

17 ⁶M.D. Centro de Investigaciones Biomédicas Y Clínicas (CINBIOCLI), Department of Clinical
18 Research, Hospital Regional Universitario José María Cabral Y Báez (HRUJM CB), Santiago,
19 Dominican Republic.

20 **Corresponding author***

21 E-mail: reyeslenisse@gmail.com (LMR).

22

23 **Authors Contributions:**

24 L.M.R. conceived, designed, drafted, edited, led the revisions and approved the final version for
25 publication. L.O, Y.L, P.J.R. and W.R were involved in the revision, drafting, edition and data
26 collection. M.A. was involved in the drafting, editing, data analysis and interpretation. All
27 authors critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content and approved the final
28 manuscript.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

ABSTRACT

36 Despite the vast scientific evidence obtained from the genomic sequencing of COVID-19, a
37 controversy regarding its origin has been created in the mass media. This could potentially have
38 a long-term influence on the behavior among individuals, such as failure to comply with
39 proposed social distancing measures, leading to a consequent rise in the morbidity and mortality
40 rates from COVID-19 infection. Several studies have collected information about knowledge,
41 attitudes and practices regarding COVID-19; however, very little is known about the relationship
42 of the perceptions of the individuals regarding the origin of the virus with the knowledge and
43 perception about social distancing. This study aimed at ascertaining this relationship. For such
44 purpose, a web-based cross-sectional study was conducted among a sample population from five
45 provinces of the Dominican Republic within the period of June to July of 2020. The data
46 collection instrument exploited in the study was a self-designed questionnaire distributed
47 throughout different social media platforms. A purposive sampling strategy was implemented
48 and a total of 1195 respondents completed the questionnaire. The collected data was analyzed
49 using SPSS. Descriptive statistics, stepwise multiple linear regression and one-way multivariate
50 analysis were implemented to test the hypotheses. The level of education was significantly
51 associated ($P = 0.017$) with individuals' perception about the origin of COVID-19, whilst only
52 age ($P = 0.032$) and education level ($P < 0.001$) statistically significantly predicted 'knowledge
53 about social distancing'. Perception of COVID-19 origin was statistically significant associated
54 ($P = < 0.001$) with the measures of the dependent variables (knowledge and perception on social
55 distancing). The present study has established a possible link between the 'perception of
56 COVID-19 origin' and 'the perception and knowledge about social distancing'.

57 INTRODUCTION

58 Following the bubonic plague, there has been myriad well-recognized epidemics and pandemics
59 worldwide [1,2], which have recorded a rapid increase in morbidity and mortality rates coupled
60 with a disruption in the dynamics of environmental, ecological and socio-economic factors
61 among humans [2,3]. Recent occurring pandemics are zoonotic in nature [3] due to the rapid
62 growth rate among both the human and animal populations, thereby bridging the transmission
63 gap between the two and consequently easing the expansion of such zoonotic infections globally
64 [4,5]. In 2019, a brand-new viral infection emerged in Wuhan, China [6] caused by the
65 coronavirus SARS-CoV-2, also known as COVID-19. The infection has been declared in the
66 current year as a “Public Health Emergency of International Concern ” and has posteriorly
67 become a pandemic [7].

68 The coronavirus family is characterized by a low fidelity RNA polymerase, nucleic acids with a
69 high recombination frequency and an unusual extended genome, which facilitate their diversity
70 and the emergence of viruses that can easily adapt to new hosts and environments [8-10]. The
71 genomic sequence of SARS-CoV-2 has been documented to be akin to SARS-CoV [11].
72 Following the foregoing discovery, many other β -coronaviruses have been identified in both bats
73 and humans. Notable among them was the BatCoV RaTG13 (isolated from *Rhinopulus affinis*),
74 which shares about 96% of its genomic sequence with the novel SARS-CoV-2 [12,13]. Further,
75 Pangolin-CoV harbored in Guangdong pangolins was again noted to have a genomic sequence
76 very similar [12,14] to the amino acid residues of the receptor binding domain (RBD) of SARS-
77 CoV-2 [13,15]. BatCoV RaTG13 [15], on the other hand, shares only one amino acid residue in
78 the RBD as that of the novel coronavirus, despite sharing 96% homology otherwise. Moreover, a

79 scientific theory published in a pre-printed repository vis-à-vis the origin of COVID-19 [16]
80 found shared amino acids with those of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV-1) in the
81 genomic sequence of SARS-CoV-2. The validity of such findings was immediately questioned
82 and dismissed by several researchers, which subsequently led to a formal retraction by the
83 authors and a withdrawal of the paper from the repository [17]. However, despite the withdrawal
84 of the article and the reassurance made by other scientists who verified the genomic sequence of
85 SARS-CoV-2 and the natural origin of the virus [18,19] these findings spread in the news and
86 social media around the world, generating more controversy and reinforcing existing unofficial
87 and popularly disseminated theories that established that the virus “leaked from a laboratory in
88 Wuhan” and is probably a product of genetic manipulation in an effort to discover a vaccine for
89 HIV-1[20-22].

90 In a short period of time, millions of infections and thousands of deaths have been reported from
91 SARS-CoV-2 around the world. In the Dominican Republic, more than 100,000 cases have been
92 recently reported with a case fatality ratio of 1.9% and a tendency to increase, similar to other
93 countries of the region [23]. Owing to the ease of person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-
94 2, a non-pharmacological intervention deemed ‘social distancing’ is currently being practiced to
95 minimize spread of the virus [24]. Conventionally, early and sustained imposition of these
96 interventions have been demonstrated to reduce mortality rates and flatten the epidemiologic
97 curve significantly among varied countries, such as the United States, during the last registered
98 pandemic in 1918 [25-26]. Currently, early interventions like social distancing have significantly
99 limited the effects and slowed the transmission of COVID-19 in its stage of epidemic in
100 mainland China [27] and New Zealand [28]. Among the Caribbean, the Dominican Republic has
101 adapted the mandatory usage of nose masks in public places, as well as the suspension of small

102 businesses, public transportation and a 10 hours' curfew (7 p.m.-5 a.m.) as an additional measure
103 to strengthen the social distancing protocols in an attempt to flatten the epidemiologic curve [29].
104 Despite these measures to contain the spread of the virus, some rule-breaking events have still
105 occurred [30,31].

106 Various observational studies have been performed to assess the knowledge, attitudes and
107 perceptions about COVID-19 among healthcare workers and the general populace, and some of
108 them assess the perception and knowledge about the origin of COVID-19 and social distancing
109 [32-35], yet very little literature exists on the relationship between an individual's understanding
110 of social distancing and their perceptions regarding the origin of SARS-CoV-2; it is possible that
111 the controversy revolving around the origin of COVID-19 in the mass media is influencing the
112 perceptions and knowledge about social distancing of the general population. This study sheds
113 light on this issue and therefore was conducted to verify the hypothesis.

114

115 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

116

117 **Study area and sampling technique**

118

119 This web-based cross-sectional study was conducted among five provinces of the Dominican
120 Republic population within a period of June to July, 2020. The data collection instrument was an
121 online administered questionnaire. Five provinces included in the study were described as the
122 Ozama region (comprising Santo Domingo and the National District), Santiago, La Vega and
123 Duarte. The study area was chosen due to the significant mortality trend from COVID-19

124 [36,37]. Overall, a total of 1195 participants who completed the survey questionnaire were
125 included for the study. Purposive sampling was adopted for participants' recruitment from the
126 targeted provinces.

127 **Data collection instrument**

128
129 The data collection instrument exploited in the study was a short and precise web-based self-
130 designed questionnaire containing closed-ended questions adapted to the target population. The
131 closed-ended items enabled to obtain specific responses from the respondents. The questionnaire
132 comprised four sections: the first section (6 items) obtained sociodemographic data from the
133 respondents, the second section (2 items), third section (1 item) and the fourth section (2 items)
134 were designed to obtain information on the 'perception of COVID-19 origin', 'perception of
135 social distancing' and 'knowledge of social distancing', respectively. An open-ended question
136 about the year of birth was included with the purpose of confirming the age of the participants,
137 due to the easy access that adolescents have to the internet in the Dominican Republic, according
138 to our experience. A pilot study utilising 65 respondents was conducted prior to the actual data
139 collection. To avoid instrumentation which introduces bias to the research, participants' data for
140 the pilot testing were not selected again for the main study.

141 **Data collection procedure**

142
143 A *SurveyMonkey*TM collector web link containing the self-designed questionnaire was distributed
144 among participants from the study site at the time of data collection. Individuals aged ≥ 18 years
145 and only from the Dominican Republic were eligible for participating in the study. The survey
146 link was sent as a message via the social media platforms *WhatsApp*TM, *Facebook*TM and

147 InstagramTM. The forgoing are the most commonly utilized social media platforms among the
148 Dominican Republic populace [38,39].

149 **Statistical analysis**

150 Collected data from *SurveyMonkey*TM was exported into an excel spreadsheet (*Microsoft Excel*
151 *365*®, 2016) for data cleaning, and the dataset was analyzed using SPSS software (IBM SPSS®
152 version 21). Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were computed to describe the
153 perception and knowledge about the origin of COVID-19 among the study participants, whilst
154 frequencies and percentages were performed to describe the sociodemographic variables (gender,
155 age, province, educational level and monthly income). Stepwise multiple linear regression
156 (MLR) was adopted to estimate the perception of COVID-19 origin using selected
157 sociodemographic variables (gender, age, educational level and income) as predictor variables.
158 Further, one-way multivariate analysis of variance (one-way MANOVA) was performed to
159 determine whether any differences existed between independent groups on more than one
160 continuous dependent variable. The dependent variables were described as ‘perception and
161 knowledge on social distancing’ and the independent variable was ‘perception of COVID-19
162 origin’. For the purpose of the present study, a *P* value less than 0.05 at 95% confidence interval
163 ($P < 0.05$) was deemed statistically significant.

164

165 **RESULTS**

166 *Descriptive statistics derived from the measurement of participants sociodemographic*

167 A total of 1195 respondents successfully completed the online questionnaire survey. Exactly
168 597(50.0%) were males whilst the remaining 598(50%) were females. The age (years) of the

169 participants were recorded as categorical values in this order: ≥ 25 -44 years (n = 630, 52.2%), \geq
170 45-64 years (n = 284, 23.8%), ≥ 18 -24 years (n = 211, 17.7%), ≥ 65 years (n = 70, 5.9%). The
171 overall average age was documented as the mean value 2.18 (± 0.786), thus falling in the age
172 range 25-44 years. About 244 (20.4%) of the respondents originated from Santiago, 723(60.5%)
173 from Santo Domingo and the National District, 124 (10.4%) from La Vega and 104(8.7) from
174 Duarte. Regarding education level, 93(7.8%) were in primary school, 247(20.7%) in secondary
175 or elementary school, 95(7.9%) had technical/vocational degree, 611(51.1%) were university
176 students, 101(8.5%) had professional degree, 41(3.4%) had master's degree and only 7(0.6%)
177 had doctorate (PhD) degree. The household income in Dominican Pesos (DOP) was also
178 explored. 440 (36.8%) of the respondents earned less than RD\$ 41,164 (DOP) per month (low
179 income), 46 (3.8%) and 335 (28%) of the respondents earned exactly RD\$ 41,164 (DOP) per
180 month (average income) and more than RD\$ 41,164 (DOP) per month (high income),
181 respectively. About 217 (18.2%) did not know their monthly income whilst 157(13.1%) decided
182 to keep their monthly income confidential. Distribution of sociodemographic characteristics
183 among the participants is presented in [Table 1](#).

184

185 **Table 1. Descriptive statistics on gender, age, province, education and monthly income**
186 **among the study participants**

Variables		Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	597	50
	Female	598	50
Age/years	18-24	211	17.7

	25-44	630	52.2
	45-64	284	23.8
	≥ 65	70	5.9
Province	Santiago	244	20.4
	Ozama region	723	60.5
	La Vega	124	10.4
	Duarte	104	8.7
Education	Primary school	93	7.8
	Secondary school	247	20.7
	Technical/Vocational degree	95	7.9
	University student	611	51.1
	Professional degree	101	8.5
	Master's degree	41	3.4
	Doctorate/PhD	7	0.6
Monthly Income	Low	440	36.8
	Average	46	3.8
	High	335	28
	Don't know	217	18.2
	Prefer not to say	157	13.1

187 $N = 1195$; Ozama region comprises Santo Domingo and National district

188 ***Perception and knowledge about the origin of COVID-19***

189 Questions regarding perception about the origin of COVID-19 among the study participants
 190 ([Table 2](#)) were assigned values on a five-point Likert scale format (1- mostly false, 2- false, 3-

191 neutral, 4- true, 5- mostly true for the perceptions about the origin of COVID-19; 1- strongly
192 disagree, 2- disagree, 3-neutral, 4- agree, 5- strongly agree for the perceptions about social
193 distancing). Since the scales were five-point Likert-type scales format, three (3), the mid-value,
194 was chosen as an average value so that, mean scores below it, were considered a poor response
195 and vice versa. Further, the analyses of the responses were computed in terms of the percentage
196 of the respondents who either “Affirmed” or “Rejected” a given statement. If the summation
197 percentage of respondents who indicated ‘mostly true’ or ‘true’ (or ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’)
198 exceeded the percentage of active respondents who revealed ‘mostly false’ or ‘false’ (or
199 ‘strongly disagree’ or ‘disagree’), then the statement was said to have been “Affirmed” in the
200 study and vice versa.

201 Our study showed that 332 (27.8%) of the respondents affirmed that ‘COVID-19 is a virus that
202 comes from the interaction between bat and pangolin (a carnivorous animal from Guangdong,
203 China), and may later become capable of producing disease in humans (S1)’. About 517
204 (43.2%) of the study participants, ‘COVID-19 is a virus whose genes were handled by scientists
205 inside a laboratory in Wuhan, China in order to discover a vaccine against the Human
206 Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV/ AIDS) and that accidentally escaped from that laboratory (S2)’.
207 A greater proportion of the respondents (n = 1079, 90.3%) affirmed that ‘Social distancing
208 measures are effective in the reduction of the transmission and spread of COVID-19 infection’.

209

210 **Table 2. Perception and knowledge about the origin of COVID-19**

Response, n(%)

95% CI

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Mean ± SD</i>	<i>True</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>False</i>	<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
		<i>or</i>		<i>or</i>		
		<i>Agree</i>		<i>Disagree</i>		
S1	2.76 ± 1.263	332(27.8)	475(39.7)	388(32.5)	2.69	2.84
S2	3.35 ± 1.245	517(43.2)	304(25.5)	374(31.3)	3.28	3.42
S3	4.42 ± 0.820	1079(90.3)	56(4.7)	60(5.0)	4.38	4.47

211 ***S1: COVID-19 is a virus that comes from the interaction between bat and pangolin (a carnivorous***
212 ***animal from Guangdong, China), and may later become capable of producing disease in humans; S2:***
213 ***COVID-19 is a virus whose genes were handled by scientists inside a laboratory in Wuhan, China in***
214 ***order to discover a vaccine against the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV/ AIDS) and that***
215 ***accidentally escaped from that laboratory; S3: Social distancing measures are effective in the reduction***
216 ***of the transmission and spread of COVID-19 infection***

217

218 ***Stepwise Multiple linear regression model for estimating the influence of sociodemographic***
219 ***characteristics on the ‘perception of COVID-19 origin’ and knowledge of social distancing***

220 Multiple linear regression (MLR) equations with corresponding standard error of estimate (SEE)
221 and coefficient of determination (R^2) were used to estimate the influence of selected
222 sociodemographic characteristics on the ‘perception of COVID-19 origin’ and ‘knowledge of
223 social distancing’ among the respondents ([Table 3](#)). No sociodemographic characteristics
224 significantly predicted ($P > 0.05$) individuals’ perception about the origin of COVID-19, except
225 for the level of education ($P = 0.017$). Further, the findings revealed that only age ($P = 0.032$)
226 and education level ($P < 0.001$) statistically significantly predicted ‘knowledge about social
227 distancing’. The coefficient of determination (R^2) for Perception of COVID-19 origin ($R^2 =$

228 0.009) and Knowledge of social distance ($R^2 = 0.032$) revealed that only 0.9% and 3.2% of
 229 variations, respectively, may be associated with the sociodemographic background of the
 230 participants.

231
 232 **Table 3. Stepwise multiple linear regression model for assessing the influence of**
 233 **sociodemographic characteristics on the perception of COVID-19 origin**

Dependent variable	Model	Coefficient (B)	±SEE	R ²	Sig
Perception of COVID-19 origin	Constant	3.623	0.184	0.009	.000
	Gender	0.028	0.073	0.000	.697
	Age	0.021	0.046	0.000	.655
	Educational level	-0.070	0.029	0.006	.017
	Income	-0.044	0.025	0.004	.078
Knowledge of social distancing	Constant	0.728	0.052	0.032	.000
	Gender	0.016	0.020	0.002	.436
	Age	-0.028	0.013	0.005	.032
	Educational level	0.008	0.019	0.028	<.001
	Income	0.007	0.016	0.001	.597

234 *SEE: Standard error of the estimate*

235
 236 ***One-way MANOVA test for the difference between “knowledge and perception on social***
 237 ***distancing” and “perception of COVID 19 origin”***

238 This study further estimated the relationship between the “perception of COVID 19 origin” and
 239 “knowledge and perception on social distancing”. The dependent variables were described as
 240 “knowledge and perception on social distancing” and the predictor variable or the independent
 241 variable was documented as “perception of COVID 19 origin”. A P value of less than 0.05 ($P <$
 242 0.05) was considered statistically significant.

243 Using an alpha level of 0.05 (95% confidence interval), we observe that the MANOVA test
 244 produced a statistically significant result; Wilk’s Lambda = 0.967, $F(4, 1190) = 5.105$, $P < 0.001$.
 245 This significant F indicates that there are significant differences among the “perception of
 246 COVID 19 origin” groups on a linear combination of the two dependent variables (knowledge
 247 and perception on social distancing). This disclosure explicates that perception of COVID-19
 248 origin were statistically significant ($P = < 0.001$) with the measures of the dependent variables
 249 (knowledge and perception on social distancing). Distribution of the Multivariate test is
 250 presented in [Table 4](#).

251 **Table 4. Distribution on multivariate test^a (MANOVA test) for the difference between**
 252 **“knowledge and perception on social distancing” and “perception of COVID 19 origin”**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
<i>Intercept</i>	Pillai’s Trace	0.965	16323.31 ^b	2.0	1189	< .001
	Wilk’s Lambda	0.035	16323.31 ^b	2.0	1189	< .001
	Hotelling’s Trace	27.457	16323.31 ^b	2.0	1189	< .001
	Roy’s Largest Root	27.457	16323.31 ^b	2.0	1189	< .001
<i>Perception theory</i>	Pillai’s Trace	.034	5.097	8.0	2380	< .001
	Wilk’s Lambda	.967	5.105	8.0	2378	< .001

Hotelling's Trace	.034	5.114	8.0	2376	< .001
Roy's Largest Root	.027	7.923 ^c	4.0	1180	< .001

253 ^a = Design: Intercept + Year of study, *b* = Exact statistic, *c* = The test statistic is an upper bound
 254 of *F* that yield a lower bound on the significant level.

255 Since the MANOVA test was significant, we then examined the univariate ANOVA results to
 256 look at the association between the awareness of social distancing and the origin of COVID-19.
 257 Follow-up univariate ANOVAs indicated that both knowledge and perception on social
 258 distancing were statistically significantly different for participants' perception about the origin of
 259 COVID 19; $F(4, 1190) = 5.370, P = <0.001$, multivariate η^2 (partial eta squared) = 0.018 and F
 260 $(4, 1190) = 4.685, P = 0.001$, multivariate η^2 (partial eta squared) = 0.016 respectively. The
 261 partial eta squared of 0.018 and 0.016 explains that only 1.8% and 1.6% of the multivariate
 262 variance in the dependent variable; perception and knowledge of social distancing, respectively,
 263 is associated with the group factor (perception of COVID-19 origin). Distribution on the follow-
 264 up univariate ANOVAs is presented in [Table 5](#).

265
 266 **Table 5. Distribution on the follow-up univariate ANOVAs to test the difference between the**
 267 **dependent variables and the factor group (Perception of COVID 19 origin)**

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III sum of square	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Corrected model	PSD	14.218 ^a	4	3.555	5.370	<.000
	KSD	2.327 ^b	4	.582	4.685	.001

Intercepts	PSD	18477.65	1	18477.654	27915.5	<.000
	KSD	691.94	1	691.935	5572.9	<.000
Perception theory	PSD	14.218	4	3.555	5.37	<.000
	KSD	2.327	4	.582	4.69	.001
Error	PSD	787.678	1190	.662		
	KSD	147.752	1190	.124		
Total	PSD	24193.0	1195			
	KSD	1019.0	1195			
Corrected Total	PSD	801.896	1194			
	KSD	150.079	1194			

269 $a = R\text{-squared} = 0.018$; $b = R\text{-squared} = 0.016$; PSD – Perception about social distancing; KSD
 270 – Knowledge about social distancing

271

272 **DISCUSSION**

273 To date, no research has been conducted in the Dominican Republic focusing on associations
 274 between the perceptions about the origin of COVID-19 and the knowledge and perception about
 275 social distancing among the general population. Therefore, the present study was conducted to
 276 ascertain the associations between the triage (perceptions regarding the origin of COVID-19,
 277 knowledge about social distancing and perception about social distancing), as well as the
 278 socioeconomic status of the population.

279 The results of the study indicate that the majority of the participants' perception is 'COVID-19
 280 emerged from genetic manipulation by scientists within a laboratory in Wuhan, China, whose

281 purpose was to produce a vaccine against HIV, and spread from an accidental escape’ [[16,19-](#)
282 [22](#)], while the remaining minority of the individuals’ perception is ‘COVID-19 emerged from
283 the genetic interactions between bat’s and pangolin’s genomic, and may later become capable of
284 producing infection in humans’ [[8-15](#)].

285 Most of the participants perceived social distancing as an effective preventative measure for
286 COVID-19 infection and have ample knowledge about it, results that match those of other
287 studies such as that of Taghrir et al. [[40](#)]. Since social media outlets have been the primary
288 reported source for research of information regarding COVID-19 by participants in similar
289 studies [[34](#)], our findings suggest that the message about social distancing is being propagated
290 correctly via social media, the news and, most importantly, international health organizations
291 [[24](#)]. Interestingly, however, this is the same way misinformation about conspiracy and
292 contradicting scientific theories regarding the origin of COVID-19 have also been reproduced
293 [[20-22](#)].

294 A significant association was found between those that perceived the origin of the virus coming
295 from manipulation within a laboratory and their knowledge and perception about social
296 distancing, supporting our hypothesis that there is a relationship between these variables.
297 Although we cannot specifically prove a causal association, these results suggest that the
298 controversy surrounding the origin of COVID-19 and the misinformation disseminated through
299 mass media may also influence other aspects related to individuals’ perceptions and their
300 behavior towards the virus, such as the lack of compliance to government protocols [[35,41](#)] and
301 social distancing. These perceptions may also promote distrust in the scientific community, a
302 matter that scientists have tried to raise awareness about [[42-47](#)].

303 Most of the participants in this study were young university students, followed by those with a
304 professional degree. Interestingly, among the sociodemographic characteristics reported, the
305 educational level was the only variable significantly associated with the perceptions about the
306 origin of COVID-19, while both educational level and age were, at the same time, found to be
307 associated with the knowledge about social distancing. However, the variations in the
308 perceptions about the origin of COVID-19 and the knowledge about social distancing within the
309 sample were only 0.9% to 3.2%, respectively, a result that reveals, perhaps, that other
310 sociodemographic factors were not considerably correlated with these variables. These findings
311 contradict those of Bhagavathula [34], where factors such as a professional degree and age of
312 participants were found to be significantly associated with a poor perception and knowledge
313 regarding COVID-19. Further, our findings differ from those in the study of Morinha et. al [35],
314 where the lower the educational level, the more the individuals considered the virus a result of
315 genetic manipulation within a scientific laboratory.

316 Particularly, the results of our study may suggest that the lack of education level is not the main
317 factor related to perceptions regarding the source of the virus. We think that this phenomenon,
318 resembling the ‘polarization effect’, may support the tendency of individuals with a higher
319 educational level and greater knowledge in science to have more polarized beliefs [48]; a
320 propensity that could be incited by the way the information regarding the origin of COVID-19 is
321 being reproduced in the media. Nonetheless, it is important to highlight that our study differs in
322 several aspects compared to the aforementioned studies, such as the scenario where their
323 research was conducted, and the target populations, and therefore, their results may be not
324 reproducible to our study’s setting. Further, the data collected about these variables may suggest
325 that other sociodemographic factors could be potentially involved with the knowledge and

326 perception about social distancing. Further studies are necessary to be conducted to help clarify
327 these surprising findings.

328 **Study limitations**

329 A web-based approach was adopted for the purposes of collecting data from the participants.
330 Hence the data collection was made through varied social media platforms which is relatively
331 less utilized among the aged and persons with low socioeconomic background. This approach
332 albeit regarded as an effective and innovative considering the current pandemic situation [49]
333 may introduce a high level of biasness among the group of selected participants for the study.
334 For instance, among the Dominican Republic populace, the average profile of social media users
335 comprises young people from urban areas with a relatively high socioeconomic status compared
336 to the average in other countries of the region [38,39]. Further, about 32.5% of the overall
337 Dominican population do not have access to the internet [50]. This directly implies, this group of
338 the population will be unfairly ruled out automatically. Similar drawbacks have been elaborated
339 by previous researchers [49,51]. Furthermore, another limitation was the difficulty in finding
340 current information about the total population of the country and the national income per capita
341 in public databases; however, for this purpose, data available from the national office of statistics
342 [37] and the central bank of the Dominican Republic [52,53] was used to obtain the most
343 accurate estimation of these values.

344 Nevertheless, a self-administered online questionnaire is not only an effective and innovative
345 tool at the forefront of the current situation, but provides a relatively feasible monitoring of
346 potential non-respondents, as well as a reduction in the implementation time of the collection
347 instrument, the overall cost of the study [51] and, most importantly, allows compliance with

348 social distancing and other preventive measures imposed by the Dominican government
349 authorities to reduce COVID-19 infection.

350

351 **CONCLUSIONS**

352 Our study strongly suggests that more attention needs to be paid to the misinformation regarding
353 the origin of COVID-19 in social media and the news. Further variables are also warrant
354 studying, such as the attitudes of the participants towards social distancing, in order to find
355 associations with these factors and their perceptions about the origin of COVID-19. We
356 acknowledge that inquiring into the perceptions of people from rural areas is also of vital
357 importance and is a matter that demands more research.

358 **Acknowledgements:**

359 We thank all the anonymous participants for providing their responses voluntarily in the survey
360 and Dr. Alondra C. Sepúlveda La Hoz, Marlenis A. Bueno García and Dr. Anabel Castillo
361 Espailat for their contributions in the promotion and distribution of the survey on social media.
362 We also want to express our gratitude to Dr. María Zunilda Nuñez Payamps, internal medicine
363 specialist and director of the clinical research center Centro de Investigaciones Biomédicas Y
364 Clínicas (CINBIOCLI) and the Dominican Republic's site centers of the Harvard's Principles
365 and Practices of Clinical Research (PPCR) for her contributions to the development of ethical
366 and quality research in the Dominican Republic.

367 **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are openly
368 available in the data repository figshare at [10.6084/m9.figshare.12915422](https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12915422).

369

370 REFERENCES

- 371 1. Huremović D. Brief History of Pandemics (Pandemics Throughout History). Psychiatry
372 of Pandemics. 2019 May 16:7–35.
- 373 2. Madhav, N., Oppenheim, B., Gallivan, M., et. al. Pandemics: Risks, Impacts, and
374 Mitigation. In: rd, Jamison DT, Gelband H, et al., editors. Disease Control Priorities:
375 Improving Health and Reducing Poverty. Washington (DC)2017.
- 376 3. Jones KE, Patel NG, Levy MA, et al. Global trends in emerging infectious diseases.
377 Nature. 2008 Feb 21;451(7181):990-3.
- 378 4. Murphy FA. Emerging zoonoses. Emerg Infect Dis. 1998 Jul-Sep;4(3):429-35.
- 379 5. Fraser C, Riley S, Anderson RM, et al. Factors that make an infectious disease outbreak
380 controllable. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2004 Apr 20;101(16):6146-51.
- 381 6. World Health Organization Regional Oficine for Europe [Internet]. Copenhagen,
382 Denmark: World Health Organization; 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 7]. Available from:
383 [https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov)
384 [19/novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov)
- 385 7. World Health Organization [Internet]. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization;
386 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 7]. Available from:
387 [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern-(pheic)-global-research-and-innovation-forum)
388 [international-concern-\(pheic\)-global-research-and-innovation-forum](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern-(pheic)-global-research-and-innovation-forum)
- 389 8. Shereen MA, Khan S, Kazmi A, et al. COVID-19 infection: Origin, transmission, and
390 characteristics of human coronaviruses. J Adv Res. 2020 Jul; 24:91-98.

- 391 9. Li X, Geng M, Peng Y, et al. Molecular immune pathogenesis and diagnosis of COVID-
392 19. *J Pharm Anal.* 2020 Apr;10(2):102-108.
- 393 10. Li X, Zai J, Zhao Q, et al. Evolutionary history, potential intermediate animal host, and
394 cross-species analyses of SARS-CoV-2. *J Med Virol.* 2020 Jun;92(6):602-611.
- 395 11. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, et al. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease
396 in China. *Nature.* 2020 2020/03/01;579(7798):265-269.
- 397 12. Xiao K, Zhai J, Feng Y, et al. Isolation and Characterization of 2019-nCoV-like
398 Coronavirus from Malayan Pangolins. *bioRxiv.* 2020:2020.02.17.951335 [Preprint].
399 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 7] Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.17.951335>
- 400 13. Menachery VD, Yount BL, Jr., Debbink K, et al. A SARS-like cluster of circulating bat
401 coronaviruses shows potential for human emergence. *Nat Med.* 2015 Dec;21(12):1508-
402 13.
- 403 14. Zhang T, Wu Q, Zhang Z. Probable Pangolin Origin of SARS-CoV-2 Associated with the
404 COVID-19 Outbreak. *Curr Biol.* 2020 Apr 6;30(7):1346-1351 e2.
- 405 15. Lam TT, Jia N, Zhang YW, et al. Identifying SARS-CoV-2-related coronaviruses in
406 Malayan pangolins. *Nature.* 2020 Jul;583(7815):282-285.
- 407 16. Pradhan P, Pandey AK, Mishra A, et al. Uncanny similarity of unique inserts in the 2019-
408 nCoV spike protein to HIV-1 gp120 and Gag. *bioRxiv.* 2020:2020.01.30.927871
409 [Preprint]. 2020 [cited Aug 7 2020]. Available from:
410 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.01.30.927871>
- 411 17. Oransky I. Quick retraction of a faulty coronavirus paper was a good moment for science.
412 *STAT News [Internet].* 2020 Feb 3 [cited 2020 Aug 7]; Research: [about 5 screens].

- 413 Available from: [https://www.statnews.com/2020/02/03/retraction-faulty-coronavirus-](https://www.statnews.com/2020/02/03/retraction-faulty-coronavirus-paper-good-moment-for-science/)
414 [paper-good-moment-for-science/](https://www.statnews.com/2020/02/03/retraction-faulty-coronavirus-paper-good-moment-for-science/)
- 415 18. Andersen KG, Rambaut A, Lipkin WI, et al. The proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2. Nat
416 Med. 2020 Apr;26(4):450-452.
- 417 19. Xiao C, Li X, Liu S, et al. HIV-1 did not contribute to the 2019-nCoV genome. Emerg
418 Microbes Infect. 2020;9(1):378-381.
- 419 20. Mosher SW. Don't buy China's story: The coronavirus may have leaked from a lab. New
420 York Post [Internet]. 2020 Feb 22 [cited 2020 Aug 06]; Research: [about 4 screens].
421 Available from: [https://nypost.com/2020/02/22/dont-buy-chinas-story-the-coronavirus-](https://nypost.com/2020/02/22/dont-buy-chinas-story-the-coronavirus-may-have-leaked-from-a-lab/)
422 [may-have-leaked-from-a-lab/](https://nypost.com/2020/02/22/dont-buy-chinas-story-the-coronavirus-may-have-leaked-from-a-lab/)
- 423 21. Aitken P. China's 'Bat Woman' Shi Zhengli denies 'defecting with intelligence files.'
424 Fox News [Internet] 2020 May 02 [cited 2020 Aug 6]. Research: [about 5 screens].
425 Available from: [https://www.foxnews.com/world/chinas-bat-woman-shi-zhengli-denies-](https://www.foxnews.com/world/chinas-bat-woman-shi-zhengli-denies-defecting)
426 [defecting](https://www.foxnews.com/world/chinas-bat-woman-shi-zhengli-denies-defecting)
- 427 22. Makowski E. Theory that Coronavirus Escaped from a Lab Lacks Evidence. The
428 Scientist [Internet] 2020 Mar 05 [cited 2020 Aug 6]. Research: [about 4 screens].
429 Available from: [https://www.the-scientist.com/news-opinion/theory-that-coronavirus-](https://www.the-scientist.com/news-opinion/theory-that-coronavirus-escaped-from-a-lab-lacks-evidence-67229)
430 [escaped-from-a-lab-lacks-evidence-67229](https://www.the-scientist.com/news-opinion/theory-that-coronavirus-escaped-from-a-lab-lacks-evidence-67229)
- 431 23. Johns Hopkins-Coronavirus Resource Center [Internet]. Mortality Analyses. Baltimore,
432 Maryland, United States: Johns Hopkins University; 2020 [Updated: 2020 Sep 9; cited
433 2020 Sep 9]. Available from: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/data/mortality>
- 434 24. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. Coronavirus disease 2019
435 (COVID-19). Atlanta, Georgia, United States: Centers for Disease Control and

- 436 Prevention; 2020 [Updated: 2020 Jul 15; cited 2020 Aug 7]. Available from:
437 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/social-distancing.html>
- 438 25. Tomes N. "Destroyer and teacher": Managing the masses during the 1918-1919 influenza
439 pandemic. *Public Health Rep.* 2010 Apr;125 Suppl 3(Suppl 3):48-62.
- 440 26. Markel H, Lipman HB, Navarro JA, et al. Nonpharmaceutical interventions implemented
441 by US cities during the 1918-1919 influenza pandemic. *Jama.* 2007 Aug 8;298(6):644-54.
- 442 27. Zhang Y, Jiang B, Yuan J, et al. The impact of social distancing and epicenter lockdown
443 on the COVID-19 epidemic in mainland China: A data-driven SEIQR model study.
444 medRxiv. 2020:2020.03.04.20031187 [Preprint] 2020 [cited Aug 7 2020]. Available from:
445 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.04.20031187>
- 446 28. Johns Hopkins-Coronavirus Resource Center [Internet]. New cases of COVID-19 in
447 world countries. Baltimore, Maryland, United States: Johns Hopkins University; 2020
448 [Updated: 2020 Aug 7; cited 2020 Aug 7]. Available from:
449 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/data/new-cases>
- 450 29. CoronavirusRD [Internet]. Listado de medidas RD vs COVID-19. Santo Domingo,
451 Dominican Republic: Comisión de alto nivel para la prevención y control del
452 coronavirus; [Updated 2020 Jul 21; cited 2020 Aug 7]. Available from:
453 <https://coronavirusrd.gob.do/2020/04/26/listado-de-medidas-rd-vs-covid-19/>. Spanish.
- 454 30. Listín Diario. Colocarán cordón epidemiológico en Puerto Plata luego de la
455 concentración con el "Peregrino". Listín Diario [Internet] 2020 Apr 27 [cited 2020 Aug
456 7]. Research: [about 2 screens]. Available from: <https://listindiario.com/la-republica/2020/04/27/614968/colocaran-cordon-epidemiologico-en-puerto-plata-luego-de-la-concentracion-con-el-peregrino>. Spanish.

- 459 31. Mathiasen P. La ruta del ‘peregrino’ por Puerto Plata. Listín Diario [Internet] 2020 Apr
460 29 [cited 2020 Aug 7]. Research: [about 3 screens]. [https://listindiario.com/la-](https://listindiario.com/la-republica/2020/04/29/615235/la-ruta-del-peregrino-por-puerto-plata)
461 [republica/2020/04/29/615235/la-ruta-del-peregrino-por-puerto-plata](https://listindiario.com/la-republica/2020/04/29/615235/la-ruta-del-peregrino-por-puerto-plata). Spanish.
- 462 32. Huynh TLD. Data for understanding the risk perception of COVID-19 from Vietnamese
463 sample. Data Brief. 2020 Jun;30:105530.
- 464 33. Zhong BL, Luo W, Li HM, et al. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices towards COVID-19
465 among Chinese residents during the rapid rise period of the COVID-19 outbreak: a quick
466 online cross-sectional survey. Int J Biol Sci. 2020;16(10):1745-1752.
- 467 34. Bhagavathula AS, Aldhaleei WA, Rahmani J, et al. Knowledge and Perceptions of
468 COVID-19 Among Health Care Workers: Cross-Sectional Study. JMIR Public Health
469 Surveill. 2020 Apr 30;6(2):e19160.
- 470 35. Morinha F, Magalhães P. Genomics, social media and the novel coronavirus pandemic,
471 COVID-19. Journal of Global Health Reports. 2020 May 19; 4: e2020032.
- 472 36. Ministerio de Salud Pública de la República Dominicana. [Internet] Último Boletín.
473 Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic: Ministerio de Salud Pública, Dirección General de
474 Epidemiología [Updated 2020 Aug 2; cited 2020 Aug 7] Available from:
475 https://www.msp.gob.do/web/?page_id=6948. Spanish.
- 476 37. Consulta en línea REDATAM [Internet]. Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic: Oficina
477 Nacional de Estadística (ONE). 2010- [cited 2020 Aug 7]. Available from:
478 <https://www.one.gob.do/recursos-automatizados/consulta-en-linea-redatam>. Spanish.
- 479 38. Hoy. Conozca aquí cuáles son las redes sociales más usadas en RD. Hoy digital [Internet]
480 2019 Nov 22 [cited 2020 Aug 7]. Research: [about 3 screens]. Available from:
481 <https://hoy.com.do/conozca-aqui-cuales-son-las-redes-sociales-mas-usadas-en-rd/>

- 482 39. The AmericasBarometer by the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP)
483 [Internet]. Nashville, Tennessee, United States: Vanderbilt University. 2018-2019- [cited
484 2020 Aug 7]. Available from: www.LapopSurveys.org
- 485 40. Taghrir MH, Borazjani R, Shiraly R. COVID-19 and Iranian Medical Students; A Survey
486 on Their Related-Knowledge, Preventive Behaviors and Risk Perception. Arch Iran Med.
487 2020 Apr 1;23(4):249-254.
- 488 41. Farhana K. Knowledge and Perception Towards Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) in
489 Bangladesh. International Research Journal of Business and Social Science. 2020 Apr 17
490 6(2): 76-9. Available at: <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3578477>
- 491 42. Limaye RJ, Sauer M, Ali J, et al. Building trust while influencing online COVID-19
492 content in the social media world. The Lancet Digital Health. 2020
493 2020/06/01/;2(6):e277-e278.
- 494 43. Mian A, Khan S. Coronavirus: the spread of misinformation. BMC Medicine. 2020
495 2020/03/18;18(1):89.
- 496 44. Karasneh R, Al-Azzam S, Muflih S, et al. Media's effect on shaping knowledge,
497 awareness risk perceptions and communication practices of pandemic COVID-19 among
498 pharmacists. Res Social Adm Pharm. 2020 Apr 23.
- 499 45. Calisher C, Carroll D, Colwell R, et al. Statement in support of the scientists, public
500 health professionals, and medical professionals of China combatting COVID-19. Lancet.
501 2020 Mar 7;395(10226):e42-e43.
- 502 46. Simon T, Goldberg A, Adini B. Socializing in emergencies—A review of the use of
503 social media in emergency situations. International Journal of Information Management.
504 2015 2015/10/01/;35(5):609-619.

- 505 47. PAHO/WHO Pan American Health Organization [Internet]. Understanding infodemic
506 and the information fight against COVID-19. Washington, D.C., United States: Pan
507 American Health Organization; 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 7]. Available from:
508 [https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/52052/Factsheet-](https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/52052/Factsheet-infodemic_eng.pdf?sequence=14)
509 [infodemic_eng.pdf?sequence=14](https://iris.paho.org/bitstream/handle/10665.2/52052/Factsheet-infodemic_eng.pdf?sequence=14)
- 510 48. Drummond C, Fischhoff B. Individuals with greater science literacy and education have
511 more polarized beliefs on controversial science topics. Proceedings of the National
512 Academy of Sciences. 2017;114(36):9587-9592.
- 513 49. Archer TM. Web-Based Surveys. Journal of Extension. 2003 Aug; 4: Epub 2020 Aug 7.
- 514 50. Pichardo C. El 67.6 % de la población dominicana tiene acceso a internet. Listín Diario
515 [Internet] 2018 Dec 12 [cited 2020 Aug 7]. Research: [about 2 screens]. Available from:
516 [https://listindiario.com/la-republica/2018/12/12/545443/el-67-6--de-la-poblacion-](https://listindiario.com/la-republica/2018/12/12/545443/el-67-6--de-la-poblacion-dominicana-tiene-acceso-a-i)
517 [dominicana-tiene-acceso-a-i](https://listindiario.com/la-republica/2018/12/12/545443/el-67-6--de-la-poblacion-dominicana-tiene-acceso-a-i). Spanish.
- 518 51. Heiervang E, Goodman R. Advantages and limitations of web-based surveys: evidence
519 from a child mental health survey. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2011
520 Jan;46(1):69-76.
- 521 52. Mercado de trabajo (ENFT) con población ajustada por zona y regiones [Internet]. Santo
522 Domingo, Dominican Republic: Banco Central República Dominicana. 2000-2016-
523 [cited 2020 Aug 7]. Available from: [https://www.bancentral.gov.do/a/d/2540-mercado-](https://www.bancentral.gov.do/a/d/2540-mercado-de-trabajo-enft-con-poblacion-ajustada-por-zona-y-regiones)
524 [de-trabajo-enft-con-poblacion-ajustada-por-zona-y-regiones](https://www.bancentral.gov.do/a/d/2540-mercado-de-trabajo-enft-con-poblacion-ajustada-por-zona-y-regiones). Spanish.
- 525 53. Cortiñas H. La concentración del ingreso monetario. El Dinero [Internet] 2019 Feb 28
526 [cited 2020 Aug 7]. Research: [about 5 screens]. Available from:
527 <https://www.eldinero.com.do/78567/la-concentracion-del-ingreso-monetario/>. Spanish.

528 **Supporting information**

529 **S1 fig. Diagram illustrating the process of participants' recruitment and purposive**

530 **sampling.** An estimated total of 23,000 participants were reached through different social media

531 platforms. From those, only the results from the responses of 1,195 participants that successfully

532 completed the survey and met the inclusion criteria were analyzed. Note that Ozama region

533 comprises Santo Domingo and the National District provinces that together are also known as the

534 capital city of the Dominican Republic.