Knowledge and perceptions of coronavirus disease 2019 among the general public in the United States and the United Kingdom: A cross-sectional online survey

Pascal Geldsetzer[1,*]

[1] Division of Primary Care and Population Health, Department of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

* Corresponding author:

Pascal Geldsetzer MD PhD MPH

Division of Primary Care and Population Health, Department of Medicine, Stanford University

1265 Welch Road, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

E-mail: pgeldsetzer@stanford.edu

Phone: +1 415 694 8503

Abstract

Background: The behavior of the general public will likely have an important bearing on the course of the coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) epidemic. Human behavior is influenced by people's knowledge and perceptions.

Objective: To determine knowledge and perceptions of Covid-19 among the general public in the United States (US) and the United Kingdom (UK).

Design: Cross-sectional online survey conducted between February 23rd and March 3rd 2020.

Setting: Online.

Participants: A sample of 3,000 adults residing in the US and 3,000 adults residing in the UK who were representative of the general population by age, sex, ethnicity, education, and household income.

Measurements: Response to 21 survey questions.

Results: 2,987 of 3,000 US and 2,978 of 3,000 UK adults completed the questionnaire (response rate of 99.4%). The median estimate by participants for the probability of a fatal disease course among those infected with Covid-19 was 4.0% (IQR: 2.0% – 10.0%). Participants generally had good knowledge of the main mode of disease transmission and common symptoms of Covid-19. However, a substantial proportion of participants had misconceptions about how to prevent an infection and the recommended care-seeking behavior. For instance, 33.8% (95% CI: 32.6% – 35.0%) of participants thought that wearing a common surgical mask was 'highly effective' in protecting them from acquiring Covid-19. 27.6% (95% CI: 26.5% – 28.7%) of participants thought it prudent to refrain from eating at Chinese restaurants. In addition, 29.7% (95% CI: 28.1% – 31.3%) of US participants and 40.7% (95% CI: 39.0% – 42.5%) of UK participants stated that if they were an Uber driver, they would at least sometimes refuse rides to passengers with East Asian-sounding names to reduce their risk of

infection. 46.6% (95% CI: 45.3% – 47.8%) of participants thought that children were at an especially high risk of death from Covid-19.

Limitation: While participants were representative of the UK and US adult population by age, sex, ethnicity, household income, and education, they may not be representative by other (unobserved) characteristics.

Conclusion: These findings can guide information campaigns by public health authorities, clinicians, and the media. Rapid online surveys could be an important tool in tracking the public's knowledge and misperceptions of Covid-19 over time.

Primary funding source: National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences

Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) was first reported in Wuhan, China, in December 2019.(1) By the end of February 2020, there were 85,681 confirmed cases and 2,933 reported deaths from Covid-19.(2) While the vast majority of these reported cases and deaths have taken place in China's Hubei Province, the number of new cases *outside* of China has risen rapidly in late February, first surpassing the number of new cases in China on February 26th 2020.(2) This development has raised concerns of the possibility of a pandemic. The World Health Organization (WHO) has declared Covid-19 a "public health emergency of international concern" on January 30th 2020.(3)

Given their connectedness to China and the world in general, both the United States (US) and the United Kingdom (UK) could be faced with sustained community transmission of Covid-19 within weeks. In fact, on February 25th 2020, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention identified for the first time a person in the US who had no travel history or exposure to a known Covid-19 case.(4) The course of the Covid-19 epidemic in the US and the UK will likely be strongly impacted by how the population behaves, which in turn is influenced by what people know and believe about this disease.(5) A particular concern in this regard is the spread of dis- and misinformation about Covid-19 on social media sites, which has led the WHO to host a page with "myth busters" on their website and engage in discussions with social media companies.(6) Understanding what the general public knows about Covid-19 and which misperceptions they hold about the condition is important for US and UK public health authorities as well as the media to design effective information campaigns. This study, therefore, aims to determine knowledge and misperceptions of Covid-19 among the general adult population in both the US and the UK.

Methods

Sampling participants:

This study is a cross-sectional online survey conducted on the research platform created and managed by Prolific Academic Ltd.. Prolific is an online platform that connects researchers with individuals around the world who are interested in participating in online research studies.(7) The platform's pool of participants numbers approximately 80,000 individuals of whom circa 43% reside in the UK and 33% in the US.(8) Researchers are required to pay participants a minimum of $6.50 per hour.

For this study, Prolific selected a sample of 2,987 participants residing in the US and 2,978 participants residing in the UK who are representative by age, sex, and ethnicity (and each combination thereof) of the US and UK general population (using numbers from the latest census in each country), respectively. Prolific achieves representativeness by age, sex, and ethnicity by establishing population strata for the survey into which eligible participants in the online participant pool can enroll on a first-come first-serve basis. Participants had to have indicated that they are fluent in English when registering with Prolific to be eligible for this study.

Data collection:

The data were collected between February 23rd and March 3rd 2020 using an online questionnaire (**Text S1** and **Text S2**). Participants received US$1.50 (UK participants received the equivalent in pound sterling) for participating in the study. Following an informed consent form, the questionnaire asked participants about i) the cause, current state, and future development of the Covid-19 epidemic; ii) the risk of a fatal disease course; iii) knowledge of symptoms and recommended healthcare-seeking behavior; iv) measures to prevent a Covid-19 infection; and v) their perception of the risk posed by individuals of East-Asian ethnicity in their

community. In order to investigate to what degree dis- and misinformation about Covid-19 has affected the general public's beliefs about the condition, participants were directly asked whether or not they believed several falsehoods listed on the WHO's "myth busters" website,(9) which the WHO selected because they had been circulating on social media.(10) Specifically, the questionnaire asked whether receiving a letter or package from China poses a risk of infection, and whether using hand dryers, rinsing your nose with saline, eating garlic, applying sesame oil to the skin, taking antibiotics, and vaccinating against pneumonia are effective in preventing a Covid-19 infection. The questionnaire was built using Qualtrics software. Participants had to answer a question to reach the next question. Numerical entry questions did not allow for non-sensical inputs (e.g., percentage questions were restricted to inputs between 0 and 100).

Data analysis:

For binary and categorical response options, I computed the percentage of participants who selected each response. For Bernoulli trials, I calculated two-sided 95% confidence intervals using the Wilson score interval.(11) The use of sampling weights was not required for age, sex, and ethnicity because, given the sampling strategy, the sample is self-weighting by these variables. I computed and used sampling weights to weight participants to the estimated distribution of total household income and educational attainment in the general population in the US and the UK in 2019.(12, 13)

Six types of data quality checks were performed. First, participants who took less than two minutes to complete the questionnaire were excluded from the analysis because I judged this to indicate random clicking. This resulted in the exclusion of one participant. Second, to further investigate the robustness of the findings to possible random clicking by respondents, I ran all analyses for each question when excluding the 10% and 20% of participants who took the least

time to answer the question. Third, if some respondents used random clicking to obtain the $1.50 reward as fast as possible, then a bimodal distribution in the time taken to complete the survey might be expected (with one study population clicking as fast as possible and one reading the questions). I, therefore, plotted a histogram of the time taken to complete the survey. Fourth, I checked whether any participants always selected the same response option (e.g., always the second option in multiple choice questions), alternating response options (e.g., the first option followed by the second and then again the first), or steadily increasing or decreasing response options (e.g., the first, followed by the second, then the third option, and so on), which was not the case for any participants. Fifth, participants were asked at the end of the questionnaire whether they looked up any answers online (*"It is natural to be tempted to look up the answer to a question, especially when it's only a click away. For approximately how many of the questions did you first look up the answer on Google or somewhere else before responding? The answer to this question will not affect your payment in any way."*) and if so, for which question. Those who self-reported looking up an answer online for a question were excluded from the analysis for that particular question. This was the case for 81 US participants and 63 UK participants who reported looking up the answer online on a median of 1 (IQR: 1 – 5) and 1 (IQR: 1 – 2.5) questions, respectively. Sixth, based on the rationale that this may indicate having looked up an answer online, I ran the analysis for each question when excluding the 10% and 20% of participants who took the longest time to answer the question as a further robustness check.

Results

Sample characteristics:

Out of 3,000 adults residing in the US and 3,000 residing in the UK who could participate, 2,987 and 2,978 adults, respectively, completed the questionnaire (response rate of 99.6% for US and 99.3% for UK adults). Approximately two thirds of US participants and one half of UK participants had a tertiary education degree (**Table 1**). 67.5% (2,015/2,987) of US participants had a total household income between $20,000 and $99,999. 74.4% (2,215/2,978) of UK participants had a total household income between £15,000 and £74,999. 17.3% (516/2,987) of US participants and 13.7% (408/2,978) of UK participants were current students.

Table 1. Sample characteristics

	United States	**United Kingdom**
n	*2,987*	*2,978*
Female, n (%)	1,519 (50.9)	1,528 (51.3)
Age group, n (%)		
18 – 27 years	654 (21.9)	545 (18.3)
28 – 37 years	687 (23.0)	551 (18.5)
38 – 47 years	531 (17.8)	562 (18.9)
48 – 57 years	492 (16.5)	480 (16.1)
≥ 58 years	621 (20.8)	837 (28.1)
Education, n (%)		
Less than a high school diploma / A-Levels	24 (0.8)	396 (13.3)
High school degree / Completed A-Levels	334 (11.2)	680 (22.8)
Some undergraduate education (no degree)	704 (23.6)	368 (12.4)
Associate degree	322 (10.8)	n.a.[1]
Bachelor's degree	1,069 (35.8)	1,027 (34.5)
Master's degree	405 (13.6)	327 (11.0)
Professional degree	63 (2.1)	100 (3.4)
Doctorate	66 (2.2)	80 (2.7)
Total household income, n (%)		
<$10,000 / <£7,500	165 (5.5)	172 (5.8)
$10,000 – $19,000 / £7,500 - £14,999	223 (7.5)	332 (11.1)
$20,000 – $29,000 / £15,000 - £22,499	342 (11.4)	464 (15.6)
$30,000 – $39,000 / £22,500 - £29,999	325 (10.9)	473 (15.9)
$40,000 – $49,000 / £30,000 - £37,499	280 (9.4)	355 (11.9)
$50,000 – $59,000 / £37,500 - £44,999	304 (10.2)	309 (10.4)
$60,000 – $69,000 / £45,000 - £52,499	230 (7.7)	239 (8.0)
$70,000 – $79,000 / £52,500 - £59,999	242 (8.1)	156 (5.2)
$80,000 – $89,000 / £60,000 - £67,499	138 (4.6)	121 (4.1)
$90,000 – $99,000 / £67,500 - £74,999	154 (5.2)	98 (3.3)
$100,000 – $149,000 / £75,000 - £99,999	401 (13.4)	167 (5.6)
≥$150,000 / ≥£100,000	183 (6.1)	92 (3.1)
Race or ethnicity, n (%)		
White	2,269 (76.0)	2,540 (85.3)
Black or African American	392 (13.1)	100 (3.4)
Asian or Asian Indian	192 (6.4)	227 (7.6)
Mixed	74 (2.5)	61 (2.0)
Other	60 (2.0)	50 (1.7)
Current student	516 (17.3)	408 (13.7)

Chinese descent, n (%)		
Born in China	11 (0.4)	15 (0.5)
Parents or grandparents born in China	57 (1.9)	27 (0.9)
Works as a healthcare provider, n (%)		
Nurse	33 (1.1)	44 (1.5)
Physician	5 (0.2)	15 (0.5)
Pharmacist	10 (0.3)	6 (0.2)
Other	102 (3.4)	118 (4.0)

[1] Associate degrees are not awarded in the UK.

Cause, current state, and future development of the Covid-19 epidemic:

On a seven-point Likert scale ranging from ‘extremely unlikely’ to ‘extremely likely’, 23.9% (22.4% – 25.5%) of US participants and 18.3% (16.9% – 19.7%) of UK participants selected ‘slightly likely’, ‘moderately likely’, or ‘extremely likely’ when asked whether Covid-19 is a bioweapon developed by a government or terrorist organization (**Figure S1**). US and UK participants estimated that a median of 100 (IQR: 20 – 500) and 40 (IQR: 13 – 200) individuals in their country, respectively, were currently infected with Covid-19. 66.4% (95% CI: 65.1% – 67.5%) of participants thought that the number of fatalities from Covid-19 in their country will be 500 people or less by the end of 2020 (**Figure 1**).



Figure 1. Percent of participants who selected each category for their estimate of the number of Covid-19 deaths in their country by the end of 2020.

Case fatality rate:

When asked what percent of individuals infected with Covid-19 experience a fatal disease course, the median estimate given by participants was 5.0% (IQR: 2.0% – 15.0%) among US participants and 3.0% (IQR: 2.0% – 10.0%) among UK participants. The full distribution of responses, as well as a magnification of the distribution of responses among those who estimated a risk of death ≤10%, is shown in **Figure 2**.



Figure 2. Distribution of responses to the question "What percent of people who get infected with the new coronavirus die from this infection?"

When asked "when they have been infected, what age groups are most likely to die from the illness caused by the new coronavirus" and presented with the option to select 'children', 'young

adults', or 'older adults' (selecting more than option was possible), 96.3% (95% CI: 95.6% – 96.9%) of participants in the US and 98.2% (95% CI: 97.7% – 98.7%) of participants in the UK selected 'older adults'. However, 53.9% (95% CI: 52.1% – 55.7%) and 39.2% (95% CI: 37.5% – 41.0%) of participants in the US and the UK, respectively, also thought that children were at a high risk of death when infected. Almost all participants in both countries (96.3% [95% CI: 95.6% – 97.0%] in the US and 97.5% [95% CI: 97.0% – 98.1%] in the UK) responded that adults with other health problems were more likely to experience a fatal disease course than those without any other health problems.

Symptoms of COVID-19 and recommended healthcare-seeking behavior:

Most participants in both the US and the UK recognized fever, cough, and shortness of breath as three common symptoms and signs of a Covid-19 infection (**Figure 3**).



Figure 3. Percent of participants who replied with "yes" to whether each of seven symptoms or signs were common in a Covid-19 infection[1]

[1] The horizontal black bars depict 95% confidence intervals using Wilson's method.(11)

When asked *"if you have a fever or cough and recently visited China, or spent time with someone who did, what would be the best course of action?"*, 64.2% (95% CI: 62.4% – 65.9%) of US participants and 64.3% (95% CI: 62.5% – 66.0%) of UK participants responded with the recommended care-seeking option of staying home and contacting their health system. About a third of respondents stated that they would either delay care-seeking, attend the hospital

emergency department unannounced, or take a taxi or public transport to their primary care provider (**Figure 4**).



Figure 4. Responses to the question "If you have a fever or cough and recently visited China, or spent time with someone who did, what would be the best course of action?"

Preventing a Covid-19 infection:

More than 90% of participants in both the US and the UK thought that washing your hands, avoiding close contact with people who are sick, and avoiding touching your eyes, nose, and mouth with unwashed hands were effective in preventing a Covid-19 infection (**Figure 5**). However, a substantial proportion of participants also thought that using a hand dryer, rinsing

your nose with saline, taking antibiotics, and gargling mouthwash were effective prevention measures. 37.8% (95% CI: 36.1% – 39.6%) of US participants and 29.8% (95% CI: 28.2% – 31.5%) of UK participants agreed with the following statement: *"Consistently wearing a face mask is highly effective in protecting you from getting infected with the new coronavirus. For the purpose of this question, "highly effective" is defined as reducing your risk of getting infected by >95% and a "face mask" is a common medical mask."*



Figure 5. Percent of participants who replied with 'yes' to whether each of eleven actions help prevent an infection with Covid-19.[1]

[1] The horizontal black bars depict 95% confidence intervals using Wilson's method.(11)

74.8% (95% CI: 73.2% – 76.3%) of US participants and 81.3% (95% CI: 79.8 – 82.6%) of UK participants correctly selected *"droplets of saliva that land in the mouths or noses of people who are nearby when an infected person sneezes or coughs"* as the main mode of Covid-19 transmission (**Figure S2**). Virtually all participants disagreed with the statement that *"only older adults can become infected with the new coronavirus"* (96.4% [95% CI: 95.8% – 97.1%] of US participants and 97.1% [95% CI: 96.4 – 97.7%] of UK participants) and thought that there is currently no vaccine available that protects against Covid-19 (96.0% [95% CI: 95.2% – 96.7%] of US participants and 97.5% [95% CI: 96.9% – 98.0%] of UK participants). More than 20% of participants in both the US and the UK thought that their government should quarantine everyone coming in from abroad for 14 days and suspend all air travel to their country (**Figure 6**).



Figure 6. Percent of participants who replied with 'yes' to each government action in response the question "At this point in the coronavirus epidemic, do you think your government should implement the following measures to prevent spreading of the virus?".[1]

[1] The horizontal black bars depict 95% confidence intervals using Wilson's method.(11)

Perceptions of the risk posed by community members of East-Asian ethnicity:

More than half of both US and UK participants estimated that the prevalence of Covid-19 among East-Asian individuals in their country was greater than 0.5% (**Figure 7**). This percentage rose to more than 60% for both US and UK participants when asking about the prevalence of Covid-19 among *"adults of East-Asian ethnicity in your neighborhood who wear a face mask".*



Figure 7. Distribution of the responses to questions on Covid-19 prevalence among individuals of East-Asian ethnicity[1]

[1] 32 and 129 participants estimated a prevalence greater than 50% for the prevalence among East-Asian individuals in their country and East-Asian individuals wearing a face mask in their community, respectively. The responses from these individuals are not shown in the histogram above.

25.6% (95% CI: 24.1% – 27.2%) of US participants and 29.6% (95% CI: 28.0% – 31.3%) of UK participants responded with ‘yes’ to the question *“Do you think it would be prudent for you to not eat at Chinese restaurants for the next few weeks to reduce the risk of getting infected with the new coronavirus?”*. Approximately a quarter of participants (29.1% [95% CI: 27.4%– 30.7%] of US participants and 24.4% [95% CI: 22.9% – 26.0%] of UK participants) thought one may become infected with Covid-19 by receiving a package from China. When asked *“If you were an Uber driver today, would you try to reject ride requests from people with East Asian-sounding names (or a profile photo of East-Asian ethnicity) to reduce your risk of getting infected with the new coronavirus?”*, 29.7% (95% CI: 28.1% – 31.3%) of US participants and 40.7% (95% CI: 39.0% – 42.5%) of UK participants responded with ‘sometimes’, ‘often’, or ‘always’ (**Figure 8**).



Figure 8. Distribution of responses to the question "If you were an Uber driver today, would you try to reject ride requests from people with East Asian-sounding names (or a profile photo of East-Asian ethnicity) to reduce your risk of getting infected with the new coronavirus?"

Robustness checks:

For none of the questions in the questionnaire did the results change to a degree that it substantively altered the conclusions when excluding the 10% and 20% of respondents who took the least and the most amount of time to answer a question. There was also no evidence of a bimodal distribution in the time taken to complete the survey (**Figure S3**).

Discussion

The general public in both the US and the UK holds several important misconceptions about Covid-19. Participants in both countries generally overestimated the probability of a fatal disease course among those infected with Covid-19 (the case fatality rate is currently believed to be between one and two percent among reported cases,(1, 14, 15) but could be substantially lower if there are many unreported and/or asymptomatic cases(16)), thought that children were at an especially high risk of death from Covid-19 (which is currently not believed to be the case(1, 15-17)), and believed that common surgical masks are highly effective in protecting them from catching a Covid-19 infection. Participants also vastly overestimated the prevalence of Covid-19 among East-Asian individuals in their communities. Relatedly, a substantial proportion thought that they should refrain from frequenting Chinese restaurants, stated that they would refuse Uber rides to individuals of East-Asian ethnicity, and perceived that receiving a package from China poses a risk of a Covid-19 infection. In general, differences in knowledge and misperceptions between US and UK participants were small.

The findings of this study could be used to set priorities in information campaigns on COVID-19 by public health authorities and the media. Specifically, such information provision could emphasize the comparatively low fatality rate, the low risk posed by individuals of East-Asian ethnicity living in the US and the UK, and that children do not appear to be at a heightened risk of contracting or dying from Covid-19. It is also important to note that while the general public appears to be well informed regarding the common symptoms of Covid-19, over a third of participants selected a healthcare-seeking option that could lead to further transmission of Covid-19. Thus, clear messaging on the recommended care-seeking action when experiencing some of the core symptoms of Covid-19 will be crucial. In addition, to ensure that individuals focus their attention on those prevention measures that are most effective, this study suggests

that it will be important to inform the public about the comparative effectiveness of common surgical masks versus frequent and thorough handwashing and avoiding close contact with people who are sick.

Public health information campaigns may also want to directly target some of the mis- and disinformation that appears to have circulated on social media.(6, 9, 10, 18) Such measures could include information that rinsing your nose with saline, using a hand dryer, taking antibiotics, and gargling mouthwash are not effective prevention measures, and that receiving a letter or package from China does not pose a risk of Covid-19 infection. These are all falsehoods listed on the WHO's "myth busters" website that a substantial proportion of participants in this study believed.(9) More broadly, this study underscores the need for the WHO and other public health bodies to continue working with social media campaigns to minimize the circulation of inaccurate information about Covid-19. In line with recent media reporting that this conspiracy theory has been actively spread on Twitter,(18) about one in five participants believed it to be 'slightly likely', 'moderately likely', or 'extremely likely' that SARS-CoV-2 is a bioweapon developed by a government or terrorist organization.

Participants did not expect that a large number of individuals would die from Covid-19 in their country by the end of 2020. This finding may be surprising considering that fear-inducing headlines in the media may (at least up to a certain extent(19)) result in more attention by readers than more emotionally neutral ones, which could result in a catastrophizing of the epidemic. Moving forward, information campaigns on Covid-19 may need to balance the messaging of two important facts about the Covid-19 epidemic that could be interpreted by the general public to stand in direct conflict with each other. That is, on the one hand, the case fatality rate of Covid-19 appears to be lower compared to other recent infectious disease outbreaks, such as Ebola,(20) the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS),(21) and the

Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS).(21, 22) On the other hand, however, the epidemic could cause a large number of fatalities, which implies that actions by governments and the general public to reduce transmission of Covid-19 could save many lives.

This study has several limitations. First, while the sample of participants is representative of the US and UK general population by age, sex, and ethnicity, and the distribution of participants by household income and education was similar to that in the US and UK general population (and weighted in the analysis to be exactly representative by household income and education), participants may still differ from the general population on a variety of other characteristics. These characteristics may be both correlated with their knowledge and perceptions of Covid-19 as well as with their decision to participate in the study and/or to create a profile with Prolific. However, conducting a nationally representative household survey in the time frame needed to yield useful insights for a rapidly developing infectious disease epidemic is infeasible. Similarly, random-digit-dial phone surveys tend to suffer from very low response rates (typically well below 10%(23)), which can be a major source of bias even when sophisticated weighting adjustments are undertaken.(24) Second, the estimates of discrimination against individuals of East-Asian ethnicity may be an underestimate because some participants may not have wanted to volunteer their discriminating tendencies to themselves or to the researcher. However, I as the researcher had no access to any identifying information about the research participants and participants were reminded of this fact prior to answering the question. In addition, such social desirability bias has been found to be lower in online surveys than in telephone or in-person surveys.(25, 26) Third, it is possible that some participants may have randomly selected responses to spend the least amount of time in order to earn the $1.50 reward. I believe this is unlikely to be an important source of bias because i) only one individual completed the survey in under two minutes (while it was physically possible to complete it in well under 90 seconds), ii) the results for each question were robust to excluding the 10% and 20% of survey respondents

who took the shortest amount of time to complete the question, iii) there was no bimodal distribution in the time taken to complete the survey, and iv) $1.50 is a relatively small monetary incentive suggesting that earning the reward was probably not the main motivation for participating in the study. Lastly, it is possible that individuals looked up the answers to some of the questions online prior to answering, which may have biased the results from factual (rather than opinion-focused) questions. Participants were reminded of the importance not to look up answers online prior to taking the survey and were asked at the end of the survey (while being reassured that their payment is not influenced by whether they volunteer information on having looked up an answer online) for which, if any, questions they searched for an answer online prior to responding.

The general public in the US and the UK appears to have important misconceptions about Covid-19, which should be targeted in information campaigns organized by government agencies, information provision by clinicians to their patients, and news coverage furnished by the media and social media platforms. Ensuring that the general public is well informed about Covid-19 could reduce unnecessary anxiety as well as reduce transmission of the virus and, thus, ultimately save lives.

Funding source:

PG was supported by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number KL2TR003143.

IRB approval:

This study received an exemption for minimal risk research by the Stanford University Institutional Review Board on February 22 2020.

References

1. WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019. Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2020.
2. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020.
3. World Health Organization. Statement on the second meeting of the International Health Regulations (2005) Emergency Committee regarding the outbreak of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). Geneva, Switzerland; 2020.
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2020;Pageshttps://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/summary.html on February 29 2020.
5. Janz NK, Becker MH. The Health Belief Model: A Decade Later. Health Education Quarterly. 1984;11(1):1-47.
6. Zarocostas J. How to fight an infodemic. The Lancet. 2020;395(10225):676.
7. Prolific Academic Ltd. 2020;Pages. Accessed at Prolific Academic Ltd. at https://www.prolific.co/#researcher-content on February 29 2020.
8. Prolific 2020;Pages. Accessed at Prolific at https://www.prolific.co/demographics on February 17 2020.
9. World Health Organization 2020;Pages. Accessed at World Health Organization at https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public/myth-busters on February 29 2020.
10. Richtel M. W.H.O. Fights a Pandemic Besides Coronavirus: an 'Infodemic'. The New York Times. New York, NY, USA: The New York Times; 2020.
11. Wilson EB. Probable Inference, the Law of Succession, and Statistical Inference. Journal of the American Statistical Association. 1927;22(158):209-12.
12. United States Census Bureau 2020;Pages. Accessed at United States Census Bureau at https://www.census.gov/data.html on March 1 2020.
13. Office for National Statistics 2020;Pages. Accessed at Office for National Statistics at https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity on March 1 2020.
14. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Jama. 2020.
15. Guan W-j, Ni Z-y, Hu Y, Liang W-h, Ou C-q, He J-x, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. New England Journal of Medicine. 2020.
16. Fauci AS, Lane HC, Redfield RR. Covid-19 — Navigating the Uncharted. New England Journal of Medicine. 2020.
17. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2020;Pages. Accessed at Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, at https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/specific-groups/children-faq.html on February 29 2020.
18. Romm T. Millions of tweets peddled conspiracy theories about coronavirus in other countries, an unpublished U.S. report says. The Washington Post. Washington, D.C., USA: The Washington Post; 2020.
19. Kim HS, Forquer H, Rusko J, Hornik RC, Cappella JN. Selective Exposure to Health Information: The Role of Headline Features in the Choice of Health Newsletter Articles. Media Psychology. 2016;19(4):614-37.
20. Jacob ST, Crozier I, Fischer WA, 2nd, Hewlett A, Kraft CS, Vega MA, et al. Ebola virus disease. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2020;6(1):13.

21. de Wit E, van Doremalen N, Falzarano D, Munster VJ**.** SARS and MERS: recent insights into emerging coronaviruses. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2016;14(8):523-34.
22. Mahase E**.** Coronavirus: covid-19 has killed more people than SARS and MERS combined, despite lower case fatality rate. BMJ. 2020;368:m641.
23. Kennedy C, Hartig H 2019;Pages. Accessed at Pew Research Center at https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/02/27/response-rates-in-telephone-surveys-have-resumed-their-decline/ on March 1 2020.
24. Katharine G. Abraham, Sara Helms, Stanley Presser**.** How Social Processes Distort Measurement: The Impact of Survey Nonresponse on Estimates of Volunteer Work in the United States. American Journal of Sociology. 2009;114(4):1129-65.
25. Kreuter F, Presser S, Tourangeau R**.** Social Desirability Bias in CATI, IVR, and Web Surveys: The Effects of Mode and Question Sensitivity. Public Opinion Quarterly. 2009;72(5):847-65.
26. Keeter S 2015;Pages. Accessed at Pew Research Center at https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/2015/05/13/from-telephone-to-the-web-the-challenge-of-mode-of-interview-effects-in-public-opinion-polls/ on March 1 2020.