medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.15.21251765; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

When efficacy and adherence conflict: preferences and patterns of response to public health advice during the COVID-19 pandemic

Oded Nov [1]
Graham Dove [1]
Martina Balestra [1]
Katharine Lawrence [2]
Devin Mann [2]
Batia Wiesenfeld [3]
[1]NYU Tandon School of Engineering, New York, NY, USA
[2]NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY, USA
[3]NYU Stern School of Business, New York, NY, USA
Corresponding author: Oded Nov onov@nyu.edu

Abstract

With recurring waves of the Covid-19 pandemic, a dilemma facing public health leadership is whether to provide public advice that is medically optimal (e.g., most protective against infection if followed), but unlikely to be adhered to, or advice that is less protective but is more likely to be followed. To provide insight about this dilemma, we examined and quantified public perceptions about the tradeoff between (a) the stand-alone value of health behavior advice, and (b) the advice's adherence likelihood. In a series of studies about preference for public health leadership advice, we asked 1,061 participants to choose between (1) strict advice that is medically optimal if adhered to but which is less likely to be broadly followed, and (2) relaxed advice, which is less medically effective but more likely to gain adherence - given varying infection expectancies. Participants' preference was consistent with risk aversion. Offering an informed choice alternative that shifts volition to advice recipients only strengthened risk aversion, but also demonstrated that informed choice was preferred as much or more than the risk-averse strict advice.

Introduction

With recurring waves of the Covid-19 pandemic, preventing infection is a key public health strategy that frequently utilizes targeted advice about the behavior expected of the public. Public adherence to practices advised by health experts, however, has been uneven. Both high efficacy and high adherence are necessary for public health policies to generate desired outcomes, yet advice that most effectively protects people from infection (e.g., wearing a mask when outside one's home) is often onerous, leading to low adherence. As a result, a dilemma facing public health leadership is whether to provide public advice that is medically optimal (e.g., most protective against infection if followed), but unlikely to be adhered to, or advice that is less protective but is more likely to be followed.

To provide insight about this dilemma, we examine and quantify public perceptions about the tradeoff between (a) the stand-alone value of health behavior advice (e.g. its efficacy in protecting against infection), and (b) the advice's adherence likelihood (see Figures 1, 2). Following the scientific evidence supporting mask wearing (1,2), in a series of studies we asked 1,061 participants to indicate their opinion about the appropriate public health advice strategies to be used by public health leadership, given different infection rates (i.e., the product of advice's efficacy and adherence with it).

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.15.21251765; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Methods

The study obtained clearance from NYU Institutional Review Board (#IRB-FY2020-4671).

Study 1

We recruited a total of participants on Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) who completed over 100 prior HITs with an approval rate greater than 95%. Between August-September 2020 1,061 participants were presented information on infection expectancies and asked to choose between two directive public health advice strategies:

A. Strict advice that is medically optimal for preventing infection if adhered to, but which is less likely to be broadly followed.
B. More relaxed advice, which is less medically effective at the individual level if adhered to, but more beneficial to reducing infection rates than no advice at all, and which will have higher rates of public adherence.

For the purpose of this study, 'strict advice' was described as 'Advice that is medically best for preventing infection', and participants were shown the example 'Wear a mask at all times outside the home. Keep six feet away from others'. 'Relaxed advice' was described as 'Useful advice that is more likely to be adopted by a larger proportion of people', and the example 'Wear a mask in enclosed public spaces where it is not possible to maintain a safe distance from others'. Participants were given additional explanatory text and an example of projected infection rates for a city of 10,000 inhabitants (see additional information in the Supporting Information section).



Figure 1. Experiment design, Study 1.

To study the effect of different infection expectancies on participants' perceptions of public health advice strategies, in Study 1 participants were either given no information about infection expectancies, or placed in one of three conditions describing infection expectancies associated with strict vs. relaxed advice (see Figure 1). They were then asked to indicate whether public health leadership should offer 'strict advice' or 'relaxed advice'.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.15.21251765; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study 2

In study 2, we sought to evaluate the directive advice strategies (strict and relaxed) in relation to a strategy of informed decision-making (3) whereby the public is informed about the risks, benefits and acceptable alternatives, to empower them to make decisions taking their individual preferences into account. A third option was provided to participants to choose from, in addition to (A) and (B):

C. A strategy in which advice recipients (i.e., members of the public) are presented *both* advice types outlined in (A) and (B), along with their likely adherence and infection rates. (see additional information in the Supporting Information section).



Figure 2. Experiment design, Study 2.

Results

Study 1

Using two-proportion z-tests within condition we found that there was a significant preference for the strict advice strategy (N = 51, 75% [64.7%, 85.3%]) over the relaxed advice (N=17, 25% [14.7%, 35.3%]) when the projected infection rates for 'strict advice' were lower than for 'relaxed advice' (z=4.761, p=0.000). However, when infection rates for strict advice were higher than for relaxed advice, there was no significant preference for either advice type (z=0.948,p=0.34); N(relaxed)=40, 56.3% [44.8%, 67.9%]; N(strict)=31, 43.7% [32.1%, 55.2%]).

There was also no significant preference for advice type when infection expectancies were unknown (z=0.854, p=0.39; N(strict)=74, 53.6% [45.3%, 61.9%]); (N(relaxed)=64, 46.4% [38.06%, 54.70%] or equal (z=0.354, p=0.72; N(strict)=66, 51.6% [42.9%, 60.2%]; N(relaxed)=62, 48.4% [39.8%, 57.1%]).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.15.21251765; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 3. Study 1 results: Proportions of people who preferred each type of advice strategy under various infection expectancy conditions; dashed line: indifference rate (random choice between 2 options); error bars: 95% confidence intervals.

Study 2 Results:

A Chi-squared test of independence was performed to evaluate the relationship between the infection expectancy and participants' preferred advice. The differences between infection expectancies on advice preference was significant (X-squared = 27.307, df = 6, p-value = 0.0001). Chi-squared goodness of fit tests were used to test if the distribution of preferences differed significantly from chance (i.e. probability of ⅓ of selecting any of the advice types) in each condition. Participants' preferences were significantly different from random in all four conditions (see Figure 4 for Chi-squares by condition).

Across conditions, participants displayed a negative preference for the relaxed advice. When infection expectancies were unknown, or higher for relaxed than strict advice, participants' preference for the relaxed advice was significantly lower than all other types. When infection rates were equal for strict and relaxed advice, their preference for the relaxed advice was significantly lower than the informed choice strategy. Even when infection rates indicated that the relaxed advice was superior, advice recipients merely became indifferent.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.15.21251765; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 4. Study 2 results: Proportions of people who preferred each type of advice strategy under various infection expectancy conditions; dashed line: indifference rate (random choice between 3 options); error bars: 95% confidence intervals.

Discussion

Across Studies 1 and 2, where participants displayed a preference between alternative directive (relaxed vs. strict) advice, their preference was consistent with risk aversion. Offering an informed choice alternative that shifts volition to advice recipients only strengthened risk aversion, but also demonstrated that informed choice was preferred as much or more than the risk-averse strict advice.

Participants' risk aversion suggests that they preferred policy makers to minimize social risk with stricter policies. A number of different values may drive this preference. Strict policies may be valued because of moral or ethical reasons, such as the notion that it is ethically desirable to prioritize prosocial (i.e., community-level well-being) over more self-interested (i.e., individual freedom) objectives when lives are at stake (4). Efficiency may also justify a preference for stricter policy advice; public risk, such as that associated with community transmission of a virus, is relatively inescapable and cannot be controlled by individual decision makers. People can therefore maximize their utility by reducing public risk that they cannot manage while accepting controllable private or personal risk, even perhaps in violation of strict directives.

The results of Study 2 suggest that informed choice, which combines information disclosure and recipient participation in decision-making, is preferred by advice recipients to policy maker control, particularly when information suggests that strict policies are not superior from an infection control perspective. Informed choice advice is both more informative and it offers greater freedom and volition to individuals, who have better knowledge of their own preferences. It could therefore be viewed as both more

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.15.21251765; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

individually efficient and fairer. On the other hand, it is more ambiguous and uncertainty-provoking. In our studies, the differences in infection expectancies were not very large and the strict directive may not have been viewed as infringing on personal freedom much more than the relaxed directive. Preferences may shift more if these differences were larger.

Taken together, the findings of both studies suggest that potential advice recipients prefer policy makers to reduce risk and enable informed choice, with a negative preference to a relaxed advice approach under any infection rate scenario.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation award #1928614.

References

Eikenberry, S.E., Mancuso, M., Iboi, E., Phan, T., Eikenberry, K., Kuang, Y., Kostelich, E. and Gumel, A.B., 2020. To mask or not to mask: Modeling the potential for face mask use by the general public to curtail the COVID-19 pandemic. Infect. Disease Modelling, 5, pp.293-308.

Li, T., Liu, Y., Li, M., Qian, X. and Dai, S.Y., 2020. Mask or no mask for COVID-19: A public health and market study. PloS one, 15(8), p.e0237691.

Laine C, and Davidoff F. Patient-centered medicine. A professional evolution. JAMA. 1996; 275:152-6

Jordan, J., Yoeli, E. and Rand, D., 2020. Don't get it or don't spread it? Comparing self-interested versus prosocially framed COVID-19 prevention messaging. https://psyarxiv.com/yuq7x