

## **Understanding of and Trust in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Revised COVID-19 Isolation and Quarantine Guidance Among US Adults**

Vishala Mishra, MBBS

Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health

Joseph P. Dexter, PhD

Data Science Initiative, Harvard University

Corresponding Author:

Joseph P. Dexter, PhD

Data Science Initiative

Science and Engineering Complex

Harvard University

150 Western Avenue

Allston, MA 02134

[jdexter@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:jdexter@fas.harvard.edu)

(802) 338-1330

Word Count: 647

## **Understanding of and Trust in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Revised COVID-19 Isolation and Quarantine Guidance Among US Adults**

### **Abstract**

On December 27, 2021 the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) announced changes to their guidance for individuals who are exposed to or test positive for COVID-19. The revised recommendations have prompted widespread discussion of both the scientific rationale and communication strategy, including criticism from the American Medical Association.<sup>1,2</sup> In this survey study, we assessed understanding of and trust in the CDC's initial public statement about the new guidance among US adults.

**Introduction** | On December 27, 2021 the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) announced changes to their guidance for individuals who are exposed to or test positive for COVID-19. The revised recommendations have prompted widespread discussion of both the scientific rationale and communication strategy, including criticism from the American Medical Association.<sup>1,2</sup> In this survey study, we assessed understanding of and trust in the CDC’s initial public statement about the new guidance among US adults.

**Methods** | We administered the online survey to 603 participants recruited through Prolific between January 5-6, 2022. The survey instrument is provided in eAppendix 1.

The cohort was assembled using nonprobability convenience sampling of US adults, with quotas chosen to match 2019 US Census data on age, race, ethnicity, and education (eMethods). The study was approved by Harvard University’s Committee on the Use of Human Subjects, and participants provided informed consent electronically before beginning the survey.

Associations between participant characteristics and passage comprehension were determined using ordinal logistic regression.

**Results** | The demographic characteristics of the participants are listed in the Table. Participants answered comprehension questions about application of the isolation and quarantine guidelines to hypothetical scenarios, based on either a vaccination history specified in the question (“scenario” questions) or their own history (“personal” questions). 150 (25%) participants correctly answered all 4 scenario questions, and 180 (30%) participants correctly answered all 4 personal questions (Table). Being unvaccinated for COVID-19 was negatively associated with number of correct responses to both the scenario (odds ratio [OR], 0.74; 95% CI, 0.59-0.93;  $P =$

.01) and personal (OR, 0.61; 95% CI, 0.48-0.77;  $P < .001$ ) questions; not having received a booster was negatively associated with number of correct responses to the personal questions (OR, 0.72; 95% CI, 0.58-0.88;  $P = .001$ ).

The CDC web page stated that vaccination “decreases the risk of severe disease, hospitalization, and death from COVID-19” but gave quantitative estimates only for effectiveness against infection. When participants were asked to guess the effectiveness against hospitalization from COVID-19, the modal response was 30-39% without a booster (139 [23%] participants; Figure) and 70-79% with a booster (177 [29%] participants; Figure), corresponding to the stated numbers for effectiveness against infection (35% and 75%, respectively). A majority of participants guessed that vaccination is less than 90% effective against death from COVID-19 both without (437 [72%] participants) and with a booster (342 [57%]; Figure).

Participants were asked about their current attitudes towards the CDC’s COVID-19 guidance, as well as what their attitudes had been before announcement of the changes. In response to these counterfactual questions (eMethods),<sup>3</sup> 158 (26%) participants indicated that the change in guidance lowered their overall trust of the CDC’s recommendations (Figure). 167 (28%) participants expressed reduced confidence that the agency relies on the best scientific evidence, and 265 (44%) said they now think it is more likely that economic factors influence CDC guidance (Figure).

**Discussion** | Public health messaging about the Omicron variant must balance speed, clarity, and responsiveness to rapid scientific changes.<sup>1,4</sup> In a survey of a representative sample of US adults, comprehension testing of the CDC’s revised guidance revealed widespread gaps in

understanding. The negative association of comprehension scores with vaccination status suggests the recommendations may be least accessible to individuals at greatest risk of infection.

When asked counterfactual questions, many participants expressed reduced trust in CDC recommendations about COVID-19 and a stronger belief that the agency's guidance is influenced by economic considerations. Participants also underestimated the protectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against hospitalization and death, suggesting that specific numbers should have been provided on the web page to reduce variability in risk perception.<sup>5</sup> This omission is notable in light of evidence that highlighting protection against death may reduce COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy.<sup>6</sup>

Limitations of the study include that it was conducted only online, such that individuals without internet access may have been undersampled, and use of a nonprobability sample, which limits generalizability to the US population as a whole.

**Vishala Mishra, MBBS**

**Joseph P. Dexter, PhD**

**Author Affiliations:** Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts (Mishra); Data Science Initiative, Harvard University, Allston, Massachusetts (Dexter).

**Corresponding Author:** Joseph P. Dexter, PhD, Data Science Initiative, Science and Engineering Complex, Harvard University, 150 Western Avenue, Allston, MA 02134 (jdexter@fas.harvard.edu).

**Author Contributions:** Drs Mishra and Dexter had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

*Concept and design:* Both authors.

*Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data:* Both authors.

*Drafting of the manuscript:* Both authors.

*Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content:* Both authors.

*Statistical analysis:* Both authors.

*Obtained funding:* Dexter.

*Supervision:* Both authors.

**Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** Dr Dexter reported receiving grants from the Poynter Institute and the Harvard Data Science Initiative during the conduct of the study. No other disclosures were reported.

**Funding/Support:** This work was supported by a CoronaVirusFacts Alliance Grant from the Poynter Institute and a Harvard Data Science Fellowship.

**Role of the Funder/Sponsor:** The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

1. Mandavilli A. The C.D.C.'s new challenge? Grappling with imperfect science. Published January 17, 2022. Accessed January 27, 2022.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/17/health/cdc-omicron-isolation-guidance.html>

2. Harmon GE. AMA: CDC quarantine and isolation guidance is confusing, counterproductive. Published January 5, 2022. Accessed January 27, 2022.

<https://www.ama-assn.org/press-center/press-releases/ama-cdc-quarantine-and-isolation-guidance-confusing-counterproductive>

3. Graham MH, Coppock A. Asking about attitude change. *Public Opin Q.* 2021;85(1):28-53. doi:10.1093/poq/nfab009

4. Klein WMP, Boutté AK, Brake AK, et al. Leveraging risk communication science across US federal agencies. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2021;5:411-413. doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01081-0

5. Wood S, Schulman K. Beyond politics—Promoting Covid-19 vaccination in the United States. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;384(7):e23. doi:10.1056/NEJMms2033790

6. Merkley E, Loewen PJ. Assessment of communication strategies for mitigating COVID-19 vaccine-specific hesitancy in Canada. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021;4(9):e2126635. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.26635

**Table. Characteristics and Responses of Participants Who Completed the Online Survey About Change in CDC Isolation and Quarantine Guidance**

Characteristic	Participants, % (N = 603)
Age, y	
18-24	70 (12)
25-39	163 (27)
≥40	370 (61)
Gender <sup>a</sup>	
Female	329 (55)
Male	269 (45)
Non-binary, transgender, or other	14 (2)
Ethnicity	
Hispanic or Latinx	77 (13)
Race <sup>a</sup>	
Asian	45 (7)
Black or African American	78 (13)
White	480 (80)
Other <sup>b</sup>	9 (1)
Education	
High school diploma or lower	125 (21)
Some college or associate's degree	279 (46)
Bachelor's degree or higher	199 (33)
Political partisanship	
Democratic (including leaners)	290 (48)
Republican (including leaners)	142 (24)
Independent or other	171 (28)
COVID-19 vaccination history	
Unvaccinated	133 (22)
Partially or fully vaccinated, no booster	199 (33)
Fully vaccinated, booster	271 (45)
Comprehension score (scenarios) <sup>c</sup>	
4	150 (25)
3	188 (31)
2	161 (27)
0-1	104 (17)
Comprehension score (personal) <sup>c</sup>	
4	180 (30)
3	231 (38)
2	127 (21)
0-1	65 (11)
Self-reported impressions of passage <sup>d</sup>	
Accurate and should be trusted	276 (46)
High-quality evidence	269 (45)
Clear and easy to read	396 (66)

<sup>a</sup>Participants could select more than one option.

<sup>b</sup>Includes participants who selected "American Indian or Alaska Native," "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander," or "Another option not listed here."

<sup>c</sup>Number of participants who gave the indicated number of correct answers to these questions.

<sup>d</sup>Number of participants who answered "Strongly agree" or "Agree" about each description on a 6-point Likert scale.

## **Figure. Self-Reported Attitude Changes and Estimated Vaccine Effectiveness Against Hospitalization or Death from COVID-19**

The graphs show (A) estimated effectiveness of a COVID-19 vaccine without a booster against hospitalization (orange bars) or death (gray bars), (B) estimated effectiveness of a COVID-19 vaccine with a booster against hospitalization (orange bars) or death (gray bars), and (C) the percentage of respondents who expressed changes in attitude before and after release of the revised guidance in response to three counterfactual questions.

