

1 **Community responses during the early phase of the COVID-19 epidemic in Hong Kong: risk**
2 **perception, information exposure and preventive measures**

3
4 Kin On Kwok^{1,2,3*}, Kin-Kit Li⁴, Henry Ho Hin Chan¹, Yuan Yuan Yi¹, Arthur Tang⁵, Wan In Wei^{1*},
5 Samuel Yeung Shan Wong¹

6
7 ¹ JC School of Public Health and Primary Care, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
8 Special Administrative Region, China.

9 ² Stanley Ho Centre for Emerging Infectious Diseases, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong
10 Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

11 ³ Shenzhen Research Institute of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China

12 ⁴ Department of Social and Behavioural Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, China

13 ⁵ Department of Software, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, South Korea.

14

15 *Correspondence: kkokwok@cuhk.edu.hk, vivian1628@cuhk.edu.hk

16

17 **ABSTRACT**

18

19 **Background:** Community responses are important for outbreak management during the early phase
20 when non-pharmaceutical interventions are the major preventive options. Therefore, this study aims to
21 examine the psychological and behavioral responses of the community during the early phase of the
22 COVID-19 epidemic in Hong Kong.

23

24 **Method:** A cross-sectional online survey was launched within 36 hours after confirmed COVID-19
25 cases were first reported. Councilors of all 452 district council constituency areas were approached for
26 survey dissemination. Respondent demographics, anxiety level, risk perception, sources to retrieve

27 COVID-19 information, actual adoption and perceived efficacy of precautionary measures were
28 collected.

29
30 **Result:** Analysis from 1715 complete responses indicated high perceived susceptibility (89%) and high
31 perceived severity (97%). Most respondents were worried about COVID-19 (97%), and had their daily
32 routines disrupted (slightly/greatly: 98%). The anxiety level, measured by the Hospital Anxiety and
33 Depression Scale, was borderline abnormal (9.01). Nearly all respondents were alert to the disease
34 progression (99.5%). The most trusted information sources were doctors (84%), followed by broadcast
35 (57%) and newspaper (54%), but they were not common information sources (doctor: 5%; broadcast:
36 34%; newspaper: 40%). Only 16% respondents found official websites reliable. Enhanced personal
37 hygiene practices and travel avoidance to China were frequently adopted (>77%) and considered
38 effective (>90%). The adoption of social-distancing measures was lower (39%-88%), and their drivers
39 for greater adoption include: being female (adjusted odds ratio [aOR]:1.27), living in the New
40 Territories (aOR:1.32-1.55), perceived as having good understanding of COVID-19 (aOR:1.84) and
41 being more anxious (aOR:1.07).

42
43 **Discussion:** Risk perception towards COVID-19 in the community was high. Most respondents are alert
44 to the disease progression, and adopt self-protective measures. This study contributes by examining the
45 psycho-behavioral responses of hosts, in addition to the largely studied mechanistic aspects, during the
46 early phase of the current COVID-19 epidemic. The timely psychological and behavioral assessment of
47 the community is useful to inform subsequent interventions and risk communication strategies as the
48 epidemic progresses.

49
50 Word count: 316

51

52

53 INTRODUCTION

54 On 12 January 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the novel coronavirus which
55 caused unknown pneumonia cases in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China since December 2019 as “2019-
56 nCoV”, which was renamed by the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses as “SARS-CoV-2”
57 on 11 February 2020. In parallel, the WHO formally named the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2 as
58 “COVID-19”, short for Coronavirus Disease 2019. Back in late December 2019, a cluster of 27
59 pneumonia cases associated with SARS-CoV-2 with a common link to the Huanan Seafood Wholesale
60 Market were reported [1], and the first death case attributable to SARS-CoV-2 occurred on 9 January
61 2020. Soon after the first global incidence was confirmed in Thailand on 12 January 2020, new cases
62 were reported in different countries and were mostly associated with Wuhan travel history or residency.
63 As of 20 February 2020, there have been 75465 confirmed cases in China, including 11633 severe cases
64 and 2236 deaths [2]. In Hong Kong, the number of confirmed cases has risen to 68 on 20 February 2020
65 since the first local detection on 23 January 2020 [3].

66
67 Health officials have enacted interventions to slow transmission. In Hong Kong, adopted strategies
68 include: border screening (measuring body temperature, imposing a health declaration form system,
69 imposing a 14-day mandatory quarantine period on all individuals entering Hong Kong from the
70 Mainland), social-distancing (border shutdown, reducing cross-border commuting services, deferring
71 class resumption for schools governed by the Education Bureau, home-office arrangement for civil
72 servants, suspension of public services from the Leisure and Cultural Services Department) and
73 extending the Enhanced Laboratory Surveillance Program to adult patients with fever and mild
74 respiratory symptoms presenting at accident and emergency departments or general out-patient clinics
75 under the public sector.

76
77 To control this COVID-19 epidemic, much effort has been paid to identifying the etiological agent,
78 epidemiological parameters such as incubation period [4], disease transmissibility [4, 5], clinical

79 characteristics [6, 7], treatment options [8, 9], and route of transmission [10]. Although these
80 information help devise optimal infection control strategies, such as contact tracing and follow-up
81 isolation [11], they center purely on the mechanistic aspect of the disease.

82
83 The host's behaviors are important for outbreak management, particularly during the early phase when
84 no treatment or vaccination is available and non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) are the only
85 options. The efficacy of NPIs depends on the host's degree of engagement and compliance in
86 precautionary behaviors, such as wearing masks, hand hygiene and self-isolation. Whether individuals
87 voluntarily engage in precautionary behaviors depends on their risk perception towards the current
88 health threat. In fact, risk perception is a main theme in common health behavior theories, including
89 Health Belief Model and Protection Motivation Theory. In addition, with advanced information
90 technology in recent years comes the uncertainty of how risk perception is shaped by various
91 information sources. Hong Kong's past experience with outbreaks of novel pathogens (2003 Severe
92 Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), and 2009 Pandemic Influenza) also provides a reference point to
93 evaluate the risk perceptions of the current COVID-19 epidemic.

94
95 In light of the importance of host behavior in mitigating transmission and the vision to inform policy
96 formation in a timely manner, this study aims to examine risk perceptions and behavioral responses of
97 the general community during the early phase of the COVID-19 epidemic. Considering the rapid
98 development of the epidemic during the survey period and the potential variability in the adoption of
99 preventive measures among hosts, this study also examines the temporal changes in anxiety, the factors
100 associated with adoption of preventive measures and their sources of information gathering.

101

102 **METHODS**

103 *Subject recruitment*

104 A cross-sectional online survey was conducted within 36 hours after the first confirmed COVID-19 case
105 was reported in Hong Kong. To ensure good coverage of the general community in Hong Kong,
106 chairpersons and vice-chairpersons of all eighteen district councils and all individual councilors of the
107 452 District Council Constituency Areas (DCCAs) were approached by electronic mails and their
108 contact numbers listed in the District Council websites (<https://www.districtcouncils.gov.hk/index.html>)
109 for survey dissemination. District councilors were invited to share our survey link and promotion
110 messages on their webpages, social media platforms or any channels which they usually use to convey
111 information to their targeted residents, but in general there was no restriction on their dissemination.
112 Individuals who were aged 18 or above, understood Chinese and lived (on average) over five days per
113 week in Hong Kong in the last month are eligible to participate. Respondents were compensated with a
114 HKD10 cash coupon if they indicated willingness for receipt. To avoid duplicated responses from the
115 same respondent, the survey could only be taken once from the same electronic device.

116

117 *Respondent characteristics*

118 Respondents were asked about their demographics (including sex, age, living district, education
119 attainment, household income), self-perceived health status, travel history in the past month, occurrence
120 of respiratory symptoms in the past fourteen days and anxiety level using the Hospital, Anxiety and
121 Depression scale - Anxiety (HADS-A) (0-7 = Normal; 8-10 = Borderline abnormal; 11-21 = Abnormal).
122 Although HADS-A is intended for screening clinically significant anxiety symptoms in clinical
123 populations, many studies have showed that it is valid for community populations [12, 13], including
124 employees [14], general population aged 65-80 years in Sweden [15], an Italian community sample aged
125 18-85 years [16]. As a complementary measure, the state anxiety level of a subset of respondents was
126 assessed with the validated State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI).

127

128 *Risk perception*

129 Risk perception towards COVID-19 was measured by two psychological dimensions: (i) perceived
130 susceptibility, and (ii) perceived severity. The first dimension was proxied by how likely one considered
131 oneself (his/her families) would be infected with COVID-19 if no preventive measure was taken. The
132 second dimension was proxied by how one rated the seriousness of symptoms caused by COVID-19,
133 their perceived chance of having COVID-19 cured and that of survival if infected with COVID-19.
134 Subjects were also asked to rate the relative severity of COVID-19 compared with common non-
135 communicable diseases (NCDs) and previous outbreaks by novel pathogens in Hong Kong. Responses
136 were captured with a five-point Likert scale.

137

138 *Information exposure*

139 Respondents were asked about the sources from which they obtained information about COVID-19, and
140 how much they trust those sources. They were also asked about the types of information that they
141 wanted to receive.

142

143 *Preventive measures*

144 Respondents were asked whether they performed precautionary measures and what their perceived
145 efficacy of those measures are. Three types of precautionary measures were considered: hygienic
146 practices, social distancing and travel avoidance.

147

148 *Ethics consideration*

149

150 This study has been approved by the Survey and Behavioral Research Ethics Committee of The Chinese
151 University of Hong Kong.

152

153 *Patient and Public Involvement Statement*

154 It was not appropriate or possible to involve patients or the public in the design, or conduct, or reporting,
155 or dissemination plans of this research.

156

157 *Statistical analysis*

158 Frequency and proportions of responses were tabulated. Demographics of respondents were compared to
159 the 2016 population by-census in Hong Kong with Cohen's w effect size (small: 0.1; medium: 0.3; large:
160 0.5) [17]. Regression models were used to test for temporal change in anxiety level and to identify
161 factors associated with greater adoption of social-distancing preventive measures. The latter is proxied
162 by adopting five or more social-distancing precautionary measures. Variables that appears to be
163 associated ($p < 0.2$) in the univariate analysis are considered in the multivariate analysis. The final model
164 is determined by stepwise selection. Adjusted odds ratio (aOR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) are
165 estimated. Candidate variables include: demographics of respondents, self-perceived health status, travel
166 history and anxiety level. A statistical significance of 0.05 was specified. Analysis was performed in R.

167

168 **RESULTS**

169 The survey was conducted from 24 January 2020 to 13 February 2020 (Figure 1). Our survey period
170 covers important clinical incidences, including first local death case and first overseas death case
171 (Philippines), and social incidences, including healthcare workers on strike to call for entire border
172 shutdown. It was also amid of the start-up of large-scale social-distancing interventions, including halt
173 of sales of high-speed rail tickets to and from Wuhan, closure of public cultural and leisure facilities and
174 deferral of school resumption. Meanwhile, alongside the launch of this survey was the escalating official
175 threat tone on COVID-19: The WHO declared the COVID-19 epidemic as a public health emergency of
176 international concern, with Hong Kong activated the emergency response level.

177

178 *Respondent characteristics*

179 Complete data from 1715 respondents were analyzed. Table 1 shows the demographics of respondents.
180 Many of the respondents are female (69%; 1176/1715), of young age (18-44 years) (80%; 1380/1715),
181 working population (68%; 1168/1715). The study sample is comparable to the population in terms of
182 residential district (effect size=0.27). Table 2 shows the background health conditions and travel history
183 of respondents. The majority perceived their health status as good or very good (78%; 1331/1715), a
184 quarter of them experienced respiratory symptoms in the past 14 days (423/1715) and travelled outside
185 Hong Kong in the previous month (408/1715). Among the 408 respondents who were abroad, at least 24%
186 of them (96-109) went to the Mainland China excluding Macau.

187

188 *Risk perception*

189 Table 3 shows the perceived susceptibility and perceived severity towards COVID-19 among
190 respondents. Most respondents regarded themselves as likely to be infected with COVID-19 (very
191 likely/likely: 89%), and most considered the symptoms of COVID-19 (if infected) as serious (very
192 serious/serious: 97%). Less than a quarter of the respondents thought that it was likely to have COVID-
193 19 cured (if infected) (15%), and only 18% thought that it was likely to survive through COVID-19.
194 When referencing to existing diseases (Table 4), almost all respondents (>98%) consider equivalent
195 disease severity between COVID-19 and SARS. This magnitude was similar to other deadly NCDs
196 (85%-94%), but much higher than the annual seasonal influenza (66%).

197

198 Most respondents were worried about COVID-19 (97%; 1667/1715), and they claimed that their daily
199 routines were slightly (42%; 727/1715) or greatly (56%; 955/1715) disrupted. The average HADS-A
200 score is 9.01 (95% CI: 8.44, 9.59); while the average score of state anxiety by STAI, from 804 complete
201 responses, is 2.00 (95% CI: 1.46, 2.55). A significantly increasing time trend in HADS-A score is
202 identified ($p < 0.05$) (Figure 2).

203

204 *Information exposure*

205 Nearly all respondents were continuously alert to the disease progression of COVID-19 (99.5%;
206 1707/1715) and actively searched for related information (83%; 1431/1715). Table 5 lists the types of
207 COVID-19 information wanted by the 1639 (96%) respondents who indicated such need. Information
208 which respondents were most interested were: distribution of cases (92%), number of infected
209 individuals (91%), infection control interventions undertaken by local officials (88%), and preventive
210 measures (87%).

211
212 Figure 3 shows the sources from which respondents obtained information about COVID-19, and how
213 well the information sources were trusted. The most trusted sources were doctors (84%; very
214 reliable/reliable: 1449/1715), but only 5% (87/1715) respondents could obtain information from them.
215 The next two most trusted sources were broadcast (57%) and newspaper (54%), but they were used by
216 less than 40% of the respondents. On the other hand, the two most common information sources were
217 social platforms (94%; 1608/1715) and websites (regardless of official or unofficial) (90%; 1539/1715),
218 but they were rated as reliable or very reliable by only 26% and 16%-23% of the respondents
219 respectively. Only 16% (269/1715) of respondents found information from official websites reliable or
220 very reliable.

221
222 *Preventive measures*

223 Figure 4 shows the adoption of precautionary measures by respondents and their perceived efficacy.
224 Enhanced personal hygiene practices (including wearing masks, cleaning hands and better coughing and
225 sneezing etiquette) and avoid travelling to Mainland China were adopted by most respondents (>89%),
226 and these practices were considered very effective or effective (>90%). For social-distancing measures,
227 although they were considered useful in preventing COVID-19 (very effective/effective: 70%-93%),
228 their actual adoption was lower (range: 39%-88%).

229

230 Table 6 shows the regression analysis results for greater adoption (five or more) of social-distancing
231 interventions during the early phase of this COVID-19 epidemic. Being female (aOR:1.27; 95%
232 CI:1.02,1.58), living in the NT (aOR:1.32-1.55), perceived as having good understanding of COVID-19
233 (aOR:1.84; 95% CI:1.29,2.63), being more anxious (aOR:1.07; 95% CI: 1.04,1.10) were positively
234 associated with greater adoption.

235

236 **DISCUSSION**

237 This study provides timely assessment of the risk perception, information exposure and adoption of
238 precautionary measures during the initial phase of the COVID-19 epidemic in Hong Kong. Despite
239 disease uncertainty (including transmissibility, route of transmission and pathogenicity) at the early
240 stage, individuals in the community had high perceived risk towards COVID-19 at large, viz: high
241 perceived susceptibility and high perceived severity. A slightly increasing general anxiety level was
242 observed over the three-week study period. Enhanced personal hygiene and travel avoidance were
243 adopted by nearly all respondents, higher propensity of adopting greater degree of social-distancing
244 measures were associated with being female, living in the NT, perceived as having good understanding
245 of COVID-19 well, work status except students and being more anxious.

246

247 Our results have several immediate and significant public health implications. First, our results provide
248 the baseline psychological and behavioral responses of the community against which current infection
249 control strategies fit in. With the high perceived risk and large proportion of individuals adopting
250 preventive measures in the community at the beginning, during which the accumulated number of local
251 cases is 68 (as of 21 February 2020) with a significant initial portion of them being imported cases [18],
252 we have an edge to block local transmission. This suggests that efforts to curb imported cases were
253 efficient at the early phase of this outbreak. Following the recent enactment of a 14-day quarantine
254 period for individuals entering Hong Kong from the mainland China, and the emergence of clustered
255 local cases [19], the next important strategy on the agenda is to stabilize the supply of preventive

256 materials, such as masks, so that the blockage of local transmission chain can be sustained. This is
257 particularly important during the 24-day incubation period [20] associated with an elevated influx of
258 individuals from the Mainland to Hong Kong between the announcement date (5 February 2020) and the
259 effective date (8 February 2020) of the 14-day quarantine policy, and the recent emergence of super-
260 spreaders to speed up local transmission.

261
262 Second, our results reveal the risk perception in the community, which is an important piece of
263 information to enhance epidemic control [21]. Although the epicenter of the COVID-19 epidemic is
264 Wuhan, the perceived risk of the community in Hong Kong was high. For emotional status, the HADS-
265 A score in our survey (9.01) suggests that the community was borderline abnormal in terms of anxiety.
266 Despite the slight difference in the inclusion of measurement items, the community was seemingly more
267 anxious about the current COVID-19 epidemic (mean STAI score=2.00) than the 2009 pandemic
268 influenza (mean STAI score = 1.8) [22], but was less worried than the SARS outbreak in 2003 (mean
269 STAI score = 2.24) [23]. The significant time trend associated with HADS-A (Figure 2) suggests that
270 the community became more and more anxious as new cases and new incidences came up (Figure 1).

271
272 Third, our results suggest an alternative strategy for better risk communication. The large proportion of
273 respondents were alert to COVID-19 (99.5%) or actively searching for related information (83%)
274 highlighted the role of social media in shaping risk perception and epidemic-related emotion. It is
275 particularly important amid of much disease uncertainty as mass scares can be triggered easily.
276 Considering the high level of trust given by respondents to doctors and the low level of trust to the two
277 most frequently used information sources, social platform and websites, health officials can collaborate
278 frequently with associations of medical doctors, and invite them to help propagating official information
279 in more sociable channels. This strategy is deemed more acceptable by the community than relying
280 solely on the official channel, given only 16% of respondents rates official websites as reliable or very

281 reliable. Our results also shortlisted information preferred by the community among an upsurge of
282 disease-related information during the early stage (Table 5).
283
284 Fourth, our results pinpoint the drivers for greater level of adoption of social-distancing precautionary
285 measures. In line with literatures that being female and an elevated anxiety level prompted compliance
286 of precautionary measures [23, 24], we also identified similar association in this survey (Table 6).
287 Interestingly, specific to this COVID-19 epidemic, residents in the NT were more likely to comply with
288 social-distancing precautionary measures than their counterparts in other areas of Hong Kong.
289 Separating Hong Kong and the Guangdong Province are two busiest custom borders, Lo Wu and Lok
290 Ma Chau [19], such that the residents in NT may consider themselves at greater risk of infection. Those
291 who claimed they understood COVID-19 were more likely to adopt preventive measures, suggesting
292 mass promotion of knowledge about COVID-19 in the community can boost uptake of precautionary
293 measures. On the other hand, the less propensity to adopt precautionary measures among individuals
294 who left Hong Kong in the previous month or who regularly visited China reinforces the need for border
295 screening and for promoting social hygiene amid of epidemic times.
296
297 Fifth, this local study has profound implication to overseas countries undergoing the initial phase of the
298 COVID-19 epidemic. The WHO European region has been accumulating COVID-19 cases, but in only
299 two days (22-24 February 2020), the number of laboratory-confirmed cases in Italy has risen from 17 to
300 219 [25]. Recently on 24 February 2020, the Ministry of Health announced the first COVID-19 case in
301 Iraq. The presence of initial cases, aligning with the human-to-human [26] and asymptomatic [27]
302 transmission, suggest that many countries may experience the initial phase of the COVID-19 epidemic
303 soon. Results of this survey serve as a reference for overseas health officials to better prepare their
304 containment strategies and handle the potential mass scares in their community.
305

306 This study has two strengths. First, it started within 36 hours after the detection of first local cases. This
307 early start enables timely assessment of the community responses such that there is sufficient gap period
308 to inform intervention policies. Second, our recruitment method, online survey via dissemination by
309 DCCA councilors, is the first of its kinds to capture responses during public holidays while maintaining
310 good geographical representation. The COVID-19 epidemic was amid of the Chinese New Year
311 holidays and a series of large-scale social-distancing interventions enacted by Hong Kong government,
312 particularly the home-office arrangement for employees. Therefore, the conventional random digit
313 dialing approach adopted in the past local outbreaks [22, 23, 28] was not possible. And the involvement
314 of all 452 DCCA councilors allows a thorough representation of every district in Hong Kong in the
315 absence of a universal email database.

316
317 This study has two limitations. First, with an online approach, responses of those without internet access,
318 particularly the oldest age group (55 years or above), were under-represented. Despite this, online
319 surveys were the only feasible means of data collection during outbreak times. Second, this survey was
320 conducted during the early phase that temporal variations of responses are not captured as the epidemic
321 progresses. However, contact information were collected from this study cohort and follow-up surveys
322 will be carried out as the disease progresses.

323
324 To conclude, we identified high risk-perception towards COVID-19 in the community, with the anxiety
325 level higher than pandemic influenza but lower than SARS. Most respondents are alert to the disease
326 progression of COVID-19, and adopt self-protective measures. This study contributes by examining the
327 psycho-behavioral responses of hosts, in addition to the largely studied biological and mechanistic
328 aspects of COVID-19, during the early phase of the current COVID-19 epidemic. The timely
329 psychological and behavioral assessment of the community is useful to inform subsequent intervention
330 and risk communication strategies as the epidemic progresses.

331 Word count: 3226

REFERENCES

- 332 1. 武汉市卫生健康委员会: **武汉市卫健委关于当前我市肺炎疫情的情况通报**. In.; 2019.
- 333 2. **Countries/areas with reported cases of novel coronavirus infection (Last updated on February 21,**
334 **2020, 6 pm)**. In.: Center for Health Protection; 2020.
- 335 3. Centre for Health Protection: **Latest situation of cases of COVID-19**. 2020.
- 336 4. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, Ren R, Leung KSM, Lau EHY, Wong JY *et al*: **Early**
337 **Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia**. *N Engl J Med*
338 2020.
- 339 5. Jonathan M Read, Jessica RE Bridgen, Derek AT Cummings, Antonia Ho, Jewell CP: **Novel coronavirus**
340 **2019-nCoV: early estimation of epidemiological parameters and epidemic predictions**. 2020.
- 341 6. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, Wang B, Xiang H, Cheng Z, Xiong Y *et al*: **Clinical**
342 **Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in**
343 **Wuhan, China**. *JAMA* 2020.
- 344 7. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, Zhang L, Fan G, Xu J, Gu X *et al*: **Clinical features of**
345 **patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China**. *Lancet* 2020.
- 346 8. Chen ZM, Fu JF, Shu Q, Chen YH, Hua CZ, Li FB, Lin R, Tang LF, Wang TL, Wang W *et al*: **Diagnosis**
347 **and treatment recommendations for pediatric respiratory infection caused by the 2019 novel**
348 **coronavirus**. *World J Pediatr* 2020.
- 349 9. Lu H: **Drug treatment options for the 2019-new coronavirus (2019-nCoV)**. *Biosci Trends* 2020.
- 350 10. Riou J, Althaus CL: **Pattern of early human-to-human transmission of Wuhan 2019 novel**
351 **coronavirus (2019-nCoV), December 2019 to January 2020**. *Euro Surveill* 2020, **25**(4).
- 352 11. Kwok KO, Tang A, Wei VWI, Park WH, Yeoh EK, Riley S: **Epidemic Models of Contact Tracing:**
353 **Systematic Review of Transmission Studies of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome and Middle**
354 **East Respiratory Syndrome**. *Comput Struct Biotechnol J* 2019, **17**:186-194.
- 355 12. Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, Neckelmann D: **The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression**
356 **Scale. An updated literature review**. *J Psychosom Res* 2002, **52**(2):69-77.
- 357 13. Snaith RP: **The Hospital Anxiety And Depression Scale**. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2003, **1**:29.

- 358 14. Bocerean C, Dupret E: **A validation study of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) in a**
359 **large sample of French employees.** *BMC Psychiatry* 2014, **14**:354.
- 360 15. Djukanovic I, Carlsson J, Arestedt K: **Is the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) a valid**
361 **measure in a general population 65-80 years old? A psychometric evaluation study.** *Health Qual Life*
362 *Outcomes* 2017, **15**(1):193.
- 363 16. Iani L, Lauriola M, Costantini M: **A confirmatory bifactor analysis of the Hospital Anxiety and**
364 **Depression Scale in an Italian community sample.** *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2014, **12**:84.
- 365 17. Cohen J: **Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences**, 2nd edn. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum
366 Associates; 1988.
- 367 18. **Latest situation of cases of novel coronavirus infection.** In.: Center for Health Protection; 2020.
- 368 19. **Customs Statistics on Control Points Passenger Throughput (Traditional Chinese).** In.: Customs and
369 Excise Department; 2019.
- 370 20. Wei-jie Guan, Zheng-yi Ni, Yu Hu, Wen-hua Liang, Chun-quan Ou, Jian-xing He, Lei Liu HS, Chun-
371 liang Lei, David SC Hui, Bin Du *et al*: **Clinical characteristics of 2019 novel coronavirus infection in**
372 **China.** 2020.
- 373 21. Herrera-Diestra JL, Meyers LA: **Local risk perception enhances epidemic control.** *PLoS One* 2019,
374 **14**(12):e0225576.
- 375 22. Cowling BJ, Ng DM, Ip DK, Liao Q, Lam WW, Wu JT, Lau JT, Griffiths SM, Fielding R: **Community**
376 **psychological and behavioral responses through the first wave of the 2009 influenza A(H1N1)**
377 **pandemic in Hong Kong.** *J Infect Dis* 2010, **202**(6):867-876.
- 378 23. Leung GM, Lam TH, Ho LM, Ho SY, Chan BH, Wong IO, Hedley AJ: **The impact of community**
379 **psychological responses on outbreak control for severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong.**
380 *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2003, **57**(11):857-863.
- 381 24. Bults M, Beaujean DJ, de Zwart O, Kok G, van Empelen P, van Steenbergen JE, Richardus JH, Voeten
382 HA: **Perceived risk, anxiety, and behavioural responses of the general public during the early phase**
383 **of the Influenza A (H1N1) pandemic in the Netherlands: results of three consecutive online surveys.**
384 *BMC Public Health* 2011, **11**:2.
- 385 25. **COVID-19 situation in the WHO European Region.** In.: World Health Organization; 2020.

- 386 26. Paules CI, Marston HD, Fauci AS: **Coronavirus Infections-More Than Just the Common Cold.** *JAMA*
387 2020.
- 388 27. Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, Tian F, Jin DY, Chen L, Wang M: **Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier**
389 **Transmission of COVID-19.** *JAMA* 2020.
- 390 28. Lau JT, Yang X, Tsui H, Kim JH: **Monitoring community responses to the SARS epidemic in Hong**
391 **Kong: from day 10 to day 62.** *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2003, **57**(11):864-870.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Respondent characteristics

Characteristics	Number of respondents (%) (n = 1715)	Effect Size ^a
Sex		0.27
Male	539 (31)	
Female	1176 (69)	
Age (years)		0.82
18-24	441 (26)	
25-34	558 (33)	
35-44	381 (22)	
45-54	197 (11)	
55 or above	138 (8)	
Education attainment		1.14 ^b
Lower secondary or below	58 (3)	
Higher secondary	302 (18)	
Diploma	274 (16)	
Degree or above	1081 (63)	
Living district		0.27
Hong Kong Island	307 (18)	
Kowloon West	128 (7)	
Kowloon East	268 (16)	
New Territories West	471 (27)	
New Territories East	541 (32)	
Employment status		0.57 ^{b,c}
Employee	1106 (64)	
Employer	62 (4)	
Housekeeper	135 (8)	
Student	285 (17)	
Retired	46 (3)	
Unemployed	81 (5)	
Monthly household income (HKD)		Nil ^d
10,000 or below	104 (6)	
10,001 - 20,000	277 (16)	
20,001 - 30,000	297 (17)	
30,001 - 40,000	233 (14)	
40,001 - 60,000	290 (17)	
> 60,000	257 (15)	
Not disclosed	257 (15)	

^a Cohen's w effect size

^b Data for 15 years old or above is extracted from 2016 by-census for comparison.

^c The "unemployed" category is excluded from comparison as it is unavailable from 2016 by-census.

^d The "monthly household income" category is excluded from comparison as it is unavailable from 2016 by-census.

Table 2. Background health conditions and travel history of respondents

Characteristics	Number of respondents (%) (n = 1715)
Self-perceived health status	
Very good / good	1331 (78)
Fair	352 (21)
Very bad / bad	32 (2)
Medical consultation^a in the past 14 days	
Yes	293 (17)
No	1422 (83)
Presence of respiratory symptoms in the past 14 days	
Yes	423 (25)
No	1292 (75)
Leave Hong Kong in the previous month	
Yes ^b	408 (24)
No	1307 (76)
Regular visitors to the Mainland China	
Yes ^c	46 (3)
No	1669 (97)

^a Both Chinese and Western medical consultations are included.

^b Multiple destinations are allowed. Number of respondents (out of 408) who indicated travel outside Hong Kong in the previous month: outside China (294), China - Guangdong province (96), China - other province (13), Macau (29).

^c Number of respondents (out of 46) who indicated regular visit to the Mainland China: daily (4), weekly (7), monthly (21), quarterly (4), and at most quarterly (10).

Table 3. Risk perception of the community towards COVID-19

	Number (%)				
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Perceived susceptibility (assuming no preventive measure)					
How likely you will be infected ^a	776 (45)	751 (44)	160 (9)	23 (1)	5 (0)
How likely your families will be infected ^a	924 (54)	660 (38)	113 (7)	14 (1)	4 (0)
Perceived severity					
Seriousness of symptoms caused by SARS-CoV-19 ^b	1102 (64)	569 (33)	33 (2)	7 (0)	4 (0)
Chance of having COVID-19 cured ^c	190 (11)	552 (32)	708 (41)	239 (14)	26 (2)
Chance of survival if infected with COVID-19 ^c	136 (8)	476 (28)	788 (46)	290 (17)	25 (1)

^a Level 1 = Very likely; Level 2 = Likely; Level 3 = Neutral; Level 4 = Unlikely; Level 5 = Very unlikely

^b Level 1 = Very serious; Level 2 = Serious; Level 3 = Neutral; Level 4 = Not serious; Level 5 = Not serious at all

^c Level 1 = Very low; Level 2 = Low; Level 3 = Neutral; Level 4 = High; Level 5 = Very high

Table 4. Comparison of disease severity


Diseases	Very bad	Bad	Neutral	Not bad	Not bad at all
Emerging infectious disease					
COVID-19	1545 (90)	150 (9)	15 (1)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Existing infectious diseases					
SARS	1551 (91)	133 (8)	21 (1)	2 (0)	4 (0)
2009 pandemic influenza	604 (35)	889 (52)	172 (10)	40 (2)	6 (0)
Seasonal influenza	191 (11)	948 (55)	311 (18)	251 (15)	10 (1)
Non-communicable diseases					
Diabetes	659 (39)	804 (47)	188 (11)	51 (3)	9 (1)
Cancer	1432 (84)	215 (13)	45 (3)	11 (1)	8 (0)
Heart disease	1123 (66)	502 (29)	66 (4)	17 (1)	3 (0)
Acquired immune deficiency syndrome	1354 (79)	257 (15)	69 (4)	22 (1)	9 (1)

Table 5. Information wanted by the respondents

Information you want to receive about COVID-19	Number (%) (n = 1639)
Distribution of cases	1506 (92)
Number of people infected	1497 (91)
Interventions of Hong Kong government	1450 (88)
Preventive measures	1424 (87)
Disease progression	1327 (81)
Symptoms/how to know if one is infected	1310 (80)
Interventions of international organizations	1182 (72)
What to do if infected	1087 (66)
Impact on risk groups	1073 (65)
Risks and consequences	1061 (65)
Interventions of Chinese government	1010 (62)

Table 6. Factors associated with greater adoption of social-distancing interventions during the early phase of the COVID-19 epidemic in Hong Kong

Characteristics	aOR (95% CI)	p-value
Sex		
Male	-	
Female	1.27 (1.02 , 1.58)	0.03
Age (years)		
18-24	-	
25-34	1.21 (0.86 , 1.69)	0.28
35-44	1.06 (0.74 , 1.53)	0.75
45-54	1.08 (0.71 , 1.66)	0.71
55 or above	0.61 (0.36 , 1.02)	0.06
Living district		
Hong Kong Island	-	
Kowloon West	0.97 (0.63 , 1.50)	0.89
Kowloon East	0.93 (0.66 , 1.32)	0.69
NT West	1.32 (0.98 , 1.79)	0.07
NT East	1.55 (1.15 , 2.08)	<0.01
Presence of respiratory symptoms in the past 14 days		
No	-	
Yes	0.82 (0.65 , 1.04)	0.1
Leave Hong Kong in the previous month		
No	-	
Yes	0.71 (0.56 , 0.90)	<0.01
Regular visit to mainland China		
No	-	
Yes	0.49 (0.25 , 0.97)	0.04
Perceived understanding to COVID-19		
Not well / not well at all	-	
Neutral	1.10 (0.78 , 1.56)	0.58
Well / very well	1.84 (1.29 , 2.63)	<0.01
Work status in the past seven days		
Employee	-	
Employer	1.77 (1.03 , 3.05)	0.04
Unemployed	1.62 (1.01 , 2.60)	0.05
Housekeeper	2.13 (1.42 , 3.21)	<0.01
Student	1.03 (0.71 , 1.50)	0.86
Retired	2.08 (1.03 , 4.19)	0.04
HADS-A score	1.07 (1.04 , 1.10)	<0.01



- A. CN: unexplained pneumonia in Wuhan
- B. HK: temperature screenings at border checkpoints for travelers from Wuhan
- C. HK: launch of Preparedness and Response Plan for novel infectious disease of public health significance; activation of the “serious response level”
- D. CN: the first death of the novel coronavirus in Wuhan
- E. WHO: named the disease as “2019-nCoV acute respiratory disease” and the virus as “2019-nCoV” (refer to Y for subsequent renaming)
- F. CN: confirmation of human-to-human transmission of COVID-19
- G. HK: introduction of a health declaration form system on inbound travelers by air from Wuhan
- H. WHO: declined to declare COVID-19 a public health emergency of international concern
- I. HK: the first confirmed COVID-19 case; halt of the sale of high-speed rail tickets to and from Wuhan
- J. HK: activation of the “emergency response level”
- K. HK: closure of public leisure and cultural facilities until further notice
- L. WHO: declared COVID-19 a public-health emergency of international concern.
- M. US: declared the COVID-19 a public health emergency; imposed entry-restriction
- N. HK: four-week school suspension; one-week extension for home-office arrangement for civil servants.
- O. PH: the first death case outside China
- P. HK: medical workers on strike to call for border shutdown
- Q. HK: the first death case of COVID-19; closure of four more border control points
- R. CN: 46 foreign airlines cancelled flights to mainland China
- S. HK: implementation of further port hygiene measures
- T. HK: home-office arrangement for civil servants until 2020-02-16
- U. CN: the first death case of a doctor in Wuhan
- V. HK: introduction of a mandatory 14-day quarantine on individuals entering HK from CN
- W. HK: incidence of a COVID-19 cluster involving nine people in a gathering on 2019-01-26
- X. HK: incidence of a COVID-19 cluster involving five residents (two families) in the same building
- Y. WHO and ICTV: renamed the disease as “COVID-19” and the virus as “SARS-CoV-2”
- Z. HK: home-office arrangement for civil servants until 2020-02-23; school suspension until 2020-03-16

Figure 1. Laboratory confirmed cases and chronology of major events of COVID-19

Abbreviations: China (CN); Hong Kong (HK); International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV); the Philippines (PH); the United States (US); World Health Organization (WHO)




Figure 2. Time trend of HADS-A score




Figure 3. Information reliability and the access to information of COVID-19




Figure 4. Perceived efficacy and actual adoption of precautionary measures to prevent transmission and contracting COVID-19