

---

# Psychological and social impact of COVID-19 in Pakistan: Need for Gender Responsive Policies

Fauziah Rabbani<sup>1\*</sup>, Hyder Ali Khan<sup>2</sup>, Suneel Piryani<sup>3</sup>, Areeba Raza Khan<sup>4</sup>, Fahad Abid<sup>5</sup>

1. Associate Vice Provost, Department of Community Health Sciences, Office of Research & Graduate Studies, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

2. Senior Research Coordinator, Department of Community Health Sciences, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

3. Research Specialist, Department of Community Health Sciences, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

4. Assistant Manager – Office of Research & Graduate Studies, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

5. Specialist Early Intervention in Psychosis Pakistan

\*Corresponding Author: Dr. Fauziah Rabbani (MBBS, MPH, FCPS, FRCP, PhD)

The Noordin M. Thobani Professor Dept of Community Health Sciences and Associate Vice Provost Research and Graduate Studies

Aga Khan University, PO Box 3500, Stadium Road, Karachi, Pakistan.

E-mail : [fauziah.rabbani@aku.edu](mailto:fauziah.rabbani@aku.edu) , Tel: (9221) 34864801, 34930051 Ext.4801, 4800, fax: (9221) 34934294, 3493-2095



3 **ABSTRACT**

4 **BACKGROUND:**

5 COVID-19 has rapidly crossed borders, infecting people throughout the world. Women may be  
6 especially vulnerable to depression and anxiety due to the pandemic,

7 **AIMS:** This study attempted to assess how gender impacts risk perceptions, anxiety levels  
8 behavioral responses to the COVID 19 pandemic in Pakistan in order to recommend gender  
9 responsive health policies

10 **METHODS:** A cross-sectional online survey was conducted. Participants were asked to  
11 complete a sociodemographic data form, the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS),  
12 and questions on their risk perceptions, preventive behavior and information exposure.  
13 Regression analysis was used to assess effects of factors such as age, gender and household  
14 income on anxiety levels.

15 **RESULTS:** Of the 1390 respondents, 478 were women, and 913 were men. Women considered  
16 their chances of survival to be relatively lower than men ( 59 % women vs 73% men). They were  
17 also more anxious (62% women vs 50% men), and more likely to adopt precautionary behavior,  
18 such as avoiding going to the hospital (78% women vs. 71% men), not going to work (72%  
19 women and 57% men), and using disinfectants (93% women and 86% men). Men were more  
20 likely to trust friends, family and social media as reliable sources of COVID-19 information,  
21 while women were more likely to trust doctors.

22 **CONCLUSION:** Women experience a disproportion burden of the psychological and social  
23 impact of the pandemic compared to men. Involving doctors in healthcare communication  
24 targeting women, might prove effective. Social media and radio programs may be effective in  
25 disseminating information related to COVID among men.

26 **Keywords**

27 risk perception, anxiety, gender , COVID 19

28

## 29 **Background**

30 The occurrence of novel Coronavirus Disease 2019 was first detected in December, 2019 in  
31 Wuhan, China (1). On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization declared the outbreak of  
32 the disease as a global pandemic. Within two weeks of this announcement, COVID-19 cases  
33 outside of China had increased 13-fold with the number of affected countries rising by 3-fold (2).  
34 Since its emergence, there are more than 15.2 million confirmed global cases of the virus with  
35 the number of deaths exceeding 623,000 as of 23 July, 2020. In the initial stages of the outbreak,  
36 most cases of COVID-19 that were exported internationally had a history of prior travel to  
37 Wuhan (3). Despite its close geographic proximity with China and Iran, the first two cases of  
38 COVID-19 in Pakistan were reported on February 26, 2020 (4). To curb the spread of the virus,  
39 Provincial Governments in Pakistan initiated partial and subsequent, complete lockdowns in their  
40 respective administrative territories. These measures however, were taken in phases, with  
41 educational institutions across the country closing on 13 March, 2020 in response to the  
42 pandemic (5). As of 23 July, 2020, Pakistan has over 260,000 confirmed cases of COVID-19,  
43 and approximately 5,700 deaths (1).

44

45 Exposure to a traumatic event, such as a global health crisis, is associated with an increased  
46 incidence of anxiety and depression (6). Moreover, the stigma and isolation due to infectious  
47 diseases could generate anxiety (7). A study conducted on a sample of Severe Acute Respiratory  
48 Syndrome (SARS) survivors in Hong Kong revealed increased levels of psychological distress  
49 and anxiety, not only during the epidemic but also one year following the outbreak (8). Another  
50 research concluded that SARS had long-term psychiatric effects on survivors, with post

51 traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and depressive disorders being the most prevalent conditions  
52 recorded (9). Moreover, a US survey conducted during the H1N1 pandemic, with 7236  
53 participants, suggests an increase in the prevalence of anxiety (10). Similarly, one internet  
54 survey conducted in China (n=7,236) reported that over one third participants exhibit symptoms  
55 of anxiety disorders during the COVID-19 outbreak while, one fifth recently experienced sleep  
56 issues and depressive symptoms (11).

57  
58 Past research during large epidemics/pandemics, such as during the Ebola outbreak of 2014-  
59 2016 in West Africa suggests that women may be disproportionately impacted during public  
60 health emergencies. The COVID-19 pandemic is also expected to affect women's health and  
61 increase their short-term and long-term needs for livelihood support, and health (12). One study  
62 in the heavily impacted areas around Wuhan, highlighted an increase of 7% in prevalence of  
63 posttraumatic stress symptoms (PTSS), and women had significantly higher levels of PTSS than  
64 men (13). One study conducted in Turkey revealed that the pandemic had a greater  
65 psychological impact on women than men. In this study of 343 respondents, women had  
66 significantly higher depression and anxiety scores (14). During the SARS epidemic, people with  
67 higher levels of anxiety were frequently found to adopt precautionary behaviours (15). Studies  
68 conducted in Singapore and Hong Kong also report that women were more likely to adhere to  
69 precautionary behaviours during SARS than men (16). Similarly, women in the UK were found  
70 to practice precautionary behaviours such as hand washing and disinfecting surfaces more often  
71 than men (17).

72

73 Female responses to stress and trauma may be contributing factors towards anxiety. Studies also  
74 indicate that gendered responses to trauma contribute to the greater onset of depression and  
75 PTSD in women (18,19). Evidence attributes this to women’s belief that worry is uncontrollable,  
76 and may cause anxious thoughts (20). The manner in which young boys and girls are socialised  
77 into their gender roles has an impact on these perceptions. A review discussed how mothers are  
78 more likely to converse about their emotional condition with their daughters as compared to with  
79 their sons (21). Further, young boys are conditioned to exercise problem-solving skills for  
80 managing their emotions, girls are traditionally granted less autonomy. This increases their  
81 dependency on others, and reduces the capability to effectively cope with anxious thoughts (21).

82

83 This study aims to assess gender differences in perceived risk, anxiety levels and behavioural  
84 responses to COVID 19. This study uses sociocultural patterns to examine the effect of age,  
85 gender, and household income on anxiety levels, and develops gender responsive policy options  
86 for grappling with the pandemic in Pakistan .

## 87 **METHOD**

### 88 **Study design**

89 This is a cross-sectional study, with the survey tool disseminated online. The survey in Pakistan  
90 was conducted eleven weeks after the first case was reported on February 26, 2020; during a  
91 government-imposed lockdown.

92

### 93 **Study Participants**

94 A convenience sampling strategy was used to recruit participants. The questionnaire was  
95 launched for two weeks on the social media pages of a Karachi based university hospital.  
96 Potential study participants were encouraged to share the link on their social media platforms.  
97 People aged 18 and above, residing in Pakistan for the last month, with access to internet and  
98 willingness to participate in the study were included. Participants who could not respond to the  
99 study tool in either English or Urdu, and those who reported having filled the questionnaire at  
100 least once before were excluded. A total of 1406 respondents filled the online questionnaire.  
101 Fifteen respondents preferred not to disclose their gender. Thus 1391 participants were included  
102 in this study.

103

### 104 **Data Collection**

105 Data was collected through an online self-administered structured questionnaire developed on  
106 Google Forms. Respondents were inquired about their gender, age, level of education,  
107 household income, and city of permanent residence. They were asked how likely it is that they or  
108 their families might be infected with COVID-19 if no preventive measures were taken. Further  
109 questions assessed how participants perceived the severity of the symptoms caused by COVID-

110 19, their likelihood of survival if infected, and their adoption of precautionary measures.  
111 Respondents also rated the reliability of various sources of COVID-19 information.  
112 Subsequently, the psychological impact of COVID-19 on respondents' job, personal life, sleep  
113 pattern, and eating habits was assessed. Participants' anxiety and depression levels were assessed  
114 using the validated Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). This consists of 14-items  
115 (7-items of anxiety and 7-item of depression) scored on a four-point Likert scale. The lowest  
116 possible scores for anxiety and depression are 0, and the highest possible score is 15 for anxiety  
117 and 21 for depression. The scale defines a normal score as  $\geq 7$ , borderline abnormal score as 8-  
118 10, and abnormal score as  $\leq 11$ . Higher scores imply the severity of anxiety or depression (22-  
119 24).

120

## 121 **Data Analysis**

122 Data collected from respondents was stored in Google Spreadsheets then imported to Microsoft  
123 Excel and SPSS version 21 (IBM Corp). Data was cleaned, coded, and analysed using SPSS  
124 Version 21. A descriptive analysis was performed. Results were tabulated as number  
125 (percentage) for qualitative variables and mean ( $\pm$ standard deviation) for quantitative variables.  
126 Independent t-test or Mann Whitney U test or Pearson Chi-square test was applied to assess the  
127 differences between women's and men's perception of susceptibility and severity towards  
128 COVID-19, anxiety and depression, psychological impact of COVID-19, adoption of  
129 precautionary measures, and reliability of information sources. Bivariate and multivariate binary  
130 logistic regression analyses were performed to identify predictors (age, gender, and household  
131 income) of anxiety and depression. Initially, a single predictor at a time was entered; crude odds  
132 ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) were computed using bivariate analysis.

133 Multivariate analysis with all predictors entered at the same time was completed to adjust for the  
134 effect of confounding, and adjusted OR and 95% CI were computed. All statistical tests were  
135 two sided and p-value of  $\leq 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

136

### 137 **Ethical Considerations**

138 Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethical Review Committee (ERC) of the Aga Khan  
139 University, Pakistan. Prior to filling the online questionnaire, each respondent was asked to  
140 provide consent for participation in the survey.

141

## 142 **Results**

143 A total of 1391 participants' responses were included in the analysis. Table 1 shows the  
144 sociodemographic characteristics (age, education, and household income) of women and men  
145 which are comparable. Majority of the respondents were aged between 25-34 years (69% women  
146 and 66% men) and possessed a Bachelor's Degree or above (75% women and 79% men). About  
147 29% of women and 17% men preferred not to disclose their household income. Around one-third  
148 of women (32%) and two-fifths of men (40%) mentioned that their household income is below  
149 PKR 60,000. More women (69%) than men (40%) from Karachi participated in the survey  
150 (Table 1).

151  
152 Around three-fourths of respondents perceived that they (strongly agree/agree: 71% women vs.  
153 73% men) and their family (strongly agree/agree: 74% women vs. 73% men) might be infected  
154 with COVID-19 if no preventive measures were taken. However, significantly more women than  
155 men considered symptoms of COVID-19 (if infected) as severe (very severe/severe: 46% women  
156 and 39% men, p-value: 0.045). On probing regarding, 59% women vs. 73% men perceived  
157 themselves likely to survive an infection (Table 2).

158  
159 Women were also reported to have a higher anxiety score (Mean  $\pm$  SD: 6.80  $\pm$  3.61 in women,  
160 and 5.93  $\pm$  3.58 in men, p-value: <0.001).. Furthermore, the depression score was high among  
161 women (Mean  $\pm$  SD: 8.39  $\pm$  3.93 in women 8.01  $\pm$  3.69 in men, p-value: <0.079). More women  
162 were found to be depressed compared to men, with 58% of women and 54% of men scoring  
163 above the depression cut-off point( $\geq$  8).Around three-fifths of the respondents (strongly  
164 agree/agree: 58% women and 61% men) mentioned that COVID-19 had affected their jobs.

165 About three-fourths of the respondents (strongly agree/agree: 73% women and 74% men) also  
166 expressed concerns that the current pandemic is impacting their personal life. About two-fourths  
167 of the respondents believed that their sleeping pattern (strongly agree/agree: 40% women and  
168 39% men) and eating habits (strongly agree/agree: 36% both women and men) have been  
169 disturbed due to COVID-19. Significantly more men compared to women mentioned that they  
170 might start/increase cigarette consumption (strongly agree/agree: 6% women vs. 11% men, p-  
171 value: <0.001), and might resort to the use of recreational drugs such as marijuana, crystallised  
172 methamphetamines, cocaine or opium products etc. (strongly agree/agree: 4% women vs. 6%  
173 men) (Table 3).

174  
175 Significant differences were identified between women and men in adopting several  
176 precautionary measures such as washing their hands with soap/sanitizer frequently (100%  
177 women vs. 98% men, p-value: 0.012), wearing masks (93% women vs. 92% men, p-value:  
178 0.025), covering nose and mouth while sneezing or coughing (98% women vs. 95% men, p-  
179 value: 0.043), avoiding contacting people who have fever or respiratory symptoms (95% women  
180 and 91% men), avoiding going out (87% women vs. 71% men, p-value: <0.001), avoiding  
181 crowded areas (96% women and 92% men, p-value: 0.003), refraining from going to hospital or  
182 clinic (78% women and 71% men, p-value: <0.001), avoiding to go to work (72% women and  
183 57% men, p-value: <0.001), avoiding social events (97% women and 93% men, p-value: 0.046),  
184 and avoiding domestic travel (93% women and 86% men, p-value: <0.001). (Table 4.)

185  
186 Information about COVID-19 provided by the doctor was considered reliable by significantly  
187 more women compared to men (very reliable/reliable: 91% women and 88% men, p-value:

188 0.041). Most of the respondents (very reliable/reliable: 81% women and 82% men) thought that  
189 the information provided through official websites such as those run by the government is  
190 reliable. Significantly more men than the women believed that the radio (very reliable/reliable:  
191 46% women vs. 55% men, p-value: 0.014), and family or friends (very reliable/reliable: 46%  
192 women vs. 55% men, p-value: 0.003) are reliable sources for gaining information about COVID-  
193 19. Furthermore, television (very reliable/reliable: 57% women vs. 61% men), newspaper (very  
194 reliable/reliable: 56% women vs. 58% men), magazine (very reliable/reliable: 39% women and  
195 44% men), social media such as Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram (very reliable/ reliable: 28%  
196 women vs. 32% men) and unofficial websites (very reliable/reliable: 22% women and 31% men)  
197 were considered as reliable information sources by more men than women. (Table. 5)

198  
199 Table 6 demonstrates the predictors of anxiety. Gender, age, and household income had a  
200 significant positive association with anxiety. Women were nearly two times more likely to be  
201 anxious than men (aOR: 1.70, 95% CI: 1.26-2.28). Moreover, respondents of a younger age (25-  
202 34 years) (aOR 2.30, 95% CI: 1.26-4.18) were nearly two times more likely to have anxiety than  
203 respondents above 55 years of age. Respondents with a household income between PKR 60,000  
204 and PKR 120,000 were more likely to have anxiety than respondents with a household income of  
205 >PKR 120,000 (aOR: 1.84; 95% CI: 1.27-2.67).

206  
207 Table 7 shows the predictors of depression. Only household income was found have a  
208 significantly positive association with depression in multivariate analysis. Respondents having a  
209 household income of PKR 60,000 – PKR 120,000 were more likely to have anxiety in

210 comparison with respondents who had a household income of >PKR 120,000 (aOR: 1.99; 95%  
211 CI: 1.38-2.87).  
212

## 213 **Discussion**

214 This study assessed how gender roles in Pakistan can impact anxiety levels and behavioural  
215 responses among men and women during the COVID-19 pandemic. Both men and women were  
216 found to be mildly anxious due to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, compared to men, more  
217 women perceived the disease to be fatal, and were more likely to engage in preventive behavior.  
218 These results highlight a greater need to develop gender-responsive policies in the fight to  
219 contain COVID-19.

220 Overall, fewer women than men responded to the questionnaire. This may be due to a prominent  
221 male dominated access to internet facilities in Pakistan. Indeed, several reports on internet  
222 penetration found that, at least three-fourths of internet and social users in the country are male  
223 (25). In Pakistan, cellular devices remain the most frequent means of accessing internet facilities,  
224 and there is a gender gap of 38% in mobile phone ownership (26).

225 There were also significant differences in respondents' city of permanent residence. Three-fifths  
226 of all the female participants, and two-fifths of the males were from Karachi. This was expected,  
227 as the survey tool was disseminated over a Karachi-based university hospital's Facebook page.  
228 The remaining respondents were from Punjab and Sindh. There are significant provincial  
229 disparities in access to internet facilities. Islamabad Capital Territory has the highest internet  
230 penetration, followed by Punjab and Sindh (27). The fewest respondents were from Balochistan,  
231 further reflecting the province's poor internet accessibility. One-third of the male respondents  
232 were from smaller cities and towns throughout the country, compared to one-tenth of women.  
233 Differences in the nature of Pakistani men in smaller towns/cities may impact mobile phone

234 ownership and social media usage, and explain why fewer women were from these towns and  
235 cities (28).

236 Although men and women considered themselves equally susceptible to a COVID-19 infection,  
237 women were more likely to perceive the disease to be fatal. This is a misperception, as gender-  
238 disaggregated data (until 24 June) on COVID-19 in Pakistan shows that three-quarters of  
239 diagnosed cases and deaths were among males, compared to a quarter among females (29).  
240 Gender-specific patterns of smoking are implicated as a significant contributor to disease  
241 severity among men (30). Indeed, this study also suggested that men were twice as likely as  
242 compared to women in reporting that either they might start smoking cigarettes and using  
243 recreational drugs or their usage might increase. These gender disparities in use of tobacco and  
244 narcotics are frequently seen in Pakistan (31–33). Furthermore, men are more likely to suffer  
245 from non-communicable diseases (34). Research suggests that excess mortality during the  
246 pandemic is higher than if these surplus deaths were caused by COVID-19 alone, particularly  
247 among cancer or heart disease patients and are attributable to delays in seeking or obtaining  
248 lifesaving care (35,36). Furthermore, women, particularly working mothers, tend to spend more  
249 time than men focused on medical issues related to their family's healthcare, as well as their own  
250 (37). This could explain why women are more likely to believe that the disease symptoms are  
251 severe, with a low likelihood of survival.

252 Despite at being lower risk, women were more likely to conform to preventive measures. This  
253 included practicing social distancing measures, such as avoiding going to meat shops/market,  
254 going out, and going to work. One digital ethnographic study suggests that the majority of the  
255 population in Pakistan was in favor of continuing prayers in mosques while 1 in 4 men reported  
256 to have attended Friday prayers (38). Other studies also demonstrate men's priorities during the

257 pandemic. A comparison of COVID-19-related content shared on Twitter by men and women  
258 based in the U.S. found that women were more likely to tweet about family, social distancing  
259 and healthcare whereas men were more likely to tweet about sports cancellations and politics  
260 (39).

261 While this finding might imply that men are considerably less interested in social distancing  
262 practices, only one-fifth of the Pakistani women contribute to the labor force and wherein men  
263 constitute a majority of waged and salaried workers in cities and women contribute to over 70%  
264 of share of work in agriculture and informal sectors (40). These differences in employment could  
265 explain why men are less likely to conform to social distancing practices than women. In order to  
266 improve the labor forces' capacity to work from home, initiatives should be taken to improve  
267 telecommunication facilities (including improving internet service provision).

268

269 Differences were also seen in practicing hygiene measures, such as disinfecting floors and tables  
270 at home (with phenyl products). School closure, lockdown and work-from-home orders have  
271 resulted in women carrying a double shift of home-schooling and working responsibilities. This  
272 increases the proportion of paid and unpaid labour in women's work (41). Working mothers  
273 spend more hours engaged in household work and child care than their husbands (42). One study  
274 conducted in the United Kingdom during the lockdown estimates that, on average, mothers  
275 spend 11 more hours weekly on childcare than fathers. Single parents have less time to spend on  
276 childcare than partnered mothers, as they are single-handedly forced to bear the brunt of the  
277 shifts in the job market (43). This additional housework could result in women permanently

278 exiting from the labor market. These developments are concerning, and emphasize the urgent  
279 need to develop labour policies which protect women in the workforce.

280 Women were more likely to report that they avoid going to hospitals. Furthermore, they were  
281 also more likely to perceive that doctors were a reliable source of information. It may be too  
282 soon to estimate the impact of COVID-19 on maternal and child health services, but one study  
283 estimates that a modest decline of 10% in coverage of pregnancy-related and newborn health  
284 care in lower-middle income countries could result in an additional, 1.7 million women who give  
285 birth, and 2.6million newborns who need urgent medical care (44). Studies conducted during the  
286 2013–2016 Ebola outbreak in Western Africa show how sexual and reproductive health was  
287 adversely impacted by strains on health care systems, which often resulted in interruptions of  
288 care, and redirected resources (45–49). Similar reduction in access can be seen during the current  
289 pandemic. Clinics operated by Marie Stopes International, which is the largest private provider  
290 of family planning services in India, had to halt operations due to the country-wide lockdowns  
291 (50). Similarly, Marie Stopes International reports that its activities have been reduced by up to  
292 40% in Pakistan due to the pandemic (51). Furthermore, some studies noted how diversion of  
293 staff and funding from maternal, neonatal and child health programmes to the front-line of the  
294 COVID-19 response has also decreased the quality of services available to women (52–54)

295  
296 A larger number of men than women considered radio to be a reliable source of information.  
297 Pakistan has a considerable audience of radio programming. One study found that radio has the  
298 largest listeners in Sindh (60%), followed by Balochistan (53%), KPK (52%) and Punjab (19%),  
299 particularly in rural areas and small towns (55). Therefore, this gendered difference in trusting

300 radio could be explained by the significantly larger proportion of men who came from smaller  
301 cities and towns. Furthermore, men in this study were more likely to trust friends and family than  
302 women. Pakistanis are considered to be a collectivistic society, with an emphasis on men  
303 engaging in commitments to the members of their ‘group’, friends and family (56). Similarly,  
304 men were more likely to trust social media sources than women. The lockdown enforced due to  
305 COVID pandemic has resulted in online activity substituting social activity between families,  
306 and may be considered as representative of a given person’s public interactions (38,39). While  
307 one study found that the public was often skeptical of official figures on COVID-19, but most  
308 polling suggests that Pakistanis in general are confident in the government’s management of the  
309 crisis (4,5). This is in contrast with Syria, where experiences of war, and propaganda campaigns  
310 by the state and its opponents, meant that Syrians were very distrustful of official news sources  
311 (38). Facebook users were much more likely to share official news sources. Therefore, radio  
312 content, as well as shareable social media content might be an appropriate avenue to provide  
313 targeted health information to men and improve their risk perceptions and subsequent indulgence  
314 in precautionary measures

315  
316 In this study, women depicted higher levels of anxiety and depression in comparison with men,  
317 which suggests that they hold a greater psychiatric burden of the COVID-19 pandemic. One  
318 study conducted in India found that 33% of the respondents had experienced either depression or  
319 anxiety as a result of COVID-19 (57). Another study in China established that 54% of  
320 respondents suffered some psychological impact from the outbreak (58). In both studies, women  
321 were found to have suffered a greater psychological impact due to the pandemic as compared to  
322 men. Similarly, our findings corroborate with data from Turkey, where women had significantly

323 higher scores of depression and anxiety (14). Research conducted in China also reports that  
324 women may be three times more anxious than their male counterparts because of COVID-19  
325 (11,54,58). These results align with previous studies which show that women have a higher  
326 vulnerability for developing anxiety disorders (59)

327 There are many possible sources of this concern. Apart from their professional role, women  
328 serve as primary caregivers within their family (57). Women's greater sensitivity towards  
329 familial roles and responsibilities was also reflected in a research which noted that pregnant  
330 women had heightened stress levels regarding the health status of their older relatives, their  
331 children and then their unborn baby during COVID-19 (60). One study found that family income  
332 stability and social support networks were protective factors against anxiety (61). Given the  
333 difficulties in forming stable social support networks during pandemic-induced lockdowns, as  
334 well as women's lower likelihood of seeking medical care, this psychological support could be  
335 provided via telemedicine or other online platforms which can connect them to qualified  
336 psychiatrists. The timely and effective provision of such psychological support is also imperative  
337 for literate women that are already suffering from mental illness and feel that their symptoms  
338 have aggravated due to the ongoing pandemic.

## 339 **Conclusion**

340 This study assessed the gender differences in risk perceptions (susceptibility and severity of the  
341 disease), preventive behaviour (social distancing, enhanced hygiene measures), and anxiety. The  
342 results highlight the need for gender-responsive policies in mitigating the health and economic  
343 impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The global economy has grinded to a stop, and respondents  
344 face severe economic uncertainty. Differences in type-of-work, based on gender, may result in

345 men being unable to maintain social distancing. Furthermore, it results in women being burdened  
346 with increasing house work, which can impact their ability to engage in professional work. This  
347 indicates the urgent need to develop labour laws to protect the workforce, particularly women.  
348 Furthermore, the results indicate potential avenues of disseminating gender-specific health  
349 communication. Involving doctors in healthcare communication targeting women, focusing on  
350 their need to avoid skipping hospital appointments, might prove effective. Research is required  
351 to assess strategies of reducing the frequency of in-person MNCH appointments, and the  
352 potential of telemedicine in all women to remain in contact with the health system, As men are  
353 more likely to trust what they read on social media, especially if it is shared by friends or family,  
354 social media campaigns and radio programming may be effective in disseminating information  
355 and the latter could be an effective tool to reach towns and cities. This health communication  
356 should include messages about men's higher risk of dying, due to COVID-19, a lack of NCD  
357 management, and smoking cessation. Most importantly, based on the discussion, policy  
358 measures must be taken to ensure the continued provision of quality healthcare to women. This  
359 must include provisions to mitigate the growing anxiety among women, and compensate for the  
360 loss of social support networks during pandemic times.

361 Differences in type-of-work, based on gender, may result in men being unable to maintain social  
362 distancing. Furthermore, it results in women being burdened with increasing house work, which  
363 can impact their ability to engage in professional work.

#### 364 **Conflict of Interest**

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

367 **Author Contributions**

368 FR conceived the study, guided data collection and reviewed all drafts of the manuscript. HAK  
369 and ARK adapted the questionnaires and wrote the manuscript. SP analyzed and narrated the  
370 data. HAK and ARK edited and revised multiple drafts of the manuscript. ARK also assisted in  
371 adapting the questionnaires and posting it on social media channels of AKU. All authors  
372 reviewed and endorsed the final submission.

373 **Funding**

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

375 **Acknowledgments**

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

377

## 378 **References**

- 379 1. Global Cases by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins  
380 University (JHU). Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. 19.
- 381 2. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO declares COVID-19 a pandemic. *Acta Bio-Medica Atenei*  
382 *Parm.* 2020;91(1):157–60.
- 383 3. Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, Liu Y, Edmunds J, Funk S, et al. Early dynamics  
384 of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect*  
385 *Dis.* 2020;
- 386 4. Waris A, Khan AU, Ali M, Ali A, Baset A. COVID-19 outbreak: current scenario of  
387 Pakistan. *New Microbes New Infect.* 2020;100681.
- 388 5. Nafees M, Khan F. Pakistan's Response to COVID-19 Pandemic and Efficacy of  
389 Quarantine and Partial Lockdown: A Review. *Electron J Gen Med.* 2020; 17 (6): em240.  
390 2020.
- 391 6. Suliman S, Mkabale SG, Fincham DS, Ahmed R, Stein DJ, Seedat S. Cumulative effect of  
392 multiple trauma on symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, anxiety, and depression in  
393 adolescents. *Compr Psychiatry.* 2009;50(2):121–7.
- 394 7. Huremović D. *Psychiatry of pandemics: a mental health response to infection outbreak.*  
395 Springer; 2019.
- 396 8. Lee AM, Wong JG, McAlonan GM, Cheung V, Cheung C, Sham PC, et al. Stress and  
397 psychological distress among SARS survivors 1 year after the outbreak. *Can J Psychiatry.*  
398 2007;52(4):233–40.
- 399 9. Mak IWC, Chu CM, Pan PC, Yiu MGC, Chan VL. Long-term psychiatric morbidities  
400 among SARS survivors. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry.* 2009;31(4):318–26.
- 401 10. Wheaton MG, Abramowitz JS, Berman NC, Fabricant LE, Olatunji BO. Psychological  
402 predictors of anxiety in response to the H1N1 (swine flu) pandemic. *Cogn Ther Res.*  
403 2012;36(3):210–8.
- 404 11. Huang Y, Zhao N. Generalized anxiety disorder, depressive symptoms and sleep quality  
405 during COVID-19 outbreak in China: a web-based cross-sectional survey. *Psychiatry Res.*  
406 2020;112954.
- 407 12. Fuhrman S, Kalyanpur A, Friedman S, Tran NT. Gendered implications of the COVID-19  
408 pandemic for policies and programmes in humanitarian settings. *BMJ Glob Health.*  
409 2020;5(5):e002624.

- 410 13. Liu N, Zhang F, Wei C, Jia Y, Shang Z, Sun L, et al. Prevalence and predictors of PTSS  
411 during COVID-19 outbreak in China hardest-hit areas: Gender differences matter.  
412 *Psychiatry Res.* 2020;112921.
- 413 14. Özdin S, Bayrak Özdin Ş. Levels and predictors of anxiety, depression and health anxiety  
414 during COVID-19 pandemic in Turkish society: The importance of gender. *Int J Soc*  
415 *Psychiatry.* 2020;0020764020927051.
- 416 15. Leung GM, Ho L-M, Chan SK, Ho S-Y, Bacon-Shone J, Choy RY, et al. Longitudinal  
417 assessment of community psychobehavioral responses during and after the 2003 outbreak  
418 of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2005;40(12):1713–20.
- 419 16. Bish A, Michie S. Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours  
420 during a pandemic: A review. *Br J Health Psychol.* 2010;15(4):797–824.
- 421 17. Rubin GJ, Amlôt R, Page L, Wessely S. Public perceptions, anxiety, and behaviour change  
422 in relation to the swine flu outbreak: cross sectional telephone survey. *Bmj.*  
423 2009;339:b2651.
- 424 18. Holbrook TL, Hoyt DB, Stein MB, Sieber WJ. Gender differences in long-term  
425 posttraumatic stress disorder outcomes after major trauma: women are at higher risk of  
426 adverse outcomes than men. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg.* 2002;53(5):882–8.
- 427 19. Ditlevsen DN, Elklit A. Gender, trauma type, and PTSD prevalence: a re-analysis of 18  
428 nordic convenience samples. *Ann Gen Psychiatry.* 2012;11(1):26.
- 429 20. Bahrami F, Yousefi N. Females are more anxious than males: a metacognitive perspective.  
430 *Iran J Psychiatry Behav Sci.* 2011;5(2):83.
- 431 21. McLean CP, Anderson ER. Brave men and timid women? A review of the gender  
432 differences in fear and anxiety. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2009;29(6):496–505.
- 433 22. Herrero MJ, Blanch J, Peri JM, De Pablo J, Pintor L, Bulbena A. A validation study of the  
434 hospital anxiety and depression scale (HADS) in a Spanish population. *Gen Hosp*  
435 *Psychiatry.* 2003;25(4):277–83.
- 436 23. Lodhi FS, Elsous AM, Irum S, Khan AA, Rabbani U. Psychometric properties of the Urdu  
437 version of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) among pregnant women in  
438 Abbottabad, Pakistan. *Gen Psychiatry.* 2020;33(5).
- 439 24. Spinhoven PH, Ormel J, Sloekers PPA, Kempen G, Speckens AEM, Van Hemert AM. A  
440 validation study of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) in different groups  
441 of Dutch subjects. *Psychol Med.* 1997;27(2):363–70.
- 442 25. Simon Kemp. Digital 2020: Pakistan [Internet]. DataReportal – Global Digital Insights.  
443 [cited 2020 Oct 22]. Available from: <https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2020-pakistan>

- 444 26. Ali, Kalbe. Highest male-female gap on cell-phone ownership registered in Pakistan: report  
445 - Newspaper - DAWN.COM [Internet]. dawn.com. [cited 2020 Oct 22]. Available from:  
446 <https://www.dawn.com/news/1538756>
- 447 27. EIU Inclusive Internet Index [Internet]. EIU Inclusive Internet Index. [cited 2020 Oct 22].  
448 Available from: <https://theinclusiveinternet.eiu.com/explore/countries/PK/>
- 449 28. Malik AA. Of migration, marriage, and men: Rethinking the masculinity of transnational  
450 husbands from rural Pakistan. In: Gender and sexuality in Muslim cultures. Routledge;  
451 2016. p. 71–88.
- 452 29. The COVID-19 Sex-Disaggregated Data Tracker | Global Health 50/50 [Internet]. [cited  
453 2020 Oct 22]. Available from: [https://globalhealth5050.org/the-sex-gender-and-covid-19-](https://globalhealth5050.org/the-sex-gender-and-covid-19-project/the-data-tracker/)  
454 [project/the-data-tracker/](https://globalhealth5050.org/the-sex-gender-and-covid-19-project/the-data-tracker/)
- 455 30. Cai H. Sex difference and smoking predisposition in patients with COVID-19. *Lancet*  
456 *Respir Med.* 2020;8(4):e20.
- 457 31. Masud H, Oyebode O. Inequalities in smoking prevalence: a missed opportunity for  
458 tobacco control in Pakistan. *J Public Health.* 2018;40(2):271–8.
- 459 32. Khubaib MU, Shahid ZY, Lodhi SK, Malik H, Jan MM. Prevalence and associated factors  
460 of smoking among final year medical students: a multicentric survey from Pakistan. *Cureus.*  
461 2016;8(7).
- 462 33. Smith PH, Bessette AJ, Weinberger AH, Sheffer CE, McKee SA. Sex/gender differences in  
463 smoking cessation: a review. *Prev Med.* 2016;92:135–40.
- 464 34. Rafique I, Saqib MA, Munir MA, Qureshi H, Rizwanullah KS, Khan SA, et al. Prevalence  
465 of risk factors for noncommunicable diseases in adults: key findings from the Pakistan  
466 STEPS survey. *East Mediterr Health J.* 2018;24(1):33–41.
- 467 35. Lai AG, Pasea L, Banerjee A, Denaxas S, Katsoulis M, Chang WH, et al. Estimating excess  
468 mortality in people with cancer and multimorbidity in the COVID-19 emergency. *medRxiv.*  
469 2020;
- 470 36. Covid CDC, COVID C, COVID C, Chow N, Fleming-Dutra K, Gierke R, et al. Preliminary  
471 estimates of the prevalence of selected underlying health conditions among patients with  
472 coronavirus disease 2019—United States, February 12–March 28, 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly*  
473 *Rep.* 2020;69(13):382.
- 474 37. Greene J. A Health Care Consumer Gender Gap. *Manag Care Langhorne Pa.*  
475 2016;25(8):14–7.
- 476 38. Ghadyani M, Hussain H, Odeh W, Wood P. Issue 2: Responses to the COVID-19 Pandemic  
477 in Syria, Iran and Pakistan. 2020;

- 478 39. Thelwall M, Thelwall S. Covid-19 tweeting in English: Gender differences. ArXiv Prepr  
479 ArXiv200311090. 2020;
- 480 40. Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Statistics, Pakistan Bureau of Statistic. PAKISTAN  
481 EMPLOYMENT TRENDS. :35.
- 482 41. McLaren HJ, Wong KR, Nguyen KN, Mahamadachchi KND. Covid-19 and Women's  
483 Triple Burden: Vignettes from Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Vietnam and Australia. Soc Sci.  
484 2020;9(5):87.
- 485 42. Del Boca D, Oggero N, Profeta P, Rossi M. Women's Work, Housework and Childcare,  
486 before and during COVID-19. 2020;
- 487 43. Zhou M, Hertog E, Kolpashnikova K, Kan M-Y. Gender inequalities: Changes in income,  
488 time use and well-being before and during the UK COVID-19 lockdown. 2020;
- 489 44. Riley T, Sully E, Ahmed Z, Biddlecom A. Estimates of the potential impact of the COVID-  
490 19 pandemic on sexual and reproductive health in low-and middle-income countries. Int  
491 Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2020;46:46.
- 492 45. Sochas L, Channon A, Nam S. Counting Indirect Crisis-Related Deaths In The Context Of  
493 A Low-Resilience Health System.
- 494 46. Delamou A, El Ayadi AM, Sidibe S, Delvaux T, Camara BS, Sandouno SD, et al. Effect of  
495 Ebola virus disease on maternal and child health services in Guinea: a retrospective  
496 observational cohort study. Lancet Glob Health. 2017;5(4):e448–57.
- 497 47. Menéndez C, Lucas A, Munguambe K, Langer A. Ebola crisis: the unequal impact on  
498 women and children's health. Lancet Glob Health. 2015;3(3):e130.
- 499 48. Harman S. Ebola, gender and conspicuously invisible women in global health governance.  
500 Third World Q. 2016;37(3):524–41.
- 501 49. Dynes MM, Miller L, Sam T, Vandi MA, Tomczyk B, Prevention (CDC) C for DC and.  
502 Perceptions of the risk for Ebola and health facility use among health workers and pregnant  
503 and lactating women—Kenema District, Sierra Leone, September 2014. MMWR Morb  
504 Mortal Wkly Rep. 2015;63(51):1226–7.
- 505 50. Stories from the frontline | Marie Stopes International [Internet]. [cited 2020 Oct 22].  
506 Available from: <https://www.mariestopes.org/covid-19/stories-from-the-frontline/>
- 507 51. Alefia T. Hussain. Lost protection [Internet]. The News on Sunday (TNS). 2020 [cited 2020  
508 Oct 22]. Available from: <https://www.thenews.com.pk/tns/detail/652596-lost-protection>
- 509 52. de Paz C, Muller M, Munoz Boudet AM, Gaddis I. Gender Dimensions of the COVID-19  
510 Pandemic. World Bank; 2020.

- 511 53. Wenham C, Smith J, Morgan R. COVID-19: the gendered impacts of the outbreak. *The*  
512 *Lancet*. 2020;395(10227):846–8.
- 513 54. Leung TY, Sharma P, Adithipyangkul P, Hosie P. Gender equity and public health  
514 outcomes: The COVID-19 experience. *J Bus Res*. 2020;
- 515 55. Saleem A, Rizvi WR, Saleem M. Role of Radio Pakistan in Advancing Socio-Economic  
516 Development of Rural Areas.
- 517 56. Routamaa V, Hautala TM. Understanding Cultural Differences: The values in a Cross  
518 Cultural Context. *Int Rev Bus Res Pap*. 2008;4(5):129–37.
- 519 57. Roy D, Tripathy S, Kar SK, Sharma N, Verma SK, Kaushal V. Study of knowledge,  
520 attitude, anxiety & perceived mental healthcare need in Indian population during COVID-  
521 19 pandemic. *Asian J Psychiatry*. 2020;102083.
- 522 58. Wang Y, Di Y, Ye J, Wei W. Study on the public psychological states and its related  
523 factors during the outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in some regions of  
524 China. *Psychol Health Med*. 2020;1–10.
- 525 59. AKU. Study finds high levels of pandemic stress and anxiety [Internet]. [cited 2020 Oct  
526 22]. Available from: [https://www.aku.edu/news/Pages/News\\_Details.aspx?nid=NEWS-](https://www.aku.edu/news/Pages/News_Details.aspx?nid=NEWS-002262)  
527 [002262](https://www.aku.edu/news/Pages/News_Details.aspx?nid=NEWS-002262)
- 528 60. Corbett GA, Milne SJ, Hehir MP, Lindow SW, O'connell MP. Health anxiety and  
529 behavioural changes of pregnant women during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Eur J Obstet*  
530 *Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2020;249:96.
- 531 61. Cao W, Fang Z, Hou G, Han M, Xu X, Dong J, et al. The psychological impact of the  
532 COVID-19 epidemic on college students in China. *Psychiatry Res*. 2020;112934.
- 533
- 534

**Table 1. Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Respondents by Gender**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Female n= 478 No. (%)**</b>	<b>Male n=913 No. (%)**</b>	<b>P-value‡</b>
<b>Age</b>			
18-24years	167 (34.9)	291 (31.9)	0.833
25-34 years	163 (34.1)	315 (34.5)	
35-44 years	89 (18.6)	185 (20.3)	
45-54years	32 (6.7)	72 (7.9)	
55-64 years	19 (4.0)	32 (3.5)	
65-74 years	7 (1.5)	16 (1.8)	
75 years or above	0	1 (0.1)	
Prefer not to disclose	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	
<b>Education</b>			
Intermediate or below	119 (24.9)	188 (20.6)	0.069
Bachelor's or above	358 (74.9)	721 (79.0)	
Prefer not to disclose	1 (0.2)	4 (0.4)	
<b>Household incomes</b>			
PKR 20,000 or below	33 (8.4)	98 (12.0)	0.877
PKR 20,001 – PKR 40,000	53 (13.5)	133 (16.2)	
PKR 40,001 – PKR 60,000	40 (10.2)	99 (12.1)	
PKR 60,001 – PKR 80,000	28 (7.1)	74 (9.0)	
PKR 80,001 – PKR 100,000	28 (7.1)	58 (7.1)	
PKR 100,001 – PKR 120,000	33 (8.4)	85 (10.4)	
> PKR 120,000	63 (16.0)	135 (16.5)	
Prefer not to disclose	115 (29.3)	137 (16.7)	
<b>Permanent residence</b>			

Karachi	329 (68.8)	364 (39.9)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Lahore	36 (7.5)	91 (10.0)	
Islamabad	25 (5.2)	56 (6.1)	
Peshawar	8 (1.7)	45 (4.9)	
Quetta	2 (0.4)	13 (1.4)	
Hyderabad	18 (3.8)	34 (3.7)	
Others*	60 (12.6)	310 (34.0)	

\*\*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

‡Pearson Chi-Square test

**Table 2. Perceived Severity and Susceptibility for COVID-19 in women and men**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Female n= 478 No. (%)*</b>	<b>Male n=913 No. (%)*</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Susceptibility</b>			
<b>1. I might contract the disease if no preventive measure is taken</b>			
Strongly agree	175 (36.6)	336 (36.8)	0.489†
Agree	166 (34.7)	329 (36.0)	
Neutral	58 (12.1)	110 (12.0)	
Disagree	25 (5.2)	44 (4.8)	
Strongly Disagree	54 (11.3)	85 (9.3)	
Don't know	0	9 (1.0)	
<b>2. My family might contract the disease if no preventive measure is taken</b>			
Strongly agree	181 (37.9)	352 (38.6)	0.599†
Agree	172 (36.0)	314 (34.4)	
Neutral	40 (8.4)	106 (11.6)	
Disagree	24 (5.0)	46 (5.0)	
Strongly Disagree	60 (12.6)	85 (9.3)	
Don't know	1 (0.2)	10 (1.1)	
<b>3. I might contract COVID-19 if one of my family members tests positive for the disease</b>			
Strongly agree	141 (29.6)	273 (29.9)	0.844†
Agree	187 (39.2)	333 (36.5)	
Neutral	65 (13.6)	132 (14.5)	
Disagree	25 (5.2)	60 (6.6)	
Strongly Disagree	47 (9.9)	84 (9.2)	
Don't know	12 (2.5)	30 (3.3)	
<b>Severity</b>			

<b>1. Seriousness of symptoms caused by SARS-COVID19</b>			
Very severe	68 (14.2)	79 (8.7)	<b>0.045†</b>
Severe	150 (31.4)	275 (30.1)	
Neutral	126 (26.4)	213 (23.3)	
Not severe	39 (8.2)	91 (10.0)	
Not severe at all	25 (5.2)	48 (5.3)	
Don't know	70 (14.6)	207 (22.7)	
<b>2. Chance of survival if infected with COVID-19</b>			
Very high	67 (14.0)	238 (26.1)	<b>&lt;0.001†</b>
High	214 (44.8)	427 (46.8)	
Neutral	137 (28.7)	136 (14.9)	
Not high	27 (5.6)	38 (4.2)	
Not high at all	5 (1.0)	15 (1.6)	
Don't know	28 (5.9)	59 (6.5)	

\*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

† Mann-Whitney test

**Table 3. Psychological Impact of COVID-19 among men and women**

	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Female No. (%)*</b>	<b>Male No. (%)*</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Anxiety (HADS-A Score)</b>	Normal (<6)	184 (38.5)	455 (49.8)	<b>&lt;0.001</b> ‡
	Abnormal (≥ 6)	294 (61.5)	458 (50.2)	
	Mean (±SD)	6.80 (3.61)	5.93 (3.58)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Depression (HADS-D Score)</b>	Normal (<8)	202 (42.3)	417 (45.7)	0.244‡
	Abnormal (≥ 8)	276 (57.7)	496 (54.3)	
	Mean (±SD)	8.39 (3.93)	8.01 (3.69)	0.079
<b>1. COVID-19 will affect my job</b>	Agree/	278 (58.3)	559 (61.2)	0.242‡
	Neutral	78 (16.4)	149 (16.3)	
	Disagree	102 (21.4)	177 (19.4)	
	Don't know	19 (4.0)	28 (3.1)	
<b>2. COVID-19 will affect my personal life</b>	Agree	301 (63.0)	581 (63.6)	0.263‡
	Neutral	73 (15.3)	171 (18.7)	
	Disagree	97 (20.3)	150 (16.4)	
	Don't know	7 (1.5)	11 (1.2)	
<b>3. COVID-19 has affected my sleeping pattern</b>	Agree	193 (40.4)	352 (38.6)	0.710‡
	Neutral	77 (16.1)	161 (17.6)	
	Disagree	190 (39.7)	372 (40.7)	
	Don't know	18 (3.8)	28 (3.1)	
<b>4. COVID-19 has affected my eating habits</b>	Agree	170 (35.6)	329 (36.1)	0.726‡
	Neutral	90 (18.8)	158 (17.3)	
	Disagree	208 (43.5)	399 (43.8)	
	Don't know	10 (2.1)	26 (2.9)	
<b>5. I might start smoking cigarettes/my smoking cigarette</b>	Agree	28 (5.9)	102 (11.2)	<b>&lt;0.001</b> ‡

<b>consumption might increase</b>	Neutral	23 (4.8)	95 (10.4)	
	Disagree	411 (86.0)	669 (73.3)	
	Don't know	16 (3.3)	47 (5.1)	
<b>6. I might start/increase the use of recreational drugs (such as marijuana, crystal meth, cocaine or opium products etc.)</b>	Agree	21 (4.4)	51 (5.6)	<b>0.001†</b>
	Neutral	21 (4.4)	69 (7.6)	
	Disagree	417 (87.2)	747 (81.8)	
	Don't know	19 (4.0)	46 (5.0)	

\*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

† Mann-Whitney test ‡ Pearson Chi-square test

**Table 4. Adoption of Precautionary measures**

Variable	Female	Male	P-value
	No. (%)	No. (%)	
<b>Adoption of Precautionary Measures (frequency of yes response) *</b>			
1. Wear face masks	444 (92.9)	834 (91.3)	<b>0.025</b> ‡
2. Wash hands frequently (With soap or hand sanitizer)	476 (99.6)	891 (97.6)	<b>0.012</b> ‡
3. Disinfecting floors and tables at home (with phenyl products)	391 (81.8)	646 (70.8)	<b>&lt;0.001</b> ‡
4. Cover nose and mouth when sneezing or coughing	468 (97.9)	870 (95.3)	<b>0.043</b> ‡
5. Avoid contacting people who have fever or respiratory symptoms	452 (94.6)	832 (91.1)	<b>0.040</b> ‡
6. Avoid contacting people who have been traveling abroad within one month	441 (92.3)	800 (87.6)	0.058‡
7. Avoid going out	417 (87.2)	646 (70.8)	<b>&lt;0.001</b> ‡
8. Avoid crowded areas	457 (95.6)	840 (92.0)	<b>0.003</b> ‡
9. Avoid going to meat shops/market	391 (81.8)	580 (63.5)	<b>&lt;0.001</b> ‡
10. Avoid going to hospital or clinic	373 (78.0)	648 (71.0)	<b>&lt;0.001</b> ‡
11. Avoid going to work	346 (72.4)	516 (56.5)	<b>&lt;0.001</b> ‡

\*Multiple answers † Mann-Whitney test ‡ Pearson Chi-square test

**Table 5. Perceived reliability of information sources in Pakistan by Gender**

Variable	Female	Male	P-value†
	n= 478	n=913	
	No. (%)*	No. (%)*	
<b>Reliability of information sources</b>			
<b>a. Newspaper</b>			
Reliable/Very reliable	248 (56.0)	512 (58.2)	0.843
Neutral	150 (33.9)	256 (29.2)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	45 (10.1)	111 (12.6)	
<b>b. Magazine</b>			
Reliable/Very reliable	173 (38.5)	389 (44.0)	0.104
Neutral	186 (41.4)	329 (37.2)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	90 (20.0)	167 (18.9)	
<b>c. Radio</b>			
Reliable/Very reliable	207 (46.0)	486 (54.9)	<b>0.014</b>
Neutral	185 (41.1)	284 (32.1)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	58 (12.9)	115 (13.0)	
<b>d. Television</b>			
Reliable/Very reliable	258 (57.3)	541 (61.1)	0.401
Neutral	117 (26.0)	206 (23.3)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	75 (16.7)	138 (15.6)	
<b>e. Official websites, like the Government</b>			
Reliable/Very reliable	367 (81.4)	727 (82.2)	0.507
Neutral	61 (13.5)	93 (10.5)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	23 (5.1)	64 (7.2)	
<b>f. Unofficial websites</b>			
Reliable/Very reliable	99 (22.0)	271 (30.7)	<b>0.013</b>

Neutral	138 (30.7)	256 (29.0)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	212 (47.3)	357 (40.3)	
<b>g. Social media platforms (WhatsApp, Facebook, Instagram)</b>			
Reliable/Very reliable	131 (29.2)	286 (32.3)	0.459
Neutral	130 (29.0)	236 (26.6)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	188 (41.8)	364 (41.1)	
<b>h. Your doctor</b>			
Reliable/Very reliable	410 (91.1)	775 (87.6)	<b>0.041</b>
Neutral	33 (7.3)	96 (10.8)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	7 (1.6)	14 (1.6)	
<b>i. Your family or friends</b>			
Reliable/Very reliable	206 (46.0)	471 (53.3)	<b>0.003</b>
Neutral	155 (34.6)	288 (32.6)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	87 (19.4)	125 (14.1)	

---

\*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

† Mann-Whitney test

**Table 6. Predictors of Anxiety in Pakistan**

Characteristics	cOR (95% CI)	P-value	aOR* (95% CI)	P-value
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	1.59 (1.27-1.99)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	1.69 (1.26-2.27)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Male	Reference		Reference	
<b>Age</b>				
18-24years	2.36 (1.65-3.38)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	2.68 (1.70-4.23)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
25-34 years	2.57 (1.80-3.68)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	2.77 (1.82-4.22)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
35-44 years	2.42 (1.64-3.56)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	2.53 (1.61-3.99)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
45 or above	Reference		Reference	
<b>Household incomes</b>				
≤ PKR 60,000	1.69 (1.20-2.36)	<b>0.002</b>	1.49 (1.05-2.11)	<b>0.027</b>
PKR 60,001 – PKR 120,000	1.85 (1.29-2.65)	<b>0.001</b>	1.84 (1.27-2.67)	<b>0.001</b>
> PKR 120,000	Reference		Reference	

\*Adjusted for gender, age, education, household income

**Table 7. Predictors of Depression in Pakistan**

Characteristics	cOR (95% CI)	P-value	aOR (95% CI)	P-value
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	1.15 (0.92-1.44)	0.224	1.28 (0.96-1.71)	0.087
Male	Reference		Reference	
<b>Age</b>				
18-24years	1.48 (1.04-2.09)	<b>0.027</b>	1.26 (0.81-1.95)	0.305
25-34 years	1.34 (0.95-1.89)	0.093	1.32 (0.88-1.97)	0.183
35-44 years	1.42 (0.97-2.07)	0.069	1.44 (0.93-2.24)	0.103
45 or above	Reference		Reference	
<b>Household incomes</b>				
≤ PKR 60,000	1.57 (1.12-2.19)	<b>0.009</b>	1.53 (1.09-2.17)	<b>0.015</b>
PKR 60,001 – PKR 120,000	1.99 (1.39-2.85)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	1.99 (1.38-2.87)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
> PKR 120,000	Reference		Reference	

\*Adjusted for gender, age, education, household income,