medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Vulnerability to rumors during the COVID-19 pandemic:

Results of a national survey

Victoria Jane En Long[1], *MPH*, Medical student

Wei Shien Koh[1], *BSocSc*, Medical student

Young Ern Saw[2], *BA*

*Jean CJ Liu[1,2], *PhD*, Assistant Professor

[1]Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore

[2]Division of Social Sciences, Yale-NUS College, Singapore

Victoria Jane En Long: victoria.long@u.duke.nus.edu

Wei Shien Koh: weishienkoh@u.duke.nus.edu

Young Ern Saw: sawyoungern@u.yale-nus.edu.sg

Jean CJ Liu: jeanliu@yale-nus.edu.sg

Affiliation addresses:
Duke-NUS Medical School
8 College Rd, Singapore 169857
Yale-NUS College
28 College Ave West

Running head: COVID-19 rumors

*Please address correspondence to:
Jean CJ Liu
Yale-NUS College
28 College Ave West
#01-501
Singapore 138533
Email: jeanliu@yale-nus.edu.sg

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Funding

This research was funded by a grant awarded to JCJL from the JY Pillay Global Asia Programme [grant number: IG20-SG002].

Highlights

- Prior studies linked exposure to COVID-19 rumors with poor mental health.
- In a community sample, most participants reported having heard rumors.
- Few participants shared or believed rumors.
- Sharing sometimes occurred in the absence of belief.
- More educated individuals believed and shared fewer rumors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Amidst the COVID-19 pandemic, many rumors have emerged. Given prior research linking rumor exposure to mental well-being, we conducted a nation-wide survey to document the base rate of rumor exposure and factors associated with rumor vulnerability. Between March to July 2020, 1237 participants were surveyed on 5 widely-disseminated COVID-19 rumors (that drinking water frequently could be preventive, that eating garlic could be preventive, that the outbreak arose because of bat soup consumption, that the virus was created in an American lab, and that the virus was created in a Chinese lab). For each rumor, participants reported whether they had heard, shared or believed each rumor. Although most participants had been exposed to COVID-19 rumors, few shared or believed these. Sharing behaviors sometimes occurred in the absence of belief; however, education emerged as a protective factor for both sharing and belief. Together, our results suggest that campaigns targeting skills associated with higher education (e.g. epistemology) may prove more effective than counter-rumor messages.

KEYWORDS: Infectious diseases; public health; COVID-19; misinformation; social media; infodemic; fake news

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Vulnerability to rumors during the COVID-19 pandemic: Results of a national survey

1. Introduction

The global outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has come with increased psychological burden. In several meta-analyses, depression and anxiety symptoms have been found to be elevated amongst healthcare workers and the general population since the start of the pandemic (da Silva and Neto, 2021; Pappa et al., 2020; Salari et al., 2020). Others have reported a higher incidence of stress-related symptoms or post-traumatic stress disorder (Cooke et al., 2020; Torales et al., 2020). These findings highlight the urgent need to understand factors these predicting anxiety and mood outcomes, allowing vulnerable individuals to be identified and interventions to be developed.

In terms of predictors, exposure to COVID-19 rumors has emerged as a risk factor for poor mental health (Gao et al., 2020; Liu and Tong, 2020; Vardanjani et al., 2020; Xiong et al., 2020). This negative mental health impact has occurred against the backdrop of an “infodemic” – a surge of COVID-19 misinformation created and shared primarily via social media (World Health Organization, 2020). In particular, the fast-changing nature of the pandemic means that accurate information has not always been accessible (Cuan-Baltazar et al., 2020; Hou et al., 2020), resulting in many uncertainties. This has given rise to a large number of rumors (Depoux et al., 2020; Larson, 2018; Vosoughi et al., 2018).

To date, several publications have used publicly available data to analyze and document the spread of rumors. For example, during the early stage of the pandemic (December 2019 to April 2020), search engine keywords reflected popular myths (Rovetta and Bhagavathula, 2020; Singh et al., 2020), with a large number of searches pertaining to alternative medicines that had been speculated to prevent COVID-19 (e.g., garlic, Chinese medicinal herbs, or the malaria medication chloroquine; Hou et al., 2020). On the social media platform Twitter, conspiratorial

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

theories were posted regarding disease origins – suggesting, for example, that the virus had been developed as a bioweapon or had resulted from the introduction of 5G mobile networks (Abd-Alrazaq et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020).

In turn, the spread of COVID-19 rumors has led to deleterious consequences. In Iran for example, a myth that alcohol consumption could prevent or treat COVID-19 resulted in over 700 deaths related to methanol poisoning, with deaths attributed to methanol poisoning exceeding those attributed to COVID-19 in some provinces (Aghababaeian et al., 2020). Returning to mental health outcomes, the extent to which an individual has been exposed to, has shared, or believed in COVID-19 rumors has also been found to predict anxiety symptoms (Liu and Tong, 2020).

While demographic predictors of pandemic-related mental health are difficult to address (e.g., age, gender, pre-existing medical conditions; (Torales et al., 2020), a person's exposure to rumors may constitute a modifiable risk factor (Abdoli, 2020; Ebrahim et al., 2020; Holmes et al., 2020). Correspondingly, efforts to develop interventions would benefit from an understanding of rumor vulnerability: (i) the base rates by which individuals are exposed to, believe in, or share rumors; and (ii) factors predicting these rumor-related experiences (Chua and Banerjee, 2018).

At present, little is known about individual vulnerability to COVID-19 rumors. While a handful of studies have surveyed individuals on their social media usage and enquired about rumor dissemination via these platforms (Banakar et al., 2020), we are not aware of any study that has identified persons most likely to encounter, believe in, or to share COVID-19 rumors. To address this gap in the literature, we thus conducted a nationwide survey examining rumor vulnerability during the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. Methods

2.1 Study design and population

Our study was conducted across five months in Singapore (7 March to 27 July 2020), a city-state in Asia that experienced a high number of COVID-19 cases in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

the early stage of the pandemic. During this time, we recruited 1237 participants who met the following eligibility criteria: (1) aged ≥21 years old, and (2) had lived in Singapore for ≥2 years. All participants were recruited via social media advertisements within community groups (e.g., groups for residential estates, universities, and workplaces), or through paid Facebook advertisements targeting Singapore-based users.

Upon study enrolment, participants provided informed consent and completed a 20-minute online survey via Qualtrics. As part of a larger study, participants reported their: (i) demographics, (ii) responses to the pandemic; (iii) sources of COVID-19 news; and (as we report in this paper) (iv) familiarity with rumors (Liu and Tong, 2020; Long and Liu, 2020; Saw et al., 2020). The study protocol was approved by the Yale-NUS College Ethics Review Committee (#2020-CERC-001) and was pre-registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04305574).

2.2 Outcome variables

As the primary outcome variables, we assessed participants' familiarity with five rumors that had been widely spread during the COVID-19 pandemic: that (1) drinking water frequently will help prevent infection (COVID-19 prevention); (2) eating garlic can help prevent infection (COVID-19 prevention); (3) the outbreak arose from people eating bat soup (COVID-19 origins); (4) the virus was created in a US lab to affect China's economy (COVID-19 origins); and (5) the virus was created in a Chinese lab as a bioweapon (COVID-19 origins). These rumors were presented in the survey as claims, rather than rumors to avoid influencing participants' response. Rumors were selected for their widespread distribution both internationally and within the local context (Taylor, 2020; World Health Organisation, 2020).

For each rumor, participants indicated whether they: (1) had heard the claim before (yes/no); (2) thought the claim was true (yes/no); or (3) had shared the claim on social media (e.g., Facebook, WhatsApp) (yes/no). We assigned a score of 1 for "yes" responses, and summed across the rumors to create three scores: the total

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

number of claims heard, the total number of claims believed, and the total number of claims shared. Finally, participants also indicated which of 13 possible sources they had encountered the rumors (e.g., Facebook, WhatsApp, online forums, television).

2.3 Predictor variables

As predictor variables, participants reported the following demographic details: age, gender, ethnicity, religion, country of birth, marital status, education, house type (a proxy of socio-economic status), and household size. Using the survey timestamp, we also recorded two situation-related variables: the total number of local cases reported to date, and whether the country had been in a lock-down when participants completed the survey.

2.4 Statistical analysis

Using counts (%), we first summarized the baseline rates of rumor familiarity and rumor sources. As further exploratory analyses, we conducted Fisher's exact test exploring the relationship between believing and sharing each rumor.

We then ran linear regression models to predict the following outcome measures: the total number of claims heard [Model 1], the total number of claims believed [Model 2], and the total number of claims shared [Model 3]. Each model involved the full set of predictor variables (described in 2.3), with the number of COVID-19 cases log-transformed for linearity.

For each model, we applied Bonferroni correction to control the type 1 family-wise error rate at 0.05 (Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level of 0.05/22 predictors = 0.002). All statistical analyses were conducted using R (Version 4.0).

3. Results

3.1 Response rate

Out of 1751 individuals who accessed the survey link, 1446 (82.6%) provided informed consent and participated in the survey. However, 209 (14.5%) participants did not complete the primary outcome measures (on COVID-19 rumors) and were excluded from statistical analyses.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The final sample of 1237 participants is comparable to the resident population with regards to: the proportion of participants born in Singapore, ethnicity, and household size (≤10% difference) and age. However, our sample had more participants who were female (63.9% vs. 51.1%), single (41.9% vs 18.8%), and university graduates (70.7% vs. 32.4%); and fewer participants who lived in 1-3 room public housing flats (8.2% vs. 23.7%) or who had Buddhist beliefs (14.6% vs 33.2%) (Table 1).

[Table 1 about here.]

3.2 Base rates of familiarity with COVID-19 rumors

Out of 5 widely-disseminated rumors, the average participant had heard of 3.34 (*SD* = 1.33) rumors. The most commonly-heard rumor – reported by 8 in 10 participants (84.6%) – was that the outbreak had arisen from individuals eating bat soup. Despite high exposure to COVID-19 rumors, however, participants only believed an average of 0.27 claims (*SD* = 0.59) and shared 0.18 (*SD* = 0.63). The most commonly-believed rumor was that drinking water could prevent infection (11.4%), whereas the most commonly-shared rumor was again that the disease had arisen from bat soup consumption (7.1%) (Figure 1).

[Figures 1 and 2 about here.]

In other words, most participants who had heard each of the 5 rumors neither believed in nor shared the claims. Using Fisher's exact test, we conducted exploratory analyses to examine how belief and sharing behaviors were related. First, for the claim about the United States manufacturing the coronavirus to affect China's economy, none who shared this rumor believed that it was true (*p*-value of 1 for Fisher's exact test). In the case of the other 4 rumors, however, there was a significant association between belief and sharing ($p < 0.001$ for the rumors on drinking water and bat soup; $p = 0.001$ for the rumor on garlic, and $p = 0.02$ for the rumor on China creating the virus). Nonetheless, even with these 4 rumors, not all who propagated the rumors believed that they were true (Figure 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Finally, Figure 3 depicts how participants had encountered COVID-19 rumors. As has been previously reported (Ippolito et al., 2020; Pew Research Center, 2018), social media platforms emerged as the leading sources, with 1 in 2 individuals reporting exposure through Facebook (55.5%) or WhatsApp (53.6%).

[Figure 3 about here.]

3.3 Predicting rumor hearing, sharing, and believing

Model 1 examined if any demographic or situational factors predicted the number of rumors heard. As shown in Table 2, participants reported hearing more rumors when confirmed local cases were few (early in the pandemic) (b = -0.621, t(1190) = -3.588, p < 0.001) or as lockdown restrictions were lifted (b = 1.129, t(1190) = 4.289, p < 0.001). Additionally, there was a trend for education to predict rumor exposure, with those with higher education hearing more rumors, (b = 0.077, t(1190) = 2.625, p = 0.009). (However, this association was not observed with Bonferroni correction.)

In Models 2 and 3, the same set of predictors were used to predict the number of rumors shared and believed, respectively. For both these models, those who were more educated shared or believed fewer rumors (Model 2: b = -0.046, t(1190) = -3.289, p = 0.001; Model 3: b = -0.046, t(1190) = -3.488, p = 0.001).

[Table 2 about here.]

4. Discussion

During times of crisis, rumors have the potential to transmit misinformation and induce anxiety (Jin et al., 2014; Tran et al., 2020). Against the backdrop of the COVID-19 pandemic, we thus documented how individuals in the community were vulnerable to receive, believe in, or share specific COVID-19 rumors.

First, we observed that rumor exposure was endemic. Nearly all participants had heard at least one rumor and were familiar with an average of 3 out of 5 popular claims assessed. Additionally, most rumor transmission occurred via social media

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

channels (e.g., Facebook and WhatsApp), as others have noted (Islam et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2019).

Extending previous research, we further described how the base rate of believing or sharing rumors was far lower than the rate of exposure (with an average of <1 rumor believed or shared). Notably, belief and sharing behaviors did not always co-occur. In the extreme case of one rumor in particular (that the COVID-19 crisis had been manufactured by the United States), not a single participant who reported forwarding the rumor actually believed in it. Although belief and sharing were linked for the other rumors we assessed, there continued to be – in each case – individuals who shared rumors without believing their veracity.

Our finding that COVID-19 rumors were disseminated even when disbelieved highlights the sheer difficulty of managing the so-called 'infodemic'. Although similar findings had been reported outside the COVID-19 context (Chua and Banerjee, 2017), the World Health Organization and individual governments continue to issue – as the prevailing strategy – fact-checking statements to debunk rumors (Wong et al., 2020; World Health Organisation, 2020; Zarocostas, 2020). Our results bring to question the utility of such statements, since individuals continue to share claims despite perceiving them to be untrue.

Based on our findings, an alternative strategy might be to target individual vulnerabilities instead of rumor content. Given that rumor exposure changed with pandemic severity (e.g., the number of cases) and most individuals had encountered COVID-19 rumors, the ensuing question is why only certain individuals fell prey to either belief in or the sharing of these rumors. In our analyses, we found that educational level was a consistent predictor of vulnerability: although higher education predicted that an individual would hear more rumors, higher education was nonetheless protective, associated with fewer rumors shared or believed in. Consequently, it may be profitable to increase public awareness of knowledge and skillsets associated with higher education – for example, epistemology or scientific

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

thinking (Chong et al., 2020; Chua and Banerjee, 2017) . We note, however, that the correlational nature of our dataset precludes causal inferences, and further research will need to examine the efficacy of such strategies in curbing pandemic-related rumors.

4.1 Limitations

In describing these findings, we highlight several limitations of our research methods. First, we relied on participants' self-reports regarding rumor exposure and behaviors. Although this strategy provided individual-level information (e.g., beliefs, demographics) not available in studies of actual rumor posts (e.g., when Twitter posts are mined), the survey method is vulnerable to recollection and reporting biases. Moving forward, future studies may opt to integrate digital documentation of rumor posts alongside self-reported measures.

As a second limitation, we only sampled rumors that were not time-sensitive. Given the limitations of the survey methodology, we could not track rumors that arose from fast-changing events on the ground – for example, rumors about the first COVID-19-related death in Singapore, or rumors about the availability of face masks (Asokan, 2020; Ministry of Communications and Information, 2020). It thus remains to be seen whether our findings can generalize to these forms of rumors.

4.2 Strengths

These study limitations need to be viewed alongside the putative strengths of our research methodology. To the best of our knowledge, our study represents the first attempt to identify individual vulnerabilities in the spread of COVID-19 rumors. The research involved a large sample size (1237 participants), captured pandemic-related dynamics over a long duration (5 months), and examined specific rumors that had been widely disseminated.

4.3 Conclusions

In conclusion, our study revealed that educational level was a protective factor amidst an onslaught of COVID-19 rumors. At a time when information

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

regulation is crucial to resilience and well-being (Abdoli, 2020; Garfin et al., 2020), our findings provide a basis to manage the spread of rumors. In other words, it is not apparent veracity that makes a rumor 'have it'. Instead, COVID-19 rumors are shared even when disbelieved, but may be stemmed through higher education.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

Abd-Alrazaq, A., Alhuwail, D., Househ, M., Hamdi, M., Shah, Z., 2020. Top Concerns of Tweeters During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Infoveillance Study. J. Med. Internet Res. 22, e19016. https://doi.org/10.2196/19016

Abdoli, A., 2020. Gossip, Rumors, and the COVID-19 Crisis. Disaster Med. Public Health Prep. 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2020.272

Aghababaeian, H., Hamdanieh, L., Ostadtaghizadeh, A., 2020. Alcohol intake in an attempt to fight COVID-19: A medical myth in Iran. Alcohol 88, 29–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcohol.2020.07.006

Ahmed, W., Vidal-Alaball, J., Downing, J., Seguí, F.L., 2020. COVID-19 and the 5G Conspiracy Theory: Social Network Analysis of Twitter Data. J. Med. Internet Res. 22, e19458. https://doi.org/10.2196/19458

Asokan, A., 2020. MOH debunks rumour about COVID-19 death in Singapore - CNA. Channel News Asia. URL https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/covid19-coronavirus-death-singapore-rumour-moh-12481200 (accessed 9.30.20).

Banakar, M., Sadati, A.K., Zarei, L., Shahabi, S., Heydari, S.T., Lankarani, K.B., 2020. Public sphere attitudes toward rumor sources on COVID-19 epidemics: Evidence from community perceptions in Iran (preprint). In Review. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-30297/v1

Chong, Y.Y., Cheng, H.Y., Chan, H.Y.L., Chien, W.T., Wong, S.Y.S., 2020. COVID-19 pandemic, infodemic and the role of eHealth literacy. Int. J. Nurs. Stud. 108, 103644. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2020.103644

Chua, A.Y.K., Banerjee, S., 2018. Intentions to trust and share online health rumors: An experiment with medical professionals. Comput. Hum. Behav. 87, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.05.021

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Chua, A.Y.K., Banerjee, S., 2017. To share or not to share: The role of epistemic belief in online health rumors. Int. J. Med. Inf. 108, 36–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2017.08.010

Cooke, J.E., Eirich, R., Racine, N., Madigan, S., 2020. Prevalence of posttraumatic and general psychological stress during COVID-19: A rapid review and meta-analysis. Psychiatry Res. 292, 113347. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113347

Cuan-Baltazar, J.Y., Muñoz-Perez, M.J., Robledo-Vega, C., Pérez-Zepeda, M.F., Soto-Vega, E., 2020. Misinformation of COVID-19 on the internet: Infodemiology study. JMIR Public Health Surveill. 6, e18444. https://doi.org/10.2196/18444

da Silva, F.C.T., Neto, M.L.R., 2021. Psychological effects caused by the COVID-19 pandemic in health professionals: A systematic review with meta-analysis. Prog. Neuropsychopharmacol. Biol. Psychiatry 104, 110062. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2020.110062

Depoux, A., Martin, S., Karafillakis, E., Preet, R., Wilder-Smith, A., Larson, H., 2020. The pandemic of social media panic travels faster than the COVID-19 outbreak. J. Travel Med. 27. https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa031

Ebrahim, S.H., Ahmed, Q.A., Gozzer, E., Schlagenhauf, P., Memish, Z.A., 2020. Covid-19 and community mitigation strategies in a pandemic. BMJ m1066. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1066

Gao, J., Zheng, P., Jia, Y., Chen, H., Mao, Y., Chen, S., Wang, Y., Fu, H., Dai, J., 2020. Mental health problems and social media exposure during COVID-19 outbreak. PLoS ONE 15. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231924

Garfin, D.R., Silver, R.C., Holman, E.A., 2020. The novel coronavirus (COVID-2019) outbreak: Amplification of public health consequences by media exposure. Health Psychol. Off. J. Div. Health Psychol. Am. Psychol. Assoc. 39, 355–357. https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000875

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Holmes, E.A., O'Connor, R.C., Perry, V.H., Tracey, I., Wessely, S., Arseneault, L., Ballard, C., Christensen, H., Cohen Silver, R., Everall, I., Ford, T., John, A., Kabir, T., King, K., Madan, I., Michie, S., Przybylski, A.K., Shafran, R., Sweeney, A., Worthman, C.M., Yardley, L., Cowan, K., Cope, C., Hotopf, M., Bullmore, E., 2020. Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. Lancet Psychiatry 7, 547–560. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1

Hou, Z., Du, F., Zhou, X., Jiang, H., Martin, S., Larson, H., Lin, L., 2020. Cross-country comparison of public awareness, rumors, and behavioral responses to the COVID-19 epidemic: Infodemiology study. J. Med. Internet Res. 22, e21143. https://doi.org/10.2196/21143

Ippolito, G., Hui, D.S., Ntoumi, F., Maeurer, M., Zumla, A., 2020. Toning down the 2019-nCoV media hype—and restoring hope. Lancet Respir. Med. 8, 230–231. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30070-9

Islam, M.S., Sarkar, T., Khan, S.H., Mostofa Kamal, A.-H., Hasan, S.M.M., Kabir, A., Yeasmin, D., Islam, M.A., Amin Chowdhury, K.I., Anwar, K.S., Chughtai, A.A., Seale, H., 2020. COVID-19-Related Infodemic and Its Impact on Public Health: A Global Social Media Analysis. Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0812

Jin, F., Wang, W., Zhao, L., Dougherty, E., Cao, Y., Lu, C.-T., Ramakrishnan, N., 2014. Misinformation propagation in the age of twitter. Computer 47, 90–94. https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2014.361

Larson, H.J., 2018. The biggest pandemic risk? Viral misinformation. Nature 562, 309–309. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-07034-4

Liu, J.C., Tong, E.M., 2020. COVID-19 news exposure as a modifiable risk factor of psychological symptoms: Can an official WhatsApp channel help? (Preprint). J. Med. Internet Res. 22, e22142. https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.22142

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Long, V.J., Liu, J.C., 2020. Behavioural changes during the COVID-19 pandemic: Results of a national survey in Singapore. medRxiv 2020.08.06.20169870. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.06.20169870

Ministry of Communications and Information, 2020. Corrections and clarifications regarding falsehoods published by States Times Review on availability of face masks. gov.sg. URL https://www.gov.sg/article/factually-clarifications-on-falsehoods-posted-by-str-on-availability-of-face-masks (accessed 9.30.20).

Pappa, S., Ntella, V., Giannakas, T., Giannakoulis, V.G., Papoutsi, E., Katsaounou, P., 2020. Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Brain. Behav. Immun. 88, 901–907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.026

Pew Research Center, 2018. News use across social media platforms 2018. Pew Research Center.

Rovetta, A., Bhagavathula, A.S., 2020. COVID-19-related web search behaviors and infodemic attitudes in Italy: Infodemiological study. JMIR Public Health Surveill. 6, e19374. https://doi.org/10.2196/19374

Salari, N., Hosseinian-Far, A., Jalali, R., Vaisi-Raygani, A., Rasoulpoor, Shna, Mohammadi, M., Rasoulpoor, Shabnam, Khaledi-Paveh, B., 2020. Prevalence of stress, anxiety, depression among the general population during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Glob. Health 16, 57. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-00589-w

Saw, Y.E., Tan, E.Y.-Q., Liu, J.S., Liu, J.C., 2020. Towards a digital solution: Predicting public take-up of Singapore′s contact tracing application during the COVID-19 crisis. medRxiv 2020.08.26.20182386. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.26.20182386

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Singh, L., Bansal, S., Bode, L., Budak, C., Chi, G., Kawintiranon, K., Padden, C., Vanarsdall, R., Vraga, E., Wang, Y., 2020. A first look at COVID-19 information and misinformation sharing on Twitter. ArXiv200313907 Cs.

Taylor, J., 2020. Bat soup, dodgy cures and “diseasology”: the spread of coronavirus misinformation. The Guardian. URL https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jan/31/bat-soup-dodgy-cures-and-diseasology-the-spread-of-coronavirus-bunkum

Torales, J., O’Higgins, M., Castaldelli-Maia, J.M., Ventriglio, A., 2020. The outbreak of COVID-19 coronavirus and its impact on global mental health. Int. J. Soc. Psychiatry 66, 317–320. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764020915212

Tran, T., Valecha, R., Rad, P., Rao, H.R., 2020. An Investigation of Misinformation Harms Related to Social Media During Humanitarian Crises, in: Sahay, S.K., Goel, N., Patil, V., Jadliwala, M. (Eds.), Secure Knowledge Management In Artificial Intelligence Era, Communications in Computer and Information Science. Springer, Singapore, pp. 167–181. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-3817-9_10

Vardanjani, H.M., Heydari, S.T., Dowran, B., Pasalar, M., 2020. A cross-sectional study of Persian medicine and the COVID-19 pandemic in Iran: Rumors and recommendations. Integr. Med. Res., Integrative Medicine for COVID-19: Researches and Evidence 9, 100482. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.imr.2020.100482

Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., Aral, S., 2018. The spread of true and false news online. Science 359, 1146–1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559

Wang, Y., McKee, M., Torbica, A., Stuckler, D., 2019. Systematic Literature Review on the Spread of Health-related Misinformation on Social Media. Soc. Sci. Med. 240, 112552. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112552

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Wong, J.E.L., Leo, Y.S., Tan, C.C., 2020. COVID-19 in Singapore—Current Experience: Critical Global Issues That Require Attention and Action. JAMA 323, 1243. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2467

World Health Organisation, 2020. COVID-19 mythbusters. World Health Organ. URL https://www.who.int/westernpacific/emergencies/covid-19/information/mythbusters

World Health Organization, 2020. Novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV): Situation report - 13. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

Xiong, J., Lipsitz, O., Nasri, F., Lui, L.M.W., Gill, H., Phan, L., Chen-Li, D., Iacobucci, M., Ho, R., Majeed, A., McIntyre, R.S., 2020. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health in the general population: A systematic review. J. Affect. Disord. 277, 55–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.08.001

Zarocostas, J., 2020. How to fight an infodemic. The Lancet 395, 676. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30461-X

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. Baseline demographics of participants

Characteristic	**N**	**(%)**
Age (Mean = 39.3, SD = 12.7)		
Gender		
Female	791	(63.9)
Male	445	(36.0)
Did not answer	1	(0.1)
Ethnicity		
Chinese	1047	(84.6)
Indian	55	(4.4)
Malay	71	(5.7)
Others	63	(5.1)
Did not answer	1	(0.1)
Religion		
Buddhism	181	(14.6)
Taoism/ Chinese traditional beliefs	51	(4.1)
Islam	71	(5.7)
Hinduism	41	(3.3)
Roman Catholicism	125	(10.1)
Christianity (Protestant)	405	(32.7)
No religion	331	(26.7)
Others	30	(2.4)
Did not answer	2	(0.2)
Married status		
Single	518	(41.9)
Married	667	(53.9)
Widowed/ separated/ divorced	47	(3.8)
Did not answer	5	(0.4)
Educational level		
Primary school	4	(0.3)
Secondary school	65	(5.3)
Junior college	91	(7.4)
Vocational training	22	(1.8)
Polytechnic/ diploma	154	(12.4)
University (undergraduate)	623	(50.3)
University (postgraduate)	252	(20.4)
Did not answer	26	(2.1)
House type		
HDB flat: 1-2 rooms	12	(1.0)
HDB flat: 3 rooms	89	(7.2)
HDB flat: 4 rooms	305	(24.6)
HDB flat: 5 rooms or executive flats	358	(28.9)
Condominium or private apartments	321	(25.9)
Landed property	131	(10.6)
Did not answer	21	(1.7)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Household size		
1	55	(4.4)
2	178	(14.4)
3	279	(22.6)
4	359	(29.0)
5+	364	(29.4)
Did not answer	2	(0.2)
Country of birth		
Singapore	1004	(81.1)
Other	232	(18.8)
Did not answer	1	(0.1)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Predicting the number of rumors, heard, shared, and believed during the COVID-19 outbreak

	Outcome Measure[a]					
	Model 1: Number of rumors heard		Model 2: Number of rumors shared		Model 3: Number of rumors believed	
Age	0.003	(0.004)	0.005	(0.002)	0.002	(0.002)
Gender (base = Female)						
Male	-0.084	(0.080)	-0.025	(0.038)	0.017	(0.036)
Ethnicity (base = Chinese)						
Indian	-0.456	(0.353)	-0.060	(0.169)	0.152	(0.159)
Malay	-0.537	(0.279)	0.349	(0.133)	0.184	(0.125)
Others	-0.234	(0.206)	0.022	(0.098)	-0.059	(0.092)
Religion (base = No religion)						
Christianity (Protestant)	0.093	(0.101)	-0.018	(0.048)	0.012	(0.045)
Buddhism	0.159	(0.125)	0.115	(0.060)	-0.025	(0.056)
Roman Catholicism	0.115	(0.144)	0.036	(0.069)	0.135	(0.065)
Taoism/ Chinese traditional beliefs	0.171	(0.207)	0.018	(0.099)	0.078	(0.093)
Islam	0.330	(0.325)	0.006	(0.155)	-0.104	(0.146)
Hinduism	0.215	(0.351)	-0.259	(0.167)	0.122	(0.157)
Others	0.560	(0.281)	0.047	(0.134)	0.072	(0.126)
Marital status (base = Single)						
Married	-0.041	(0.093)	-0.021	(0.045)	-0.036	(0.042)
Widowed/ separated/ divorced	0.002	(0.217)	0.037	(0.104)	-0.170	(0.098)
Education level	0.077	(0.029)	-0.046	(0.014)*	-0.046	(0.013)*
House type	0.092	(0.036)	-0.030	(0.017)	-0.042	(0.016)
Household size	-0.018	(0.036)	0.011	(0.017)	0.013	(0.016)
Country of birth (base = Singapore)						
Other	0.271	(0.108)	0.071	(0.051)	0.072	(0.048)
Lockdown (base = Lockdown period)						
Before lockdown	-0.437	(0.206)	-0.017	(0.098)	0.075	(0.092)
After lockdown	1.129	(0.263)*	0.011	(0.126)	-0.151	(0.118)
Number of local COVID-19 cases (log transformed)	-0.621	(0.173)*	-0.052	(0.083)	0.079	(0.078)
R^2	0.474		0.435		0.388	

[a]Data reported as beta estimates (standard error)
*Indicates significance at $p < .002$ (following Bonferroni corrections).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figures and captions



Figure 1: Proportion of participants hearing, sharing, and believe each COVID-19 rumor (that the virus originated from the consumption of bat soup, from an American lab, or from a Chinese lab; or that the virus can be cured by eating garlic or drinking water). Vertical lines represent the 95% confidence interval.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 2: For each rumor, the vertical bar depicts the quantity of participants who shared each rumor, represented as a percentage of participants who believed or disbelieved each rumor. Vertical lines represent the 95% confidence interval.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.01.20205187; this version posted October 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 3: Sources of where participants heard COVID-19 rumors. Horizontal lines represent 95% confidence interval.