

## **Perceived Risk and Distress related to COVID-19: Comparing Healthcare versus non-Healthcare Workers of Pakistan**

1 **Adeel Abid<sup>1,Ω</sup>, Hania Shahzad<sup>1,Ω</sup>, Hyder Ali Khan<sup>2</sup>, Suneel Piryani<sup>2</sup>, Areeba Raza Khan<sup>3</sup>,**  
2 **Fauziah Rabbani<sup>2,3,\*</sup>**

3 <sup>1</sup> Medical College, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

4 <sup>2</sup> Department of Community Health Sciences, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

5 <sup>3</sup> Office of Research & Graduate Studies, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

6 <sup>Ω</sup> Authors have made equal contribution

7 **\* Correspondence:**

8 Fauziah Rabbani

9 [fauziah.rabbani@aku.edu](mailto:fauziah.rabbani@aku.edu)

## 10 **Abstract**

### 11 **Background**

12 Healthcare workers (HCWs) find themselves susceptible to contracting COVID-19 or being the  
13 source of exposure for their family members. This puts them at a high risk of psychological distress  
14 which may compromise patient care. In this study we aim to explore the risk perceptions and  
15 psychological distress between HCWs and non-healthcare workers (NHCWs) in Pakistan.

### 16 **Methods**

17 A cross-sectional study was conducted in Pakistan using an online self-administered questionnaire.  
18 Respondents were categorized into HCWs (completed or aspiring to complete education in Medicine  
19 or allied fields) and NHCWs. HCWs were further categorized into front-line (direct patient care) and  
20 back-end HCWs.

### 21 **Results**

22 Data from 1406 respondents (507 HCWs and 899 NHCWs) was analyzed. No significant difference  
23 was observed between HCWs and NHCWs' perception of susceptibility and severity towards  
24 COVID-19. Healthcare graduates perceived themselves (66% students vs. 80% graduates, p-value  
25 0.011) and their family (67% students vs. 82% graduates, p-value 0.008) to be more susceptible to  
26 COVID-19 than the healthcare students. Frontline HCWs perceived themselves (83% frontline vs.  
27 70% back-end, p-value 0.003) and their family (84% frontline vs. 72% back-end, p-value 0.006) as  
28 being more susceptible to COVID-19 than back-end healthcare professionals. Over half of the  
29 respondents were anxious (54% HCWs and 55% NHCWs). Female gender, younger age and having  
30 COVID-19 related symptoms had a significant effect on the anxiety levels of both HCWs and  
31 NHCWs.

32 **Conclusion**

33 Frontline HCWs, healthcare students, young people, females and individuals with lower income were  
34 at a higher risk of psychological distress due to the pandemic. Government policies should thus be  
35 directed at ensuring the mental well-being of frontline HCWs, and improving their satisfaction in  
36 order to strengthen health care delivery system.

37 **Keywords:** COVID-19, Healthcare workers, Risk perception, Anxiety, Depression, Psychological  
38 distress

## 39 **Introduction**

40 COVID-19 has grappled the world since its first case was diagnosed in Wuhan, China (1) . This has  
41 resulted in a global socio-economic crisis and challenged healthcare systems throughout the world.  
42 According to the World Health Organization (WHO), this is the worst pandemic the organization has  
43 seen in its 75-year long history (2). As of 25<sup>th</sup> July 2020, Pakistan has officially reported 270,113  
44 confirmed cases with near 5,822 confirmed deaths (3).The pandemic has also taken an economic toll  
45 on the population due to the government imposing a nation-wide lockdown from March to May,  
46 2020. According to a Gallup Survey reported in April 2020, 6.9 million households claimed to have  
47 reduced the number or size of meals for some family members while nearly 1 in 4 Pakistanis said that  
48 they were relying on less preferred and less expensive food items to cover their basic household  
49 needs. Furthermore, almost 1 in 5 people in the country say that they had to lean on their savings to  
50 cover basic household needs (4). A major concern in the country is the impact of COVID-19 on  
51 healthcare workers (HCWs), who are at a high risk during novel disease outbreaks. HCWs around the  
52 world are at the forefront in screening, quarantining, and managing actual and suspected COVID-19  
53 patients, creating awareness about risks, and advocating for preventive measures (5). Consequently,  
54 fear of contracting the disease is likely to put them under greater stress when compared to the general  
55 population.

56 Experience from severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) and H1N1 epidemics underlines that the  
57 psychological strain on healthcare professionals, especially those working on the frontlines is  
58 significant (6,7). In these stressful times, HCWs are risking high morbidity and mortality due to the  
59 nature of their job. Demands of the job may negatively impact the emotional and psychological well-  
60 being of those working on the front line. Moreover, as compared to the general public, HCWs face  
61 more personal worries such as comparatively greater infection risk to self and others and concerns

62 regarding the well-being of family members. Increased anxiety and depression among frontline  
63 healthcare professionals is a common feature in epidemics (8,9). Moreover, there are disparities in  
64 terms of psychological impact due to COVID-19 within HCWs depending on their level of patient  
65 care. In a study conducted in Singapore the psychological distress, depression, anxiety, and stress  
66 experienced by health care workers during the COVID-19 outbreak, frontline nurses had significantly  
67 lower vicarious traumatization scores than non–frontline nurses and the general public (10). Another  
68 recent study among healthcare professionals in a tertiary infectious disease hospital for COVID-19 in  
69 China also revealed a high incidence of anxiety and stress disorders among frontline medical staff,  
70 with nurses having a higher incidence of anxiety than doctors (11).

71 The scale of the current health crisis is a bigger concern in a resource-limited country like Pakistan,  
72 where it may significantly compromise the quality of care and health care services. These  
73 unprecedented times call for an increased need to gauge the knowledge and protective behaviors of  
74 people at different levels of health care services. Unduly high anxiety levels and poor-risk  
75 perceptions often result in barriers to healthcare providers’ willingness and ability to work and  
76 constitute an important component in policy-related decisions (12,13). While data is limited on the  
77 impact of COVID-19 with regards to barriers to working, it is indicated that healthcare providers are  
78 likely to suffer from high levels of anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorders (14).

79 Prevention remains the mainstay in the treatment and containment of the pandemic, requiring people  
80 at large to practice COVID-19 mitigating behaviors. Significant efforts hence need to be undertaken  
81 to strengthen beliefs about the disease in the population including the severity and susceptibility of  
82 threat so that people are more likely to take the needed actions to reduce the damage caused by the  
83 disease. As a result, it becomes important to study these key indicators to evaluate the public sense

84 of threat to health, leading to the development of strategies for the general population and medical  
85 staff during COVID-19.

86 As psychological morbidity including depression, perceived stress and anxiety can compromise the  
87 social, emotional, psychological and physical functioning of a human being, the healthcare  
88 community is thought to be especially vulnerable. Psychological morbidity especially in the  
89 healthcare community may compromise patient care. It is therefore essential to carefully gauge the  
90 level of perceived susceptibility, severity, anxiety and subsequent response to COVID-19 between  
91 HCWs and non-healthcare workers (NHCWs). Identifying vulnerable areas and populations for  
92 psychological distress will help in strengthening health service delivery with targeted interventions.  
93 In this study we describe perceived severity, susceptibility and anxiety levels of HCWS in  
94 comparison to NHCWs. Furthermore, we explore vulnerable sub groups in the healthcare population  
95 with regards to training status, age, gender, income levels and level of patient care.

## 96 **Materials and Methods**

### 97 **Study Design**

98 A cross-sectional online survey was carried out in May 2020 through the social media channels of  
99 Aga Khan University (AKU), Pakistan, which included Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn. The survey  
100 link was also reposted on the Facebook page of Aga Khan University Hospital (AKUH), Pakistan.

### 101 **Study Participants**

102 A convenience sampling strategy was used to enroll participants in the study. The online survey link  
103 remained active for two weeks. A total of 1405 respondents (507 HCWs and 899 NHCWs) filled the  
104 questionnaires. People aged 18 or above, residing in Pakistan for at least five days a week over the  
105 last month, with access to the internet and willing to participate in the survey were included in the

106 study. The questionnaire was supposed to be filled once by each participant. Participants who could  
107 not respond to the study tool in either English or Urdu and participants who reported having filled the  
108 questionnaire at least once before were excluded from the study.

109 Respondents were categorized into NHCWs and HCWs. Those without basic (Bachelor level)  
110 training in any health or allied field were categorized as NHCWs whereas respondents having a  
111 formal training (students or graduates) in Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Dentistry, Physiotherapy,  
112 Laboratory Technology or Allied Health Sciences including but not limited to homeopathy and  
113 *Hikmat* (a system of alternative medicine that involves the use of herbal remedies, dietary practices,  
114 and alternative therapies and addresses the prevention and treatment of disease) were categorized as  
115 HCWs. HCWs were further categorized into front-line and back-end HCWs. Front-line HCWs  
116 included all those professionals who are involved in direct patient care. Back-end HCWs included  
117 those who are currently not involved in direct clinical patient care including but not limited to  
118 undergraduate students of Medicine and Nursing and HCWs employed in the fields of Pharmacy,  
119 Dentistry, Physiotherapy, Laboratory Technology, Allied Health Sciences or others.

## 120 **Data Collection**

121 Data was collected through two online self-administered semi-structured questionnaires  
122 (Questionnaire A and B). Questionnaire A was for NHCWs and Questionnaire B was for HCWs.  
123 Both questionnaires were developed on Google Forms. The questionnaires were adapted from the  
124 survey tool used in a similar study conducted in Hong Kong (21). Questionnaires A and B contained  
125 mostly identical questions, with a few additional questions in Questionnaire B related to HCWs' field  
126 of study, training, place of work, perception about governmental measures, severity of COVID-19 as  
127 compared to other diseases and if they had acquired specific training related to COVID-19 in their  
128 respective organizations. Respondents, were asked about their demographics including gender, age,

129 level of education, household income, permanent city of residence, and travel history followed by  
130 their health status in the past 14 days and whether they experienced any symptoms of illness.

131 Next, they were asked to rate the severity of the symptoms caused by COVID-19 and their perceived  
132 chance of survival if infected with COVID-19. Responses were captured using a five-point Likert  
133 scale. Subsequently, information exposure was probed by asking respondents about the sources from  
134 which they obtain information about COVID-19, and how reliable they deemed those sources to be.  
135 This was followed by questions on how likely one considered themselves and their families to be  
136 infected with COVID-19 if no preventive measures were taken. Participants' anxiety and depression  
137 levels were assessed using the validated Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). This scale  
138 was used in a study conducted in Hong Kong for assessing anxiety related to COVID-19 (15,16). The  
139 possible minimum score for anxiety and depression is 0 and the maximum is 21. A score of 8 or  
140 above indicates anxiety. Respondents were also asked about the psychological impact of COVID-19  
141 on their job, personal life, sleep, and eating habits.

## 142 **Data Analysis**

143 Data collected from respondents was directly stored in Google Spreadsheets and later imported to  
144 Microsoft Excel and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 21 (IBM Corp). Data  
145 was cleaned, coded, and analyzed using SPSS. A descriptive analysis was performed and results were  
146 tabulated as numbers (percentages) for qualitative variables and mean ( $\pm$ standard deviation) for  
147 quantitative variables. The Independent t-test or Mann Whitney U test or Pearson Chi-square test was  
148 applied to assess the differences between the groups' (healthcare vs. NHCWs, healthcare students vs.  
149 graduates, frontline vs. back-end HCWs) perception of susceptibility and severity towards COVID-  
150 19, anxiety and depression level, the psychological impact of COVID-19, adoption of precautionary  
151 measures, reliability of information sources, and satisfaction with government measures. Bivariate



152 and multivariate binary logistic regression analyses were performed to identify predictors (age,  
153 gender, household income, and presence of symptoms) of anxiety and depression among HCWs and  
154 NHCWs. Initially, in bivariate analysis, a single predictor at a time was entered and crude odds ratio  
155 (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were subsequently computed. A multivariate analysis, with  
156 all predictors entered at the same time, was completed to adjust for the effect of confounding, and  
157 adjusted OR and 95% CI were computed. All statistical tests were two-sided and a p-value of  $\leq 0.05$   
158 was considered to be statistically significant.

### 159 **Ethical Consideration**

160 Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethical Review Committee (ERC) of the Aga Khan  
161 University, Pakistan. Participants were asked to present their consent at the beginning of the survey  
162 and were free to withdraw at any stage.

### 163 **Results**

164 Data from 1406 respondents (507 HCWs and 899 NHCWs) was analyzed. Majority of the  
165 respondents were males (53% HCWs and 72% NHCWs), below the age of 35 years (78% HCWs and  
166 61% NHCWs), were residents of Karachi (49% HCWs and 50% NHCWs), and had a household  
167 income of  $\leq$  PKR 40,000 (22% HCWs and 27% NHCWs) (Refer to Table 1). More than half of the  
168 HCWs (54%) belonged to the field of Medicine and 36% were currently working in a hospital, ward  
169 or a clinic (Refer to Table 2).

### 170 **Perceived severity and susceptibility for COVID-19**

171 No significant difference was observed between HCWs and NHCWs' perception of susceptibility  
172 and severity towards COVID-19. About three-fourths of the respondents perceived that they (75%  
173 HCWs and 71% NHCWs) and their families (77% HCWs and 71% NHCWs) might get sick if they

174 do not take preventive measures. Similarly, several respondents considered the symptoms of COVID-  
175 19 (if infected) as serious (46% HCWs and 38% NHCWs). Furthermore, most respondents thought  
176 that one could survive a COVID-19 infection (HCWs 70% and NHCWs 66%). However, a  
177 statistically significant difference was seen between the healthcare students' and graduates'  
178 perception of susceptibility and severity towards COVID-19. Healthcare graduates perceived  
179 themselves (66% students vs. 80% graduates, p-value 0.011) and their family (67% students vs. 82%  
180 graduates, p-value 0.008) to be more susceptible to COVID-19 than the healthcare students.  
181 Similarly, compared to students, more graduates perceived the disease to be severe (p-value 0.040).  
182 A significant difference was also seen between frontline and back-end HCWs' perception of  
183 susceptibility and severity towards COVID-19. Frontline HCWs perceived themselves (83% frontline  
184 vs. 70% back-end, p-value 0.003) and their family (84% frontline vs. 72% back-end, p-value 0.006)  
185 as being more susceptible to COVID-19 than back-end HCWs. However, compared to those on the  
186 frontline, more back-end HCWs perceived the disease to be severe (p-value 0.045) (Refer to Table  
187 3).

### 188 **Psychological Distress in HCWs and NHCWs:**

189 Over half of the respondents were found to be either anxious (54% HCWs and 59% NHCWs) or  
190 depressed (54% HCWs and 57% NHCWs) as indicated by the HADS scores. No significant  
191 difference was seen in the anxiety and depression levels of HCWs and NHCWs. However, the  
192 incidence of depression was significantly higher among healthcare students compared to healthcare  
193 graduates (Mean (SD): 8.40 (3.45) in students 7.72 (3.80) in graduates, p-value 0.047). Around 62%  
194 of healthcare students and 49% of graduates had depression. A statistically significant difference was  
195 noted between frontline and back-end HCWs' perception about the impact of COVID-19 on their  
196 personal life (75% frontline vs. 58% back-end HCWs, p-value <0.001). However, no significant

197 difference was reported between HCWs' and NHCWs' perceived impact of COVID-19 on their jobs,  
198 personal life, sleeping pattern, and eating habits (Refer to Table 4).

### 199 **Predictors of Psychological Distress in HCWs and NHCWs:**

200 Gender, age, and presence of symptoms had significant positive associations with anxiety among  
201 HCWs. Female HCWs were nearly twice as likely to be anxious than the male HCWs (aOR: 2.34,  
202 95% CI: 1.37-3.99, p-value 0.002). HCWs of younger age (25-34 years) (aOR 3.44, 95% CI: 1.30-  
203 9.09, p-value: 0.013) were nearly three times more likely to have anxiety than HCWs of 55 years or  
204 above. HCWs having COVID-19 related symptoms were 2.09 times more likely to have anxiety than  
205 HCWs without symptoms (aOR: 2.09, 95% CI: 1.01-4.32, p-value: 0.046) (Refer to table 5).

206 Similarly, gender, age, household income, and presence of symptoms were positively associated with  
207 anxiety among NHCWs. Female NHCWs were 1.62 times more likely to have anxiety than male  
208 NHCWs (aOR: 1.62, 95% CI: 1.12-2.35, p-value 0.010). NHCWs of younger age (25-34 years) (aOR  
209 2.84, 95% CI: 1.75-4.62, p-value: <0.001) were nearly three times more likely to be anxious than  
210 NHCWs of 55 years or above. NHCWs having income level of 60,001-120,000 PKR were 2.22 times  
211 more likely to have anxiety than NHCWs having household income  $\geq$  PKR 120,000 PKR (aOR:  
212 2.22, 95% CI: 1.42-3.48, p-value: <0.001). NHCWs having COVID-19 related symptoms were 1.98  
213 times more likely to have anxiety than HCWs without symptoms (aOR: 1.98; 95% CI: 1.34-2.94, p-  
214 value: 0.001) (Refer to table 5).

215 Furthermore, presence of symptoms was positively associated with depression among HCWs (aOR:  
216 2.72; 95% CI: 1.34-5.55, p-value: 0.006). Household income had a positive association with  
217 depression among NHCWs. NHCWs having income level of 60,001-120,000 PKR were nearly two  
218 times more likely to have depression than NHCWs having household income  $>$  PKR 120,000 PKR  
219 (aOR: 2.29, 95% CI: 1.48-3.54, p-value: <0.001) (Refer to table 5).

## 220 **Adoption of Precautionary Measures**

221 Significantly more HCWs reported wearing face masks (94% HCWs vs. 91% NHCWs, p-value  
222 0.012), avoiding visiting meat shops or markets (77% HCWs vs. 66% NHCWs, p-value <0.001) than  
223 NHCWs. Moreover, significantly less HCWs reported that they refrain from going to hospitals or  
224 clinics (60% HCWs vs. 81% NHCWs, p-value <0.001) and work (55% HCWs vs. 66% NHCWs, p-  
225 value<0.001) compared to NHCWs. Additionally, there was a statistically significant difference  
226 between healthcare students' and graduates' adoption of some precautionary measures such as  
227 washing their hands with soap/sanitizer frequently (96% students vs. 99% graduates, p-value 0.001),  
228 avoiding going out (87% students vs. 73% graduates, p-value 0.003), refraining from going to  
229 hospital or clinic (80% students vs. 50% graduates, p-value <0.001) Similarly, a statistically  
230 significant difference was noted between frontline and back-end HCWs in the adoption of some  
231 precautionary measures such as washing their hands with soap/sanitizer frequently (100% frontline  
232 vs. 97% back-end, p-value 0.009, refraining from going to hospital or clinic (45% frontline vs. 72%  
233 back-end, p-value<0.001) and avoiding going to work (37% frontline vs. 68% back-end, p-  
234 value<0.001) (Refer to Table 6).

## 235 **Sources of Information utilized by the Respondents**

236 Nearly all HCWs and NHCWs remained alert to the disease progression of COVID-19 (96% for the  
237 former and 95% of the latter). The most trusted sources of information were doctors (91% HCWs and  
238 87% NHCWs, p-value 0.003) and government websites (85% HCWs and 80% NHCWs, p-value  
239 0.056). Furthermore, significantly more NHCWs considered magazine (39% HCWs vs. 44%  
240 NHCWs, p value 0.005), television (54% HCWs vs. 63% NHCWs, p value 0.043), family or friends  
241 (46% HCWs vs. 54% NHCWs, p value 0.001) as reliable sources of information. Likewise, a  
242 statistically significant percentage of healthcare students considered official government websites

243 (86% students vs. 84% graduates), television (60% students vs. 51% graduates, p-value 0.040), radio  
244 (58% students vs. 44% graduates, p-value; 0.017), and magazine (50% students vs. 33% graduates, p-  
245 value; 0.015) as reliable sources of information compared to healthcare graduates. Moreover,  
246 compared to back-end HCWs, more frontline HCWs believed in the reliability of information  
247 received through television (47% frontline vs. 59% back-end, p-value 0.049), radio (42% frontline  
248 vs. 54% back-end, p-value 0.046), newspaper (49% frontline vs. 62% back-end, p-value 0.015), and  
249 magazine (28% frontline vs. 47% back-end, p-value 0.015) (Refer to Table 7).

## 250 **Satisfaction with Government Measures**

251 Less than a third of HCWs and NHCWs were satisfied with the government's measures to control  
252 COVID-19. HCWs, in comparison with NHCWs, were significantly more dissatisfied with the  
253 availability of Personal Protective Equipment (62% vs. 46%, p value <0.001), testing kits (49% vs.  
254 41%, p value 0.028), and screening facilities (54% vs. 42%, p value <0.001). Similarly, compared to  
255 healthcare students, graduates were significantly more dissatisfied with screening facilities (57%  
256 graduates vs. 49% students, p-value 0.016), testing kits (52% graduates vs. 43% students, p-value  
257 0.016), and quarantine facilities (49% graduates vs. 38% students, p-value 0.012). However, no  
258 significant difference was seen between frontline and back-end HCWs' satisfaction with  
259 government's measures to control COVID-19 (Refer to Table 8).

## 260 **Discussion**

261 The COVID-19 pandemic has caused a global health crisis. As the disease burden exponentially  
262 increases, HCWs find themselves susceptible to contracting the disease or being the source of  
263 exposure for their family members. This constant threat puts them at a high risk of psychological  
264 distress. This study explores the similarities and differences in risk perceptions, anxiety levels, and  
265 behavioral responses of HCWs and NHCWs in Pakistan during the COVID-19 pandemic.

266 Respondents' adoption of precautionary measures and satisfaction with the government's response  
267 were also assessed.

268 This study showed that the perceived susceptibility and severity towards COVID-19 was high in both  
269 HCWs and NHCWs. Healthcare graduates perceived themselves and their families to be more  
270 susceptible to COVID-19 and found the disease to be much more severe than healthcare students. A  
271 study from Hong Kong showed an even higher perception of susceptibility and severity towards  
272 COVID-19 (15,16). The generally high-risk perception levels can be explained by the coverage of the  
273 pandemic on social media as well as television sensitizing the people to the disease. Frequency of  
274 watching the media and sources of information has been known to influence risk perception (17).  
275 This is supported by reports from the MERS, SARS and H1N1 outbreaks (18,19).

276 Additionally, frontline HCWs perceived themselves and their families to be more susceptible to  
277 COVID-19 than back-end HCWs while the latter perceived the disease to be more severe. Similar to  
278 HCWs in this study, training status and clinical placement creates differences in risk perception, as  
279 seen in the medical students of Iran (20). This indicates that HCWs felt more vulnerable with greater  
280 exposure to the infected individuals. Direct contact with COVID-19 patients is hence a major cause  
281 for concern among HCWs for themselves and their families. Greater perceived severity among  
282 backend workers on the other hand may be explained by the fact that since these workers are not  
283 seeing patients recover as frequently, their notion of disease severity is higher.

284 More than half the respondents in the study had some form of psychological distress (anxiety or  
285 depression). Data describing gaps in anxiety levels between HCWs and NHCWs is limited. Contrary  
286 to this study, which showed that both HCWs and NHCWs had similar high anxiety levels, HCWs in  
287 Italy reported higher anxiety levels in comparison to the general population (21). Therefore, the gap  
288 in anxiety levels seen in Italy (between HCWs and general population) is not seen in Pakistan. This

289 Pakistan reported a lower disease burden compared to Italy, therefore it is possible that the HCWs in  
290 Pakistan are generally less anxious due to a lesser case load and severity at the time of data  
291 collection. A possible reason for higher anxiety levels in the NHCWs group in this study could be  
292 due to higher sensitization by the social media creating undue anxiety. Another possible reason for  
293 higher anxiety levels in the NHCWs group in this study could be a higher average education level  
294 (Bachelor's) which is an independent risk factor for elevated anxiety symptoms (22).

295 Both HCWs and NHCWs had similar perceptions of the impact of COVID-19 on their daily routine.  
296 The perceived impact, however, was greater among frontline HCWs compared to the back-end  
297 HCWs. Frontline HCWs (doctors and nurses) are involved in more direct patient care and have  
298 greater patient interaction. New protocols and added personal protective equipment (PPE) are  
299 focused on frontline workers more which warrants a greater transition from the pre-pandemic life.  
300 While backend HCWs (pharmacists, dentists, physiotherapists, allied health sciences, and students)  
301 also had additions in their daily routine such as masks, social distancing, and hand sanitizing, these  
302 changes are comparatively less cumbersome compared to changes in frontline HCW's routines. The  
303 greater the patient interaction, greater number of precautions are required in daily routine which  
304 results in greater impact on personal lives. A study reported nurses having more anxiety in  
305 comparison to doctors as they are involved for a longer duration with the patients (23). Additionally,  
306 frontline HCWs perceived themselves and their families to be more susceptible to COVID-19 than  
307 back-end HCWs while the latter perceived the disease to be more severe. Greater perceived severity  
308 among backend workers on the other hand may be explained by the fact that since these workers are  
309 not seeing patients recover as frequently, their notion of disease severity is higher.

310 This study pointed out that healthcare students were more depressed than the graduates. Existing data  
311 that has generally shown students as a high risk group for depression (24). Experiences from the past



312 epidemics also provide similar evidence (25–27). All educational institutes in Pakistan were closed  
313 during the duration of the study. Although educational institutes adapted to online classes and virtual  
314 examinations, it took a long while before students could get used to new routines and methods. These  
315 interruptions in schedules, lack of physical interaction with peers and social isolation may have  
316 contributed to the greater depression levels. Furthermore, students are often more active on social  
317 media which has been a great source of information and sensitization of COVID-19 pandemic.  
318 Constant ill news and disturbing figures may have further added to the current depression levels of  
319 healthcare students. Healthcare students are required to rotate in pre-scheduled clinical clerkships  
320 which mandates interactive patient care. Completing clinical clerkships require patient interaction  
321 and are practically impossible in an online virtual setting which have led to delayed graduations. This  
322 uncertainty and implications for a wasted academic year may also contribute to the increased  
323 depression levels in healthcare students.

324 Female gender, younger age, and presence of COVID-19 related symptoms predicted increased  
325 psychological distress in HCWs while lower-income and presence of COVID-19 related symptoms  
326 predicted the same in NHCWs. Female gender has also been linked with greater anxiety levels in Iran  
327 and China (24). Unlike our results, age did not predict psychological distress in the Chinese  
328 population. The differences in the predictors of distress during the COVID-19 pandemic could be  
329 attributed to the differences in countries' healthcare systems, the availability of personal protective  
330 equipment (PPE), cultures, employment conditions, lockdown and work from home policies,  
331 maintaining a living in a pandemic and mainstream and social media information, to name just a few.  
332 COVID-19 has also increased the financial burden on households as many people struggle to run  
333 small businesses and maintain daily income. The fear of not being able to fulfil the basic necessities  
334 may be the reason why lower income can increase anxiety levels. The results, therefore, suggest the



335 need for the identification of useful predictors of mental health in individual countries during the  
336 COVID-19 pandemic.

337 Only less than a third of HCWs and NHCWs were satisfied with the government's measures to  
338 control COVID-19. HCWs, in comparison with NHCWs, were significantly more dissatisfied with  
339 the availability of PPEs and screening facilities. Pakistan is a resource-limited country with no prior  
340 experience of handling a pandemic which may explain the lack of satisfaction with the government's  
341 response. This is concerning because healthcare staff's access to PPEs predicts lower distress levels,  
342 better physical health conditions, and more job satisfaction (28). Moreover, frontline HCWs who  
343 reuse or have inadequate access to PPE are known to have the higher risk of COVID-19 infection  
344 (29). Therefore, it is important for the government to address the concerns particularly among HCWs  
345 as they are the foot soldiers fighting the pandemic.

346 The main strength of this study is the comparison of various sub-groups within HCWs for a  
347 comprehensive analysis. In this respect, it is a novel study accounting for differences in experiences  
348 among HCWs. However, frontline and back-end categorization was made without using any standard  
349 classification. Moreover, in this study, most of the respondents were aged less than 35 years, which  
350 may not accurately represent the older population who are at greater risk for contracting COVID-19.  
351 Nevertheless, as the majority of the population in Pakistan is below the age of 30 years, respondents  
352 are likely to represent the perceptions of the literate people. Lastly, this was an online survey with  
353 most respondents either having a Bachelor's degree or above. This may result in inadequately  
354 justifying the attitudes and perceptions of the NHCWs as the Pakistani population on average has a  
355 much lower educational background.

356 To decrease the level of psychological distress, hospital administrators should implement policies to  
357 target mental well-being of the HCWs. Hospital staff dealing with COVID-19 patients should be

358 monitored on a regular basis to avoid burnout. Incentives such as financial bonuses and paid leaves  
359 should be provided. To cater for the individual needs of the population, communities should establish  
360 online mental health and wellness groups to overcome social isolation. Government should ensure  
361 provision of PPE, testing kits, and screening facilities to increase satisfaction levels of HCWs in  
362 particular and the public at large. Furthermore, implementing these strategies may also contribute in  
363 mitigating the disease spread. The better the disease is controlled, the lesser will be the psychological  
364 morbidity and adverse impact on people's lives.

## 365 **Conclusion**

366 HCWs and NHCWs both have high levels of perceived susceptibility and severity along with  
367 increased psychological distress. This study also identified vulnerable groups such as frontline  
368 HCWs, healthcare students, younger aged people, females, and individuals with lower income to be  
369 at a higher risk of psychological distress. We recommend exploring other vulnerable groups not  
370 evaluated in this study such as COVID-19 positive patients, older and immunocompromised patients  
371 for risk perceptions and psychological distress. Further studies need to investigate a direct link  
372 between HCWs and the development of COVID-19 infection to quantify the infection risk. HCWs  
373 are the frontline fighters against pandemics and preventing their psychological morbidity must be  
374 prioritized for ensuring their well-being as well as that of patients that they treat within the health  
375 care system.

## 376 **Conflict of Interest**

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

## 379 **Author Contributions**

380 FR conceived the study, guided data collection and reviewed all drafts of the manuscript. AA and HS  
381 adapted the questionnaires and wrote the manuscript. SP analyzed and narrated the data. HAK and  
382 ARK edited and revised multiple drafts of the manuscript. ARK also assisted in adapting the  
383 questionnaires and posting it on social media channels of AKU. All authors reviewed and endorsed  
384 the final submission.

### 385 **Funding**

386 The authors did not receive any direct funding for the purpose of this study.

### 387 **Acknowledgments**

388 The authors would like to thank all the respondents of the survey from across Pakistan.

### 389 **References**

- 390 1. Lu H, Stratton CW, Tang Y-W. Outbreak of pneumonia of unknown etiology in Wuhan, China:  
391 The mystery and the miracle. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2020;92(4):401–2.
- 392 2. WHO. Rolling updates on coronavirus disease (COVID-19) [Internet]. World Health  
393 Organization. 2020 [cited 2020 May 29]. Available from:  
394 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen>
- 395 3. COVID-19 Health Advisory Platform by Ministry of National Health Services Regulations and  
396 Coordination [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jul 26]. Available from: <http://covid.gov.pk/>
- 397 4. Gallup Pakistan. Economic Impact of COVID-19 Lockdown on Pakistani Households.  
398 Coronavirus Attitude Tracker Survey Pakistan. [Internet]. 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Jun 2]. Available  
399 from: <https://gallup.com.pk/economic-impact-of-covid-19-lockdown-on-pakistani-households/>

- 400 5. Balicer RD, Omer SB, Barnett DJ, Everly GS. Local public health workers' perceptions toward  
401 responding to an influenza pandemic. *BMC Public Health*. 2006;6(1):99.
- 402 6. Huang Y, Zhao N. Generalized anxiety disorder, depressive symptoms and sleep quality during  
403 COVID-19 outbreak in China: a web-based cross-sectional survey. *Psychiatry Research*. 2020  
404 Jun 1;288:112954.
- 405 7. Rajkumar RP. COVID-19 and mental health: A review of the existing literature. *Asian Journal of*  
406 *Psychiatry*. 2020 Aug 1;52:102066.
- 407 8. Lai J, Ma S, Wang Y, Cai Z, Hu J, Wei N, et al. Factors associated with mental health outcomes  
408 among health care workers exposed to coronavirus disease 2019. *JAMA network open*.  
409 2020;3(3):e203976–e203976.
- 410 9. Aoyagi Y, Beck CR, Dingwall R, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS. Healthcare workers' willingness to work  
411 during an influenza pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Influenza and other*  
412 *respiratory viruses*. 2015;9(3):120–130.
- 413 10. Tan BYQ, Chew NWS, Lee GKH, Jing M, Goh Y, Yeo LLL, et al. Psychological Impact of the  
414 COVID-19 Pandemic on Health Care Workers in Singapore. *Annals of Internal Medicine*  
415 [Internet]. 2020 Apr 6; Available from: <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/full/10.7326/M20-1083>
- 416 11. Huang JZ, Han MF, Luo TD, Ren AK, Zhou XP. Mental health survey of 230 medical staff in a  
417 tertiary infectious disease hospital for COVID-19. *Chinese journal of industrial hygiene and*  
418 *occupational diseases*. 2020;38:E001–E001.

- 419 12. Wu P, Fang Y, Guan Z, Fan B, Kong J, Yao Z, et al. The psychological impact of the SARS  
420 epidemic on hospital employees in China: exposure, risk perception, and altruistic acceptance of  
421 risk. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2009;54(5):302–311.
- 422 13. Harvey A. Covid-19: medical students and FY1 doctors to be given early registration to help  
423 combat covid-19. *BMJ*. 2020 Mar 27;368:m1268.
- 424 14. Ives J, Greenfield S, Parry JM, Draper H, Gratus C, Petts JI, et al. Healthcare workers' attitudes  
425 to working during pandemic influenza: a qualitative study. *BMC Public Health*. 2009;9(1):56.
- 426 15. Kwok KO, Li KK, Chan HH, Yi YY, Tang A, Wei WI, et al. Community responses during the  
427 early phase of the COVID-19 epidemic in Hong Kong: risk perception, information exposure and  
428 preventive measures. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* [Internet]. 2020;26(7). Available from:  
429 [https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/7/20-0500\\_article](https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/7/20-0500_article)
- 430 16. Kwok KO, Li KK, Chan HH, Yi YY, Tang A, Wei WI, et al. Community responses during the  
431 early phase of the COVID-19 epidemic in Hong Kong: risk perception, information exposure and  
432 preventive measures. *medRxiv* [Internet]. 2020; Available from:  
433 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.02.26.20028217v1.full.pdf>
- 434 17. Karasneh R, Al-Azzam S, Muflih S, Soudah O, Hawamdeh S, Khader Y. Media's effect on  
435 shaping knowledge, awareness risk perceptions and communication practices of pandemic  
436 COVID-19 among pharmacists. *Res Social Adm Pharm* [Internet]. 2020 Apr 23 [cited 2020 Jul  
437 25]; Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7179508/>
- 438 18. Choi D-H, Yoo W, Noh G-Y, Park K. The impact of social media on risk perceptions during the  
439 MERS outbreak in South Korea. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2017 Jul;72:422–431.

- 440 19. Chang C. News coverage of health-related issues and its impacts on perceptions: Taiwan as an  
441 example. *Health communication*. 2012;27(2):111–123.
- 442 20. Taghrir MH, Borazjani R, Shiraly R. COVID-19 and Iranian Medical Students; A Survey on  
443 Their Related-Knowledge, Preventive Behaviors and Risk Perception. *Arch Iran Med*. 2020 Apr  
444 1;23(4):249–54.
- 445 21. Simione L, Gnagnarella C. Differences between health workers and general population in risk  
446 perception, behaviors, and psychological distress related to COVID-19 spread in Italy. *PsyArXiv*  
447 [Internet]. 2020 Apr; Available from: <https://psyarxiv.com/84d2c>
- 448 22. Du J, Dong L, Wang T, Yuan C, Fu R, Zhang L, et al. Psychological symptoms among frontline  
449 healthcare workers during COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan. *General Hospital Psychiatry*  
450 [Internet]. 2020 Apr 3; Available from:  
451 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0163834320300451>
- 452 23. Sandesh R, Shahid W, Dev K, Mandhan N, Shankar P, Shaikh A, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on  
453 the Mental Health of Healthcare Professionals in Pakistan. *Cureus Journal of Medical Science*  
454 [Internet]. 2020 Jul 2;12(7). Available from: [https://www.cureus.com/articles/35257-impact-of-](https://www.cureus.com/articles/35257-impact-of-covid-19-on-the-mental-health-of-healthcare-professionals-in-pakistan)  
455 [covid-19-on-the-mental-health-of-healthcare-professionals-in-pakistan](https://www.cureus.com/articles/35257-impact-of-covid-19-on-the-mental-health-of-healthcare-professionals-in-pakistan)
- 456 24. Jahanshahi AA, Dinani MM, Madavani AN, Li J, Zhang SX. The distress of Iranian adults during  
457 the Covid-19 pandemic – More distressed than the Chinese and with different predictors. *Brain,*  
458 *Behavior, and Immunity*. 2020 Jul;87:124–5.
- 459 25. Wong TW, Gao Y, Tam WWS. Anxiety among university students during the SARS epidemic in  
460 Hong Kong. *Stress and Health*. 2007;23(1):31–5.

- 461 26. Coughlin SS. Anxiety and Depression: Linkages with Viral Diseases. Public Health Reviews.  
462 2012 Dec;34(2):1-17.
- 463 27. Gawrilow C, Gollwitzer PM. Implementation Intentions Facilitate Response Inhibition in  
464 Children with ADHD. Cognitive Therapy and Research. 2008 Apr 1;32(2):261-80.
- 465 28. Zhang SX, Liu J, Afshar Jahanshahi A, Nawaser K, Yousefi A, Li J, et al. At the height of the  
466 storm: Healthcare staff's health conditions and job satisfaction and their associated predictors  
467 during the epidemic peak of COVID-19. Brain, Behavior, and Immunity. 2020 Jul 1;87:144-6.
- 468 29. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Joshi AD, Guo C-G, Ma W, Mehta RS, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among  
469 frontline healthcare workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. medRxiv  
470 [Internet]. 2020 May 25 [cited 2020 Jul 25]; Available from:  
471 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.29.20084111v6.full.pdf>

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487



488 **Table 1. Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Respondents**

Characteristics	HCWs	NHCWs
	n = 507 No. (%)	n = 899 No. (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	269 (53.1)	644 (71.7)
Female	235 (46.3)	243 (27.0)
Prefer not to disclose	3 (0.6)	12 (1.3)
<b>Age</b>		
18-24years	220 (43.4)	239 (26.6)
25-34 years	173 (34.1)	309 (34.4)
35-44 years	69 (13.6)	213 (23.7)
45-54years	31 (6.1)	73 (8.1)
55 or above	14 (2.8)	61 (6.8)
Prefer not to disclose	0	4 (0.4)
<b>Education</b>		
Up to Matric/O-Levels		18 (2.0)
Intermediate/A-Levels/International Baccalaureate		110 (12.2)
Post-intermediate: Diploma/Certificate		22 (2.5)
Bachelor or above		743 (82.6)
Prefer not to disclose		6 (0.7)
<b>Household incomes</b>		
PKR 40,000 or below	73 (22.4)	246 (27.4)
PKR 40,001 – PKR 80,000	70 (21.4)	176 (19.6)
PKR 80,001 – PKR 120,000	50 (15.4)	156 (17.3)
≥ PKR 120,001	56 (17.2)	142 (15.8)
Prefer not to disclose	77 (23.6)	179 (19.9)
<b>Permanent residence</b>		
a. Karachi	<b>249 (49.1)</b>	<b>451 (50.2)</b>
b. Lahore	46 (9.0)	82 (9.0)
c. Islamabad	24 (4.8)	61 (6.8)
d. Peshawar	30 (5.9)	23 (2.6)
e. Quetta	8 (1.6)	7 (0.8)
f. Hyderabad	21 (4.2)	32 (3.6)
g. Others	129 (25.4)	243 (27.0)

489

490 **Table 2. HCWs' field, training status, and current work status (n=507)**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>No. (%)</b>
<b>Healthcare field</b>	
Medicine	274 (54.0)
Nursing	52 (10.3)
Pharmacy	42 (8.3)
Dentistry	21 (4.1)
Physiotherapy	24 (4.7)
Laboratory Technology or Allied Health Sciences	87 (17.2)
Others	7 (1.4)
<b>Training status</b>	
Student	181 (35.7)
Graduate	326 (64.3)
<b>Current work status</b>	
Working in hospital/ ward/clinic	117 (35.9)
Working from home (online/ telephone etc.)	49 (15.0)
Working in office setting	28 (8.6)
Unpaid leave	28 (8.6)
Paid leave	18 (5.5)
Not working	86 (26.4)

491

492 **Table 3. Perceived severity and susceptibility for COVID-19**

Variable	Perception	HCWs	NHCWs	HCWs Vs NHCWs	Health care Students	Healthcare Graduate	Students Vs Graduates	Frontline HCWs	Backend HCWs	Frontline Vs Backend
		n=507 No. (%)	n =899 No. (%)	P-value*	n = 181 No. (%)	n = 326 No. (%)	P-value*	n=216 No. (%)	n=290 No. (%)	P-value*
<b>Susceptibility</b>										
<b>1. I might contract the disease if no preventive measure is taken</b>	Agree	382 (75.3)	636 (70.7)	0.506	120 (66.3)	262 (80.4)	<b>0.011</b>	179 (82.9)	203 (69.8)	<b>0.003</b>
	Neutral	41 (8.1)	128 (14.3)		18 (9.9)	23 (7.1)		17 (7.9)	24 (8.2)	
	Disagree	81 (16.0)	129 (14.3)		42 (23.2)	39 (11.9)		20 (9.2)	61 (21.0)	
	Don't know	3 (0.6)	6 (0.7)		1 (0.6)	2 (0.6)		0	3 (1.0)	
<b>2. My family might contract the disease if no preventive measure is taken</b>	Agree	389 (76.7)	642 (71.4)	0.539	121 (66.8)	268 (82.2)	<b>0.008</b>	181 (83.8)	208 (71.5)	<b>0.006</b>
	Neutral	31 (6.1)	116 (12.9)		15 (18.3)	16 (4.9)		10 (4.6)	21 (7.2)	
	Disagree	84 (16.6)	133 (14.8)		44 (24.3)	40 (12.3)		25 (11.6)	59 (20.3)	
	Don't know	3 (0.6)	8 (0.9)		1 (0.6)	2 (0.6)		0	3 (1.0)	
<b>3. I might contract COVID-19 if one of my family members tests positive for the disease</b>	Agree	350 (69.3)	594 (66.1)	0.559	118 (65.6)	232 (71.4)	0.637	158 (73.5)	192 (66.3)	0.138
	Neutral	60 (11.9)	140 (15.5)		18 (10.0)	42 (12.9)		24 (11.2)	36 (12.4)	
	Disagree	79 (15.6)	139 (15.5)		38 (21.1)	41 (12.6)		27 (12.5)	52 (17.9)	
	Don't know	16 (3.2)	26 (2.9)		6 (3.3)	10 (3.1)		6 (2.8)	10 (3.4)	
<b>Severity</b>										
<b>1. Seriousness of symptoms caused by SARS-CoV 19</b>	Severe	232 (45.8)	342 (38.0)	0.916	96 (53.0)	136 (41.7)	<b>0.04</b>	93 (43.1)	139 (47.9)	<b>0.045</b>
	Neutral	148 (29.2)	192 (21.4)		45 (24.9)	103 (31.6)		64 (29.6)	84 (28.9)	
	Not Severe	82 (16.1)	127 (14.1)		23 (12.7)	59 (18.1)		44 (20.4)	38 (13.0)	
	Don't know	45 (8.9)	238 (26.5)		17 (9.4)	28 (8.6)		15 (6.9)	30 (10.2)	
<b>2. Chance of survival if infected with COVID-19</b>	High	356 (70.2)	596 (66.3)	0.807	124 (68.5)	232 (71.2)	0.46	147 (68.1)	209 (71.8)	0.188
	Neutral	105 (20.7)	173 (19.2)		40 (20.1)	65 (19.9)		49 (22.7)	56 (19.3)	
	Not high	34 (6.7)	51 (5.7)		13 (7.2)	21 (6.4)		17 (7.9)	17 (5.8)	
	Don't know	12 (2.4)	79 (8.8)		4 (2.2)	8 (2.5)		3 (1.3)	9 (3.1)	

493 \*Mann-Whitney test

494 Note: Categories were merged, so “agree/severe/high” and “strongly agree/very severe/very high” were merged into category

495 “agree/severe/high”, and categories “disagree/not severe/not high” and “strongly disagree/not severe at all/not high at all” were

496 merged into “disagree/not severe/not high”.

497 **Table 4. Perceived Psychological Impact of COVID-19**

Variables		HCWs	NHCWs	HCWs Vs NHCWs	HCW Students	HCW Graduates	Students Vs Graduates	Frontline HCWs	Backend HCWs	Frontline Vs Backend
		n=507	n=899	P-value	n=181	n=326	P-value	n=216	n=290	P-value
		No. (%)	No. (%)		No. (%)	No. (%)		No. (%)	No. (%)	
<b>Anxiety (HADS-A Score Cut-off ≥ 6)</b>	Normal	235 (46.4)	407 (45.3)	0.697	78 (43.1)	157 (48.2)	0.273	96 (44.4)	139 (47.8)	0.458*
	Abnormal	272 (53.6)	492 (54.7)	*	103 (56.9)	169 (51.8)	*	120 (55.6)	152 (52.2)	
	Mean (SD)	6.07 (3.56)	6.34 (3.65)	0.177 †	6.25 (3.33)	5.98 (3.69)	0.409 †	6.9 (3.60)	5.98 (3.54)	
<b>Depression (HADS-D Score Cut-off ≥ 8)</b>	Normal	235 (46.4)	390 (43.4)	0.282	68 (37.6)	167 (51.2)	<b>0.003</b>	109 (50.5)	126 (43.3)	0.110*
	Abnormal	272 (53.6)	509 (56.6)	*	113 (62.4)	159 (48.8)	*	107 (49.5)	165 (56.7)	
	Mean (SD)	7.97 (3.69)	8.26 (3.83)	0.163 †	8.40 (3.45)	7.72 (3.80)	<b>0.047</b> †	7.69 (3.92)	8.18 (3.50)	
<b>COVID-19 will affect my job</b>	Agree	315 (62.3)	529 (58.8)	0.592	105 (58.3)	210 (64.4)	0.844	146 (67.6)	169 (58.4)	0.250 ‡
	Neutral	65 (12.8)	167 (18.6)	‡	28 (15.6)	37 (11.4)	‡	26 (12.0)	39 (13.4)	
	Disagree	113 (22.3)	168 (18.7)		39 (21.7)	74 (22.7)		41 (19.0)	72 (24.8)	
	Don't know	13 (2.6)	35 (3.9)		8 (4.4)	5 (1.5)		3 (1.4)	10 (3.4)	
<b>COVID-19 will affect my personal life</b>	Agree	331 (65.3)	561 (62.4)	0.877	112 (61.9)	219 (67.2)	0.260	161 (74.5)	170 (58.4)	<0.001 ‡
	Neutral	70 (13.8)	176 (19.6)	‡	26 (14.4)	44 (13.5)	‡	23 (10.6)	47 (16.2)	
	Disagree	101 (19.9)	149 (16.6)		41 (22.6)	60 (18.4)		31 (14.4)	70 (24.1)	
	Don't know	5 (1.0)	13 (1.4)		2 (1.1)	3 (0.9)		1 (0.5)	4 (1.3)	
<b>COVID-19 has affected my sleeping pattern</b>	Agree	175 (34.5)	374 (41.6)	0.060	63 (34.8)	112 (34.4)	0.324	79 (36.6)	96 (33.0)	0.616 ‡
	Neutral	90 (17.8)	150 (16.7)	‡	33 (18.2)	57 (17.5)	‡	33 (15.3)	57 (19.6)	
	Disagree	220 (43.4)	351 (39.0)		74 (40.9)	146 (44.8)		97 (44.9)	123 (42.3)	
	Don't know	22 (4.3)	24 (2.7)		11 (6.1)	11 (3.3)		7 (3.2)	15 (5.1)	
<b>COVID-19 has affected my eating habits</b>	Agree	167 (33.0)	335 (37.3)	0.108	68 (37.6)	99 (30.5)	0.100	69 (32.2)	98 (33.7)	0.302 ‡
	Neutral	88 (17.4)	165 (18.4)	‡	29 (16.0)	59 (18.2)	‡	36 (16.7)	52 (17.9)	
	Disagree	236 (46.6)	378 (42.0)		77 (42.5)	159 (48.8)		105 (48.8)	131 (45.0)	
	Don't know	15 (3.0)	21 (2.3)		7 (3.9)	8 (2.5)		5 (2.3)	10 (3.4)	
<b>I might start/increase smoking cigarettes</b>	Agree	54 (10.7)	78 (8.7)	0.461	20 (11.1)	34 (10.4)	0.675	27 (12.5)	27 (9.3)	0.429 ‡
	Neutral	32 (6.3)	89 (9.9)	‡	10 (5.5)	19 (5.8)		13 (6.0)	19 (6.5)	
	Disagree	397 (78.3)	692 (77.0)		141 (77.9)	256 (78.5)		166 (76.9)	231 (79.4)	
	Don't know	24 (4.7)	40 (4.4)		10 (5.5)	14 (4.3)		10 (4.6)	14 (4.8)	
<b>I might start/increase the use of recreational drugs</b>	Agree	34 (6.7)	38 (4.2)	0.154	11 (6.1)	23 (7.1)	0.393	19 (8.8)	15 (5.2)	0.307 ‡
	Neutral	31 (6.1)	61 (6.8)	‡	6 (3.3)	25 (7.6)		12 (5.6)	19 (6.5)	
	Disagree	419 (82.6)	757 (84.2)		153 (84.5)	266 (81.6)		177 (81.9)	242 (83.1)	
	Don't know	23 (4.6)	43 (4.8)		11 (6.1)	12 (3.7)		8 (3.7)	15 (5.2)	

498 \*Pearson Chi-square test †Independent-samples t-test ‡Mann-Whitney test

499 Note: Percentages of categories “agree/ strongly agree” were merged into category “agree”, and categories “disagree/ strongly disagree” were merged into “disagree”.

501 **Table 5. Predictors of Anxiety and Depression**

Variable	Anxiety				Depression			
	HCWs (n=507)		NHCWs (n=899)		HCWs		NHCWs	
	aOR* (95% CI)	P- value	aOR* (95% CI)	P- value	aOR* (95% CI)	P- value	aOR* (95% CI)	P- value
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	2.34 (1.37-3.99)	<b>0.002</b>	1.62 (1.12-2.35)	<b>0.010</b>	1.53 (0.90-2.58)	0.115	1.41 (0.98-2.02)	0.065
Male	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
<b>Age</b>								
18-24years	3.52 (1.19-10.42)	<b>0.023</b>	2.53 (1.51-4.23)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	1.00 (0.37-2.71)	1.000	1.38 (0.84-2.27)	0.209
25-34 years	3.44 (1.30-9.09)	<b>0.013</b>	2.84 (1.75-4.62)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	1.72 (0.72-4.11)	0.219	1.26 (0.79-2.01)	0.325
35-44 years	4.68 (1.63-13.47)	<b>0.004</b>	2.21 (1.31-3.70)	<b>0.003</b>	1.01 (0.39-2.64)	0.978	1.66 (1.00-2.76)	<b>0.050</b>
45 years or above	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
<b>Household incomes</b>								
≤ PKR 60,000	1.30 (0.62-2.71)	0.491	1.61 (1.06-2.43)	<b>0.024</b>	1.12 (0.54-2.32)	0.762	1.58 (1.06-2.36)	<b>0.026</b>
PKR 60,001 – PKR 120,000	1.35 (0.64-2.84)	0.430	2.22 (1.42-3.48)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	1.25 (0.61-2.57)	0.548	2.29 (1.48-3.54)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
> PKR 120,000	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
<b>Presence of COVID-19 related Symptoms</b>								
Yes	2.09 (1.01-4.32)	<b>0.046</b>	1.98 (1.34-2.94)	<b>0.001</b>	2.72 (1.34-5.55)	<b>0.006</b>	1.41 (0.96-2.06)	0.077
No	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	

502 \*Adjusted for gender, age, household income, and presence of COVID-19 related symptoms.

503

504 **Table 6. Adoption of Precautions by the respondents (Number of respondents answering Yes<sup>\*)</sup>)**

Precautions	HCWs	NHCWs	HCWs Vs NHCWs	Healthcare Students	Healthcare Graduate Students	Students Vs Graduates	Frontline NHCWs	Backend NHCWs	Frontline Vs Backend
	n=507 No. (%)	n =899 No. (%)	P-value*	n = 181 No. (%)	n = 326 No. (%)	P-value*	n=216 No. (%)	n=290 No. (%)	P-value*
1. Wear face masks	475 (93.7)	815 (90.7)	<b>0.012</b>	161 (89.0)	314 (96.3)	0.082	208 (96.3)	267 (91.8)	0.344
2. Wash hands frequently (With soap or hand sanitizer)	497 (98.0)	884 (98.3)	0.756	173 (95.6)	324 (99.4)	<b>0.001</b>	215 (99.5)	282 (96.9)	<b>0.009</b>
3. Avoid contacting people who have fever or respiratory symptoms	470 (92.7)	825 (91.8)	0.597	163 (90.1)	307 (94.2)	<b>0.047</b>	203 (94.0)	267 (91.8)	0.212
4. Avoid going out	397 (78.3)	679 (75.5)	0.089	158 (87.3)	239 (73.3)	<b>0.003</b>	164 (75.9)	233 (80.1)	0.685
5. Avoid going to meat shops/market	391 (77.1)	592 (65.9)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	142 (78.5)	249 (76.4)	0.291	172 (79.6)	219 (75.3)	0.330
6. Avoid going to hospital or clinic	306 (60.4)	728 (81.0)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	144 (79.6)	162 (49.7)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	97 (44.9)	209 (71.8)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
7. Avoid taking public transportation	456 (89.9)	838 (93.2)	<b>&lt;0.021</b>	165 (91.2)	291 (89.3)	0.651	193 (89.4)	263 (90.4)	0.207
8. Avoid going to work	277 (54.6)	594 (66.1)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	137 (75.7)	140 (42.9)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	80 (37.0)	197 (67.7)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
9. Avoid going to school or avoid letting children go to school	382 (75.3)	811 (90.2)	<b>0.001</b>	154 (85.1)	228 (69.9)	<b>0.024</b>	149 (69.0)	233 (80.1)	0.733
10. Avoid international travel	467 (92.1)	853 (94.9)	<b>0.032</b>	169 (93.4)	298 (91.4)	0.954	198 (91.7)	269 (92.4)	0.980
11. Avoid domestic or inter-city travel	440 (86.8)	805 (89.5)	0.076	165 (91.2)	275 (84.4)	0.091	174 (80.6)	266 (91.4)	<b>0.001</b>

505 \* Pearson Chi-square test

506 *Note: Only the most salient variables for social distancing have been reported in this table.*

507 **Table 7. Perceived reliability of information sources**

Information Source	Perception	HCWs	NHCWs	HCWs Vs NHCWs	Healthcare Students	Healthcare Graduates	Students Vs Graduates	Frontline HCWs	Backend HCWs	Frontline Vs Backend
		n=488 No. (%)	n =864 No. (%)	P-value*	n = 175 No. (%)	n = 313 No. (%)	P-value*	n=206 No. (%)	n=282 No. (%)	
Newspaper	Reliable	268 (56.5)	500 (57.9)	0.239	105 (63.2)	163 (52.9)	0.071	100 (49.0)	168 (62.2)	
	Neutral	138 (29.2)	273 (31.7)		36 (21.7)	102 (33.1)		77 (37.8)	61 (22.6)	
	Unreliable	68 (14.3)	90 (10.4)		25 (15.1)	43 (14.0)		27 (13.2)	41 (15.2)	
Magazine	Reliable	189 (39.0)	378 (43.7)	<b>0.005</b>	87 (50.3)	102 (32.7)	<b>0.015</b>	58 (28.3)	131 (46.8)	
	Neutral	176 (36.3)	347 (40.2)		44 (25.4)	132 (42.3)		94 (45.8)	82 (29.3)	
	Unreliable	120 (24.7)	139 (16.1)		42 (24.3)	78 (25.0)		53 (25.9)	67 (23.9)	
Radio	Reliable	238 (49.0)	463 (53.6)	0.051	100 (57.5)	138 (44.2)	<b>0.017</b>	86 (42.0)	152 (54.1)	
	Neutral	163 (33.5)	311 (36.0)		44 (25.3)	119 (38.1)		84 (41.0)	79 (28.1)	
	Unreliable	85 (17.5)	90 (10.4)		30 (17.2)	55 (17.6)		35 (17.0)	50 (17.8)	
Television	Reliable	262 (53.9)	546 (63.2)	<b>0.043</b>	104 (59.8)	158 (50.6)	<b>0.040</b>	97 (47.3)	165 (58.7)	
	Neutral	141 (29.0)	186 (21.5)		43 (24.7)	98 (31.4)		73 (35.6)	68 (24.2)	
	Unreliable	83 (17.1)	132 (15.3)		27 (15.5)	56 (18.0)		35 (17.1)	48 (17.1)	
Government websites	Reliable	411 (84.6)	693 (80.2)	0.056	150 (86.2)	261 (83.7)	<b>0.001</b>	168 (81.9)	243 (86.5)	
	Neutral	48 (9.9)	110 (12.7)		13 (7.5)	35 (11.2)		25 (12.2)	23 (8.2)	
	Unreliable	27 (5.5)	61 (7.1)		11 (6.3)	16 (5.1)		12 (5.9)	15 (5.3)	
Unofficial websites	Reliable	134 (27.7)	237 (27.4)	0.156	59 (33.9)	75 (24.2)	0.983	41 (20.2)	93 (33.1)	
	Neutral	118 (24.4)	282 (32.7)		28 (16.1)	90 (29.0)		61 (30.0)	57 (20.3)	
	Unreliable	232 (47.9)	345 (39.9)		87 (50.0)	145 (46.8)		101 (49.8)	131 (46.6)	
Social media platforms	Reliable	149 (30.7)	273 (31.6)	<b>0.004</b>	65 (37.1)	84 (27.0)	0.358	50 (24.5)	99 (35.1)	
	Neutral	96 (19.7)	276 (31.9)		23 (13.2)	73 (23.5)		54 (26.5)	42 (14.9)	
	Unreliable	241 (49.6)	315 (36.5)		87 (49.7)	154 (49.5)		100 (49.0)	141 (50.0)	
Doctor	Reliable	443 (91.2)	753 (87.2)	<b>0.003</b>	158 (90.3)	285 (91.6)	0.942	186 (90.7)	257 (91.4)	
	Neutral	35 (7.2)	97 (11.2)		12 (6.9)	23 (7.4)		16 (7.8)	19 (6.8)	
	Unreliable	8 (1.6)	14 (1.6)		5 (2.8)	3 (1.0)		3 (1.5)	5 (1.8)	
Family or friends	Reliable	221 (45.7)	464 (53.8)	<b>0.001</b>	74 (42.3)	147 (47.6)	0.185	85 (41.9)	136 (48.4)	
	Neutral	158 (32.6)	290 (33.6)		57 (32.6)	101 (32.7)		71 (34.9)	87 (31.0)	
	Unreliable	105 (21.7)	109 (12.6)		44 (25.1)	61 (19.7)		47 (23.2)	58 (20.6)	

508 \*Mann Whitney test

509 Note: Percentages of categories “reliable/ very reliable” were merged into category “reliable”, and categories “unreliable / very  
510 unreliable” were merged into “unreliable”.

511 **Table 8. Respondents' satisfaction with government measures**

Measures	HCWs n=507 No. (%)	NHCWs n =589 No. (%)	HCWs Vs NHCW s P- value*	Healthcar e Students n = 181 No. (%)	Healthca re Graduate s n = 326 No. (%)	Student s Vs Gradua tes P- value*	Frontline NHCWs n=216 No. (%)	Backend NHCWs n=290 No. (%)	Frontli ne Vs Backen d P- value*
<b>Screening facilities</b>									
Satisfied/ Very Satisfied	104 (20.6)	111 (18.8)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	46 (25.6)	58 (17.9)	<b>0.016</b>	39 (18.2)	65 (22.4)	0.245
Neutral	117 (23.2)	198 (33.6)		44 (24.4)	73 (22.5)		49 (23.0)	68 (23.4)	
Unsatisfied/ Very Unsatisfied	273 (54.2)	248 (42.2)		89 (49.4)	184 (56.8)		124 (57.9)	149 (51.4)	
Don't know	10 (2.0)	32 (5.4)		1 (0.6)	9 (2.8)		2 (0.9)	8 (2.8)	
<b>Laboratory services/ testing kits</b>									
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	109 (21.6)	124 (21.0)	<b>0.028</b>	50 (27.8)	59 (18.1)	<b>0.016</b>	41 (19.1)	68 (23.4)	0.344
Neutral	134 (26.5)	191 (32.4)		48 (26.7)	86 (26.5)		60 (27.9)	74 (25.6)	
Unsatisfied/ Very Unsatisfied	248 (49.1)	243 (41.3)		78 (43.3)	170 (52.3)		111 (51.6)	137 (47.2)	
Don't know	14 (2.8)	31 (5.3)		4 (2.2)	10 (3.1)		3 (1.4)	11 (3.8)	
<b>Quarantine facilities</b>									
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	134 (26.6)	157 (26.6)	<b>0.022</b>	56 (31.1)	78 (24.1)	<b>0.012</b>	56 (26.2)	78 (26.9)	0.602
Neutral	125 (24.8)	179 (30.4)		50 (27.8)	75 (23.1)		51 (23.8)	74 (25.5)	
Unsatisfied/ Very Unsatisfied	228 (45.2)	223 (37.9)		69 (38.3)	159 (49.1)		103 (48.1)	125 (43.1)	
Don't know	17 (3.4)	30 (5.1)		5 (2.8)	12 (3.7)		4 (1.9)	13 (4.5)	
<b>Personal Protective Equipment</b>									
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	86 (17.0)	100 (17.0)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	39 (21.5)	47 (14.5)	0.072	29 (13.6)	57 (19.6)	0.076
Neutral	95 (18.8)	186 (31.6)		38 (21.0)	57 (17.6)		37 (17.3)	58 (19.9)	
Unsatisfied/ Very Unsatisfied	311 (61.6)	268 (45.5)		102 (56.4)	209 (64.5)		144 (67.3)	167 (57.4)	
Don't know	13 (2.6)	35 (5.9)		2 (1.1)	11 (3.4)		4 (1.8)	9 (3.1)	

512 \*Mann-Whitney test † Pearson Chi-square test

513 Note: Only the most salient variables have been reported in this table. Percentages of categories "satisfied" and "very satisfied" were

514 merged into category "satisfied/very satisfied", and categories "unsatisfied" and "very unsatisfied" were merged into

515 "unsatisfied/very unsatisfied".