

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

*To what extent physical distancing and other COVID-19 preventive measures
being implemented among people in Arba Minch town, Southern Ethiopia:
exploring evidences for an urgent call for action?*

Mekuria Asnakew Asfaw^{1*}, Tsegaye Yohannes¹, Chuchu Churko¹, Alemayehu Bekele¹,
Teklu Wegayehu²

¹Collaborative Research and Training Centre for Neglected Tropical Diseases, Arba Minch
University, Ethiopia

²Department of Biology, College of Natural and Computational Sciences, Arba Minch
University, Ethiopia

***Corresponding author**

E-mail: maksambaramr23@gmail.com (MA)

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background**

27 The number of confirmed Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases surge substantially in
28 resource-poor settings within the fragile health system. Since there are no proven vaccine and
29 treatment in place against the disease, controlling strategy mainly rely on preventive
30 measures. However, data on the extent of implementing physical distancing and other
31 preventive measures were under estimated. This study, therefore, investigated these gaps
32 among people in Arba Minch town, southern Ethiopia.

33 **Methods**

34 We conducted a community based cross-sectional study in Arba Minch town; from 15-30
35 June 2020. Data were collected using interviewer administered questionnaire and checklist.
36 Then, data were cleaned, coded and entered to EpiData version 4.4.2, and exported to SPSS
37 version 20 for analysis.

38 **Results**

39 Of the total participants (459), 43.6% achieved above the mean score (6 ± 1.97) on preventive
40 measures of COVID-19. Only 29.8% of participants kept the recommended physical
41 distance, and surprisingly, in all public gathering places the distance was not kept totally. In
42 addition, of the total participants, only 37.7% had face-mask use practice; 20.5% had hand
43 sanitizer use practice, and 13.1% were measuring their body temperature every two weeks.
44 Moreover, 42.5% of participants avoided attendance in public gatherings; 44.7% stopped
45 touching their nose, eye and mouth; 55.6% practiced stay-at-home; and 60% had frequent
46 hand washing practice. Majority of participants (66.7%) practiced covering their mouth and
47 nose while coughing or sneezing; 68.2% had treatment seeking behavior if they experience
48 flue like symptoms; 69.1% practiced isolating themselves while having flue like symptoms;
49 and 89.3% avoided hand shaking.

50 **Conclusions**

51 The findings of this study suggest that physical distancing and other COVID-19 preventive
52 measures were inadequately implemented among people in Arba Minch town. Thus, an
53 urgent call for action is demanding to mitigate the spread of the COVID-19 as early as
54 possible before it brings a devastating impact.

55 **Introduction**

56 The novel Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is a serious infectious disease, caused by
57 the Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-Co V-2) [1, 2]. On 30 January
58 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) Director General declared COVID-19 as public
59 health emergency of international concern [3]. Human-to-human infection due to SARS-
60 CoV-2 occurs mainly through air droplets, close contact with infected persons, particularly
61 mucus membranes secretions from nose, mouth, or eyes, contaminated surfaces, and some
62 studies suggest digestive tract transmission [4, 5]. Elder people and those with underlying
63 medical conditions, such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, chronic respiratory disease, and
64 cancer have higher risk to develop serious illness and probably result in death [6-8].

65 Despite the level of advancement in health system, the daily World Health Organization
66 (WHO) Coronavirus situation reports highlight the fast spread of COVID-19 across the
67 United States, Europe and South East-Asia [9]. As of August 7, 2020, WHO report showed
68 that the ongoing pandemic of SARS-CoV-2 infection has led 18, 614 177 cases (259 344
69 new) and 702, 642 deaths (6 488 new) globally in 215 countries. Of these, Africa accounts
70 848, 053 cases (13 906 new) and 15, 252 deaths (502) [9]. Although the number of confirmed
71 novel COVID-19 cases reported in resource-poor settings is still relatively lower, recently it
72 was noticed that cases substantially rise. However, there is a high likelihood the current
73 number represents underestimates due to inadequate test accessibility. Thus, these conditions
74 may change in the coming months [10].

75 In Ethiopia, the first case was reported in March 13, 2020, in 48-year old Japanese in
76 Addis Ababa [11]. As of August 7, 2020, 20 336 cases (46) and 356 deaths (13 new) were
77 reported [9].

78 The WHO advises people to implement different preventive measures against COVID-19
79 pandemic. According to the WHO recommendations, the best way to halt transmission of
80 human-to-human is being well informed about the virus, how it spreads and implementing the
81 preventive measures adequately [12]. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the WHO
82 along with its partners has been leading global coordination to hold the spread and reduce
83 devastating impact of the COVID-19 pandemic [13].

84 Since the first incidence of the virus in Ethiopia, the country has been implementing
85 unprecedented measures to control the rapid spread of the ongoing COVID-19 [14, 15].
86 However, anecdotally, it has been observed that communities in setting with strong social
87 interaction are neglecting physical distancing and other preventive measures of COVID-19.
88 Moreover, to best of our knowledge, there are no published studies that assess
89 implementation of preventive measures of COVID-19 among the general population in
90 Ethiopia. This study, therefore, aimed to investigate the extent of physical distancing and
91 other preventive measures among people in Arba Minch town, Southern Ethiopia to inform
92 decision made on COVID-19.

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

Methods

Study setting

This study was conducted in Arba Minch town which is located at 505kms south of Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia. The town has 11 *kebeles* (smallest unit of government administration). Based on the 2007 census conducted by central statistical agency, the total projected population for 2020 is 120, 736 (60, 127 men and 60, 609 women) [16]. As any part of the country, the community members in Arba Minch town are at high risk for Coronavirus infection due to existence of strong social interaction in the society which could favour the virus transmission rapidly. Since the first incidence of COVID-19 cases in Ethiopia, quarantine and treatment center have been established in the town. Currently, few confirmed COVID-19 cases have been reported in Arba Minch town.

Study design and period

A community based cross-sectional study was conducted to investigate the extent of physical distancing and other preventive measures among people in Arba Minch town; from 15-30 June 2020.

Study population

The study population was head of household or any adult ≥ 18 years old in the selected households who were residents and available during the survey period. Individuals were excluded from the study in situation when they were seriously ill and unable to provide information.

Sample size and sampling technique

The sample size was determined using single proportion formula,

$$n = \frac{\left(Z_{\left(\frac{\alpha}{2} \right)} \right)^2 P(1-P)}{d^2}, \text{ where, } p \text{ is } 50\% \text{ (proportion of people implementing preventive}$$

measures), since there are no previous study conducted in the study area, $Z_{\alpha/2}$ is the

reliability coefficient of standard error at 5% level of significance = 1.96 and desired degree of precision (**d**) of **5 %**; the estimated sample size was **385**, and by adding **20%** non-response rate, the total computed sample size was 462. Study participants were selected by systematic random sampling technique from each *kebele* with consideration given to equal probability proportionate to sample size. For physical distancing measure, from each public gathering place, such as market, bank, church, *ekub*, hotels, bus station, and office distance between any two or more individuals was measured.

Study variables

Variables included in this study were socio-demographic and economic characteristics, source of information, knowledge and perception on prevention and control of COVID-19; hygiene related factors, and implementation status of physical distancing, and other preventive measures.

Data collection

Data were collected by house-to-house survey using interviewer administered questionnaire and observation checklist. Data quality was maintained by developing, adapting and pre-testing standardized tool (adapted from WHO guidelines); training of data collectors and supervisors; and daily checking of consistency and accuracy of data.

Statistical analysis

Data were edited, coded and entered to Epidata version 4.4.2 and exported to SPSS version 25 software. Then, the data were cleaned, analyzed and outcome of the research were presented by figures and tables. Implementing preventive measure was measured using 12 questions and score was computed by counting value within a case.

Ethics statement

The study was reviewed and approved with reference number of IRB/412/12 by Institutional Research Ethics Review Board of College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Arba Minch

University. Oral consent was received from sub-city administrators and heads of the household before data collection started. Data collectors and supervisors used face mask and alcohol based hand rub to safeguard them and participants while they collect data collect. In addition, they kept maintained physical distancing.

Results

Socio-demographic and economic characteristics

A total of 459 individuals participated in this study; giving a response rate of 99.4%. Table 1 presents detail on socio-demographic and economic data. The mean number of individual members in a household was 4.9 ± 1.95 . Of the total participants, more males participated than females (56.4% versus 43.6%). Almost 7% (32/459) of respondents earned less than 1000 Ethiopian Birr (ETB) per month, and 32.7% (150/459) did not have hand washing facility.

Table 1. Socio-demographic and economic characteristics of study participants in Arba Minch town, June, 2020

Characteristics	Category	Frequency	%
Sex	Female	200	43.6
	Male	259	56.4
Age category	18-29	86	18.7
	30-39	123	26.8
	40-49	126	27.5
	50-59	66	14.4
	≥ 60	58	12.6
Educational status	Cannot read and write	34	7.4
	Can read and write	24	5.2
	Grade 1-8	61	13.3
	Grade 9-12	103	22.4
	College and above	237	51.7
Occupation	Farmer	16	3.5
	Government employee	169	36.8
	Business (self)	136	29.6
	Unemployed	33	7.2
	Others*	105	22.9
Marital status	Single	42	9.2
	Married	376	81.9
	Divorced	22	4.8
	Windowed	19	4.1
Number of household members	<5	295	64.3
	≥5	164	35.7
Monthly income (ETB)	<1000	32	7.0
	1000-2999	112	24.4
	3000-4999	59	12.9
	5000-5999	102	22.2
	6000-7999	55	12.0
	8000-9999	35	7.6
	≥ 10000	64	13.9
Housing condition	House or apartment with garden	18	3.9
	Condominium	10	2.2
	House or apartment in a building	10	2.2
	House in a fence where many people live	355	77.3
	Villa	44	9.6
	Kebele house	22	4.8
Obtain adequate water for hygiene	Yes	444	96.7
	No	15	3.3
Hand wash facility	Yes	309	67.3
	No	150	32.7
Soap available around hand wash facility (n=309)	Yes	281	90.9
	No	28	9.1

*=Housewife=51 and daily labourer= 54

Source of information for COVID-19 pandemic

Of the total participants, 86.5% had access to COVID-19 related information from private television, and 60.4% were access from government television. The remaining respondents obtained information from social media, friends, radio, family members, and town crier (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Sources of information related to COVID-19 pandemic in Arba Minch town, June, 2020.

Knowledge, perception and other COVID-19 related information

Table 2 shows detail on awareness and COVID-19 related information among the study participants. Of the surveyed participants (459), almost all (99.3%) were informed on COVID-19. However, only 27.9% (128/459) responded that infected person are the main source of infection; 73.9% (339/459) knew COVID-19 symptoms, and 77.1% (354/459) believed that COVID-19 can be prevented. In addition, 3.7% (17/459) of participants faced psychological violence while implementing preventive measures; 6.5% (30/459) of respondents had history of in country travel in the last 7 days; and 14.4% (66/459) of participants worried about their health.

Table 2. Knowledge, perception and other COVID-19 related information among study participants, Arba Minch town, June, 2020 (n=459)

Knowledge and perception questions and other COVID-19 related data	Category	Frequency	%
Have you been informed on COVID-19?	Yes	456	99.3
	No	3	0.7
Do you believe in effectiveness of preventive measure?	Yes	420	91.5
	No	39	8.5
How SARS-CoV-2 transmitted?	Air	143	31.2
	Water	3	0.6
	Infected person	128	27.9
	Contact	181	39.4
	I do not know	4	0.9
Knew COVID-19 symptoms	Yes	339	73.9
	No	120	26.1
Do washing hand with soap or applying alcohol based rub kill virus?	Yes	388	84.5
	No	67	14.6
	I do not know	4	0.9
How many seconds does hand washing recommended?	1 sec	3	0.6
	5 sec	28	6.1
	20-40 sec	332	72.3
	60 sec	20	4.4
	I do not know	76	16.6
Is SARS-CoV-2 can be prevented?	Yes	354	77.1
	No	94	20.5
	I do not know	11	2.4
Do you think vaccine available for COVID-19?	Yes	118	25.7
	No	303	66.0
	I do not know	38	8.3
Do you have underlying diseases?	Yes	89	19.4
	No	370	80.6
Are there family members with flu like symptom in last 7 days?	Yes	39	8.5
	No	420	91.5
How worried your health these times?	Not at all	271	59.0
	Little worried	69	15.0
	Moderately	48	10.5
	Very much	66	14.4
	Extremely	5	1.1
Have you faced psychological violence due to practicing COVID-19 preventive measures?	No	442	96.3
	Yes	17	3.7
What means of transportation you use?	Public transport	283	61.6
	Own vehicle	53	11.6
	Rented	15	3.3
Do you have travel history in the last 7 days?	Walk	108	23.5
	Yes in country	20	4.4
	No outside country	10	2.2

Status of implementing physical distancing

Of 55 surveyed public gathering places, the measured physical distances between any two or more people were less than 1 meter in 81.8% (45) of places. In addition, the recommended physical distance (at least 2 meters) was totally not kept in any of these places (Figure 2). On the other hands, of the total respondents (459), **only 29.8%** (137) of participants self-reported as maintained at least 2 meter distance outside their home (Table 4).

Figure 2. Physical distance between two or more individuals in different public gathering places of Arba Minch town, June, 2020 (n=55).

With regard to visiting crowded places, 54.9% (252/459) of participants visited market and 32.8% went to religious center (Churches and Mosques) in the last seven days (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Public gathering places visited by participants in the last seven days in Arba Minch town, June, 2020.

Status of implementing other preventive measures

We used 12 questions to assess implementation of preventive measures against COVID-19. In total, 43.6% (200/459) of participants achieved above the mean score (6 ± 1.97) on preventive measures.

Of the surveyed individuals, only 37.7% (173/459) had face mask use practice, 20.5% (67/326) had frequent hand sanitizer use practice, and 13.1% (60/459) were measuring their body temperature every two week. Moreover, 42.5% (195/459) avoided going to public gathering place in the last 7 days; 44.7% (205/459) stopped touching their nose, eye and mouth; and 55.6 % (255/459) practiced stay-at-home if going outside is not mandatory; and 60% (254/423) had frequent hand washing practice. In addition, majority, 66.7% (306/459) practiced covering their mouth and nose while coughing or sneezing with cloth or tissue; 69.1% (317/459) practiced isolating themselves while having flue like symptoms; and mouth, 68.2% (313/459) had treatment seeking behavior if they experience flue like symptoms; and 89.3% (410/459) avoided hand shaking. Among those who did not use face mask, the main mentioned reason was not having money, 45.5% (130/286), to purchase the mask (Table 4).

Table 4. Implementing other preventive measures by study participants in Arba Minch town, June, 2020

Variables	Category	Frequency	%
Which preventive measure best to prevent COVID-19?	Face mask	46	10.0
	Wash hand	87	18.9
	Stay home	222	48.4
	Social distancing	98	21.4
	I do not know	6	1.3
Maintain at least 2 meter and above	Yes	137	29.8
	No	322	70.2
If at least 2 meter and above not maintained, do you wear facemask?	Yes	130	40.4
	No	192	59.6
Measure body temperature every two week	Yes	60	13.1
	No	399	86.9
Tested for COVID-19	Yes	11	2.4
	No	448	97.6
Stay-at-home			
Do you stay-at-home if going out side is not mandatory?	Yes	255	55.6
	Not	204	44.4
How difficult staying-at-home	Not at all	142	30.9
	Little	66	14.4
	Moderate	94	20.5
	Very difficult	116	25.3
	Extremely	41	8.9
Hand washing			
Hand wash practice to prevent COVID-19	Yes	423	92.2
	No	36	7.8
Frequency of hand in 24 hours (n=423)	Rarely	4	0.9
	Sometimes	165	39.1
	Frequently	254	60.0
Wash hand after toilet	Yes	454	98.9
	No	5	1.1
Wash hand after touching any item	Yes	293	63.8
	No	166	36.2
Wash hand after touching your eye, nose or mouth	Yes	169	36.8
	No	290	63.2
Hand wash after work	Yes	449	97.8
	No	10	2.2
Wash hand before eating	Yes	458	99.8
	No	1	0.2
Hand sanitizer			
Practice of using hand sanitizer or alcohol based hand rub	Yes	326	71.0
	No	133	29.0
Frequency of using hand sanitizer (n=326)	Rarely	20	6.2
	Sometimes	239	73.3
	Frequently	67	20.5
Disinfect phone when return to home	Yes	108	23.5
	No	351	76.5
Disinfect hand after you cough or sneeze	Yes	173	37.7
	No	286	62.3

239 (Continued)

Variables	Category	Frequency	%
Public gathering			
Avoided going to public gathering place in the last 7 days	Yes	195	42.5
	No	264	57.5
Face mask			
If not avoided going to public gathering place, do you wear face mask? (N=264)	Yes	166	62.9
	No	98	37.1
Wear face mask	Yes	173	37.7
	No	286	62.3
Type of face mask (N=173)	Disposable	12	6.9
	Reusable cloth	140	80.9
	Professional mask	21	12.2
When do you wear face mask? (N=173)	Some times when go out	52	30.1
	Every time when go out	115	66.5
	At work	6	3.4
If not use face mask, why? (N=286)	No money	130	45.5
	I do not where to get	66	23.1
	Uncomfortable to use	84	29.4
	Not necessary	6	2.1
Protect other people			
Do you protect people around?	Yes	344	74.9
	No	115	25.1
Do you cover your mouth with elbow or cloth or mask when you cough or sneeze?	Yes	393	85.6
	No	66	14.4
Prefer home stay and isolate while having flue like symptoms	Yes	317	69.1
	No	142	30.9
Avoid hand shaking	Yes	410	89.3
	No	49	10.7
Number of people you met face-to-face within last 24 hours	Zero	102	22.2
	20-40	31	6.8
	25-50	326	71.0
Seek medical treatment if flue like symptoms	Yes	368	80.2
	No	91	19.8
Stopped touching eye, nose and mouth	Yes	205	44.7
	No	254	55.3
Perceived self-evaluation on preventive measure	≤ 6	168	36.6
	7 and above	291	63.4
Mean score on preventive measures	≤ 6	259	56.4
	7 and above	200	43.6
	No	254	55.3

Difference in implementing preventive measures

Although numerical differences were noticed in implementing preventive measures by socio-demographic variables among participants, difference in availability of hand washing was statistically significant with hand washing practice at p-value <0.05 (Table 5).

Table 5. Socio-demographic characteristics related difference in implementing selected preventive measures by study participants toward COVID-19 (n = 459).

Variables	Category	Preventive measures					
		Keep recommended physical distance			Use face mask		
		No	Yes	X ² (P-value)	No	Yes	X ² (P-value)
		N (%)	N (%)		N (%)	N (%)	
Sex	Male	176 (68.0)	83 (32.0)	1.373 (0.241)	160 (61.8)	99 (38.2)	0.072 (0.788)
	Female	146 (73.0)	54 (27.0)		126 (63.0)	74 (37.0)	
Age	18-29	59 (68.6)	27 (31.4)	4.167 (0.384)	59 (68.6)	27 (31.4)	2.817 (0.589)
	30-39	86 (69.9)	37 (30.1)		72 (58.5)	51 (41.5)	
	40-49	94 (74.6)	32 (25.4)		76 (60.3)	50 (39.7)	
	50-59	48 (72.7)	18 (27.3)		39 (59.1)	27 (40.9)	
	≥ 60	35 (60.3)	23 (39.7)		40 (69.0)	18 (31.0)	
Educational status	Cannot read and write	27 (79.4)	7 (20.6)	2.836 (0.586)	26 (76.5)	8 (23.5)	8.928 (0.06)
	Can read and write	15 (62.5)	9 (37.5)		17 (70.8)	7 (29.2)	
	Grade 1-8	45 (73.8)	16 (26.2)		38 (62.3)	23 (37.7)	
	Grade 9-12	73 (70.9)	30 (29.1)		71 (68.9)	32 (31.1)	
	College and above	162 (68.4)	75 (31.6)		134 (56.5)	103 (43.5)	
Occupation	Farmer	13 (81.2)	3 (18.8)	5.243 (0.263)	13 (81.3)	3 (18.8)	2.817 (0.58)
	Government employee	113 (66.9)	56 (33.1)		102 (60.4)	67 (39.6)	
	Business (self)	95 (69.9)	41 (30.1)		86 (63.2)	50 (36.8)	
	Unemployed	28 (84.8)	5 (15.2)		20 (60.6)	13 (39.4)	
	Others*	73 (69.5)	32 (30.5)		65 (61.9)	40 (38.1)	

*=Housewife=51 and daily labourer= 54

255 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Hand wash regularly			Stay-at-home		
		No	Yes	X ²	No	Yes	X ² (P-value)
		N (%)	N (%)	(P-value)	N (%)	N (%)	
Sex	Male	19 (7.3)	240 (92.3)	0.212 (0.646)	160 (61.8)	99 (38.2)	0.072 (0.788)
	Female	17 (8.5)	183 (91.5)		126 (63.0)	74 (37.0)	
Age	18-29	10 (11.6)	76 (88.4)	5.024 (0.285)	59 (68.6)	27 (31.4)	3.795 (0.434)
	30-39	12 (9.8)	111 (90.2)		72 (58.5)	51 (41.5)	
	40-49	6 (4.8)	120 (95.2)		76 (60.3)	50 (39.7)	
	50-59	3 (4.5)	63 (95.5)		39 (59.1)	27 (40.9)	
	≥ 60	5 (8.6)	53 (91.4)		40 (69.0)	18 (31.0)	
Educational status	Cannot read and write	2 (5.9)	32 (94.1)	6.850 (0.144)	26 (76.5)	8 (23.5)	8.928 (0.063)
	Can read and write	4 (16.7)	20 (83.2)		17 (70.8)	7 (29.2)	
	Grade 1-8	1 (1.6)	60 (98.4)		38 (62.3)	23 (37.7)	
	Grade 9-12	7 (6.8)	96 (93.2)		71 (68.9)	32 (31.1)	
	College and above	22 (9.3)	215 (90.7)		134 (56.5)	103 (43.5)	
Occupation	Farmer	1 (6.3)	15 (93.8)	7.061 (0.133)	13 (81.3)	3 (18.8)	2.817 (0.589)
	Government employee	19 (11.2)	150 (88.8)		102 (60.4)	67 (39.6)	
	Business (self)	5 (3.7)	131 (96.3)		86 (63.2)	50 (36.8)	
	Unemployed	4 (12.1)	29 (87.9)		20 (60.6)	13 (39.4)	
	Others*	7 (6.7)	98 (93.3)		65 (61.9)	40 (38.1)	
Hand washing facility	Yes	18 (5.8)	291 (94.2)	5.327 (0.021)*	-	-	-
	No	18 (12)	132 (88)		-	-	

* = P-value significant at <0.05

256

257

258

259

Discussion

This study explores data on adherence of people towards the recommended preventive measures of COVID-19. As any part of the country, the community members in Arba Minch town are at high risk for Coronavirus infection due to existence of strong social interaction in the society which could favour the virus transmission rapidly in the community. However, the findings of this study suggest that physical distancing and other COVID-19 preventive measures were inadequately implemented among people in Arba Minch town, southern Ethiopia. While almost all participants (99.3%) were informed on COVID-19, our study found out that only 43.6% of participants achieved above the mean score (6 ± 1.97) on preventive measures. On the contrary, data of our study revealed that 63.4% of participants perceived as they were implementing the preventive measures against COVID-19.

In the current study, only 29.8% of participants self-reported as they kept at least 2 meters distance outside their home, and in none of the public gathering places the recommended physical distance (at least 2 meter) was not kept totally. The possible reason for low implementation of physical distancing is probably due to the strong social interaction norms that exist in the society. In consistent with this finding, a facility based study conducted in another part of Ethiopia (Jimma) revealed that slightly higher practice of avoiding physical proximity (33.6%) [17]. The higher report of keeping physical distance in Jimma probably due to proximity was measured at a distance with minimum of 1 meter.

In this study, only 37.7% of participants had face mask use practice when leaving out home, which is lower than the face mask use practice in Malaysia (51.2%) [18]. The lower practice of face mask in our study might be due to lack of money to purchase face mask, as justified by data of our study. Surprisingly, study participants in China demonstrated “as high as 98% of respondents had face mask use practice” [19].

With regard to hand sanitizer use, this study showed that only 20.5% of respondents had frequent use of hand sanitizer. The reason behind for low utilization of hand sanitizer in our study might be lack of access to hand sanitizer at affordable cost.

In the current study, only 13.07% of participants were measuring their body temperature every two week. The low practice of measuring body temperature is probably due to lack of access to temperature screening service.

In our study, we observed that less than 50% (42.5%) of respondents avoided going to public gathering places in the last 7 days. This result might be due to the fact that strong social interaction norm exist in the society, and our data justified as many people move to market areas to purchase their groceries. In consistent with this finding, a study conducted in Jimma town, Ethiopia demonstrated that a higher avoidance of going to public gathering place (53.8%) [17]. In addition, the finding of a study conducted in Malaysia showed a significant higher difference in avoiding going to public gathering places (83.4%) [18].

With regard to stopping touching nose, eye and mouth practice, in our study, 44.7% of participants stopped touching their nose, eye and mouth. This finding indicated that still more intervention is required to bring behavioral change.

This study demonstrated that 55.6 % of participants practiced stay-at-home as preventive measure. However, data of our study showed that substantial number of participants mentioned that stay-at-home is very challenging as a result of economic problem, which force people going outside their home to look for their daily breads.

Finding of the current study showed that only 60% of participant had frequent hand washing practice. The inadequate hand washing practice observed in this study could be due to lack of sustainable social behavioral change communication (SBCC). In consistent with this result, findings of studies conducted in another part of Ethiopia, in Philippines and Malaysia revealed much better hand washing practice [17, 18, 20].

Data of our study revealed that 66.7% of respondents had practice of covering their mouth and nose while coughing or sneezing with cloth, mask or tissue. Inadequate mouth and nose covering while coughing or sneezing with cloth, mask or tissue observed in this study could be due to lack of sustainable social behavioral change communication (SBCC).

In the current study, 68.2% of participants had treatment seeking behavior if they experience flue like symptoms. This might be due to people have high fear of the virus as it could result in death.

Moreover, 69.1% of participants practiced isolating themselves while having flue like symptoms. In consistent with this finding, a bi-national study conducted in Africa (Nigeria and Egypt) showed that “as many as 96% of study participants practiced self-isolation and social distancing” [21].

Furthermore, predominantly, this study demonstrated that as high as 89.3% of participants avoided hand shaking. On the contrary, a lower practice of hand shaking was observed in a study conducted at another part of Ethiopia (53.8%) [17].

The main strengths are that we could assess community’s adherence towards the recommended preventive measures of the COVID-19 pandemic at community level, which address an important national and global operational research priority.

While interpreting data presented in this study, the following limitations need to be considered. First, findings are relied on self-reported practices of participants. Second, people may report as they were implementing preventive measures due to social desirability.

Conclusions

The findings of this study suggest that physical distancing and other COVID-19 preventive measures were inadequately implemented among people in Arba Minch town. Thus, an urgent call for action is demanding in order to combat this dangerous infectious virus as early

as possible before it brings devastating impact. Further, studies focusing on barriers relate to implementation of preventive measures against COVID-19 should be explored.

Acknowledgements


Authors would like to thank study participants, data collectors, and administrative officials.


References

1. Gorbalenya AE, Baker SC, Baric R, Groot RJ, Drosten C, Gulyaeva AA, et al. Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus: The species and its viruses—a statement of the Coronavirus Study Group.
2. Hassan SA, Sheikh FN, Jamal S, Ezech JK, Akhtar A. Coronavirus (COVID-19): a review of clinical features, diagnosis, and treatment. *Cureus*. 2020 Mar; 12(3).
3. World Health Organization. COVID 19 Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC). Global research and innovation forum: towards a research roadmap.
4. Carlos WG, Dela CC, Cao B, Pasnick S, Jamil S. Novel Wuhan (2019-nCoV) Coronavirus. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*. 2020 Feb 15; 201(4):P7.
5. Zhang H, Kang Z, Gong H, Xu D, Wang J, Li Z, et al. Digestive system is a potential route of COVID-19: an analysis of single-cell coexpression pattern of key proteins in viral entry process. *Gut*. 2020 Jun 1; 69(6):1010-8.
6. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a report of 72 314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *Jama*. 2020 Apr 7; 323(13):1239-42.

7. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. The Lancet. 2020 Feb 15; 395(10223):507-13.
8. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. The lancet. 2020 Mar 11.
9. World Health Organization, World health organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports-199. 2020
10. Hotez PJ, Bottazzi ME, Singh SK, Brindley PJ, Kamhawi S. Will COVID-19 become the next neglected tropical disease?.
11. World Health Organization. First case of COVID-19 confirmed in Ethiopia. 2020. <https://www.afro.who.int/news/first-case-covid-19-confirmed-ethiopia>
12. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) advice for the public. 2020.
13. World Health Organization. WHO COVID-19 preparedness and response progress report.2020
14. Federal Ministry of health. National comprehensive covid19 management hand book. Ethiopia. 2020
15. World Health Organization. COVID-19 Response Bulletin for Ethiopia 04 April 2020. <https://www.afro.who.int/publications/covid-19-response-bulletin-ethiopia-04-april-2020>
16. CSA. Population Projection for Ethiopia 2007-2037 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. 2013.
17. Kebede Y, Yitayih Y, Birhanu Z, Mekonen S, Ambelu A. Knowledge, perceptions and preventive practices towards COVID-19 early in the outbreak among Jimma

- 380 university medical center visitors, Southwest Ethiopia. PloS one. 2020 May 21;
381 15(5):e0233744.
- 382 18. Azlan AA, Hamzah MR, Sern TJ, Ayub SH, Mohamad E. Public knowledge, attitudes
383 and practices towards COVID-19: A cross-sectional study in Malaysia. Plos one.
384 2020 May 21;15(5):e0233668.
- 385 19. Zhong BL, Luo W, Li HM, Zhang QQ, Liu XG, Li WT, et al. Knowledge, attitudes,
386 and practices towards COVID-19 among Chinese residents during the rapid rise
387 period of the COVID-19 outbreak: a quick online cross-sectional survey. International
388 journal of biological sciences. 2020; 16(10):1745.
- 389 20. Lau LL, Hung N, Go DJ, Ferma J, Choi M, Dodd W, et al. Knowledge, attitudes and
390 practices of COVID-19 among income-poor households in the Philippines: A cross-
391 sectional study. Journal of global health. 2020 Jun; 10(1).
- 392 21. Elnadi H, Odetokun IA, Bolarinwa O, Ahmed Z, Okechukwu O, Al-Mustapha AI.
393 Knowledge, attitude, and perceptions towards the 2019 Coronavirus Pandemic: A bi-
394 national survey in Africa. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1.





Place of physical distancing (n=55)

■ < 1 meter

■ Between 1 and 2 meter

■ 2 meter and above

