

1 **Knowledge, Attitude and Practice towards COVID-19**
2 **among people in Bangladesh during the pandemic: a**
3 **cross-sectional study.**

4 **Author**

5 **Md. Golam Rabbani^{1, *}, Orin Akter², Md. Zahid Hasan², Nandeeta Samad³, Shehrin**
6 **Shaila Mahmood², Taufique Joarder^{1,4}**

7 **Affiliation**

8 ¹Public Health Foundation, Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

9 ²Health Systems and Population Studies Division, International Centre for Diarrhoeal
10 Disease Research, Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

11 ³Department of Public Health, North South University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

12 ⁴Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, United States

13 *** Corresponding author:** Md. Golam Rabbani

14 **E-mail:** rabbaniduihe@gmail.com

15 **Abstract**

16 The world is grappling with Covid-19, a dire public health crisis. Preventive and control
17 measures are adopted to reduce the spread of COVID-19. It is important to know the
18 knowledge, attitude, and practice (KAP) of people towards this pandemic to suggest
19 appropriate coping strategies. The aim of this study was to assess the KAP of Bangladeshi
20 people towards Covid-19 and determinants of those KAPs. We conducted a cross-sectional
21 survey of 492 Bangladeshi people aged above 18 years from May 7 to 29, 2020 throughout
22 the country. Simple and multiple logistic regression analyses were conducted to identify the
23 factors associated with KAP on COVID-19. About 45% of respondents had good
24 knowledge, 49% of respondents expressed positive attitude towards controlling of

25 COVID-19 and 24% of respondents had favorable practice towards COVID-19. Almost
26 three fourths of the respondents went outside home during the lockdown period.
27 Furthermore, the study found that good knowledge and attitude were associated with better
28 practice of COVID-19 health measures. An evidence informed and context specific risk
29 communication and community engagement, and a social and behavior change
30 communication strategy against COVID-19 should be developed in Bangladesh, based on
31 the findings of this study, targeting different socio-economic groups.

32 **Introduction**

33 The world is struggling with COVID-19 pandemic for quite some time, and Bangladesh
34 is hard hit [1]. As of July 30, 2020, it has been reported across 215 countries and regions due
35 to human interaction, and has infected more than 17 million people with 672,364 deaths [2].
36 It is concerning that , in terms of daily identified case rates, Bangladesh--a lower middle
37 income country (LMIC)--has ranked 16th in the world and 3rd among the South Asian
38 countries[2]. Although Bangladesh detected the first case later than many countries (8
39 March 2020), to date (July 30, 2020), a total of 234,889 cases have been identified,
40 including total 3,083 deaths [3].

41 One of the reasons for such a rapid increase may be that Bangladesh is the second most
42 densely populated country in the world [4]. Recent statistics have estimated that population
43 of Bangladesh is about 165 million with 1,239.6 people per square kilometers [5,6]. In
44 Bangladesh, a large proportion of population still lives below the poverty line, and almost
45 half of the population is exposed to multiple socioeconomic vulnerabilities[4,7]. Evidently,
46 newer underprivileged communities are falling a victim to COVID-19 [8]. Bangladesh

47 suffers from a low literacy rate [5], which may potentially expose the population to an
48 unfavorable knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP) towards a persisting pandemic.
49 Socio-economic status, over population, lifestyle, etc. may contribute to the recent rapid
50 increase of Covid-19 cases in Bangladesh.

51 There is no control measure and treatment considered effective to combat the pandemic
52 except for Convalescent Plasma Therapy (CPT), until vaccine is available [9,10]. However,
53 regarding prevention of the spread of this disease, non-clinical interventions based on
54 primary health care practice have been suggested by the World Health Organization (WHO)
55 considering existing scientific evidences [11]. These interventions have been proposed as
56 the cheapest, easiest, and the most effective ways to interrupt the spread of the virus
57 [12,13,14], but these are largely dependent on people's KAP. Appropriate maintenance of
58 these interventions is important to reduce the spread of outbreaks and a responsive health
59 system can play a key role to implement social and behavior change communication
60 (SBCC) interventions to control such outbreaks [15,16]. Public behavior is also crucial in
61 combating the pandemic influenced by people's knowledge of preventing this infectious
62 disease. Recent scientific evidences have demonstrated that the adequate knowledge,
63 attitude and appropriate practice of the interventions are associated with reduction of
64 morbidity and mortality and ultimately total control over COVID-19 [17, 18]. Thus,
65 coordination of whole-society in an appropriate way for generating knowledge and
66 maintaining proper attitude and practice is essential to counter the pandemic [16]. Although
67 it is believed that knowledge and practice measures are the ultimate solutions, the

68 interventions such as social distancing, hand hygiene, home quarantine, etc. may seem to the
69 people of Bangladesh as new concepts which should be ingrained. Hence, In Bangladesh, it
70 would be difficult to get used to with the interventions in a short of time, without a
71 thoroughly designed context specific SBCC strategy.

72 As of now, there have been no alternative to generating awareness against COVID-19
73 among the people and construct relevant KAP among them. Therefore, to facilitate
74 management against COVID-19 in Bangladesh, it is important to understand the public's
75 KAP of COVID-19 and undertake necessary strategies. Although several studies related to
76 KAP towards COVID-19 have been conducted globally, there is paucity of such study in
77 Bangladesh that includes all divisions and conducts survey through audio communication
78 instead of online survey. This evidence should be useful for policymakers, as it will allow
79 them to design a context-specific social and behavior change strategy in Bangladesh. The
80 objective of this study was to assess the KAP towards COVID-19 of Bangladeshi residents
81 during the rapid rise period of the COVID-19 outbreak in Bangladesh.

82 **Materials and Methods**

83 **Study design and setting**

84 A cross-sectional survey from May 7 to May 29, 2020, during the lockdown period in
85 Bangladesh was conducted among 492 individuals aged 18 years and above for measuring
86 the KAPs regarding COVID-19. The study was conducted throughout the country as it
87 surveyed individuals from eight administrative divisions (Barishal, Chattogram, Dhaka,
88 Khulna, Mymensingh, Rajshahi, Rangpur, and Sylhet) of Bangladesh. As it was not feasible

89 to conduct a community-based national sampling survey during the national lockdown or
90 restricted-mobility period, we decided to collect the data through direct phone calls or
91 through digital social media platforms like WhatsApp, Messenger, Skype, Zoom etc.
92 However, we also conducted face-to-face surveys in some cases for the convenience of the
93 respondents. Primarily, we collected contact numbers from the network of the studied
94 population. Later, we contacted the individuals and surveyed them if consented.
95 Additionally, from eight divisions, we hired volunteers who assisted in data collection from
96 their respective divisions.

97 **Sample design**

98 We calculated the sample size from an unknown population by using simple random
99 sampling technique at 95% confidence interval and at 0.5 level of precision, and the sample
100 size was determined as 384. We anticipated that around 20% of participants would not
101 participate in the survey. Therefore, the sample size was increased to 480 after adjusting for
102 the 20% non-response rate. We split the sample into eight divisions proportionately to the
103 population of the respective divisions (Barishal 5.7%, Chattogram 17.5%, Dhaka 23.3%,
104 Khulna 11.9%, Mymensingh 7.4%, Rajshahi 14.3%, Rangpur 11.8%, and Sylhet 6%) [19].

105 **Data collection instruments and measures**

106 We developed a structured questionnaire for the individual survey which consisted of
107 two segments: 1) Socio-demographic characteristics, and 2) Knowledge, attitude and
108 practice. Socio-demographic variables included age, gender, education, occupation, current
109 residence, religion, marital status, number of persons, room, toilets in current living

110 residence and income. According to national guidelines for clinical and community
111 management of COVID-19 by the Government of Bangladesh, WHO reports, and rigorous
112 literature review, the investigators pilot tested a COVID-19 questionnaire [1,10,11,17]. The
113 questionnaire includes a few questions regarding clinical presentations, transmission routes,
114 prevention and control, and source of knowledge of COVID-19. These questions were
115 answered on a yes or no basis with an additional “don’t know” option. A correct answer was
116 assigned 1 point and an incorrect and don’t know answer was assigned 0 point. The total
117 knowledge score ranged from 0 to 14, with a higher score denoting a better knowledge of
118 COVID-19. To determine the KAP level, the cut off value was determined by authors based
119 on the context of Bangladesh considering the ghastliness of COVID-19. Having more than
120 80% scores was classified as “Good knowledge” and having less than or equal to 80%
121 scores was considered as “poor knowledge”. Similar scoring approach was used for
122 classifying “positive attitude” and “negative attitude”, “good practice” and “poor practice”.

123 **Statistical Analysis**

124 Both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were performed. In the descriptive
125 analyses, the characteristics of the study participants were presented in terms of frequency (n)
126 and percentages (%) with 95% confidence interval (CI). KAPs of different groups according
127 to demographic and socio-economic characteristics were compared. Simple logistic and
128 multiple logistic regression analyses were conducted using all of the socio-demographic
129 variables as exposures and knowledge as the outcome variable to identify factors associated

130 with knowledge. Similar analyses were performed to identify factors associated with
131 attitudes and practices. We analyzed the data using Stata version 13 and Microsoft Excel.

132 **Ethical approval**

133 The study protocol was approved by Ethical Review Committee of Public Health
134 Foundation, Bangladesh [Ethics Reference No:2020/01]. We adhered to all ethical principles
135 during the research process.

136 **Results**

137 **Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics**

138 As shown in Table 1. Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of participants (N =
139 492)., a total of 492 individuals were surveyed in this study and majority of them belonged to
140 younger age group (52% below 35 years). Among the participants, about 65% were male,
141 32% had a higher level of education (bachelor or higher level), 62% were currently living in
142 the rural area, 41% were not employed and had no income, and more than 90% of
143 respondents had access to available running water. Other characteristics are shown in Table
144 1. Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of participants (N = 492).

145 **Table 1. Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of participants (N = 492).**

146

Variables	n	%	95% CI
Age group			
≤ 25	84	17.07	(14-20.7)
26-35	172	34.96	(30.9-39.3)
36-45	83	16.87	(13.8-20.5)
46-55	59	11.99	(9.4-15.2)
56-65	54	10.98	(8.5-14.1)
≥ 66	40	8.13	(6-10.9)
Sex			
Male	321	65.24	(60.9-69.3)

Female	171	34.76	(30.7-39.1)
Education Level			
No education	76	15.45	(12.5-18.9)
Primary and can sign	87	17.68	(14.5-21.3)
Secondary and SSC	103	20.93	(17.6-24.8)
HSC passed or equivalent	70	14.23	(11.4-17.6)
Higher	156	31.71	(27.7-36)
Occupation			
Currently not employed	202	41.06	(36.8-45.5)
Service holder	134	27.24	(23.5-31.4)
Farmer	28	5.69	(4-8.1)
Business man	57	11.59	(9-14.7)
Day labor	52	10.57	(8.1-13.6)
Others	19	3.86	(2.5-6)
Religion			
Muslim	454	92.28	(89.6-94.3)
Others	38	7.72	(5.7-10.4)
Current living residence			
Urban	188	38.21	(34-42.6)
Rural	304	61.79	(57.4-66)
Marital status			
In a marital relationship	331	67.28	(63-71.3)
Not in a marital relationship	161	32.72	(28.7-37)
Family size			
1-3 members	109	22.15	(18.7-26.1)
3-6 members	316	64.23	(59.9-68.4)
7 & more	67	13.62	(10.9-17)
Earning person in family			
No earning person	6	1.22	(0.5-2.7)
Single earning person	253	51.42	(47-55.8)
Two & more	233	47.36	(43-51.8)
Monthly income			
No earning	202	41.06	(36.8-45.5)
1000-10000	111	22.56	(19.1-26.5)
11000-20000	80	16.26	(13.2-19.8)
21000-30000	39	7.93	(5.8-10.7)
31000-40000	33	6.71	(4.8-9.3)
>40000	27	5.49	(3.8-7.9)
Availability of running water at home			
Yes	449	91.26	(88.4-93.5)
No	43	8.74	(6.5-11.6)

Division

Barishal	30	6.1	(4.3-8.6)
Chattogram	87	17.68	(14.5-21.3)
Dhaka	120	24.39	(20.8-28.4)
Khulna	59	11.99	(9.4-15.2)
Mymensingh	38	7.72	(5.7-10.4)
Rajshahi	69	14.02	(11.2-17.4)
Rangpur	59	11.99	(9.4-15.2)
Sylhet	30	6.1	(4.3-8.6)

147 **Assessment of knowledge and factors associated with knowledge about COVID-19**

148 The average knowledge score for participants was 10.56 (Standard deviation [SD] =
 149 2.86, range 0–14). Among all participants, the range of correct answer rates was between
 150 55.28 and 91.46. About 44.51% of participants were able to provide correct answer for more
 151 than 11 questions or obtained scores more than 80%, representing an acceptable level of good
 152 knowledge on COVID-19, which was 0.64 more than the average score [Table 2:
 153 Respondents’ Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices towards COVID-19].

154 **Table 2: Respondents’ Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices towards COVID-19.**

155

Questions	Rate of response (%)		Mean (SD)	KAP Level (%)	
	Yes	No		Poor	Good
Knowledge about COVID-19					
1. Fever, dry cough and shortness of breath are the main clinical symptoms.	90.85	9.15	10.56 (2.86)	55.49	44.51
2. Neck pain/sore throat, tiredness, runny nose, sneezing and diarrhea are fewer common symptoms.	55.28	44.72			
3. Currently there is no effective treatment except symptomatic and supportive treatment.	71.95	8.05			
4. The elder people with chronic illnesses such as diabetic, high BP, heart disease etc. are more likely to be severe cases.	72.76	7.24			
5. Eating or contacting wild animals would result in the infection by the COVID-19 virus.	60.16	39.84			
6. Persons with COVID-2019 without fever can infect others.	62.4	37.6			
7. The COVID-19 virus spreads via respiratory droplets of infected individuals.	82.11	17.89			
8. It is necessary to all to take measures to prevent the infection by the COVID-19 virus.	56.1	43.9			
9. Individuals should avoid going to crowded places such as market, public transportations to prevent the infection.	83.13	16.87			

10. At least 1 meter/ 3 feet is the recommended social distance or physical distance for COVID-19 if go outside of home.	85.37	14.63			
11. Individual should wash hand frequently after coming from outside, before eating or touching mouth, nose, or eyes to prevent the infection.	91.46	8.54			
12. Recommended time for washing hand with soap/ alcohol is minimum 20-30 seconds to prevent the infection.	78.86	21.14			
13. Isolation and supportive treatment are effective ways to reduce the spread of the virus.	80.28	19.72			
14. The immediate observation period is 14 days if anyone contact with someone infected with the COVID-19.	84.96	15.04			
Attitudes towards COVID-19	Yes	No	Mean (SD)	Poor	Good
1. I agree that COVID-19 will finally be successfully controlled.	68.5	31.5	1.24 (0.83)	51.02	48.98
2. I have confidence that Bangladesh will win the battle against the COVID-19.	55.28	44.72			
Practices towards COVID-19	Yes	No	Mean (SD)	Poor	Good
1. When I went out, I have avoided crowded place.	42.62	57.38	3.17 (1.50)	76.04	23.96
2. When I went out, I have maintained the recommended social distance of 1 meter or 3 feet.	63.79	36.21			
3. When I went out, I have worn a mask regularly and thoroughly.	71.31	28.69			
4. If I were to go out, I have washed my hand after coming from outside and before eating or touching mouth, nose or eyes regularly and thoroughly.	76.04	23.96			
5. I have maintained the recommended hand washing time of 20-30 seconds regularly and thoroughly.	63.23	36.77			

156 Table 3. Association of background characteristics with knowledge towards COVID-19.

157 demonstrates the factors associated with knowledge about COVID-19. Unadjusted model

158 showed that several factors, such as age groups, sex, education, occupation, current living

159 residence, marital status, income level, and administrative regions, were significantly

160 associated with knowledge on COVID-19. The adjusted model, after adjusting for the other

161 variables, showed that education, marital status, family size, monthly income, and

162 administrative regions were significantly associated with knowledge about COVID-19. The

163 higher age groups, such as 46-55, 56-65, and greater or equal to 66, were more likely to have

164 poor knowledge with the lower odds compared to the reference age group below or equal to

165 25. The female respondents were more likely to have poor knowledge with the lower odds

166 (OR: 0.64; 95% CI: 0.44-0.94) compared to their male counterparts. Among the different
 167 occupation groups, farmer (OR:0.42; 95% CI: 0.16-1.09) and day laborer (OR:0.42; 95% CI:
 168 0.2-0.86) were significantly associated with lower knowledge as they had 58% lower odds to
 169 have good knowledge compared to reference category, currently not employed. In terms of
 170 residence, the rural people (OR:0.44; 95% CI: 0.3-0.64) were significantly lower
 171 knowledgeable as they had 56% lower odds to have good knowledge about COVID-19,
 172 compared to their urban counterparts. According to administrative regions, the respondents
 173 of Rajshahi division (OR:0.25; 95% CI:0.09-0.65) had poor knowledge compared to the
 174 respondents from reference regions, Barishal division.

175 **Table 3. Association of background characteristics with knowledge towards COVID-19.**

176

Variables	%(N=492)	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
		OR (SE)	95% CI	p-Value	OR (SE)	95% CI	p-Value
Age group							
≤ 25	17.07	Ref.			Ref.		
26-35	34.96	1.77 (0.48)	(1.05-3.01)	0.034*	1.93 (0.73)	(0.92-4.06)	0.084
36-45	16.87	0.57 (0.18)	(0.3-1.05)	0.072	0.79 (0.37)	(0.31-1.99)	0.616
46-55	11.99	0.34 (0.13)	(0.17-0.7)	0.004*	0.87 (0.45)	(0.31-2.39)	0.782
56-65	10.98	0.42 (0.16)	(0.2-0.87)	0.019*	1.33 (0.73)	(0.45-3.9)	0.602
≥ 66	8.13	0.18 (0.09)	(0.07-0.46)	0.001*	0.38 (0.25)	(0.1-1.41)	0.149
Sex							
Male	65.24	Ref.			Ref.		
Female	34.76	0.64 (0.12)	(0.44-0.94)	0.021*	0.67 (0.2)	(0.38-1.2)	0.179
Education Level							
No education	15.45	Ref.			Ref.		
Primary and can sign	17.68	2.38 (0.96)	(1.08-5.25)	0.031*	1.88 (0.88)	(0.75-4.69)	0.175
Secondary and SSC	20.93	2.43 (0.95)	(1.13-5.23)	0.023*	1.59 (0.76)	(0.62-4.06)	0.336
HSC passed or equivalent	14.23	7.88 (3.2)	(3.56-17.45)	0.001*	4.58 (2.56)	(1.53-13.72)	0.006*
Higher	31.71	15.53 (5.78)	(7.49-32.2)	0.001*	6.07 (3.23)	(2.14-17.23)	0.001*

Occupation							
Curr. not employed	41.06	Ref.			Ref.		
Service holder	27.24	2.98 (0.69)	(1.89-4.69)	0.001*	0.77 (0.41)	(0.27-2.2)	0.625
Farmer	5.69	0.42 (0.2)	(0.16-1.09)	0.076	0.62 (0.44)	(0.16-2.45)	0.5
Business man	11.59	1.22 (0.37)	(0.67-2.2)	0.519	0.43 (0.26)	(0.13-1.39)	0.157
Day laborer	10.57	0.42 (0.15)	(0.2-0.86)	0.018*	0.35 (0.21)	(0.11-1.14)	0.082
Others	3.86	1.73 (0.83)	(0.67-4.45)	0.255	1.15 (0.81)	(0.29-4.6)	0.845
Religion							
Muslim	92.28	Ref.			Ref.		
Others	7.72	1.6 (0.54)	(0.82-3.11)	0.168	0.8 (0.41)	(0.29-2.2)	0.667
Current living residence							
Urban	38.21	Ref.			Ref.		
Rural	61.79	0.44 (0.08)	(0.3-0.64)	0.001*	0.67 (0.18)	(0.39-1.14)	0.142
Marital status							
In a marital relationship	67.28	Ref.			Ref.		
Not in a marital relationship	32.72	2.6 (0.51)	(1.76-3.82)	0.000*	1.98 (0.55)	(1.14-3.43)	0.015*
Family size							
1-3 members	22.15	Ref.			Ref.		
3-6 members	64.23	0.98 (0.22)	(0.63-1.51)	0.916	2.13 (0.68)	(1.14-3.96)	0.017*
7 & more	13.62	0.56 (0.18)	(0.3-1.05)	0.069	0.98 (0.46)	(0.39-2.47)	0.974
Earning person in family							
No earning person	1.22	Ref.			Ref.		
Single earning person	51.42	0.38 (0.33)	(0.07-2.1)	0.267	0.23 (0.24)	(0.03-1.81)	0.163
Two & more	47.36	0.42 (0.37)	(0.07-2.32)	0.318	0.23 (0.24)	(0.03-1.82)	0.163
Monthly income							
No earning	41.06	Ref.			Ref.		
1000-10000	22.56	0.81 (0.2)	(0.5-1.33)	0.412	2.2 (1.11)	(0.82-5.92)	0.119
11000-20000	16.26	1.6 (0.43)	(0.95-2.7)	0.079	1.56 (0.84)	(0.54-4.5)	0.408
21000-30000	7.93	4.5 (1.73)	(2.12-9.56)	0.001*	2.51 (1.57)	(0.74-8.54)	0.139
31000-40000	6.71	3.53 (1.4)	(1.62-7.7)	0.001*	2.73 (1.75)	(0.78-9.58)	0.117
>40000	5.49	10.16 (5.7)	(3.38-30.52)	0.001*	14.28 (11.17)	(3.08-66.16)	0.001*
Availability of running water at home							
Yes	91.26	Ref.			Ref.		
No	8.74	0.51 (0.18)	(0.26-1.01)	0.052	0.54 (0.23)	(0.24-1.24)	0.146
Division							
Barishal	6.1	Ref.			Ref.		
Chattogram	17.68	1.4 (0.6)	(0.61-3.23)	0.429	1.38 (0.74)	(0.48-3.94)	0.548
Dhaka	24.39	0.7 (0.29)	(0.31-1.59)	0.398	1.02 (0.55)	(0.36-2.91)	0.966

Khulna	11.99	2.37 (1.08)	(0.96-5.81)	0.06	1.58 (0.91)	(0.51-4.89)	0.426
Mymensingh	7.72	2.01 (0.99)	(0.76-5.3)	0.161	2.87 (1.82)	(0.83-9.94)	0.096
Rajshahi	14.02	0.25 (0.12)	(0.09-0.65)	0.005*	0.22 (0.13)	(0.06-0.73)	0.013*
Rangpur	11.99	0.84 (0.38)	(0.34-2.04)	0.693	3.41 (2.16)	(0.98-11.83)	0.053
Sylhet	6.1	5.23 (3.07)	(1.66-16.51)	0.005*	5.37 (4.01)	(1.24-23.22)	0.025*

177 Fig. 1: Source of knowledge about COVID-19 among participants. shows the sources of
 178 knowledge and it indicates television (54%), followed by social media (22%) to be the major
 179 sources of knowledge on Covid-19. Other important sources were family members (9%),
 180 neighbors (8%), and internet (5%), respectively.

181 **Fig. 1: Source of knowledge about COVID-19 among participants.**

182 **Assessment of attitude and factors associated with attitude towards COVID-19.**

183 The range of positive attitudes rates for all participants was between 55.28 and 68.50.
 184 About 49% of participants were confident and agreed with the 2 questions or obtained scores
 185 of 100%, representing an acceptable level of positive attitude towards control and battle
 186 against the COVID-19, which was 0.76 more than the average score [Table 2: Respondents'
 187 Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices towards COVID-19.].

188 Table 4. Association of background characteristics with attitudes towards COVID-19.
 189 demonstrates the factors associated with attitudes towards COVID-19. Unadjusted model
 190 presented that several factors, such as religion, knowledge about COVID-19, and
 191 administrative regions, were significantly associated with attitudes towards COVID-19.
 192 Whereas the adjusted model, after adjusting for the other variables, showed that education,
 193 occupation, religion, monthly income, knowledge about COVID-18, administrative regions
 194 were significantly associated with attitudes towards COVID-19. According to education
 195 level, the higher educated people (OR:0.3; 95% CI: 0.12-0.77) were more likely have

196 negative attitudes with the lower odds regarding the controlling of COVID-19 compared to
 197 the people with no education. People with income level between 21,000 and 30000,
 198 (OR:0.29; 95% CI: 0.09-0.91) and more than 40,000 (OR:0.25; 95% CI: (0.07-0.9) had
 199 higher likelihood of negative attitudes compared to the no income people towards controlling
 200 of COVID-19.

201 **Table 4. Association of background characteristics with attitudes towards COVID-19.**

202

Variables	%(N=492)	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
		OR (SE)	95% CI	p-Value	OR (SE)	95% CI	p-Value
Age group							
≤ 25	17.07	Ref.			Ref.		
26-35	34.96	0.98 (0.26)	(0.58-1.64)	0.927	0.95 (0.33)	(0.48-1.89)	0.89
36-45	16.87	0.98 (0.3)	(0.53-1.79)	0.939	1.15 (0.48)	(0.5-2.61)	0.743
46-55	11.99	0.75 (0.26)	(0.38-1.47)	0.402	0.74 (0.33)	(0.3-1.8)	0.503
56-65	10.98	0.66 (0.23)	(0.33-1.31)	0.231	0.66 (0.32)	(0.25-1.72)	0.394
≥ 66	8.13	1.05 (0.41)	(0.5-2.24)	0.892	0.79 (0.42)	(0.28-2.26)	0.66
Sex							
Male	65.24	Ref.			Ref.		
Female	34.76	0.87 (0.17)	(0.6-1.27)	0.476	0.9 (0.24)	(0.54-1.5)	0.684
Education Level							
No education	15.45	Ref.			Ref.		
Primary and can sign	17.68	0.77 (0.24)	(0.42-1.43)	0.408	0.74 (0.28)	(0.35-1.56)	0.43
Secondary and SSC	20.93	0.8 (0.24)	(0.44-1.44)	0.452	0.56 (0.22)	(0.26-1.2)	0.138
HSC passed or equivalent	14.23	1.19 (0.4)	(0.62-2.29)	0.595	0.57 (0.28)	(0.22-1.5)	0.252
Higher	31.71	0.92 (0.26)	(0.53-1.6)	0.78	0.3 (0.14)	(0.12-0.77)	0.012
Occupation							
Curr. not employed	41.06	Ref.			Ref.		
Service holder	27.24	1.16 (0.26)	(0.75-1.8)	0.505	2.2 (1.09)	(0.83-5.81)	0.111
Farmer	5.69	0.73 (0.3)	(0.33-1.63)	0.442	1.58 (0.99)	(0.46-5.42)	0.469
Business man	11.59	1.66 (0.51)	(0.92-3.02)	0.094	3.54 (1.96)	(1.2-10.47)	0.022*
Day labor	10.57	1.04 (0.32)	(0.57-1.92)	0.893	2.37 (1.24)	(0.85-6.61)	0.101
Others	3.86	0.82 (0.4)	(0.32-2.12)	0.681	1.85 (1.28)	(0.48-7.19)	0.375
Religion							

Muslim	92.28	Ref.			Ref.		
Others	7.72	5.15 (2.21)	(2.22-11.93)	0.001*	3.56 (1.81)	(1.31-9.64)	0.013*
Current living residence							
Urban	38.21	Ref.			Ref.		
Rural	61.79	0.87 (0.16)	(0.61-1.26)	0.468	0.77 (0.2)	(0.47-1.27)	0.31
Marital status							
In a marital relationship	67.28	Ref.			Ref.		
Not in a marital relationship	32.72	1.4 (0.27)	(0.96-2.05)	0.08	1.56 (0.4)	(0.95-2.57)	0.079
Family size							
1-3 members	22.15	Ref.			Ref.		
3-6 members	64.23	1.32 (0.29)	(0.85-2.05)	0.214	1.49 (0.42)	(0.86-2.61)	0.157
7 & more	13.62	1.16 (0.36)	(0.63-2.14)	0.63	1.27 (0.52)	(0.57-2.83)	0.551
Earning person in Household							
No earning person	1.22	Ref.			Ref.		
Single earning person	51.42	1.72 (1.51)	(0.31-9.56)	0.535	2.95 (2.8)	(0.46-18.95)	0.255
Two & more	47.36	2.2 (1.93)	(0.39-12.24)	0.369	4.03 (3.88)	(0.61-26.56)	0.148
Monthly income							
No earning	41.06	Ref.			Ref.		
1000-10000	22.56	0.74 (0.18)	(0.46-1.18)	0.199	0.42 (0.19)	(0.17-1.03)	0.057
11000-20000	16.26	1.34 (0.36)	(0.79-2.25)	0.274	0.37 (0.19)	(0.14-1.01)	0.052
21000-30000	7.93	1.1 (0.38)	(0.55-2.17)	0.795	0.29 (0.17)	(0.09-0.91)	0.033
31000-40000	6.71	1.11 (0.42)	(0.53-2.31)	0.79	0.32 (0.19)	(0.1-1.06)	0.062
>40000	5.49	1.12 (0.46)	(0.5-2.5)	0.782	0.25 (0.16)	(0.07-0.9)	0.033
Availability of running water at home							
Yes	91.26	Ref.			Ref.		
No	8.74	0.53 (0.18)	(0.27-1.02)	0.056	0.54 (0.21)	(0.25-1.15)	0.108
Knowledge about COVID-19							
Poor	55.49	Ref.			Ref.		
Good	44.51	1.93 (0.35)	(1.34-2.76)	0.001*	1.76 (0.45)	(1.07-2.89)	0.027*
Division							
Barishal	6.1	Ref.			Ref.		
Chattogram	17.68	1.06 (0.46)	(0.45-2.47)	0.895	1.14 (0.53)	(0.46-2.84)	0.775
Dhaka	24.39	1.11 (0.46)	(0.49-2.51)	0.804	0.86 (0.4)	(0.35-2.12)	0.741
Khulna	11.99	7.35 (3.74)	(2.71-19.94)	0.001*	8.96 (5.04)	(2.98-26.98)	0.000*
Mymensingh	7.72	4.2 (2.2)	(1.5-11.73)	0.006*	4.29 (2.47)	(1.39-13.27)	0.011*
Rajshahi	14.02	0.45 (0.21)	(0.18-1.14)	0.091	0.42 (0.22)	(0.15-1.18)	0.099

Rangpur	11.99	1.35 (0.62)	(0.56-3.3)	0.504	1.54 (0.84)	(0.53-4.49)	0.426
Sylhet	6.1	3.5 (1.91)	(1.2-10.2)	0.022*	1.63 (1)	(0.49-5.42)	0.425

203

204 Fig. 2: Distribution of respondents based on went outside of home during lockdown period. shows
 205 that about 73% of study population went outside of home during lockdown period. Practices
 206 toward COVID-19 were analyzed considering this group. Among the participants, 74% were
 207 males who went outside of home.

208 **Fig. 2: Distribution of respondents based on went outside of home during lockdown period.**

209

210 Fig. 3. Reasons to go outside of home during lockdown period. shows that about 36% of
 211 respondents went outside during lockdown period due to work, followed by 34% to
 212 purchases essential goods such as food/ medicine.

213 **Fig. 3. Reasons to go outside of home during lockdown period.**

214 **Assessment of practice and factors associated with practice regarding COVID-19.**

215 The average practices score for participants was 3.17 (SD = 1.50, range 0–5). Among all
 216 participants, the range of good practices rates was between 42.62% and 76.04%. Overall,
 217 about 24% of participants had a favorable practice, and they obtained scores more than 80%,
 218 representing an acceptable level of good practice towards COVID-19. This was 0.83 more
 219 than the average score [Table 2: Respondents’ Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices towards
 220 COVID-19.].

221 Table 5. Association of background characteristics with practices towards COVID-19.
 222 demonstrates the factors associated with practices regarding COVID-19. The unadjusted
 223 model showed that several sociodemographic factors, such as age group, education,
 224 occupation, residence, income, knowledge and attitude towards COVID-19, and

225 administrative regions were significantly associated with the good practice towards
 226 COVID-19. After adjusting for the other variables, the adjusted model showed that religion,
 227 number of earning person in family, monthly income, attitudes towards COVID-19,
 228 administrative regions were significantly associated with practice towards COVID-19. The
 229 results showed that the age group of 46-55 (OR:0.36; 95% CI: 0.13-1.01) had more
 230 likelihood of poor practices, compared to the reference age group (age ≤ 25). The people from
 231 other religion category (OR:0.23; 95% CI:0.05-1.01) was found with more likelihood of poor
 232 practices, compared to Muslim category. In terms of current residence, rural people (OR:
 233 0.48; 95% CI: 0.29-0.78) had lower practices of safety measures, compared to their urban
 234 counterparts. Respondents who from the family with two and more earning persons (OR:
 235 0.06; 95% CI: 0-0.94) were more likelihood to have poor practices, compared to respondents
 236 from family with no earning person. According to the income, the respondents with monthly
 237 income more than 40,000 (OR:0.08; 95% CI: 0.01-0.67) had more likelihood of poor
 238 practices, compared to the their no income reference category.

239 **Table 5. Association of background characteristics with practices towards COVID-19.**

240

Variables	%(N=359)	Unadjusted Model			Adjusted Model		
		OR (SE)	95% CI	p-Value	OR (SE)	95% CI	p-Value
Age group							
≤ 25	16.16	Ref.			Ref.		
26-35	37.33	0.92 (0.32)	(0.47-1.82)	0.81	0.49 (0.25)	(0.18-1.33)	0.16
36-45	19.22	0.92 (0.36)	(0.42-1.99)	0.83	0.52 (0.32)	(0.16-1.74)	0.29
46-55	12.81	0.36 (0.19)	(0.13-1.01)	0.05*	0.32 (0.24)	(0.07-1.38)	0.13
56-65	9.47	0.42 (0.23)	(0.14-1.26)	0.12	0.52 (0.42)	(0.11-2.52)	0.42
≥ 66	5.01	0.3 (0.24)	(0.06-1.46)	0.14	0.36 (0.37)	(0.05-2.73)	0.32
Sex							

Male	74.09	Ref.			Ref.		
Female	25.91	0.83 (0.24)	(0.47-1.46)	0.52	1.04 (0.47)	(0.43-2.52)	0.93
Education Level							
No education	12.53	Ref.			Ref.		
Primary and can sign	18.94	0.99 (0.56)	(0.33-3.01)	0.99	0.69 (0.48)	(0.18-2.69)	0.59
Secondary and SSC	20.89	1.76 (0.92)	(0.63-4.9)	0.28	1.21 (0.83)	(0.32-4.62)	0.78
HSC passed or equivalent	15.32	2.67 (1.41)	(0.94-7.53)	0.06	1.13 (0.87)	(0.25-5.12)	0.87
Higher	32.31	3.29 (1.58)	(1.28-8.44)	0.01*	1.51 (1.14)	(0.34-6.63)	0.58
Occupation							
Curr. not employed	32.03	Ref.			Ref.		
Service holder	30.64	2.03 (0.63)	(1.11-3.71)	0.02*	2.5 (2.13)	(0.47-13.28)	0.28
Farmer	6.69	0.8 (0.48)	(0.25-2.57)	0.71	6.3 (6.7)	(0.78-50.67)	0.08
Business man	15.32	1.37 (0.53)	(0.64-2.92)	0.42	2.99 (2.7)	(0.51-17.54)	0.23
Day labor	10.86	0.73 (0.36)	(0.27-1.94)	0.53	2.51 (2.42)	(0.38-16.6)	0.34
Others	4.46	0.57 (0.45)	(0.12-2.69)	0.48	0.84 (0.95)	(0.09-7.7)	0.88
Religion							
Muslim	92.48	Ref.			Ref.		
Others	7.52	0.53 (0.3)	(0.18-1.58)	0.25	0.23 (0.17)	(0.05-1.01)	0.05*
Current living residence							
Urban	36.49	Ref.			Ref.		
Rural	63.51	0.48 (0.12)	(0.29-0.78)	0.001*	0.49 (0.18)	(0.24-1.02)	0.06
Marital status							
In a marital relationship	69.64	Ref.			Ref.		
Not in a marital relationship	30.36	1.41 (0.37)	(0.84-2.35)	0.19	0.95 (0.36)	(0.45-2.02)	0.89
Family size							
1-3 members	23.12	Ref.			Ref.		
3-6 members	64.9	1.72 (0.55)	(0.92-3.22)	0.09	1.46 (0.63)	(0.63-3.41)	0.38
7 & more	11.98	0.88 (0.44)	(0.33-2.36)	0.80	1.4 (0.92)	(0.38-5.1)	0.61
No of earning person in family							
No earning person	0.84	Ref.			Ref.		
Single earning person	49.86	0.16 (0.2)	(0.01-1.84)	0.14	0.07 (0.1)	(0-1.22)	0.07
Two & more	49.3	0.15 (0.18)	(0.01-1.65)	0.12	0.06 (0.08)	(0-0.94)	0.05*
Monthly income							
No earning	32.31	Ref.			Ref.		
1000-10000	24.79	0.51 (0.2)	(0.24-1.11)	0.09	0.38 (0.31)	(0.08-1.9)	0.24
11000-20000	19.5	1.9 (0.64)	(0.98-3.69)	0.06	1.2 (0.94)	(0.26-5.56)	0.82
21000-30000	9.47	2.25 (0.94)	(0.99-5.12)	0.05	0.8 (0.71)	(0.14-4.58)	0.80

31000-40000	6.96	2.86 (1.32)	(1.16-7.07)	0.02*	0.86 (0.81)	(0.14-5.46)	0.88
>40000	6.96	0.32 (0.24)	(0.07-1.43)	0.14	0.08 (0.09)	(0.01-0.67)	0.02*
Availability of running water at home							
Yes	92.48	Ref.			Ref.		
No	7.52	1.37 (0.6)	(0.58-3.25)	0.47	1.28 (0.73)	(0.42-3.92)	0.67
Knowledge about COVID-19							
Poor	54.32	Ref.			Ref.		
Good	45.68	2.5 (0.64)	(1.52-4.12)	0.001*	1.88 (0.71)	(0.91-3.92)	0.09
Attitude							
Negative	26.74	Ref.			Ref.		
Positive	73.26	3.77 (1.02)	(2.22-6.4)	0.001*	4.47 (1.59)	(2.23-8.98)	0.001*
Division							
Barishal	5.29	Ref.			Ref.		
Chattogram	17.27	3.15 (2.14)	(0.83-11.97)	0.09	5.65 (4.67)	(1.12-28.53)	0.04*
Dhaka	23.68	1.43 (0.98)	(0.38-5.46)	0.60	2.58 (2.12)	(0.52-12.88)	0.25
Khulna	14.76	5.97 (4.1)	(1.55-22.95)	0.01*	7.61 (6.23)	(1.53-37.84)	0.01*
Mymensingh	8.08	0.62 (0.54)	(0.11-3.43)	0.58	0.48 (0.48)	(0.07-3.4)	0.47
Rajshahi	18.94	0.33 (0.27)	(0.07-1.64)	0.18	0.79 (0.74)	(0.12-4.96)	0.80
Rangpur	7.24	0.97 (0.81)	(0.19-4.95)	0.97	2.01 (2.04)	(0.28-14.65)	0.49
Sylhet	4.74	1.14 (1.02)	(0.2-6.6)	0.88	0.73 (0.78)	(0.09-5.85)	0.77

241 Discussion

242 Our analysis has shown that the knowledge related to Covid-19 of certain socioeconomic
 243 groups (e.g., age 46 years of higher, females, those with no education, farmers, day laborers,
 244 rural residents, those in a marital relationship, those with a larger family, those with an
 245 earning less than BDT 20,000 [USD 236], and residents of Rajshahi division) are
 246 significantly lower than the reference category, and most of the people rely on television
 247 followed by social media as a source of knowledge. Almost three fourths of the respondents
 248 went outside home during the lockdown period and the majority were males (74%), and most
 249 went out to purchase essential goods, followed by daily routine work. In terms of practice,
 250 rural people lagged behind, as they had 52% lower odds of adhering to appropriate practice

251 measures, compared to their urban counterparts. Finally, we found that a good knowledge
252 and attitude is associated with a better practice of Covid-19 health measures.

253 The study results showed that higher prevalence of poor knowledge was significantly
254 associated with several demographic and socioeconomic factors. A difference in
255 socioeconomic status contributed to the lower rate of correct COVID-19 knowledge among
256 people in Bangladesh even though the study was conducted after a certain period of the
257 advent of COVID-19 pandemic to Bangladesh. The study observed that aged people tend to
258 have a poor knowledge about COVID-19. This finding is supported by several international
259 studies from developing and developed countries that reported older respondents had poor
260 knowledge on COVID-19 than that of younger [17,20,21]. This fact might be the result of
261 physical condition and loss of cognition status due to ageing associated to watch, read, and
262 understand available and recommended information on COVID-19 considered as barriers to
263 access information about COVID-19 and result in poor knowledge [22]. Familiarity and use
264 of modern technology might be other reasons of poor knowledge among older adults [23,24].
265 The study observed that farmers and daily laborers were more likely to have poor knowledge
266 about COVID-19. This finding is partially similar with the study in Malaysia and China that
267 the laborers had poorer knowledge [17,26]. Day laborers are one of the major contributors in
268 the informal economy of Bangladesh and depend on their daily wage. Due to the nationwide
269 extended lockdown, they were extremely affected group as they immediately have become
270 jobless. This may indicate limited access to reliable and appropriate information about
271 COVID-19.

272 Many people did not maintain the lockdown in Bangladesh. Primarily this may be the
273 result of the government's policies to declare a 'general holiday' rather than calling it a
274 lockdown [26,27]. It is worth noting that calling it a holiday rather than a lockdown reduces
275 the gravity of the matter among the public and provide a speculation that people are free to do
276 whatever they want. As a result, many people willingly ignored the stay-at-home or social
277 distancing guidelines and took the opportunity to move to different cities across the country
278 which massively contributed to rapid spread of infection at community level throughout the
279 country [28]. On the hand, the government extended the general holidays without ensuring
280 adequate subsistence support for the poor before lockdown that compelled people to go
281 outside their home [29,30]. Changing the time of lockdown every week might preclude
282 people from taking preparation for the forthcoming days. Moreover, the government's
283 inability to provide information on how people in lockdown situation can avail essential
284 materials for their life and engage the community groups for meeting essential needs may be
285 the reason of poor practices of safety measures [31,32]. This result reinforces the conclusions
286 of previous studies identifying strict prevention practices and community volunteers
287 mobilization to take care of people under lockdown are the primary solution of reducing
288 spread and control of COVID-19 in China and Vietnam [15,17,33].

289 Bangladesh is still a predominantly rural based country with only 37% of its population
290 living in urban areas [34]. However, most of the socioeconomic and health indicators are
291 poor for rural areas compared to the urban. For example, 76% of the rural areas are under
292 national electricity grid (urban 92%), 38% of the rural households possess a television (urban

293 70%), 61% of the rural women got married before age 18 (urban 55%), 60% of the rural
294 women of reproductive age use any contraceptive method (urban 65%), 79% of the rural
295 women received antenatal care from a skilled provider (urban 90%), 45% of the rural women
296 delivered in a health facility (urban 63%), 33% of the rural children under age 5 were stunted
297 (urban 25%), and so on [35]. Similar pattern was observed in our study among the rural
298 people as they had a lower odd of adhering to Covid-19 related hygiene practices. This is
299 particularly troublesome for Bangladesh which has a large number of migrant workers in
300 different countries, returning constantly and spreading out to the rural communities [30,36].
301 The systematic negligence and ignorance of rural communities towards health policy and
302 programs is observed in several other countries, and this phenomena may pose a higher
303 degree of threat in case of communicable diseases like Covid-19 [20,37,38].

304 Good knowledge and positive attitudes towards controlling of COVID-19 were
305 associated with the good practices of safety measures. This finding is well recognized in
306 several global studies that a good knowledge and positive attitudes towards COVID-19 leads
307 to improve practices of safety measures [17,20,25,39,40,41]. It is worth mentioning that the
308 consistency of theory-based approaches demonstrates that there is an association among
309 knowledge, belief, and change in human behavior [42]. Adequate and proper knowledge on a
310 specific health emergency is a key modifier of personal belief in changing human behavior
311 [43,44].

312 Since the level of KAP varies across different socioeconomic groups, we recommend
313 that customized information on Covid-19 should be developed targeting different groups,

314 such as, villagers, slum-dwellers, township residents, urban middle-class, etc. Special
315 emphasis should be given on the groups with lower KAP scores, such as the elderly, females,
316 less educated people, farmers, day laborers, rural residents, those in a marital relationship,
317 those with a larger family, those with a meagre earning, and the residents of Rajshahi
318 division. The information should be clearly and widely circulated through contextually
319 appropriated channels, with emphasis on television and the social media, as these came out to
320 be the major sources of information. Secondly, since many people did not comply with the
321 lockdown directives, the lockdown should be imposed only after ensuring the subsistence
322 support for the poor, arranging emergency requirements of the locked-down community,
323 communicating clearly what to do and not to do during the lockdown period, and clarifying
324 who to consult in case of any unforeseen situation. A voluntary community support group
325 should be engaged in answering to people's demands. Instead of increasing the duration of
326 lockdown week by week, a tentatively concrete period, in consultation with the
327 epidemiologists, should be imposed on the public so that they can take adequate preparation
328 to stay at home during the instructed period. The term 'national holiday' may not convey the
329 right message to the people, so, instead, 'lockdown' or any contextually appropriate
330 synonym, in consultation with the communication experts or social scientists, should be
331 used. Special attention should be directed towards the rural communities, where the
332 Covid-19 health practices are found to be the least performed. Finally, since practices are
333 found associated with knowledge and attitude, we recommend that, a scientifically oriented
334 SBCC strategy to be developed in consultation with the relevant experts. To turn these

335 strategies into actions or practices, the religious, cultural, political, and any other
336 community-based forces should be consulted and actively engaged.

337 **Limitations**

338 The strength of the study is that data were collected from eight administrative divisions
339 throughout the country and participants were surveyed over phone, face to face, and through
340 social media platform from both rural and urban areas. This data collection process improved
341 the generalizability of the findings to the Bangladeshi population. However, this study is not
342 free from limitation. The small sample size of the study may not be representative as
343 compared to the current population in Bangladesh [5]. Another limitation might be the
344 number questions under attitude section where only two questions were considered in the
345 KAP questionnaire to measure the attitude level. The major limitation can be considered with
346 regards to the study design. As a cross-sectional study, causal inferences cannot be drawn
347 here as we cannot assert that the factors which were significantly associated with KAP are
348 certain. Despite these limitations, the findings of the study are believed to motivate and alert
349 policymakers and program implementers who are working on appropriate risk
350 communication and community engagement (RCCE), and SBCC strategies based on the
351 levels of KAP towards COVID-19.

352 Further research is needed to understand KAP of service providers in Covid-19
353 pandemic response. Qualitative formative research is useful in designing communication
354 strategies to address the pandemic, and subsequent implementation and evaluation research

355 can generate useful knowledge about the implementation and scaling up of the such
356 strategies in different parts of Bangladesh, and even abroad.

357 **Conclusions**

358 RCCE is an integral part of pandemic management [45]. In a resource constraint country
359 like Bangladesh, and during a health emergency like Covid-19 pandemic, a study on KAP
360 can render itself to be helpful for the public health decision-makers in designing an
361 evidence-informed and context specific RCCE or SBCC strategies. This study can assist the
362 decisionmakers to identify which groups of people require additional attention for
363 communication. For example, our study identified certain socioeconomic groups with lower
364 level of KAP compared to the reference category. In addition, we figured out the most
365 frequently used source of knowledge, which can be exploited as communication channels
366 which can also be utilized so circulate further knowledge, rules and regulations. The study
367 explored the reasons for nonadherence to lockdown, another important non pharmaceutical
368 intervention against Covid-19, and this information can be supportive to the implementers
369 design a better implementation strategy for lockdown. Finally, this study, by virtue of
370 establishing a positive association between knowledge and attitude with Covid-19 related
371 health practices, highlights the need for an evidence-based informed RCCE and SBCC
372 strategy to foster improved health practices against Covid-19 pandemic.

373 **Acknowledgement**

374 The authors are thankful to the Public Health Foundation, Bangladesh and its leadership
375 for sponsoring and providing logistic support in conducting the research. We are grateful to

376 Dr. Dipak Kumar Mitra, Professor and Chairman, Department of Public Health, School of
377 Health and Life Sciences, North South University for his valuable inputs in this research. We
378 are also thankful to Mr. Quazi Maksudur Rahmaan, Department of Public Health and
379 Informatics, Jahangirnagar University and Mr. Sourav Paul, Department of Industrial and
380 Production Engineering, Shahjalal University of Science and Technology for their invaluable
381 effort to conduct this study. We would also thanks to the volunteers for their countless
382 support in data collection and a sincere thanks to all respondents participated in the survey.

383 **Authors' contribution**

384 **Conceptualization:** Md. Golam Rabbani, Orin Akter, Taufique Joarder

385 **Data curation:** Md. Golam Rabbani, Orin Akter

386 **Formal analysis:** Md. Golam Rabbani, Md. Zahid Hasan

387 **Funding acquisition:** Md. Golam Rabbani, Orin Akter

388 **Investigation:** Md. Golam Rabbani, Orin Akter, Taufique Joarder

389 **Methodology:** Md. Golam Rabbani, Orin Akter, Taufique Joarder

390 **Project administration:** Md. Golam Rabbani, Orin Akter, Taufique Joarder

391 **Supervision:** Taufique Joarder

392 **Validation:** Md. Golam Rabbani

393 **Writing – original draft:** Md. Golam Rabbani, Orin Akter, Md. Zahid Hasan, Nandeeta
394 Samad, Shehrin Shaila Mahmood, Taufique Joarder

395 **Writing—review and editing:** Md. Golam Rabbani, Orin Akter, Md. Zahid Hasan,
396 Nandeeta Samad, Shehrin Shaila Mahmood, Taufique Joarder

397 **Conflict of Interest**

398 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

399 **Source of Funding**

400 Not supported by any funding body.

401 **References**

402 1. WHO. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report-51 [Internet]. Vol. 2019. 2020.

403 Available from: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>

404 2. Worldometer. COVID-19 CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC. [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jul 30].

405 p. 1–27. Available from: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>

406 3. Worldometer. WORLD (CORONAVIRUS): COUNTRIES _ BANGLADESH. [Internet]. 2020

407 [cited 2020 Jul 30]. p. 1–9. Available from:

408 <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/bangladesh/>

409 4. UNDP. Support to the National Response to contain the impact of COVID-19. 2020.

410 5. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS). Report on Bangladesh Sample Vital Statistics 2018.

411 2019.

412 6. World Bank. Country Profile: Bangladesh - World Development Indicators. [Internet]. 2019. p.

413 4–5. Available from: <https://data.worldbank.org/country/bangladesh?view=chart>

414 7. ADB. ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK [Internet]. 2020. Available from:

415 <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/27753/ban-2019.pdf>

416 8. PPRC and BIGD BRAC. Rapid Response Survey □: Poverty Impact of COVID -19. [Internet].

417 2020. Available from: <http://www.pprc-bd.org/covid19response/>

- 418 9. Chen L, Xiong J, Bao L, Shi Y. Convalescent plasma as a potential therapy for COVID-19.
419 Lancet Infect Dis. 2020 Apr;20(4):398–400.
- 420 10. DGHS. National Guidelines on Clinical Management of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (Covid-19).
421 Vol. 2019. 2020.
- 422 11. World Health Organization. Modes of transmission of virus causing COVID-19: implications
423 for IPC precaution recommendations. 2020.
- 424 12. Jefferson T, Foxlee R, Mar C Del, Dooley L, Ferroni E, Hewak B. Physical interventions to
425 interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses: systematic review. BMJ Glob Heal.
426 2017;3:1–9.
- 427 13. Gamma AE, Slekiene J. The Impact of Various Promotional Activities on Ebola Prevention
428 Behaviors and Psychosocial Factors Predicting Ebola Prevention Behaviors in the Gambia
429 Evaluation of Ebola Prevention Promotions. 2019;
- 430 14. Dooley E, Ferroni E, Glasziou P, Hoffmann T, Thorning S, Ml VD. Physical interventions to
431 interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. 2020;
- 432 15. Pollack T, Thwaites G, Rabaa M, Choisy M. Emerging COVID-19 success story: Vietnam ' s
433 commitment to containment Country overview. 2020;(i):1–21. Available from:
434 <https://ourworldindata.org/covid-exemplar-vietnam>
- 435 16. Huque R and Addullah SM. Health system responsiveness to contain Covid-19. 2020; Available
436 from:
437 [https://thefinancialexpress.com.bd/views/views/health-system-responsiveness-to-contain-covid-](https://thefinancialexpress.com.bd/views/views/health-system-responsiveness-to-contain-covid-19-1587135165)
438 [19-1587135165](https://thefinancialexpress.com.bd/views/views/health-system-responsiveness-to-contain-covid-19-1587135165)

- 439 17. Zhong B, Luo W, Li H, Zhang Q, Liu X, Li W, et al. Knowledge , attitudes , and practices towards
440 COVID-19 among Chinese residents during the rapid rise period of the COVID-19 outbreak □: a
441 quick online cross-sectional survey. 2020;16.
- 442 18. UNICEF. National Knowledge , Attitudes and Practices (KAP) Study on Ebola Virus Disease in
443 Liberia. 2015;(March).
- 444 19. BBS and UNICEF. Progotir Pathey, Bangladesh Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2019, Survey
445 Findings Report. Dhaka, Bangladesh: Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS). 2019.
- 446 20. Akalu Y, Ayelign B MM. Knowledge , Attitude and Practice Towards COVID-19 Among
447 Chronic Disease Patients at Addis Zemen Hospital, Northwest Ethiopia. 2020;
- 448 21. Wolf MS, Gazmararian JA, Baker DW. Health Literacy and Functional Health Status Among
449 Older Adults. Arch Intern Med [Internet]. 2005 Sep 26;165(17):1946–52. Available from:
450 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.165.17.1946>
- 451 22. Murman DL. The Impact of Age on Cognition. Semin Hear [Internet]. 2015 Aug;36(3):111–21.
452 Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27516712>
- 453 23. Knowles B. and Hanson V.l. The wisdom of older technology (non)users. Commun. ACM 61, 3
454 (March 2018), 72–77. 2018; Available from: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3179995>
- 455 24. Lancaster University. Why some older people are rejecting digital technologies. 2018; Available
456 from: <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/03/180312091715.htm>
- 457 25. Azlan AA, Hamzah MR, Jen T, Id S, Hadi S, Id A. Public knowledge , attitudes and practices
458 towards COVID-19 □: A cross-sectional study in. 2020;1–15. Available from:
459 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233668>

- 460 26. Shawon AA. Coronavirus: Bangladesh declares public holiday from March 26 to April 4. Dhaka
461 Tribune [Internet]. 2020; Available from:
462 [https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/2020/03/23/govt-offices-to-remain-closed-till-april-](https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/2020/03/23/govt-offices-to-remain-closed-till-april-4)
463 [4](https://www.dhakatribune.com/bangladesh/2020/03/23/govt-offices-to-remain-closed-till-april-4)
- 464 27. Shammi M. Strategic assessment of COVID-19 pandemic in Bangladesh: comparative
465 lockdown scenario analysis , public perception ,. 2020.
- 466 28. Biswas RK, Huq S, Afiaz A. Letter to Editor Relaxed Lockdown in Bangladesh During
467 COVID-19: Should Economy Outweigh Health? 2020;(x):1–3.
- 468 29. The Business Standard. General holidays likely to be further extended till May 16. 2020;
469 Available from:
470 [https://tbsnews.net/coronavirus-chronicle/covid-19-bangladesh/govt-extend-general-holidays-till-](https://tbsnews.net/coronavirus-chronicle/covid-19-bangladesh/govt-extend-general-holidays-till-may-16-76291)
471 [m-may-16-76291](https://tbsnews.net/coronavirus-chronicle/covid-19-bangladesh/govt-extend-general-holidays-till-may-16-76291)
- 472 30. CARE, UNOPS and Uk. COVID-19: Bangladesh Multi-Sectoral Anticipatory Impact and
473 Needs Analysis Needs Assessment Working Group Date: Needs Assessment Working Group.
474 2020;(April). Available from:
475 [https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/covid_nawg_anticipatory_impacts_and_n](https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/covid_nawg_anticipatory_impacts_and_needs_analysis.pdf)
476 [eeds_analysis.pdf](https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/covid_nawg_anticipatory_impacts_and_needs_analysis.pdf)
- 477 31. Siddika A, Islam M. COVID-19 and Bangladesh: A study of the public perception on the
478 measures taken by the government. 2020.
- 479 32. Huq S. and Biswas RK. COVID-19 in Bangladesh: Data deficiency to delayed decision.
480 2020;10(1):1–3.

- 481 33. Zhu J, Cai Y. Engaging the communities in Wuhan , China during the COVID-19 outbreak.
482 2020;3:3–6.
- 483 34. The World Bank. Urban population (% of total population) - Bangladesh. [Internet]. 2019 [cited
484 2020 Aug 3]. Available from:
485 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.URB.TOTL.IN.ZS?locations=BD>
- 486 35. NIPORT and USAID. Bangladesh Demographic and Health Survey 2017–18: Key Indicators.
487 [Internet]. Dhaka, Bangladesh; 2019. Available from:
488 <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/PR104/PR104.pdf>
- 489 36. International Organization for Migration. IOM assists vulnerable returning migrants impacted by
490 the COVID-19 pandemic. [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 May 20]. Available from:
491 <https://bangladesh.iom.int/news/iom-assists-vulnerable-returning-migrants-impacted-covid-19-pandemic>
492 [andemic](https://bangladesh.iom.int/news/iom-assists-vulnerable-returning-migrants-impacted-covid-19-pandemic)
- 493 37. Das S, Mia MN, Hanifi SMA, Hoque S, Bhuiya A. Health literacy in a community with low
494 levels of education: findings from Chakaria, a rural area of Bangladesh. BMC Public Health
495 [Internet]. 2017;17(1):203. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4097-y>
- 496 38. Zahnd W, Scaife S, Francis M. Health Literacy Skills in Rural and Urban Populations. Am J
497 Health Behav. 2009 Sep 1;33:550–7.
- 498 39. Tomar BS, Singh P, Suman S, Raj P, Nathiya D. Indian community ’ s Knowledge , Attitude &
499 Practice towards. 2020;
- 500 40. Christopher R, Margaret R, Dauda MAD, Saleh A, Ene P. Knowledge , Attitudes and Practices
501 Towards COVID 19: An Epidemiological Survey in North Central Nigeria. J Community

502 Health [Internet]. 2020;(0123456789). Available from:

503 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-020-00881-1>

504 41. Erfani A, Shahriarirad R, Ranjbar K, Mirahmadizadeh A and MM. Knowledge, Attitude and
505 Practice toward the Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) Outbreak: A Population-Based Survey in
506 Iran. Bull World Heal Organ [Internet]. 2020; Available from:

507 https://www.who.int/bulletin/online_first/20-256651.pdf

508 42. Ryan P. Integrated Theory of Health Behavior Change: background and intervention
509 development. Clin Nurse Spec [Internet]. 2009;23(3):161–72. Available from:

510 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19395894>

511 43. Glanz K, Bishop DB. The Role of Behavioral Science Theory in Development and
512 Implementation of Public Health Interventions. 2010;

513 44. World Health Organization. A D H E R E N C E T O L O N G - T E R M T H E R A P I E S :
514 Evidence for action [Internet]. 2003. Available from:

515 https://www.who.int/chp/knowledge/publications/adherence_full_report.pdf?ua=1

516 45. IFRC, UNICEF and W. Risk Communication and Community Engagement (RCCE) Action
517 Plan Guidance COVID-19 Preparedness and Response. [Internet]. Available from:

518 [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/risk-communication-and-community-engagement-\(rcce
519 \)-action-plan-guidance](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/risk-communication-and-community-engagement-(rcce)

520 **Supporting information**

521 S1 file. Data sheet.





