having a health care provider of a similar ethnicity/o rigin to myself'		1.97	1.077						1.86	1.009		1.94	1.055	0.001

'I think a health care provider of a similar ethnicity/origin as me can provide better care'		1.82	0.942			1.64	0.784		1.80	0.918		2.28	1.197	<0.001
'If my healthcare provider is of a similar ethnicity/origin as I am, I am more satisfied with the communication during an appointment'		2.24	1.164			2.24	1.192		2.22	1.146		2.34	1.219	0.308
'If my healthcare provider is of a similar ethnicity/origin as I am, I get better information about the treatment, disease, etc.'		2.00	1.004			1.81	0.861		2.01	0.999		2.30	1.207	<0.001
'The Dutch government acts in the best interest of people of my		2.85	1.190			3.25	1.280		2.72	1.142		2.84	1.124	<0.001

ethnicity / origin'														
'Racism makes a difference in getting access to certain medicines or treatments in certain ethnic groups'		2. 19	1. 10 3			2.04	1. 0 9 6		2. 19	1. 08 4		2.51	1.17 4	<0.001

Supplementary table 2: Improvement of vaccine willingness in the vaccine hesitant group and perspectives on cultural tailoring of health care providers in all participants and divided by different media outlets.

Improvement of vaccine willingness	OR	CI
Unadjusted		
Communicator (Dutch vs. Indian)	1.183	0.693 - 2.017
Unadjusted		
Media outlet		
<i>Indian radio station vs. FB</i>	7.520	3.361 - 16.824
<i>Dutch newspaper vs. FB</i>	6.875	3.439 - 13.743
<i>Indian radio station vs. Dutch newspaper</i>	1.094	0.433 - 2.765
Adjusted		
Media outlet		
<i>Indian radio station vs. FB</i>	6.490	1.808 - 23.291
<i>Dutch newspaper vs. FB</i>	6.103	2.935 - 12.688
<i>Indian radio station vs. Dutch newspaper</i>	1.063	0.257 - 4.396
Communicator (Dutch vs. Indian)	0.912	0.495 - 1.679
Age	1.001	0.971 - 1.031
Gender (female vs. male)	1.579	0.787 - 3.171
Migration background (non-migrant vs. migrant)	0.482	0.196 - 1.187
Education (high vs. low)	1.033	0.563 - 1.896
Chronic disease (yes vs. no)	1.777	0.930 - 3.394

Supplementary table 3: Binary logistic regression of improvement of vaccine willingness in the vaccine hesitant group (unadjusted) and controlled for different covariates (adjusted).

	Communicator							Media outlet						
	Tailored (n=194)		Non-tailored (n=184)					Tailored (n=30)		Non-tailored (n=348)				
	freq uen cies	%	freq uen cies	%	p- val ue	OR (un adj uste d)*	CI*	freq uen cies	%	freq uen cies	%	p- val ue	OR (unad justed)*	CI*
Improve ment of vaccine willingn ess	27	13.9	38	20.7	0.083	0.621	0.362 - 1.067	14	46.7%	51	14.7%	<0.001	5.096	2.344 - 11.076

Supplementary table 4: Cultural tailoring versus non-tailoring of communicators and media outlets concerning improvement of vaccine willingness in the vaccine hesitant group.

*values (unadjusted) were assessed using binary logistic regressions.

	Media outlet						
Sentimen t	Dutch newspaper		FB		Indian radio station		P-value
	frequency	%	frequency	%	frequency	%	
Negative	20	40.8	79	43.6	4	14.3	
Neutral	28	57.1	92	50.8	17	60.7	
Positive	1	2.0	10	5.5	7	25.0	
Total reactions	49		181		28		<0.001

Supplementary table 5: Sentiment analysis of 3 different media outlets, among all participants who gave feedback during the campaign.