

# Preventive behavior of Vietnamese people in response to the COVID-19 pandemic

Nhan Phuc Thanh **Nguyen**<sup>1</sup>, Tuyen Dinh **Hoang**<sup>2</sup>, Vi Thao **Tran**<sup>1</sup>, Cuc Thi **Vu**<sup>1</sup>,

Joseph Nelson **Siewe Fodjo**<sup>3</sup>, Robert **Colebunders**<sup>3</sup> Michael P. **Dunne**<sup>1,4</sup>, Van Thang **Vo**<sup>1,2\*</sup>

## Affiliations

<sup>1</sup> *Institute for Community Health Research, University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Hue*

*University, Vietnam*

<sup>2</sup> *Faculty of Public Health, University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Hue University, Vietnam*

<sup>3</sup> *Global Health Institute, University of Antwerp, Belgium*

<sup>4</sup> *Faculty of Health, Queensland University of Technology, Australia*

## \*Corresponding author:

**Vo, Van Thang**

Email: [vovanthang147@hueuni.edu.vn](mailto:vovanthang147@hueuni.edu.vn)

ORCID: 0000-0003-2018-0371

**Keywords:** COVID-19; Vietnam; social distancing; face masks; adherence

21 **Abstract** (word count: 197)

22 We sought to evaluate the adherence of Vietnamese adults to COVID-19 preventive measures, and  
23 gain insight into the effects of the epidemic on the daily lives of Vietnamese people. An online  
24 questionnaire survey was organized from March 31 to April 6, 2020. The questionnaire assessed  
25 preventive behavior using multiple-answer responses to indicate the extent of adherence. In total,  
26 2175 respondents completed the questionnaire (age range: 18–69 years). The mean adherence  
27 scores for personal and community preventive measures were  $7.23 \pm 1.63$  (range 1-9) and  $9.57 \pm$   
28  $1.12$  (range 1-11), respectively. Perceived adaptation of the community to lockdown ( $\beta=2.64$ , 95%  
29 CI 1.25-4.03), fears/worries concerning one’s health ( $\beta=2.87$ , 95% CI 0.04-5.70), residing in large  
30 cities ( $\beta=19.40$ , 95% CI 13.78-25.03), access to official COVID-19 information sources ( $\beta=16.45$ ,  
31 95% CI 6.82-26.08), and belonging to the healthcare sector ( $\beta=22.53$ , 95% CI 16.00-29.07) were  
32 associated with a higher adherence score to anti-COVID instructions. The study indicates excellent  
33 preventive behavior of the Vietnamese population which explains the low number of COVID-19  
34 infections and zero recorded mortality up to the first week of May 2020. Further monitoring is  
35 recommended to assess the sustainability of COVID-19 prevention via behavior change in the  
36 medium and long-term.

## 37 **Introduction**

38           In December 2019, an unknown viral pneumonia outbreak erupted in China and has been  
39 spreading on a global scale (1). Due to the high likelihood of virus transmission via large droplets  
40 and fomites, COVID-19 infection spread rapidly around the planet (2). Preventive public health  
41 measures have been implemented to fight the pandemic. Although the strategies applied  
42 internationally are similar, the timeliness, scale, and assertiveness of implementation regimes have  
43 varied considerably (3).

44           In Vietnam, the first person with a COVID-19 infection was detected on January 23<sup>rd</sup> and  
45 as of May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2020, Vietnam had totaled 271 confirmed cases with zero deaths (4). Currently  
46 Vietnam is among the countries with the lowest number of reported cases, which is remarkable  
47 given its population size (approx. 95 million people) and proximity to the epicenter. From the start  
48 of the outbreak the government of Vietnam implemented intensive control in the northern Vinh  
49 Phuc province (considered to be the local focus of the disease) using a strategy of rapid testing for  
50 early detection of sources of infection, assertive contact tracing, timely isolation and free clinical  
51 care for people with the infection. Community preventive efforts were implemented early and have  
52 been pervasive throughout the country. The government supported social distancing, self-isolation  
53 of vulnerable people, mandatory isolation of symptomatic people and those who test positive, focal  
54 environmental sanitization, frequent hand washing and wearing of face masks in all public spaces.

55           By February 25<sup>th</sup>, one month after the first case was recorded, all patients had successfully  
56 recovered and had been discharged from hospitals. After more than 20 days with no new case  
57 reported, the 17<sup>th</sup> positive case of COVID-19 was confirmed on March 6<sup>th</sup>. Another wave of the  
58 epidemic hit the country with cases being imported from Europe, the USA, and other countries.  
59 This led to an increase in domestic transmission of COVID-19, thus ushering in the second stage  
60 of the epidemic. Fortunately, the government and health agencies had pandemic preparedness and

61 control plans in place following the fairly recent experience with fighting SARS, Swine Flu and  
62 Avian Influenza. The Government implemented national measures restricting travel and  
63 suspended visas for foreigners entering Vietnam. On March 20<sup>th</sup>, community transmission was  
64 indicated when the 86<sup>th</sup> and 87<sup>th</sup> COVID-19 patients had no travel history and no apparent contact  
65 with COVID-19 patients (4). To further prevent disease spread in the community, on March 31<sup>st</sup>  
66 the Prime Minister mandated urgent measures, including strict social distancing throughout the  
67 country for 15 days. Accordingly, all people were required to stay at home, only go out in case of  
68 necessity, and keep a minimum distance of at least 2 meters when moving outdoors; shut down all  
69 non-essential business activities and services, only allow essential services such as food  
70 distribution, non-elective medical procedures, pharmacies store and the fuel supply. In addition,  
71 gatherings of more than 2 people were prohibited (5).

72 The primary purpose of this study was to assess how well the people have adhered to these  
73 instructions because they are crucial in preventing the spread of the virus. We also sought to  
74 investigate the effects of the epidemic on the daily lives of Vietnamese people.

## 75 **Materials and methods**

### 76 **Study design**

77 We conducted a descriptive cross-sectional survey during which we received voluntary  
78 responses continuously for seven consecutive days (from March 31<sup>st</sup> to April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020).

### 79 **Study procedures**

80 Data were collected through an online survey initiated by the ICPcovid consortium  
81 (<https://www.icpcovid.com/>). A secure website was used to design and host an online  
82 questionnaire, which was adapted to local Vietnamese context. The research team translated the  
83 English questionnaire into Vietnamese, conducted a pilot test and improved the questionnaire  
84 before official use. It took about 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The web link to the

85 online questionnaire was disseminated via various social media platforms, and consenting  
86 volunteers submitted their information anonymously. The data became available immediately  
87 upon submission. The online questionnaire was kept open for one week (recruitment period) after  
88 which it was closed and inaccessible.

## 89 **Sample size and sampling**

90 Sampling was done using the snow-ball approach: as more persons completed the online  
91 questionnaire, they were encouraged to share the survey web link to their contacts. Only data from  
92 respondents who self-identified as being at least 18 years old, who were Vietnamese citizens,  
93 understood the Vietnamese language, and resided in Vietnam at the time of the study were retained  
94 for this analysis.

## 95 **Data collection**

96 The first part of the questionnaire gathered socio-demographic information, including  
97 participants' age, gender, profession, urban vs rural residence, religion, educational level, marital  
98 status, housing conditions and household composition.

99 Given that our study sought to evaluate the level of adherence to the preventive measures  
100 recommended by the government, our study outcomes included the proportions of participants  
101 who reported following the lockdown instructions against COVID-19 Yes or No answers were  
102 given to show whether the person had followed each guideline during the previous week. Overall  
103 adherence was assessed by summing the answers with higher scores reflected higher adherence.  
104 We also asked participants to self-report their difficulty in staying home as required during the  
105 lockdown, using a 5-point Likert scale (1=not difficult at all to 5 =extremely difficult).

106 Adherence to **personal preventive measures** was assessed by using 9 questions, covering  
107 the following aspects: following the 1.5-2m meters social distance rule; wearing a face mask when  
108 outside; avoiding touching the face; covering of mouth and nose when coughing/sneezing; hand

109 hygiene via regular hand washing and/or disinfection with sanitizer; frequency of body  
110 temperature check; disinfecting mobile phone frequently.

111 Adherence to **community preventive measures** was assessed with 11 questions with a  
112 focus on the following strategies: avoiding meetings/gatherings; avoiding being in a vehicle/bus  
113 with more than 10 persons; avoiding going to crowded entertainment venues/ public gym/ beauty  
114 salon; avoiding funeral attendance; avoiding going to a fresh food market; usage of individual  
115 spoons and plates when eating together with family/non-family members; avoiding travel to  
116 another province/country during the lockdown period.

### 117 **Study covariates**

118 In addition to socio-demographic characteristics, data were collected to adjust the observed  
119 adherence scores for potential confounders. These items inquired about domestic life and  
120 professional activities during the COVID-19 pandemic. Fears about the participants' health as well  
121 as their family well-being were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1= not worried/afraid to 5=  
122 extremely worried/afraid). Similarly, perceived adaptation of the community to lockdown  
123 instructed from the government was evaluated via 10-point Likert scale (1= no adaption to 10=  
124 very strong adaptation).

### 125 **Ethical Considerations**

126 Anonymity and informed consent were assured. The study was approved by the Ethical  
127 Review Committee of Hue University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Vietnam (No. H202/041 dated  
128 March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2020).

### 129 **Data analysis**

130 Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 20.0. Descriptive statistics presented  
131 continuous data as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD), while categorical variables were presented as  
132 percentages. Adherence to anti-COVID-19 measures was the dependent variable of this study.

133 Multiple linear regression model was used to analyze which independent variables associated with  
134 squared-transformed adherence scores. 95% confidence intervals and a p-value of less than 0.05  
135 were used for significance testing.

## 136 **Results**

### 137 **Respondent characteristics and their daily activities**

138 A total of 2192 persons completed the online questionnaire. After data cleaning and  
139 application of inclusion criteria, 2175 responses were kept. The participants resided in 55/63  
140 provinces of Vietnam. 1054 (48.5%) lived in major municipalities (Ha No, Ho Chi Minh City, Hai  
141 Phong, Can Tho, and Da Nang) and 1431 (65.8%) lived in smaller urban or rural areas. The mean  
142 age was 31.39 years (SD: 10.66, range: 18-69), and the majority of participants (66.9%) were  
143 women. The characteristics of our study participants are summarized in Table 1.

144 **Table 1. Characteristics of study participants (n=2175)**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	
Gender	Male	716	32.9
Highest educational level	University and higher	1679	77.2
Marital status	Married	1000	46.0
Religion	No Religion	1651	75.9
Place of residence	Municipalities	1054	48.5
	Smaller urban or rural areas	1121	51.5
Occupation	Student	542	24.9
	Government staff	768	35.3
	Private enterprise	766	35.2
	Unemployed	99	4.6

Health Professional/student	Yes	1673	76.9
Urban/Rural or Semi-Rural residence	Urban	1431	65.8
	Sub-urban/Rural	744	34.2
Currently living with	Alone	139	6.4
	With children	1232	56.6
	With the elderly	332	15.3
Smoking	Yes	147	6.8
Eating more healthy food	Yes	1917	88.1
Taking more vitamin tablets	Yes	1262	58.0

145

## 146 **Impact of COVID-19 on respondents' domestic and professional** 147 **habits**

148 Most participants said they obtained COVID-19 information through official sources such  
149 as state television (81.1%) and the Ministry of Health of Vietnam website (74.5%). Of the 1613  
150 participants with a stable job, 777 (48.2%) started working from home because of the epidemic.  
151 Confinement measures resulted in 133 (6.1%) participants experiencing difficulties in obtaining  
152 food, and 42 (1.9%) persons reported suffering from some form of violence/discrimination because  
153 of the restrictive measures taken against COVID-19. Moreover, on a 5-point Likert scale, 30.0%  
154 and 42.3% of respondents reported a score of  $\geq 3$  indicating that they had moderate to high levels  
155 of fear and worry about their own health, and that of their relatives, respectively (Table 2).

156 **Table 2. Impact of COVID-19 confinement measures on domestic and professional habits**

Characteristic	n	%
Fear and worry about respondents' health	652	30.0

Fear and worry about their relatives' health		919	42.3
Difficulties in obtaining food		133	6.1
Working from home (n=1613)		777	48.2
Experienced violence or discrimination during the confinement		42	1.9
Physical activity during the epidemic (n=453)		421	92.9
	Indoor, with music	148	32.7
Type of physical activity	Indoor, with online video	49	10.8
	Outdoor	271	59.8

157

158 **Adherence to social distancing measures in the national response to**  
 159 **the threat of COVID-19**

160 **Adherence to personal preventive measures**

161 At the individual level, participants reported few difficulties in complying with the stay-at-  
 162 home measures instituted by the government (mean difficulty score on the Likert scale:  $1.69 \pm$   
 163  $0.86$ ; range 1 to 5). “Wearing a face mask when going outside” had the highest compliance rate of  
 164 99.5%, “regular hand washing with soap and water during the day” and “covering of mouth and  
 165 nose with a tissue paper when coughing or sneezing” ranked in the next position, with 97.4% and  
 166 94.9%, respectively. The least compliance was found for “measuring body temperature at least  
 167 twice a week” with 45.1% (Table 3). Using a 9-item score, the mean level of personal adherence  
 168 to preventive measures was  $7.23 \pm 1.63$ ; range: 1 to 9.

169 **Table 3. Adherence to personal preventive measures for COVID-19**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Follow the 1.5-2m social distance rule	1919	88.2
Face mask use when outdoor	2165	99.5
Cover mouth and nose when coughing/sneezing	2065	94.9
Usually wash/disinfect hands immediately after coughing/sneezing	1813	83.4
Wash hands regularly with water and soap during the day	2119	97.4
Use hand sanitizer/gel regularly during the day	1767	81.2
Body temperature check at least twice a week	980	45.1
Avoid touching my face, eyes, nose and mouth with my hands	1852	85.1
Disinfect phone when I get home	1047	48.1

170

### 171 **Adherence to community preventive measures**

172 During the previous week, most of the respondents said they “Had not traveled to another  
 173 province/country”, “Avoided going to a religious gathering”, and “Avoided going to a public gym”  
 174 with adherence rates at 99.4%, 99.3% and 99.2%, respectively. However, nearly half of the  
 175 participants had visited the fresh market in the past seven days (Table 4). Adherence scores for  
 176 community preventive measures, as assessed by 11 questions, ranged from 0 to 11; mean score:  
 177  $9.57 \pm 1.12$ . Most respondents reported that their community readily adapted their behaviors to the  
 178 government’s instructions, as reflected by an adaptability score of  $\geq 6$  on the 10-point Likert scale  
 179 in 76% of cases.

180 **Table 4. Adherence to community preventive measures for COVID-19**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Avoided meeting or gathering with more than 10 persons in last seven days	1791	82.3

---

Avoided going to a restaurant, bar, or club in the last seven days	2147	98.7
Avoided attending a funeral in the last seven days	2117	97.3
Avoided going to a religious gathering during the last seven days	2160	99.3
Avoided going to a public gym in the past 7 days	2157	99.2
Avoided going to a beauty parlor, massages, spa, hairdresser or nail studio	2121	97.5
Avoided being in a vehicle or bus with more than 5 persons in last seven days	2079	95.6
Avoided using of common plates/spoons when eating with family during last seven days	1137	52.3
Avoid using of common plates/spoons when eating with strangers during last seven days	1986	91.3
Avoided going to a market during the last seven days	950	43.7
Had not traveled outside my city during the last seven days	2162	99.4

---

181

182 **Factors associated with adherence to government measures against**  
183 **COVID-19**

184 Summing the responses from self-reports for both personal and community prevention  
185 strategies, produced an overall adherence score up to a maximum of 20. Respondents' scores  
186 ranged from 2 to 20, with a mean of  $16.80 \pm 2.13$ . Total adherence scores were squared-  
187 transformed to fit a normal distribution and used as the dependent variable in linear regression  
188 models investigating factors associated with adherence to preventive measures (Table 5). We  
189 observed that worries about one's health, perceived adaptation of the community to the lockdown,  
190 residence in large municipalities, official sources of Covid-19 information, and having a  
191 professional role in the health sector (worker or student) were associated with higher adherence  
192 scores. Conversely, people with higher perceived difficulty in obeying lockdown order to stay at

193 home had significantly lower adherence scores after adjusting for socio-demographic  
194 characteristics and other confounders (Model adjusted R-squared = 0.144).

195  
196 **Table 5. Multiple linear regression investigating factors associated with adherence to the**  
197 **COVID-19 preventive measures**

Co-variates	Estimate (95% Confidence interval)	P-value
Age	-0.08 (-0.36 – 0.20)	0.567
Gender: Male	2.86 (-3.09 – 8.81)	0.346
Fear and worry about their own health (Likert score)	2.87 (0.04 – 5.70)	0.047
Perceived adaptation of the community to lockdown (Likert score)	2.64 (1.25 – 4.03)	<0.001
Difficulty in obeying lockdown (Likert score)	-23.97 (-27.39 – -20.55)	<0.001
Residence in large Municipalities	19.40 (13.78 – 25.03)	<0.001
Official sources to obtain Covid-19 information	16.45 (6.82 – 26.08)	0.001
Being a healthcare worker/student	22.53 (16.00 – 29.07)	<0.001

## 198 **Discussion**

199 The government of Vietnam took relatively prompt and intensive measures to reduce the  
200 spread of COVID-19 infection in Vietnam. Our data show that most Vietnamese people who  
201 participated in the survey complied with most strategies to prevent infection. Very few people  
202 resisted the orders for using face masks, frequent hand washing, avoiding large gatherings, or  
203 proper social distancing. Probably as a consequence of this early intervention and high uptake of  
204 protective behaviors, up to the first week of May 2020 the spread has been minimised with only

205 63 new cases since the implementation of strategies for the whole population, and no new cases  
206 detected in the community since April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020 (6).

207 Most companies/organizations have applied unprecedented working methods in  
208 accordance with national efforts to promote working from home. This study found that 48.2% of  
209 workers were obliged to work from home during the COVID-19 confinement. Although negative  
210 effects of social distancing on people's jobs and lives might emerge if sustained for long periods,  
211 the participants in this study indicated relatively few difficulties in the short term, such as meeting  
212 daily needs for food.

### 213 **Respondents' adherence to social distancing measures**

214 The survey revealed that many people were moderately to severely worried or afraid about  
215 the health risks for family members (42.3%) and this was more than the level of concern about  
216 their own health (30.0%). This may reflect the mean age of participants; as most were young adults,  
217 they may be concerned about risks to older family members, which is particularly relevant in  
218 Vietnam where many people live in multi-generational extended family households.

219 It is common and easy to apply measures such as wearing a mask, washing hands frequently  
220 with soap or disinfectant solutions. Although the efficacy of non-medical masks in preventing  
221 COVID-19 spread is currently subject to debate, mask use among infected persons can limit the  
222 spread of the virus to the outside environment (7-9). The rate of wearing masks when going out in  
223 this study was 99.5%, similar to an estimate of 98% in a Chinese study but higher than 70.1%  
224 observed in Japan (9, 10)

225 Two reasons for such high mask use are the fact that the Vietnamese government made  
226 mask use mandatory from April 1<sup>st</sup>, and that in many parts of the country, a majority of the people  
227 have a habit of wearing masks to cope with air pollution (5, 11). Although negative social  
228 interactions regarding face mask usage have been reported in some parts of the World (12), in

229 Vietnam and some East Asian countries such as China, Japan, and Korea, wearing face masks is  
230 ubiquitous (13). It has been practiced for health and cultural reasons (7, 13), so the transition to  
231 more widespread mask wearing in response to COVID-19 appears not to have caused a conflict  
232 that can sometimes arise if people are forced to change cultural norms.

233 The implementation of community prevention measures was applied very early in response  
234 to a localized outbreak in a northern province, and this was re-enforced from April 1<sup>st</sup> with official  
235 implementation of nationwide social distancing. The shutdown nationally has been unprecedented,  
236 with all except essential businesses closed (5). People were advised to stay at home as a patriotic  
237 act, and only go out when necessary. Information about outbreaks in healthcare, religious  
238 gatherings and entertainment facilities was disseminated widely via mainstream and social media  
239 (14, 15). In this survey, the item “Avoided going to a fresh market” had the lowest adherence  
240 (43.7%), probably because fresh foods are indispensable in the household and also due to the fact  
241 there were many women (66.9%) in the sample and women tend most often to procure fresh food  
242 in Vietnam. It is worth noting that in the national social distancing regulations, going to the market  
243 is a valid reason to leave the house, although people were asked to reduce the frequency of this  
244 activity to the bare minimum (5).

245 People living in Municipalities had higher adherence scores, perhaps because about 70%  
246 of the COVID-19 cases were diagnosed in cities (16). Many respondents were working as  
247 healthcare professionals or were medical students, so they may tend to be more adherent to health  
248 protection efforts. Age and gender were not significantly associated with adherence score in this  
249 study (Table 5).

250 The high adherence to state recommendations has proven extremely important in the fight  
251 against COVID-19 infection. Positive attitudes and compliant behavior indicate that most people

252 in the survey tend to believe in the Government's motives and requirements, showing solidarity  
253 and supportive attitudes during the epidemic. According to Berlin-based Dalia Research, 62% of  
254 respondents in Vietnam believe the government is doing the “right amount” in response to the  
255 COVID-19 pandemic (17); it is therefore not surprising that Vietnam has been internationally  
256 recognized for their success in controlling COVID-19 (18). In our study, the proportion of  
257 respondents receiving information from reliable sources was high, which showed that most people  
258 were careful to avoid unreliable advice and deliberate misinformation. Notably, the Vietnamese  
259 government has sanctioned acts that spread fake news (19).

260         There are several limitations of this study. First, the respondents were not a representative  
261 sample of the Vietnamese population. Indeed, respondents were mainly people from medium to  
262 high social strata, since poor and vulnerable populations in Vietnam may have limited internet  
263 access. The snowball sampling method and recruitment over just one week possibly explains the  
264 high proportion of health professionals and health science students. Random sampling of the  
265 population is necessary. Second, it is not possible to verify the veracity of responses provided via  
266 a web-based questionnaire. Third, the cross-sectional study design provided only a snapshot of  
267 preventive behaviour over one week. It will be important to monitor adherence to official  
268 recommendations over time as societies adapt to changing conditions throughout the unpredictable  
269 course of this pandemic.

## 270 **Conclusion**

271         The study provides insight into compliance with the social distancing and other risk  
272 mitigation measures implemented in Vietnam in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Overall,  
273 adherence to government instructions was high and most likely played a role in rapidly controlling  
274 the epidemic in Vietnam and limiting its public health impact. On April 27<sup>th</sup> the strict lockdown

275 measures were stopped and life is gradually returning to normal in Vietnam, albeit with a stronger  
276 than usual emphasis on personal protection during social interactions. Careful monitoring for  
277 potential new imported COVID infections and community transmission will be needed to prevent  
278 a resurgence of the epidemic.

## 279 **Acknowledgements**

280 We are grateful to the respondents for their participation. The authors would also like to  
281 thank all institutions and stakeholders across the country for supporting us to collect data via online  
282 questionnaires. Finally, we would also like to acknowledge Prof. Nguyen Vu Quoc Huy, Rector  
283 of University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Hue University, Vietnam for his wonderful support for  
284 conducting this study in the difficult time of COVID-19 pandemic occurred.

## 285 **Authors' contributions**

286 TVV, NPTN, JNSF, and RC contributed to the study design and conceptualization. NPTN,  
287 TDH and TVV did the statistical analysis, interpretation, data and drafting of the initial manuscript.  
288 NPTN and TVV coordinated the study design and data collection. NPTN, TVV, MPD, VTT, CTV,  
289 TDH, JNSF and RC critically revised the draft manuscript. All authors have read and approved  
290 the final manuscript

## 291 **Declaration of conflicting interests**

292 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

## 293 **Funding**

294 This study received financial support from the Institute for Community Health Research,  
295 University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Hue University, Vietnam and Global Health Institute,  
296 University of Antwerp, Belgium.

## 297 **References**

- 298 **1.** Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected  
299 with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):497-506.
- 300 **2.** Alfonso J Rodríguez-Morales KM, Sanch Kanagarajah, Dipti Patel, Patricia Schlegelhauf.  
301 Going global – Travel and the 2019 novel coronavirus. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease*.  
302 2020;33.
- 303 **3.** WHO. WHO Director-General's remarks at the media briefing on 2019-nCoV on 11  
304 February 2020 2020 [cited 2020 05 May]. Available from:  
305 [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-2019-ncov-on-11-february-2020)  
306 [on-2019-ncov-on-11-february-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-2019-ncov-on-11-february-2020). (accessed May 05, 2020)
- 307 **4.** Vietnamese Ministry of Health. Covid-19 updates as of April 10th, 2020 2020 [Available  
308 from: <https://ncov.moh.gov.vn/dong-thoi-gian>. (accessed May 05, 2020)
- 309 **5.** Vietnamese Prime Minister of Government. DIRECTIVE NO. 16/CT-TTG Dated March  
310 31, 2020 On Implementation of Urgent Measures for Prevention and Control of Covid-19 2020  
311 [Available from: [http://datafile.chinhphu.vn/file-remote-](http://datafile.chinhphu.vn/file-remote-v2/DownloadServlet?filePath=vbpcq/2020/03/16.signed.pdf)  
312 [v2/DownloadServlet?filePath=vbpcq/2020/03/16.signed.pdf](http://datafile.chinhphu.vn/file-remote-v2/DownloadServlet?filePath=vbpcq/2020/03/16.signed.pdf). (accessed May 05, 2020)
- 313 **6.** Vietnamese Ministry of Health. Timeline of Covid-19 in Vietnam 2020 [Available from:  
314 <https://ncov.moh.gov.vn/web/guest/dong-thoi-gian>. (accessed May 05, 2020)
- 315 **7.** Greenhalgh T, Schmid MB, Czypionka T, Bassler D, Gruer L. Face masks for the public  
316 during the covid-19 crisis. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1435.
- 317 **8.** WHO. Advice on the use of masks in the context of COVID-19 2020 [cited 2020 05 May].  
318 Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-outbreak)  
319 [community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-outbreak)  
320 [coronavirus-\(2019-ncov\)-outbreak](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-outbreak). (accessed May 05, 2020)
- 321 **9.** Zhong B-L, Luo W, Li H-M, Zhang Q-Q, Liu X-G, Li W-T, et al. Knowledge, attitudes,  
322 and practices towards COVID-19 among Chinese residents during the rapid rise period of the  
323 COVID-19 outbreak: a quick online cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Biological*  
324 *Sciences*. 2020;16(10):1745-52.
- 325 **10.** Muto K, Yamamoto I, Nagasu M, Tanaka M, Wada K. Japanese citizens; behavioral  
326 changes and preparedness against COVID-19: How effective is Japan's approach of self-restraint?  
327 *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.03.31.20048876.
- 328 **11.** Adam Burgess MH. Risk, ritual and health responsabilisation: Japan's 'safety blanket' of  
329 surgical face mask-wearing. *Sociology of Health & Illness*. 2012;34(8):1184-98.
- 330 **12.** Mniszewski SM, Del Valle SY, Priedhorsky R, Hyman JM, Hickman KS. Understanding  
331 the Impact of Face Mask Usage Through Epidemic Simulation of Large Social Networks. *Theories*  
332 *and Simulations of Complex Social Systems*. 2013;52:97-115.
- 333 **13.** Feng SS, Chen Xia, Nan Song, Wei Fan, Mengzhen Cowling, Benjamin J., Rational use of  
334 face masks in the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2020.
- 335 **14.** Vietnamese Ministry of Health. Initially identify the main source of infection in Bach  
336 Mai Hospital 2020 [Available from: [https://moh.gov.vn/tin-tong-hop/-](https://moh.gov.vn/tin-tong-hop/-/asset_publisher/k206Q9qkZOqn/content/buoc-au-xac-inh-nguon-lay-nhiem-chinh-o-by-bach-mai)  
337 [/asset\\_publisher/k206Q9qkZOqn/content/buoc-au-xac-inh-nguon-lay-nhiem-chinh-o-by-bach-](https://moh.gov.vn/tin-tong-hop/-/asset_publisher/k206Q9qkZOqn/content/buoc-au-xac-inh-nguon-lay-nhiem-chinh-o-by-bach-mai)  
338 [mai](https://moh.gov.vn/tin-tong-hop/-/asset_publisher/k206Q9qkZOqn/content/buoc-au-xac-inh-nguon-lay-nhiem-chinh-o-by-bach-mai). (accessed May 05, 2020)
- 339 **15.** Vietnamese Ministry of Health. The Prime Minister chaired a Government meeting on  
340 COVID-19 2020 [Available from: [https://moh.gov.vn/hoat-dong-cua-lanh-dao-bo/-](https://moh.gov.vn/hoat-dong-cua-lanh-dao-bo/-/asset_publisher/TW6LTp1ZtwaN/content/thu-tuong-chu-tri-hop-thuong-truc-chinh-phu-ve-chong-dich-covid-19)  
341 [/asset\\_publisher/TW6LTp1ZtwaN/content/thu-tuong-chu-tri-hop-thuong-truc-chinh-phu-ve-](https://moh.gov.vn/hoat-dong-cua-lanh-dao-bo/-/asset_publisher/TW6LTp1ZtwaN/content/thu-tuong-chu-tri-hop-thuong-truc-chinh-phu-ve-chong-dich-covid-19)  
342 [chong-dich-covid-19](https://moh.gov.vn/hoat-dong-cua-lanh-dao-bo/-/asset_publisher/TW6LTp1ZtwaN/content/thu-tuong-chu-tri-hop-thuong-truc-chinh-phu-ve-chong-dich-covid-19). (accessed May 05, 2020)

- 343 **16.** Vietnamese Ministry of Health. Information on Covid-19 2020 [Available from:  
344 <https://ncov.moh.gov.vn>. (accessed May 05, 2020)
- 345 **17.** Dölitzsch C. Global study about COVID-19: Dalia assesses how the world ranks their  
346 governments' response to the pandemic 2020 [Available from:  
347 [https://daliaresearch.com/blog/dalia-assesses-how-the-world-ranks-their-governments-response-](https://daliaresearch.com/blog/dalia-assesses-how-the-world-ranks-their-governments-response-to-covid-19/)  
348 [to-covid-19/](https://daliaresearch.com/blog/dalia-assesses-how-the-world-ranks-their-governments-response-to-covid-19/). (accessed May 05, 2020)
- 349 **18.** Ki Dong Park. WHO was impressed with the prevention of COVID-19 in Viet Nam 2020  
350 [updated 14 March, 2020. Available from: [https://vtv.vn/video/who-an-tuong-voi-cong-tac-](https://vtv.vn/video/who-an-tuong-voi-cong-tac-phong-chong-covid-19-o-viet-nam-427353.htm)  
351 [phong-chong-covid-19-o-viet-nam-427353.htm](https://vtv.vn/video/who-an-tuong-voi-cong-tac-phong-chong-covid-19-o-viet-nam-427353.htm). (accessed May 05, 2020)
- 352 **19.** Hanoi Department of Justice. The level of sanctioning of violations in the prevention of  
353 Covid-19 epidemic. 2020; Available from:  
354 <http://baochinphu.vn/Utilities/PrintView.aspx?distributionid=392004> (accessed May 05, 2020).