Knowledge, attitude, and practice regarding COVID-19 outbreak in Bangladeshi people: An online-based cross-sectional study

Most. Zannatul Ferdous[a,d], Md. Saiful Islam[a,b,]*, Md. Tajuddin Sikder[a], Abu Syed Md. Mosaddek[c,d], J. A. Zegarra-Valdivia[e]

Most. Zannatul Ferdous, M.Sc
m.zannatul.ferdous@juniv.edu
* Md. Saiful Islam, B.Sc
saiful@phiju.edu.bd
Md. Tajuddin Sikder, PhD
sikder@juniv.edu
Abu Syed Md. Mosaddek, MBBS, Mphil
drmosaddek1968@gmail.com
J. A. Zegarra-Valdivia, M.Sc
jzegarrav@unsa.edu.pe

[a] Department of Public Health and Informatics, Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka-1342, Bangladesh
[b] Youth Research Association, Dhaka, Bangladesh
[c] Department of Pharmacology, Uttara Adhunik Medical College, Uttara, Dhaka-1230, Dhaka, Bangladesh
[d] Clinical Affairs, Quest Bangladesh
[e] Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa, Perú

Corresponding Author
Md. Saiful Islam
Department of Public Health and Informatics, Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka – 1342, Bangladesh.
E-mail: saiful@phiju.edu.bd
Mobile: +8801779439529
ORCiD: 0000-0003-3979-2423.

Knowledge, attitude, and practice regarding COVID-19 outbreak in Bangladeshi people: An online-based cross-sectional study

Abstract

Objectives: In Bangladesh, remarkable measures have been adopted to control the rapid spread of the ongoing COVID-19 epidemic. Adherence to control measures in general populations significantly influences on their perception, knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) towards COVID-19. This study aimed to investigate KAP towards COVID-19 immediately after the locked down and during the rapid rise period of the outbreak.

Study design: Cross-sectional study.

Methods: This online-based cross-sectional study was conducted from March 29 to April 19, 2020, involving 2017 Bangladeshi residents aged (12–64) years. The sample was successfully recruited via the social media. After consenting, participants completed an online survey assessing socio-demographic variables, perception, and KAP towards COVD-19.

Results: Of the 2017 survey participants, 59.8% and 40.2% were male and female, respectively. A majority of the participants were students (71.2%), aged 21-30 years (57.9%), having a bachelor's degree (61.0%), having family income >30000 in BDT (50.0%), and living urban area (69.8). The findings revealed that 48.3% of participants had more accurate knowledge, 62.3% had more positive attitudes, and 55.1% had more frequent practices for COVID-19 prevention. Majority (96.7%) of the participants agreed 'COVID-19 is a dangerous disease' and almost all (98.7%) of the participants wore a face mask in the crowded place, (98.8%) agreed to report a suspected case to health authorities, and (93.8%) good practicing of washing hands with soap and water. In multiple logistic regression analyses, the COVID-19 more accurate knowledge was associated with age, and residence. Whereas, the results reported that sociodemographic factors such as being older, having higher education, being unemployment, having a joint family, having monthly family income >30,000 BDT, and having more frequent prevention practices were the more positive attitudes' factors; and the more frequent prevention practices factors were associated to being female, being older, having higher education, having monthly family income more than 30,000 BDT, urban area and having more positive attitudes.

Conclusion: To improve the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of general populations are crucial during the rapid rise period of the COVID-19 outbreak. Therefore, an effective health education program must be initiated.

Keywords: knowledge; attitude; practice; public health; COVID-19; Bangladesh.

1. Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID -19) is a global public health threat creating a pandemic situation around the world. This ongoing threat is caused by a virus, severe acute respiratory syndrome, coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).[1] In Wuhan, China, the origin of COVID-19, where the first case was reported in December 2019. The ongoing COVID-19 epidemic has spread very quickly, and by 16 May 2020, more than 4.39 million cases have been reported in almost 216 countries, areas, or territories resulting in more than 300,441 deaths.[2] In response to this serious situation, the COVID-19 declared as a public health emergency of international concern by the World Health Organization (WHO) on January 30 and called for collaborative efforts of all countries to prevent the rapid spread of COVID-19.[3]

In Bangladesh, the first confirmed case was reported on 8 March 2020.[4] Infection stayed low until the end of March but saw a steep rise in April 2020, and by 9 April, it reached 100 cases, which exceeded 200 cases within the next 200 days (case doubling time).[5] As of 29 April 2020, according to the Institute of Epidemiology, Disease Control and Research (IEDCR), in Bangladesh reported confirmed cases were 15,691, including 2,902 (18.5%) patients who have recovered and 239 (1.52%) related death.[4] The number of confirmed cases increased in Bangladesh compared with some other countries in the WHO Southeast Asia region: India, Indonesia, Thailand, Sri Lanka. However, in Bangladesh, starting from 9 April to 11 May 2020, there were fifteen-thousand-six-hundred-nighty-one (15,691) COVID-191 confirmed by rt-PCR, including two-hundred- thirty-eight (238) related death cases (CFR 1.52%). Two-thousand-nine-hundred-nifty-two (2,902) or 18% of all reported cases recovered. 68% of all confirmed cases were males.[4] On 11 May, Bangladesh's attack rate (AR) is 92.1 per 1 million. The highest AR was observed in Dhaka division (527.0/1,000,000). Within Dhaka division, Dhaka city has the highest AR (874.9/1,000,000), followed by Narayanganj (356.6/1,000,000), Munshiganj (126.4/1,000,000), Gazipur (84.0/1,000,000) and Narshingdi (65.4/1000,000).[4]

The COVID-19 has overcome geographical barriers achieving a remarkable proliferation. Due to that, public health protocols are started by different countries to control the spread of the virus, many of them related to social distancing, hand wash, and lockdown of the cities. A variety of reactions has raised among the population because of this critical condition, creating anguish, and massive fear.[6] In addition, it should be noted that the concern is mainly present in the unaffected population.[7]

Bangladesh has not experienced similar viruses such as SARS or MERS diseases until now, and public healthcare systems are not completely prepared for this epidemic. In Bangladesh, the magnitude and rapid proliferation of COVID-19 through slightly symptomatic or asymptomatic infected people show the need to identify the behavioral responses of the population. However, in Bangladesh, some unprecedented measures have been adopted by the government to control COVID-19 transmission. Different global actions plan has been put along with government activities. The response from the government has become more forceful by placing restrictions on gathering and closing educational institutions.[8]

The government (Bangladesh Public Administration Ministry) has also announced the shutdown of offices with 30 days of general holiday from March 26 to April 25, 2020, placing restrictions on leaving home after 6.00 pm in the evening, and imposing legal actions on individuals leaving their dwellings after 7.00 pm,[9] development of isolation units, personal hygiene maintenance, isolation and care for infected people and suspected cases. Until now, out of 8, 5 divisions were partially and 3 were completely locked down to avoid contacting, and of the 64 districts 61 were either partially or completely locked down.[10]

Besides, on 24 April 2020, the Ministry of Religious Affairs announced that to maintain physical distancing during Ramadan amid the COVID-19 outbreak, the number of people in mosques for evening prayers is restricted to twelve (12) (including senior clerics and other mosque officials), and individuals or institutions are not allowed to arrange or participate in any gathering over Iftar meals at dusk during the COVID-19 outbreak.[4]

In Bangladesh, the fight against COVID-19 is continuing. People's adherence to these control measures is essential, which is affected by their knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) towards COVID-19.[11,12] There are a limited number of studies on knowledge and attitudes during epidemics that have been conducted in Bangladesh. However, the lessons learned from the studies conducted in other countries in an epidemic situation such as the SARS outbreak in 2003 suggest that knowledge and attitudes towards infectious diseases are associated with panic emotion among the population, which can further complicate attempts to prevent the spread of the disease.[13,14] Suggestions from another study In Latin America, during the outbreaks of chikungunya, zika, and dengue reported low levels of participation and commitment to the imposed control measures in populations.[15]

Knowledge of the disease is an important cognitive key in public health regarding health prevention and promotion. It involves a range of beliefs about the causes of the disease and exacerbating factors, identification of symptoms, and available methods of treatments and consequences.[16] Beliefs about COVID-19 come from different sources, such as stereotypes concerning similar viral diseases, governmental information, social media and internet, previous personal experiences, and medical sources. The accuracy of these beliefs may determine different behaviors about prevention and could vary in the population. In many cases, the absence of knowledge, or if most of these medical-related beliefs are actually false may carry a potential risk factor.[17]

In Hubei, China, one of the first studies analyzing attitudes and knowledge about COVID-19 concluded that attitudes towards government measures to contain the epidemic were highly associated with the level of knowledge about COVID-19.[18] The authors reported higher the level of information and education was associated with more positive attitudes towards Covid-19 preventive practices.[6,18] Perception of risk is also a key factor in commitment to prevention during outbreaks of global epidemics.[6,19-22]

Knowledge of infection process precautions may be linked to citizens following government guidelines regarding prevention and quarantine measures. Numerous studies also reported level of knowledge directly affects the perception of disease susceptibility.[7,21,22] On the other hand, knowledge may also influence attitudes and practices. Attitudes are a motivational/emotional posture that prepares us to respond properly or not, in a specific context. In COVID-19 breakout, positive attitudes and good practices may mediate safe behaviors, prevention measures, and disease propagation.[23] It is notable mentioning that, despite the mandatory nature of public protective measures, the adherence to each of them is still poor among some populations.

Considering the lack of studies related to epidemics and how to facilitate outbreak management of COVID-19 in Bangladesh, and hence there is an urgent need to understand the public's perception and awareness of COVID-19. This study aimed to investigate the KAP towards COVID-19 among general people during the rapid rise period and immediately after the lockdown of Bangladesh of the COVID-19 outbreak.

2. Methods

2.1. Participation and procedure

A cross-sectional and anonymous online population-based survey was carried out involving 2,017 individuals aged (12–64) years. The survey was conducted from March 29 to April 20, 2020, immediately after the lockdown of Bangladesh. A semi-structured questionnaire was designed for the Google survey tool (Google Forms), and the generated link was shared on social media (i.e., Facebook, WhatsApp). The link was also shared personally to the contact list of investigators and research assistants. The investigators decided to collect the data via online due to maintaining social distance during the strict lockdown in Bangladesh. Initially, 2,068 potential respondents provided informed consent. Of them, 2,017 respondents completed the entire survey, generating a response rate of 97.5%. The inclusion criteria to participate in the study were being a Bangladeshi resident, having internet access, and volunteering. Those who did not willingly agree to participate in the study, serious and emergency patients were excluded from the study.

2.2. Measures

A semi-structured and self-reported questionnaire containing informed consent, questions regarding socio-demographics, knowledge, attitude, and practice.

2.2.1. Socio-demographic measures

Socio-demographic information was collected, including gender, age, education, occupation, marital status, nature of the family (nuclear/joint, with the joint being an extended family, often of multiple generations), number of family members, monthly family income, and permanent residence.

2.2.2. Knowledge, attitude, and practice

With regard to assessing the level of knowledge, attitude, and practice of the respondents, a total of 17 questions (including 6 for knowledge, 6 for attitude, and 7 for practice) was asked to the respondents during the survey. The survey questions were adapted and modified from previously published literature regarding viral epidemics related to MERS-CoV disease,[24,25] infection prevention and control measures for COVID-19 by World Health Organization,[26] and guidelines suggested by the country's Institute of Epidemiology, Disease Control and Research (IEDCR).[27]

After an initial draft of the survey questionnaire, it was validated and adopted by the following two ways. Firstly, the questionnaire was sent to four experts who were well command over this field. After the coordination of all expert's opinions, the final questionnaire was designed. Secondly, A pilot test was conducted on 30 individuals to confirm the reliability of the questionnaire. Finally, these 30 data were inputted in SPSS version 25 and performed reliability coefficient analysis. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of KAP questions was 0.73, which indicates acceptable internal consistency.[28]

The knowledge section consisted of 6 items of a and each question was responded as "*Yes*", "*No*" and "*Don't know*". The correct answer was coded as 1, while the wrong answer was coded as 0. The total score ranged from 0-6, with an overall greater score indicates more accurate knowledge. A cut off level of ≥4 was set for more accurate knowledge.

The attitude section consisted of 6 items, and the response of each item was responded on a 3-point Likert scale as follows 0 ("*Disagree*"), 1 ("*Undecided*"), and 2("*Agree*"). The total score ranges from 0 to 12, with an overall greater score indicates more positive attitudes towards the COVID-19. A cut off level of ≥11was set for more positive attitudes towards the prevention of COVID-19.

The practice section included 7 items practice measures responding to the COVID-19, and each item was responded as "*Yes*", "*No*", and "*Sometimes*". Practice items' total score ranges from 0-7, with an overall greater score indicates more frequent practices towards the COVID-19. A cut off level of ≥6was set for more frequent practices.

2.3. Statistical analysis

The data analysis was performed using Microsoft Excel 2019 and SPSS version 25.0. Microsoft Excel was used for editing, sorting, and coding. The excel file was then imported into SPSS software. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations) and first-order analyses (i.e., chi-square tests) were performed. Binary logistic regression was performed with a 95% confidence interval to determine significant associations between categorical dependent and independent variables.

2.4. Ethical considerations

The study was conducted in accordance with the Institutional Research Ethics and the declaration of Helsinki. Formal ethical approval was granted by the Ethical Review Committee, Uttara Adhunik Medical College, Uttara, Dhaka-1260, Bangladesh. The consent form documented the aims, nature, and procedure of the study. Anonymity and confidentially were strictly maintained.

3. Results

A total of 2017 respondents were included in the final analysis, of which 59.8% male and 40.2% female, the average age was 24.36 years (SD=5.38) ranging from 12 to 64 years, and almost all were unmarried (80.8%). The majority were students (71.2%), had a bachelor's level of education (61.0%), came from urban areas (69.8%), lived in nuclear families (77.9%) and their monthly family income more 30000 BDT (50.0%) (Table 1).

3.1. Perception towards the COVID-19 about mode of transmission, incubation period, symptoms, risk factors, treatments, prevention, initiatives, and challenges

With regard to assessing the perception towards the COVID-19, several questions were asked to the respondents during the survey (Table 2). For the mode of transmission, more than half of the respondents reported close contact with an infected person (93.7%), direct transmission during coughing (66.4%), touching contaminated surfaces (61.3%), along with others as just as contact with infected animals (30.8%), through eating infected animal products (e.g., meat, milk) (21.4%), and only 0.5% had no idea about the mode of transmission of the COVID-19.

Most of the respondents (91.3%) reported the correct incubation period (2-14 days), and only 2.4% had no idea about it. Most of the respondents (99.4%) reported fever, dry cough, and difficulty of breathing as the common symptoms of the COVID-19. On the other hand, half of the respondents (51.2%) reported sore throat, blocked nose along with others as just as headache (0.1%), diarrhea (0.7%), and no idea (0.4%).

The respondents identified who were at risk for developing COVID-19 as follows: old aged persons (86.1%), individuals with cancer, diabetes, chronic respiratory diseases (74.6%), migrants from other parts of the world having COVID-19 (44.8%), children (25.3%), pregnant women (21.2%), and no idea (0.8%). Majority (80.7%) reported supportive treatments, but a vaccine was rarely mentioned (1.0%), and 18.3% had no idea about the treatments of COVID-19.

The respondents recognized the following preventive measures for the COVID-19: washing hands with water and soap (93.5%), maintaining social distance (93.5%), avoid touching the eyes, nose with hands (90.4%), using a mask (87.2%), avoid contacts with infected people (84.7%), taking all family members in home quarantine (78.1%), maintaining self-quarantine (76.9%), strengthening to health care (63.6%), and creating a strong force to fight against COVID-19 (26.7%).

The respondents took the initiative to protect their family members: temporary closure of outside people coming inside the home (87.8%), arrange for handwashing with soap inside or outside the home (85.5%), and wash hands with soap after touching pets (39.4%). The respondents also reported that they faced many problems to create awareness among their family members: not being able to stop going out of the house (57.1%), negligence about the severity of the disease (40.3%), reluctance to use masks (25.5%), and only 19.7% had no problems.

3.2. Knowledge

For each question of knowledge, the distribution of responses from participants was presented in Table 3 with gender differences. There were no significant gender differences for each item of knowledge questions.

The findings revealed that 48.3% of respondents had more accurate knowledge, and 51.7% of respondents had comparatively inaccurate knowledge towards the COVID-19. The rates of adequate knowledge were significantly more likely to (i) be younger (12-20 years) (49.3% vs. 38.8% in aged more than 30 years, p=.029), and (ii) be a respondent from a rural area (52.8% vs. 46.3% in those from an urban area, p=.008).

The sociodemographic factors of more accurate knowledge were 12-20 aged group vs. above 30 years (OR=1.54; 95%CI=1.10-2.16, p=.012), 21-30 aged group vs. above 30 years (OR=1.53; 95%CI=1.11-2.11, p=.010), and rural vs. urban areas (OR=1.295; 95CI%=1.07-1.57, p=.008).

3.3. Attitude

For each question of attitude, the distribution of responses from participants was presented in Table 4 with gender difference. The response rates of "*Agree*" were significantly higher in

females (99.5% vs. 98.3% in males, *p*=.043) to the item of attitude section regarding "*It is crucial to report a suspected case to health authorities*". Furthermore, the response rates of "*Agree*" were significantly higher in females (99.6% vs. 98.1% in males, *p*=.011) to the item of attitude section regarding "*It is important to use a face mask in a crowded place.*"

The findings indicated that 62.3% of respondents had more positive attitudes, and 37.7% of respondents had comparatively less positive attitudes towards the COVID-19. The rates of more positive attitudes were significantly more likely to (i) be an older (age more than 30 years) (72.5% vs. 55.1% in aged 12-20 years, *p*<.001), and (ii) have higher education (above bachelor) (74.1% vs. 52.2% in intermediate [class 11-12], *p*<.001), (iii) be married (70.4% vs. 37.5% in divorced, *p*=.001), (iv) be a housewife (78.1% vs. 58.2% in student, *p*<.001), (v) come from joint family (66.7% vs. 61.1% in nuclear family, *p*=.029), (vi) have monthly family income more than 30,000 BDT (65.2% vs. 57.8% in those less than 20,000 BDT, *p*=.016), and (vii) have more frequent practices (66.1% vs. 57.7% in comparatively less frequent practices, *p*<.001).

Finally, regarding variables related to more positive attitudes against COVID-19, we found being younger (aged 12-20 years) vs. older (>30 years) (OR=0.47; 95%CI=0.33-.67, *p*<.001), having intermediate (11th-12th grades) vs. higher education (above bachelor) (OR=0.38; 95%CI=0.28-0.53, *p*<.001), being students vs. unemployment (OR=0.40; 95%CI=0.16-0.99, *p*=0.048), having nuclear vs. joint families (OR=0.78; 95%CI=0.63-0.98, *p*=.029), having monthly family income less than 20,000 vs. more than 30,000 BDT (OR=0.73; 95%CI=0.59-0.91, *p*=.005), and having more frequent vs. comparatively less practices (OR=1.43; 95%CI=1.19-1.71, *p*<.001).

3.4. Practice

For each question of practice, the distribution of responses from participants was presented in Table 5 with gender difference. The response rates of "*Yes*" were significantly higher in females (81.8% vs. 73.5% in males, *p*<.001) to the item of practice section regarding "*Do you use tissues or hanker chips during coughing/sneezing?*". The response rates of "Yes" were significantly higher in females (95.6% vs. 92.5% in males, *p*=.023) to the item of practice section regarding "*Do you wash hands frequently using water and soaps?*". The response rates of "Yes" were significantly higher in females (96.2% vs. 87.1% in males, *p*<.001) to the item of practice section regarding "*Do you maintain social distance (or home quarantine)?*". The

response rates of "Yes" were significantly higher in females (88.3% vs. 81.4% in males, $p<.001$) to the item of practice section regarding "*Do you maintain a healthy lifestyle focusing on outbreak?*". The response rates of "Yes" were significantly higher in females (93.0% vs. 85.4% in males, $p<.001$) to the item of practice section regarding "*Do you obey all government rules related to the COVID-19?*".

The findings indicated that 55.2% of respondents had more frequent practices, and 44.8% of respondents had comparatively less frequent practices towards the COVID-19. The rates of more frequent practices were significantly more likely to be (i) be female (59.2% vs. 52.6% in male, $p=.003$), (ii) older (age more than 30 years) (64.0% vs. 48.6% in aged 12-20 years, $p<.001$), (iii) have higher education (above bachelor) (63.6% vs. 35.0% in secondary [6th-10th grades], $p<.001$), (iv) be a housewife (68.8% vs. 52.2% in student, $p=.001$), (v) have monthly family income 20,000-30,000 BDT (57.9% vs. 48.6% in those less than 20,000, $p=.002$), (vi) be a respondent from urban area (58.7% vs. 47.2% in those from rural area, $p<.001$), and (vii) have more positive attitudes (58.6% vs. 49.7% in comparatively less positive attitudes, $p<.001$).

The sociodemographic factors of more frequent practices were being males vs. females (OR=0.76; 95%CI=0.64-0.92, $p=.003$), being younger (12-20 years) vs. older (>30 years) (OR=0.53; 95%CI=0.38-0.75, $p<.001$), having secondary (6th-10th grades) vs. higher education (above bachelor) (OR=0.31; 95%CI=0.12-0.79, $p=.014$), having monthly family income less than 20,000 vs. more than 30,000 BDT (OR=0.71; 95%CI=0.57-0.88, $p=.001$), rural vs. urban area (OR=0.63; 95CI%=0.52-0.76, $p<.001$), and having more vs. comparatively less positive attitudes (OR=1.43; 95%CI=1.19-1.71, $p<.001$).

4. Discussion

Currently, COVID-19 pandemic suffering both the number of cases and deaths are increased around the world. The number of newly infected Bangladeshi people is increasing as the days go by. Considering this outbreak, this study was conducted aiming at measuring the level of knowledge, attitude, and practice of COVID-19 and perceptions regarding it among Bangladeshi people. No data have been published on the knowledge, attitudes, and practice among Bangladeshi people during the outbreak of COVID-19. Therefore, this is the first study in Bangladesh examining the KAP towards COVID-19 among general people in Bangladesh. The findings of this study may be useful when planning health education programs about this emerging infectious disease in the near future.

In perception towards COVID-19, most of the study participants (99.35%) reported some symptoms are recognized as COVID-19 related: fever, dry cough, breathing difficulty, however, this has not been confirmed as part of the diagnosis,[29] participants also reported other important symptoms such as sore throat and blocked nose (51.16%), followed by headache, and diarrhea. Only 8 (.3%) respondents did not know the symptoms which were 56.7% in Srichan et al. study.[30] Zegarra et al. identified the most frequent symptoms like fever (94.7%), fatigue (62.2%), and dry cough (88.9%) along with others as just as sore throat (81.8 %), joint and muscle pain (56.9%), and shortness of breathing (92%).[23]

The majority of participants (91.3%) well recognized the incubation period, which is almost similar (86.2%) to the study conducted by Zegarra et al.[23] Routes of transmission of COVID-19 were reported by the participants: close contact with an infected person, direct transmission during coughing, touching infected materials, etc. Only 11 (0.2%) participants were not sure or recognized transmission routes. Perception of COVID-19 severity in the community showed that 13.8 % (395) did not face any difficulty when they convinced their family members about the COVID-19 severity.

Most of the responses addressed by the participants were: negligence about the severity of the disease, reluctance to use masks, not being able to stop going out of the house. This may be related to less participation in dictated measures by the government and other global actions such as social distancing, not going out home without necessary needs, isolation of suspected cases, hand hygiene, etc. However, the results of our study revealed different preventive measures were reported by participants. Nevertheless, other effective initiatives taken by the participants to protect their family members were: temporarily prohibit outside people coming inside the home, arrange for handwashing with soap inside or outside the home, wash hands with soap after touching pets.

The most identified gap in knowledge among participants was related to disease treatment. The present study reported 18.3% of participants believed that there is no treatment for COVID-19. In contrast to 47.3% participants addressed COVID-19 is a treatable disease revealed in Srichan et al. study.[30] However, present also found 80.7% agreed with using supportive treatment for COVID-19, and only 1% of the participants reported in the presence of a vaccine for preventing COVID-19, which was 31.2% reported by Srichan et al.[30]

There is no treatment and some specific treatment under investigation and will be tested through clinical trials. In a study of Aldowyan et al. showed that only 19% participants believed there is no treatment for coronavirus like MERS-CoV; however, (26.6%) agreed with using supportive treatment for MERS-CoV, and (31.1%) of the participants believed in the presence of a vaccine for preventing MERS-CoV.[24]

Findings of current study demonstrated that almost half (48.3%) of participants had more accurate knowledge, which were 93.2%, 90% and 12.8% in Saqlain et al., Zhong et al. and Srichan et al. studies respectively,[18,30,31] 62.3% had more positive attitudes, which was 81.5% in Saqlain et al. study,[31] and 55.2% more frequent practices which were 96.4%-98% and 88.7% in Zhong et al. and Saqlain et al studies towards COVID-19.[18,31]

The results of our study showed that the responses of knowledge about COVID-19 were differed regarding gender but insignificant. The majority of participants (96.7) reported COVID-19 is dangerous and 60% reported it affects only humans. However, recently, there is no evidence that companion animals/pets such as dogs, cats can be infected by the new coronavirus.[26] Participant's more accurate knowledge was significantly more likely to be a young adult (21-30 years, p=.029), and be a respondent from a rural area (p=.008). This may be due to most of the participants of our study were students and they all went back home mostly to rural areas during this locked down period.

The main sociodemographic factors of more accurate knowledge were being young (12-20 aged group: p=.012; 21-30 aged group: p=.010), and residence of “rural area” (p=.008). In comparison, Srichan et al. found marital status (p=.015), education (p=.007), occupation(p=.002); annual income (p<.001) were the risk factors,[30] wherein Zhong et al. study male gender (p<.001), age-group of 16-29 years (p<.001), marital status of never-married (p<0.001), education of bachelor’s degree or lower (p<.001), and occupations of unemployment (p=.040) and students (p<.001) were significantly associated with lower knowledge.[18]

The findings showed highly more positive attitudes among the participants towards reporting health authorities to the suspected case of COVID-19 (98.8%), wearing a face mask before going to a crowded place (98.7%), and in the following other recommendations. These findings

were similar to a very recent study conducted in China, during the rapid rise of COVID-19 outbreak, reported optimistic attitudes towards COVID-19: most residents took precautions to prevent infection by COVID-19: not going to crowded places and wearing masks when going outside.[18] Saqlain et al. also reported highly more positive attitudes among all the healthcare professionals towards wearing gowns, gloves.[30] The present study findings also revealed an optimistic attitude presenting less likelihood of 'undecided' and 'disagree' answers in regard to 'wash hands and face after coming outsides ('*Agree*'=99.5%)', and 'health education can play an important role for COVID-19 prevention ('*Agree*'=95.6%)'.

Majority (90%) of the participants showed more positive attitudes, response as '*Agree*' to the item 'COVID-19 is preventable'. Saqlain et al. reported in their study that more than 80% participants strongly agreed that transmission of COVID-19 could be prevented by following universal precautions given by WHO, CDC.[31] During the SARS epidemic, 70.1-88.9% of Chinese residents believed that SARS can be successfully controlled or prevented.[18,32] Zhong et al. reported majority (90.8%) of the respondents agreed that COVID-19 successfully controlled measures such as traffic limits all throughout China and the shutdown of cities and counties of Hubei Province.[18]

Surprisingly, the participant's attitude differs statistically ($p<.05$) by age, education, marital status, occupation, family type, monthly income, and practices. In contrast to Saqlain et al. found participant's attitudes did not differ statistically ($p>.05$) by age, gender, experience, and job/occupation. Giao et al. also found that attitude level regarding COVID-19 did not have any association with age ($p=0.151$), gender ($p=.129$), and experience ($p=0.453$) but found a statistically significant association with occupation/job.[33] While Albarrak et al. and Khan et al. did not found any difference in attitude towards MERS among doctors, pharmacists, and nurses ($p>.05$).[34,35]

The multiple logistic regression findings of our study revealed that sociodemographic variables associated to more positive attitudes regarding COVID-19 were being an older ($p<.001$), having higher education (above bachelor) ($p<.001$), being unemployment ($p=.048$), having joint family ($p=.029$), having monthly family income > 30,000 BDT ($p=.005$), and having more frequent practices ($p<.001$). Using similar analysis in a study conducted by Zhong et al. found marital status of "others" ($p<.001$), female gender ($p <.001$), age-groups of 16-29 years ($p =.013$), education levels of associate's degree or higher ($p \leq .008$), occupations of

unemployment (p =.001) and students (p =.043) and COVID-19 knowledge score (p <.001) were significantly associated factors.[18]

The results of our study revealed that the majority of the participants had more frequent practices in the following precautionary measures. Highest (93.8%) more frequent practices were observed in washing hands with water and soap which was almost similar to the findings of Nour et al., Khan et al. and Saqlain et al. who reported 95.4%, 85.7% and 96.10% HCPs used to wash their hands with soap continuously,[31,35,36] but dissimilar to the result found by Srichan et al., where 54.8% did not regularly use soap during washing their hands.[30] There was a significant difference of more frequent practices on the basis of gender with varieties aspects of COVID-19. Female gender practiced more than male gender like (81.8%) using tissues or hanker chips during coughing/sneezing (p<.001), (95.6%) washing hands frequently using water and soap (p=.023), (96.2%) maintaining home quarantines (p<.001), (88.6%) following healthy lifestyle (p<.001), (93%) obeying government rules related to the COVID-19 (p<.001).

The sociodemographic factors of more frequent practice were being female (p=.003), age more than 30 years (p<.001), having higher education (above bachelor) (p=.014), having monthly family income more than 30,000 BDT (p=.001), urban area (p<.001), and having more positive attitudes (p<.001). Male gender (p=.019), occupation of “students” (p=.007), COVID-19 knowledge score (p<.001), marital status of “others” (p=.003), residence (p<.001) which were significantly associated factors identified in Zhong et al. study and experience factor by Saqlain et al., Hussain et al. and Ivey et al.[31,37,38]

Considering Bangladesh, a multi-ethnic country, with different economic income statuses, education levels, traditions, and the quick spread out of the COVID-19 and government response; it is expected that the levels of knowledge, attitude, and prevention display differences in the population. In our study, although a good proportion of the sample has good KAP.

Nonetheless, governmental policy and more health promotion and prevention are needed. We consider that exist susceptible clusters of people that may be vulnerable to prevention practices, related to less attitude and low knowledge about COVID-19.[23] Accessibility to information, preventive behavior, and sanitary educational measures are essential, especially in rural areas

and among old people, which may have difficulties getting access to novel information or financial/technical adversity to performing preventive measures.

In COVID-19 breakout, the knowledge accuracy of the disease is constantly confronted against the current state of objective medical knowledge.[16] It is usually believed that a more educated population/patients about the disease and those have more accurate knowledge will comply better with the preventive and treatment measures.[39] Regarding this quick implementation of preventive measures, psychological adaptation is a key factor promoted by health prevention/promotion programs.

4.1. Limitations

This study has some limitations. First, this study followed a cross-sectional study design. Therefore, causal inferences may not be established. Second, compared with face-to-face interviews, self-reporting has limitations including multiple biases. Third, related to the limited sample representativeness, this study used an online-based survey method to avoid possible transmission, causing the sampling in our study to be voluntary and conducted by an online system. In this regard, the possibility of selection bias must be considered, so this study was not representative, for example, of those who have limited access to the internet like vulnerable populations including those have lower income or have a lower level of education (less than 13% have secondary and intermediate level of education), older people, and rural people.

Therefore, KAP study towards the COVID-19 pandemic of vulnerable populations warrants special research attention in today's Bangladesh. Fourth, we used a limited number of questions to measure the level of knowledge, attitude, and practice. Thus, additional assessments would be important, using all aspects of KAP towards COVID-19, to determine the actual extent of KAP among the general population. Additionally, the unstandardized and inadequate assessment of attitudes and practices towards COVID should be developed via focus group discussion and in-depth interviews and constructed as multi-dimensional measures.

5. Conclusion

Our findings suggest that Bangladeshi general populations of a relatively high-income status and higher education status, being young, in particular female, have had more knowledge, more positive attitudes, and more frequent good practices. Whereas being older, and living in urban area have had less accurate knowledge towards COVID-19 after the immediate locked down

and during the rapid rise period of the COVID-19 outbreak. In addition, more favorable knowledge is associated with more positive attitudes and more frequent practices towards COVID-19 but insignificant. However, the figure of the proportion of more accurate knowledge, more positive attitudes, and more frequent practices was not remarkable, suggesting that effective health education programs aimed at improving COVID-19 knowledge, which boosts more positive attitudes and maintaining safe sustained practices.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to extend heartfelt graciousness to all the participants who participated in this study voluntarily and spontaneously. Furthermore, the authors highly appreciate the contribution of Rakib Hasan, Lakshmi Rani Kundu, A.S.M Mahbubul Alam, Gobida Deb Arya, Arza Miraz Keya, Md. Abdul Halim, Md Marzan Sarkar, Assaduzzaman Nur, Mohammad Yusuf, Jobair Sami, Md. Sanzid Mostofa, Miraz Mostafa, Mahmdul Hasan Shoron, Prokriti Biswas, Piya Ferdous, Mahir Shahariar Showrov, Sadman Sakib Samir, Maisha Meherin, Syeda Surayia Sultana, Sayma Islam Alin, Rejina Akter, A H Shourav, Kifayat Sadman Ishadi, Md. Safiul Hasan, Tasnima Akter Tasin, Fatema Akter Bethi, Sanzida Amin, Arpita Chakrabarty, Sayeda Sumaiya Nahrin, Rabeya Akter Mohua, Md. Rayhan Sakib, Tareq Mahmud, Md. Fakhrul Islam Maruf, Anik Roy, Tariqul Islam, Tasnimul Ahsan Shakhar, and Team SBCC (Social Behavior and Change Communication), during data collection periods.

Ethical approval

This study was approved by the Ethical Review Committee, Uttara Adhunik Medical College, Uttara, Dhaka-1260, Bangladesh (Ref: UAMC/ERC/04/2020).

Funding

The authors declare that they have not received any direct or indirect funding from any organization.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

References

1. Ruan S. Likelihood of survival of coronavirus disease 2019. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;S1473-3099(20)30257-7. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30257-7
2. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019; 2020 [accessed 16 May 2020]
3. World Health Organization. 2019-nCoV outbreak is an emergency of international concern, http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/international-health-regulations/news/news/2020/2/2019-ncov-outbreak-is-an-emergency-of-international-concern; 2020 [accessed 16 May 2020]
4. World Health Organization. COVID-19 situation report no. #11, https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/bangladesh/covid-19-who-bangladesh-situation-reports/who-ban-covid-19-sitrep-11.pdf?sfvrsn=ee79ca3d_6World; 2020 [accessed 16 May 2020]
5. Dhaka Tribune. 20-fold rise in Covid-19 cases in Bangladesh since April 1, https://www.dhakatribune.com/health/coronavirus/2020/04/14/20-fold-rise-of-covid-19-cases-in-bangladesh-since-april-1; 2020 [accessed 16 May 2020]
6. Roy D, Tripathy S, Kar SK, Sharma N, Verma SK, Kaushal V. Study of knowledge, attitude, anxiety & perceived mental healthcare need in Indian population during COVID-19 pandemic. Asian J Psychiatr. 2020;51:102083. doi:10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102083
7. Ilesanmi O, Alele FO. Knowledge, Attitude and Perception of Ebola Virus Disease among Secondary School Students in Ondo State, Nigeria, October, 2014. PLoS Curr. 2016;8:ecurrents.outbreaks.c04b88cd5cd03cccb99e125657eecd76. doi:10.1371/currents.outbreaks.c04b88cd5cd03cccb99e125657eecd76
8. BBC. Coronavirus: “Public holiday” extended in Bangladesh for 7 days, banned from going out after 6 pm, https://www.bbc.com/bengali/news-52241434; 2020 [accessed 16 May 2020]
9. Bdnews24.com. Bangladesh in virtual lockdown as coronavirus fight flares, https://bdnews24.com/bangladesh/2020/03/25/bangladesh-in-virtual-lockdown-as-coronavirus-fight-flares; 2020 [accessed 16 May 2020]
10. Corona Info. (2020). Lockdown status, https://corona.gov.bd/lockdown-status; 2020 [accessed 16 May 2020]
11. Ajilore K, Atakiti I, Onyenankeya K. College students’ knowledge, attitudes and adherence to public service announcements on Ebola in Nigeria: Suggestions for improving future

Ebola prevention education programmes. Health Education Journal. 2017;76(6):648-660. doi:10.1177/0017896917710969

12. Tachfouti N, Slama K, Berraho M, Nejjari C. The impact of knowledge and attitudes on adherence to tuberculosis treatment: a case-control study in a Moroccan region. Pan Afr Med J. 2012;12:52.
13. Tao N. An analysis on reasons of SARS-induced psychological panic among students. Journal of Anhui Institute of Education. 2013;21:78-79.
14. Person B, Sy F, Holton K, Govert B, Liang A; National Center for Inectious Diseases/SARS Community Outreach Team. Fear and stigma: the epidemic within the SARS outbreak. Emerg Infect Dis. 2004;10(2):358-363. doi:10.3201/eid1002.030750
15. Bewick S, Fagan WF, Calabrese JM, Agusto F. Zika virus: Endemic versus epidemic dynamics and implications for disease spread in the Americas. BioRxiv. 2016;41897.
16. Szymona-Pałkowska K, Janowski K, Pedrycz A, et al. Knowledge of the Disease, Perceived Social Support, and Cognitive Appraisals in Women with Urinary Incontinence. Biomed Res Int. 2016;2016:3694792. doi:10.1155/2016/3694792
17. Zhou M, Tang F, Wang Y, et al. Knowledge, attitude and practice regarding COVID-19 among health care workers in Henan, China. J Hosp Infect. 2020;S0195-6701(20)30187-0. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2020.04.012 18.
18. Zhong BL, Luo W, Li HM, et al. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices towards COVID-19 among Chinese residents during the rapid rise period of the COVID-19 outbreak: a quick online cross-sectional survey. Int J Biol Sci. 2020;16(10):1745-1752. doi:10.7150/ijbs.45221
19. Corrin T, Waddell L, Greig J, Young I, Hierlihy C, Mascarenhas M. Risk perceptions, attitudes, and knowledge of chikungunya among the public and health professionals: a systematic review. Trop Med Health. 2017;45:21. Published 2017 Sep 4. doi:10.1186/s41182-017-0061-x
20. Janjua NZ, Razaq M, Chandir S, Rozi S, Mahmood B. Poor knowledge--predictor of nonadherence to universal precautions for blood borne pathogens at first level care facilities in Pakistan. BMC Infect Dis. 2007;7:81. Published 2007 Jul 24. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-7-81
21. Lau JT, Kim JH, Tsui H, Griffiths S. Perceptions related to human avian influenza and their associations with anticipated psychological and behavioral responses at the onset of outbreak in the Hong Kong Chinese general population. Am J Infect Control. 2007;35(1):38-49. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2006.07.010

22. Smith RD. Responding to global infectious disease outbreaks: lessons from SARS on the role of risk perception, communication and management. Soc Sci Med. 2006;63(12):3113-3123. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.08.004
23. Zegarra A, Chino B, Ames R. Knowledge, perception and attitudes in Regard to COVID-19. Pandemic in Peruvian Population. 2020. doi:10.31234/osf.io/kr9ya
24. ALdowyan N, Abdallah A, & El-Gharbawy R. (2017). Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) Study about Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) among Population in Saudi Arabia. International Archives of Medicine, 10. https://doi.org/10.3823/2524
25. Medani KET, ALDuwayhis NM, ALAmeer AA, ALMaymoni SK, ALOtaibi FA, ALHassan MA. Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Corona Virus (Mers- CoV), Among Male Primary School Students in Almajmaah City, Saudi Arabia. Indo Am. J. P. Sci. 2018;5(12): 6288-16296. doi: 0.5281/zenodo.2362589
26. World Health Organization. (2020). Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) advice for the public: Myth busters, https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public/myth-busters; 2020 [accessed 16 May 2020]
27. Institute of Epidemiology Disease Control and Research (IEDCR). (2020). Interim infection prevention and control recommendations for suspected/confirmed patients with 2019 Novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in healthcare settings, https://www.iedcr.gov.bd/website/images/files/nCoV/Infection Prevention and Control Recommendations_v2.pdf; 2020 [accessed 16 May 2020]
28. Taber KS. The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. Res Sci Educ, 2018;48(6):1273-1296. doi:10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2
29. Biskup E, Chen G, Ferretti M. Understanding COVID-19 new diagnostic guidelines – A message of reassurance from an internal medicine doctor in Shanghai. Swiss Med Wkly. 2020;150:w20216. doi:10.4414/smw.2020.20216
30. Srichan P, Apidechkul T, Tamornpark R, Yeemard F, Khunthason S, Kitchanapaiboon S, Wongnuch P, Wongphaet A, Upala P. Knowledge, Attitude and Preparedness to Respond to the 2019 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) Among the Bordered Population of Northern Thailand in the Early Period of the Outbreak: A Cross-Sectional Study. SSRN Electronic Journal. 2020. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3546046
31. Saqlain M, Munir MM, Ur Rehman S, Gulzar A, Naz S, Ahmed Z, Tahir AH, Mashhood M. Knowledge, attitude, practice and perceived barriers among healthcare professionals

regarding COVID-19: A Cross-sectional survey from Pakistan. medRxiv, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.13.20063198

32. Adhikari SP, Meng S, Wu YJ, et al. Epidemiology, causes, clinical manifestation and diagnosis, prevention and control of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) during the early outbreak period: a scoping review. Infect Dis Poverty. 2020;9(1):29. Published 2020 Mar 17. doi:10.1186/s40249-020-00646-x
33. Giao H, Nguyen TNH, Tran VK, Ngan Vo K, Ngan VK, Tam V, Le An P. Knowledge and attitude toward COVID-19 among healthcare workers at District 2 Hospital, Ho Chi Minh City. Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Medicine. 2020. https://doi.org/10.4103/1995-7645.280396
34. Albarrak AI, Mohammed R, Al Elayan A, et al. Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS): Comparing the knowledge, attitude and practices of different health care workers. J Infect Public Health. 2019;S1876-0341(19)30239-4. doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2019.06.029
35. Khan MU, Shah S, Ahmad A, Fatokun O. Knowledge and attitude of healthcare workers about Middle East Respiratory Syndrome in multispecialty hospitals of Qassim, Saudi Arabia. BMC Public Health. 2014;14:1281. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-1281
36. Nour M, Babilghith A, Natto H, Elamin F, Alawneh S. Knowledge, attitude and practices of healthcare providers towards MERS-CoV infection at Makkah hospitals, KSA. International Research Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences. 2015;3:103-112.
37. Ivey MF. Global opportunity: Pharmacists working together to improve patient care. Am J Health Syst Pharm. 2019;76(12):869-872. doi:10.1093/ajhp/zxz071
38. Hussain, R, Hassali, MA, Hashmi F, Farooqui M. A qualitative exploration of knowledge, attitudes and practices of hospital pharmacists towards adverse drug reaction reporting system in Lahore, Pakistan. Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice. 2018;11:16. doi:10.1186/s40545-018-0143-0
39. Hocking A, Laurence C, Lorimer M. Patients' knowledge of their chronic disease: The influence of socio-demographic characteristics. Australian Family Physician. 2013;42(6):411.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of participants (N=2017)

Variables	n	(%)
Gender		
Male	1206	(59.8)
Female	811	(40.2)
Age		
12-20	671	(33.3)
21-30	1168	(57.9)
>30	178	(8.8)
Education		
Secondary (6-10)	20	(1.0)
Intermediate (11-12)	226	(11.2)
Bachelor	1230	(61.0)
Higher education (above bachelor)	541	(26.8)
Marital status		
Unmarried	1630	(80.8)
Married	379	(18.8)
Divorced	8	(0.4)
Occupation		
Student	1437	(71.2)
Housewife	64	(3.2)
Govt. employee	122	(6.0)
Non-govt. employee	315	(15.6)
Businessman	52	(2.6)
Unemployment	27	(1.3)
Family type		
Nuclear	1572	(77.9)
Join	445	(22.1)
No of family member		
<5	1449	(71.8)
≥5	568	(28.2)
Monthly family income		
<20,000	512	(25.4)
20,000-30,000	497	(24.6)
>30,000	1008	(50.0)
Residence		
Rural area	610	(30.2)
Urban area	1407	(69.8)

Table 2: Perception towards COVID-19 about the mode of transmission, incubation period, symptoms, risk factors, treatments, prevention initiatives, and challenges.

Variables	**Total** N=2017		**Male**		**Female**	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
How is COVID-19 spread?[a]						
Direct transmission during coughing	1339	(66.4)	816	(60.9)	523	(39.1)
Touching contaminated surfaces	1236	(61.3)	773	(62.5)	463	(37.5)
Contact with infected animals	622	(30.8)	396	(63.7)	226	(36.3)
Through eating infected animal products (e.g., meat, milk)	431	(21.4)	276	(64.0)	155	(36.0)
Close contact with an infected person	1889	(93.7)	1129	(59.8)	760	(40.2)
Don't know	11	(0.5)	7	(63.6)	4	(36.4)
Symptoms appear after which of the following?						
2-5 days	126	(6.2)	82	(65.1)	44	(34.9)
2-14 days	1842	(91.3)	1092	(59.3)	750	(40.7)
Don't know	49	(2.4)	32	(65.3)	17	(34.7)
What are the symptoms of COVID-19?[a]						
Fever, dry cough, difficulty of breathing	2004	(99.4)	1199	(59.8)	805	(40.2)
Sore throat, blocked nose	1032	(51.2)	614	(59.5)	418	(40.5)
Headache	3	(0.1)	0	(0.0)	3	(100.0)
Diarrhea	14	(0.7)	10	(71.4)	4	(28.6)
Don't know	8	(0.4)	5	(62.5)	3	(37.5)
Who is most at risk for COVID-19 infection?[a]						
Old aged persons	1737	(86.1)	1056	(60.8)	681	(39.2)
Pregnant women	427	(21.2)	249	(58.3)	178	(41.7)
Children	511	(25.3)	305	(59.7)	206	(40.3)
Individuals with cancer, diabetes, chronic respiratory diseases	1505	(74.6)	878	(58.3)	627	(41.7)
Migrants from other parts of the world having COVID-19	903	(44.8)	525	(58.1)	378	(41.9)
Don't know	17	(0.8)	15	(88.2)	2	(11.8)
Which of the following describes COVID-19 treatment?						
Supportive treatment	1627	(80.7)	967	(59.4)	660	(40.6)
Vaccine	20	(1.0)	11	(55.0)	9	(45.0)
Don't know	370	(18.3)	228	(61.6)	142	(38.4)
What to do to prevent coronavirus?[a]						
Wash hands with water and soap	1885	(93.5)	1136	(60.3)	749	(39.7)
Avoid touching the eyes and nose with hands	1823	(90.4)	1102	(60.4)	721	(39.6)
Avoid contacts with infected people	1709	(84.7)	1035	(60.6)	674	(39.4)
Using masks	1759	(87.2)	1054	(59.9)	705	(40.1)
Maintaining social distance	1886	(93.5)	1140	(60.4)	746	(39.6)
Maintaining self-quarantine	1551	(76.9)	945	(60.9)	606	(39.1)
Taking all family members in home quarantine	1575	(78.1)	931	(59.1)	644	(40.9)
Strengthening to health care	1283	(63.6)	765	(59.6)	518	(40.4)
Creating a strong voluntary force to fight against COVID-19	539	(26.7)	346	(64.2)	193	(35.8)
Have you taken any initiative to protect your family members?[a]						
Temporary closure of outside people coming inside the home	1769	(87.8)	1037	(58.6)	732	(41.4)
Arrange for handwashing with soap inside or outside the home	1723	(85.5)	1039	(60.3)	684	(39.7)
Wash hands with soap after touching pets	794	(39.4)	501	(63.1)	293	(36.9)
Have you faced any problems to create awareness in your family about COVID-19?[a]						
Negligence about the severity of the disease	810	(40.3)	531	(65.6)	279	(34.4)
Reluctance to use masks	512	(25.5)	335	(65.4)	177	(34.6)
Not being able to stop going out of the house	1147	(57.1)	695	(60.6)	452	(39.4)
Don't face the problem	395	(19.7)	225	(57.0)	170	(43.0)

[a] indicates multiple responses.

Table 3: Knowledge and gender difference of participants (N=2017).

Variables	Total N=2017		Male		Female		χ^2	df	*p*-value
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)			
Is COVID-19 a dangerous disease?									
Yes	1951	(96.7)	1160	(96.2)	791	(97.5)	2.988	2	0.224
No	40	(2.0)	27	(2.2)	13	(1.6)			
Don't know	26	(1.3)	19	(1.6)	7	(0.9)			
Does it affect only humans?									
Yes	1210	(60.0)	735	(60.9)	475	(58.6)	1.161	2	0.560
No	567	(28.1)	330	(27.4)	237	(29.2)			
Don't know	240	(11.9)	141	(11.7)	99	(12.2)			
Does it transmit from humans to animals?									
Yes	1013	(50.2)	612	(50.7)	401	(49.4)	4.690	2	0.096
No	578	(28.7)	358	(29.7)	220	(27.1)			
Don't know	426	(21.1)	236	(19.6)	190	(23.4)			
Does it transmit from animals to humans?									
Yes	1013	(50.2)	612	(50.7)	401	(49.4)	4.690	2	0.096
No	578	(28.7)	358	(29.7)	220	(27.1)			
Don't know	426	(21.1)	236	(19.6)	190	(23.4)			
Is it transmitted by animal products (e.g., milk, meat)?									
Yes	509	(25.2)	300	(24.9)	209	(25.8)	0.406	2	0.816
No	1017	(50.4)	615	(51.0)	402	(49.6)			
Don't know	491	(24.3)	291	(24.1)	200	(24.7)			
Is it transmitted in well-cooked products?									
Yes	53	(2.6)	35	(2.9)	18	(2.2)	3.859	2	0.145
No	1821	(90.3)	1076	(89.2)	745	(91.9)			
Don't know	143	(7.1)	95	(7.9)	48	(5.9)			

Table 4: Attitude and gender difference of participants (N=2017).

Variables	Total N=2017		Male		Female		χ^2	df	*p*-value
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)			
It is crucial to report a suspected case to health authorities.									
Agree	1993	(98.8)	1186	(98.3)	807	(99.5)	6.292	2	0.043
Undecided	12	(0.6)	11	(0.9)	1	(0.1)			
Disagree	12	(0.6)	9	(0.7)	3	(0.4)			
It is important to use a face mask in crowded place.									
Agree	1991	(98.7)	1183	(98.1)	808	(99.6)	9.053	2	0.011
Undecided	11	(0.5)	10	(0.8)	1	(0.1)			
Disagree	15	(0.7)	13	(1.1)	2	(0.2)			
It is important to wash hands and face after coming outsides.									
Agree	2006	(99.5)	1197	(99.3)	809	(99.8)	3.492	2	0.174
Undecided	5	(0.2)	5	(0.4)	0	(0.0)			
Disagree	6	(0.3)	4	(0.3)	2	(0.2)			
COVID-19 is a preventable disease.									
Agree	1829	(90.7)	1091	(90.5)	738	(91.0)	4.211	2	0.122
Undecided	109	(5.4)	60	(5.0)	49	(6.0)			
Disagree	79	(3.9)	55	(4.6)	24	(3.0)			
It can be treated at home.									
Agree	1158	(57.4)	686	(56.9)	472	(58.2)	1.995	2	0.369
Undecided	240	(11.9)	137	(11.4)	103	(12.7)			
Disagree	619	(30.7)	383	(31.8)	236	(29.1)			
Health education can play an important role in COVID-19 prevention.									
Agree	1928	(95.6)	1148	(95.2)	780	(96.2)	1.805	2	0.406
Undecided	52	(2.6)	32	(2.7)	20	(2.5)			
Disagree	37	(1.8)	26	(2.2)	11	(1.4)			

Table 5: Practice and gender difference of participants (N=2017).

Variables	Total N=2017		Male		Female		χ^2	df	*p*-value
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)			
Do you use tissues or hanker chips during coughing/sneezing?									
Yes	1549	(76.8)	886	(73.5)	663	(81.8)	23.392	2	<0.001
No	74	(3.7)	59	(4.9)	15	(1.8)			
Sometimes	394	(19.5)	261	(21.6)	133	(16.4)			
Do you wash hands frequently using water and soaps?									
Yes	1891	(93.8)	1116	(92.5)	775	(95.6)	7.570	2	0.023
No	14	(0.7)	10	(0.8)	4	(0.5)			
Sometimes	112	(5.6)	80	(6.6)	32	(3.9)			
Do you avoid touching face and eyes?									
Yes	1228	(60.9)	734	(60.9)	494	(60.9)	0.118	2	0.943
No	154	(7.6)	94	(7.8)	60	(7.4)			
Sometimes	635	(31.5)	378	(31.3)	257	(31.7)			
Do you maintain social distance (or home quarantine)?									
Yes	1831	(90.8)	1051	(87.1)	780	(96.2)	47.237	2	<0.001
No	41	(2.0)	34	(2.8)	7	(0.9)			
Sometimes	145	(7.2)	121	(10.0)	24	(3.0)			
Do you eat healthy food focusing on outbreak?									
Yes	760	(37.7)	464	(38.5)	296	(36.5)	0.806	1	0.369
No	1257	(62.3)	742	(61.5)	515	(63.5)			
Sometimes	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)			
Do you maintain a healthy lifestyle focusing on outbreak?									
Yes	1698	(84.2)	982	(81.4)	716	(88.3)	17.779	2	<0.001
No	19	(0.9)	15	(1.2)	4	(0.5)			
Sometimes	300	(14.9)	209	(17.3)	91	(11.2)			
Do you obey all government rules related to the COVID?									
Yes	1784	(88.4)	1030	(85.4)	754	(93.0)	29.710	2	<0.001
No	39	(1.9)	25	(2.1)	14	(1.7)			
Sometimes	194	(9.6)	151	(12.5)	43	(5.3)			

Table 6: Distribution and risk factors of Knowledge, Attitude and Practice among participants

Variables	Knowledge								Attitudes								Practices							
	Less accurate		More accurate		χ^2 *p-value*	OR	95%CI	*p-value*	Less positive		More positive		χ^2 *p-value*	OR	95%CI	*p-value*	Less frequent		More frequent		χ^2 *p-value*	OR	95%CI	*p-value*
	N	(%)	N	(%)					N	(%)	N	(%)					N	(%)	N	(%)				
Gender																								
Male	626	(51.9)	580	(48.1)	0.046	0.981	0.821-1.172	0.829	472	(39.1)	734	(60.9)	2.715	0.856	0.712-1.030	0.100	572	(47.4)	634	(52.6)	8.583	0.764	0.638-0.915	0.003
Female	417	(51.4)	394	(48.6)	0.829	1			288	(35.5)	523	(64.5)	0.099	1			331	(40.8)	480	(59.2)	0.003	1		
Age																								
12-20	340	(50.7)	331	(49.3)	7.100	1.538	1.098-2.155	0.012	301	(44.9)	370	(55.1)	25.841	0.467	0.325-.671	<0.001	345	(51.4)	326	(48.6)	20.474	0.530	0.377-0.746	<0.001
21-30	594	(50.9)	574	(49.1)	0.029	1.527	1.106-2.108	0.010	410	(35.1)	758	(64.9)	<0.001	0.702	0.495-.997	0.048	494	(42.3)	674	(57.7)	<0.001	0.766	0.552-1.063	0.110
>30	109	(61.2)	69	(38.8)		1			49	(27.5)	129	(72.5)		1			64	(36.0)	114	(64.0)		1		
Education																								
Secondary (6-10)	8	(40.0)	12	(60.0)	4.347	1.419	0.571-3.527	0.451	9	(45.0)	11	(55.0)	47.791	0.427	0.173-1.051	0.064	13	(65.0)	7	(35.0)	23.415	0.308	0.121-0.786	0.014
Intermediate (11-12)	117	(51.8)	109	(48.2)	0.226	0.881	0.646-1.202	0.426	108	(47.8)	118	(52.2)	<0.001	0.381	0.276-0.528	<0.001	110	(48.7)	116	(51.3)	<0.001	0.604	0.441-0.827	0.002
Bachelor	655	(53.3)	575	(46.7)		0.830	0.678-1.017	0.072	503	(40.9)	727	(59.1)		0.505	0.404-0.631	<0.001	583	(47.4)	647	(52.6)		0.636	0.516-0.782	<0.001
Higher education (above bachelor)	263	(48.6)	278	(51.4)		1			140	(25.9)	401	(74.1)		1			197	(36.4)	344	(63.6)		1		
Marital status																								
Single	835	(51.2)	795	(48.8)	1.659	0.571	0.136-2.398	0.444	643	(39.4)	987	(60.6)	14.932	2.558	0.609-10.742	0.199	751	(46.1)	879	(53.9)	5.854	0.702	0.167-2.948	0.629
Married	205	(54.1)	174	(45.9)	0.436	0.509	0.120-2.161	0.360	112	(29.6)	267	(70.4)	0.001	3.973	0.934-16.909	0.062	149	(39.3)	230	(60.7)	0.054	0.926	0.218-3.933	0.917
Divorced	3	(37.5)	5	(62.5)		1			5	(62.5)	3	(37.5)		1			3	(37.5)	5	(62.5)		1		
Occupation																								
Student	733	(51.0)	704	(49.0)	5.584	1.633	0.743-3.590	0.223	601	(41.8)	836	(58.2)	40.508	0.397	0.159-0.991	0.048	687	(47.8)	750	(52.2)	20.203	0.873	0.406-1.879	0.729
Housewife	40	(62.5)	24	(37.5)	0.349	1.020	0.402-2.587	0.967	14	(21.9)	50	(78.1)	<0.001	1.020	0.345-3.016	0.971	20	(31.3)	44	(68.8)	0.001	1.760	0.698-4.438	0.231
Govt. employee	59	(48.4)	63	(51.6)		1.815	0.770-4.281	0.173	38	(31.1)	84	(68.9)		0.632	0.236-1.691	0.360	46	(37.7)	76	(62.3)		1.322	0.569-3.070	0.517
Non-govt. employee	165	(52.4)	150	(47.6)		1.545	0.686-3.480	0.293	82	(26.0)	233	(74.0)		0.812	0.317-2.082	0.664	118	(37.5)	197	(62.5)		1.336	0.605-2.951	0.474
Businessman	29	(55.8)	23	(44.2)		1.348	0.519-3.499	0.539	19	(36.5)	33	(63.5)		0.496	0.170-1.445	0.199	20	(38.5)	32	(61.5)		1.280	0.499-3.285	0.608
Unemployment	17	(63.0)	10	(37.0)		1			6	(22.2)	21	(77.8)		1			12	(44.4)	15	(55.6)		1		
Family type																								
Nuclear	809	(51.5)	763	(48.5)	0.175	1.046	0.847-1.291	0.676	612	(38.9)	960	(61.1)	4.753	0.782	0.626-0.976	0.029	707	(45.0)	865	(55.0)	0.121	0.963	0.779-1.190	0.728
Joint	234	(52.6)	211	(47.4)	0.676	1			148	(33.3)	297	(66.7)	0.029	1			196	(44.0)	249	(56.0)	0.728	1		
No of family member																								
<5	746	(51.5)	703	(48.5)	0.106	1.033	0.850-1.254	0.745	553	(38.2)	896	(61.8)	0.514	0.929	0.760-1.136	0.473	631	(43.5)	818	(56.5)	3.108	1.191	0.981-1.447	0.078
≥5	297	(52.3)	271	(47.7)	0.745	1			207	(36.4)	361	(63.6)	0.473	1			272	(47.9)	296	(52.1)	0.078	1		
Monthly family income																								
<20,000	256	(50.0)	256	(50.0)	1.412	1.066	0.861-1.318	0.559	216	(42.2)	296	(57.8)	8.219	0.732	0.589-0.911	0.005	263	(51.4)	249	(48.6)	12.147	0.707	0.571-0.876	0.001
20,000-30,000	267	(53.7)	230	(46.3)	0.494	0.918	0.740-1.138	0.436	193	(38.8)	304	(61.2)	0.016	0.842	0.674-1.051	0.128	209	(42.1)	288	(57.9)	0.002	1.029	0.828-1.279	0.795
>30,000	520	(51.6)	488	(48.4)		1			351	(34.8)	657	(65.2)		1			431	(42.8)	577	(57.2)		1		
Residence																								
Rural area	288	(47.2)	322	(52.8)	7.083	1.295	1.070-1.566	0.008	238	(39.0)	372	(61.0)	0.665	0.922	0.758-1.121	0.415	322	(52.8)	288	(47.2)	22.733	0.629	0.520-0.762	<0.001
Urban area	755	(53.7)	652	(46.3)	0.008	1			522	(37.1)	885	(62.9)	0.415	1			581	(41.3)	826	(58.7)	<0.001	1		
Knowledge																								
More accurate	0	(.0)	974	(100.0)	—	—	—	—	372	(38.2)	602	(61.8)	0.211	0.959	0.801-1.148	0.646	424	(43.5)	550	(56.5)	1.167	1.102	0.924-1.313	0.280
Less accurate	1043	(100.0)	0	(0.0)	—				388	(37.2)	655	(62.8)	0.646	1			479	(45.9)	564	(54.1)	0.280	1		
Attitude																								
More positive	655	(52.1)	602	(47.9)	0.211	0.959	0.801-1.148	0.646	0	(0.0)	1257	(100.0)	—	—	—	—	521	(41.4)	736	(58.6)	14.885	1.428	1.191-1.711	<0.001
Less Positive	388	(51.1)	372	(48.9)	0.646	1			760	(100.0)	0	(0.0)	—				382	(50.3)	378	(49.7)	<0.001	1		
Practice																								
More frequent	564	(50.6)	550	(49.4)	1.167	1.102	0.924-1.313	0.280	378	(33.9)	736	(66.1)	14.885	1.428	1.191-1.711	<0.001	0	(0.0)	1114	(100.0)	—	—	—	—
Less frequent	479	(53.0)	424	(47.0)	0.280	1			382	(42.3)	521	(57.7)	<0.001	1			903	(100.0)	0	(0.0)	—			