

1 **A survey of patient and public perceptions and awareness of SARS-CoV-2-related risks**
2 **among participants in India and South Africa**

3
4 **Short Title: Perceptions and awareness of SARS-CoV-2-related risks**
5

6 Oluchi Mbamalu^{1*}, Surya Surendran^{2#}, Vrinda Nampoothiri³, Candice Bonaconsa¹, Fabia Edathadathil³,
7 Nina Zhu⁴, Vanessa Carter⁵, Helen Lambert⁶, Carolyn Tarrant⁷, Raheelah Ahmad^{4,8}, Adrian Brink⁹,
8 Ebrahim Steenkamp¹⁰, Alison Holmes⁴, Sanjeev Singh³, Esmita Charani^{1,4}, Marc Mendelson¹
9

10 ¹ Division of Infectious Diseases & HIV Medicine, Department of Medicine, Groote Schuur Hospital,
11 University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

12 ² Health Systems and Equity, The George Institute for Global Health, New Delhi, India.

13 ³ Department of Infection Control and Epidemiology, Amrita Institute of Medical Sciences, Amrita
14 Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Kochi – Kerala, India.

15 ⁴ National Institute for Health Research, Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated
16 Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance, Department of Medicine, Imperial College London,
17 London, United Kingdom.

18 ⁵ Health Communication and Social Media, Johannesburg, South Africa.

19 ⁶ Department of Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol,
20 United Kingdom.

21 ⁷ Department of Health Sciences, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom.

22 ⁸ Division of Health Services Research and Management, School of Health Sciences, City, University
23 of London, United Kingdom.

24 ⁹ Division of Medical Microbiology, Faculty of Health Sciences, National Health Laboratory Service,
25 Groote Schuur Hospital, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

26 ¹⁰ Statistical Consulting Unit, Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Cape Town, South
27 Africa.
28

29 *** Corresponding author**

30 Oluchi Mbamalu
31 Division of Infectious Diseases & HIV Medicine
32 Department of Medicine
33 University of Cape Town
34 G26/68 Groote Schuur Hospital Observatory, 7925
35 Cape Town, South Africa
36 Tel: +27 79 794 9346
37 Email: oluchi.mbamalu@uct.ac.za
38

39 **Alternative corresponding author**

40 Marc Mendelson
41 Division of Infectious Diseases & HIV Medicine
42 Department of Medicine
43 University of Cape Town
44 G26/68 Groote Schuur Hospital Observatory, 7925
45 Cape Town, South Africa
46 Tel: +27 79 794 9346
47 Email: marc.mendelson@uct.ac.za
48
49

50 # This research was conducted when the author was affiliated with the Department of Infection
51 Control and Epidemiology at Amrita Institute of Medical Sciences, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Kochi
52 – Kerala, India.

53 **ABSTRACT**

54 A cross-sectional survey was performed among the adult population of participating
55 countries, India and South Africa. The purpose of this study was to explore perceptions and
56 awareness of SARS-CoV-2-related risks in the relevant countries. The main outcome measures
57 were the proportion of participants aware of SARS-CoV-2, and their perception of infection
58 risks.

59 Self-administered questionnaires were used to collect data via a web- and paper-based survey
60 over three months. For data capturing, Microsoft Excel was employed, and descriptive
61 statistics used for presenting data. Pearson's Chi-squared test was used to assess
62 relationships between variables, and a p-value less than 0.05 was considered significant.

63 There were 844 respondents (India: n=660, South Africa: n=184; response rate 87.6%), with a
64 61.1% vs 38.3% female to male ratio. Post-high-school or university education was the lowest
65 qualification reported by most respondents in India (77.3%) and South Africa (79.3%). Sources
66 of information about the pandemic were usually media and journal publications (73.2%),
67 social media (64.6%), family and friends (47.7%) and government websites (46.2%). Most
68 respondents correctly identified infection prevention measures (such as physical distancing,
69 mask use), with 90.0% reporting improved hand hygiene practices since the pandemic.
70 Hesitancy or refusal to accept the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine was reported among 17.9% and 50.9%
71 of respondents in India and South Africa, respectively. Reasons cited included rushed vaccine
72 development and the futility of vaccines for what respondents considered a self-limiting flu-
73 like illness.

74 Respondents identified public health promotion measures for SARS-CoV-2. Reported
75 hesitancy to the up-take of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines was much higher in South Africa. Vaccination
76 campaigns should consider robust public engagement and contextually fit communication

77 strategies with multimodal, participatory online and offline initiatives to address public
78 concerns, specifically towards vaccines developed for this pandemic and general vaccine
79 hesitancy.

80 **Key words:** Awareness, Infection prevention, Perception, COVID-19, Vaccination

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101 INTRODUCTION

102 The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has highlighted the importance of infection prevention at
103 individual and community levels. The World Health Organization (WHO) has indicated that for
104 public health infection prevention measures to be successful, all members of society
105 (communities and professional groups included) should be fully engaged [1]. These measures
106 include but are not limited to physical distancing, masking, hand hygiene, avoiding poorly
107 ventilated indoor spaces, and isolation/quarantine if infected or exposed. For efficient buy-in
108 and contribution to these measures, individuals should understand the risks, mode of viral
109 transmission, and consequences of infection. As such, the success of infection prevention
110 measures depends on individual and community-level awareness and the adoption of
111 infection prevention behaviours, which in turn depends on their perceptions and cognizance
112 of risk.

113 While effective public engagement has been highlighted as key to gaining buy-in [2-4],
114 additional research is needed to explore public awareness, perceptions and behaviours about
115 SARS-CoV-2 and how these may influence adherence to public health measures, especially in
116 low- and middle-income countries (LMIC). India (lower-middle-income) and South Africa
117 (upper-middle-income) [5] are countries with emerging economies where the SARS-CoV-2
118 pandemic has had a significant impact [6]. Redeploying the capacity within an existing
119 research collaboration across participating sites in these two countries [7, 8] , we investigated
120 the public's perceptions and awareness of SARS-CoV-2-related risks and infection prevention
121 practices through analysis of data contributed by participants across the two countries.

122

123

124

125 **METHODS**

126 ***Study design***

127 We conducted a cross-sectional web- and paper-based survey. Data were collected using a
128 self-administered questionnaire. Any adult member (over 18 years old) of the public, who
129 provided informed consent before participation, was eligible to participate.

130

131 ***Study development***

132 The study development followed the STROBE cross-sectional reporting guidelines [9], as
133 shown in Table 1 under Supporting Information.

134

135 **Table 1 (Supporting Information): Reporting Checklist for cross-sectional study**

136

137 The research team – made up of pharmacists, physicians, nurses, social scientists, patient
138 advocate and public engagement specialist, and quantitative data analysts – designed a 42-
139 question survey to elicit information on the public’s knowledge, perceptions and awareness
140 of SARS-CoV-2 infection risks. The 4-part survey included participant demographics, general
141 knowledge of SARS-CoV-2, perceived risks and barriers, and self-efficacy. In South Africa,
142 survey questions and participant information leaflets were translated into IsiZulu, IsiXhosa
143 and Afrikaans languages, whereas in India, the paper-based survey was translated into
144 Malayalam for local distribution. The survey was piloted with members of the public, and
145 relevant revisions were made before dissemination.

146 ***Study settings and participant recruitment***

147 The survey was open for participation by any member of the public over a 3-month duration.
148 Voluntary response sampling was utilized. All invited individuals received participant
149 information leaflets, and those willing to participate had to provide informed consent before
150 commencing the survey. Participation was voluntary across both countries.

151 In South Africa, the survey was available online in three languages – IsiXhosa, Afrikaans and
152 English. In India, the survey was available online in the English language, and in the paper
153 format in two languages, English and Malayalam.

154

155 ***Data collection***

156 Data collection took place from 15 September to 15 December 2020 and coincided with the
157 first wave of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in India and the beginning of the second wave in South
158 Africa. In South Africa, the survey was available online *via* Qualtric. In India, in addition to the
159 online platform in English, paper surveys (in English and Malayalam) were also distributed
160 among participants (patients, patient carers and/or visitors) at the study site (hospital) in
161 Kerala.

162

163 ***Ethics Statement***

164 The study was approved by the relevant human research ethics committees at the Amrita
165 Institute of Health Sciences, Kerala, India (Ref: IRB-AIMS-2020-232) and the University of Cape
166 Town, South Africa (Ref: 311/2020). Formal consent was obtained prior to participation in the
167 survey. For the online and paper versions of the survey, consent was indicated by the
168 participant ticking the relevant box for consent on the survey form.

169 ***Statistical analysis***

170 Data from participants who completed the paper-based format were captured in a Microsoft
171 (MS) Excel file and codes assigned, while data of participants who completed the online form
172 were exported to MS Excel. The data from the paper-based and online versions of the survey
173 were cleaned and combined.

174 Descriptive statistics were used to report participant characteristics and survey responses.
175 The underlying outcomes were awareness of the pandemic, perceived threats and barriers,
176 and self-efficacy. Responses were captured as categorical variables, reported as percentages
177 of received feedback for each item of interest (missing data were excluded) or, where
178 possible, data were scaled from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Pearson's Chi-squared
179 test was used to assess relationships between variables, and $p < 0.05$ was considered
180 statistically significant.

181

182 **RESULTS**

183 ***Participant demographics***

184 There was a total of 844 respondents (660 participants from India and 184 participants from
185 South Africa). There were 318 respondents to the online survey and 342 patients or patient
186 carer respondents to the paper survey in India. The response rate for the online survey was
187 87.6% (502/573), calculated as the ratio of participants who clicked on the survey link versus
188 those who commenced participation. The response rate for the paper version of the survey
189 could not be estimated, as respondents returned a higher number of the completed survey
190 forms than the initial number disseminated, indicating the forms had been copied and shared
191 more widely.

192 There were more female (515/844, 61.0%) than male (323/844, 38.3%) respondents (Table
 193 1). Three entries for age were excluded (one was invalid with two selections and two were
 194 missing), resulting in a total response of 657 for age entries. Most of the respondents in India
 195 and South Africa were in the 20-29-year (310; [n=657] 47.2%) and 40-49-year (57; 31.0%) age
 196 groups, respectively.

197 **Table 1** Self-reported respondent demographics

Characteristic	India	South Africa	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Country of residence	660 (78.2)	184 (21.8)	844 (100)
Gender	(n=660)	(n=184)	(n=844)
Male	285 (43.2)	38 (20.7)	323 (38.3)
Female	369 (55.9)	146 (79.3)	515 (61.1)
Prefer not to say	5 (0.8)	0	5 (0.6)
Missing	1 (0.2)	0	0
Age	n = 657 (%)	n = 184 (%)	n = 841 (%)
Younger than 20 years	41 (6.2)	7 (3.8)	48 (5.7)
20 to 29 years	657 (47.2)	14 (7.6)	324 (38.5)
30 to 39 years	133 (20.2)	21 (11.4)	154 (18.3)
40 to 49 years	82 (12.5)	57 (31.0)	139 (16.5)
50 to 59 years	49 (7.5)	49 (26.6)	98 (11.7)
60 to 69 years	30 (4.6)	27 (14.7)	57 (6.8)
70 years and older	12 (1.8)	9 (4.9)	21 (2.5)
Regular water supply	n = 650 (%)	n = 176 (%)	n = 826 (%)
Yes	560 (86.2)	172 (97.7)	732 (88.6)
No	90 (13.8)	4 (2.3)	94 (11.4)
Education	n = 653 (%)	n = 175 (%)	n = 828 (%)
Primary schooling	28 (4.3)	1 (0.5)	29 (3.5)
Secondary schooling	113 (17.3)	25 (13.6)	138 (16.7)
Post-high school	291 (44.6)	96 (52.2)	387 (46.7)
Post-graduate degree	219 (33.5)	50 (27.2)	269 (32.5)
Other	2 (0.3)	3 (1.6)	5 (0.6)
Employment	n = 633 (%)	n = 166 (%)	n = 799 (%)
Student	135 (21.3)	5 (3.0)	140 (17.5)
Employed, part time	35 (5.5)	11 (6.6)	46 (5.8)
Employed, full time	249 (39.3)	62 (37.3)	311 (38.9)
Self-employed	47 (7.4)	50 (30.1)	97 (12.1)
Retired/Pensioner	27 (4.3)	19 (11.4)	46 (5.8)
I was furloughed/laid off during the lockdown	8 (1.3)	5 (3.0)	13 (1.6)

Unemployed	122 (19.3)	13 (7.8)	135 (16.9)
Other	10 (1.6)	1 (0.6)	11 (1.4)

198

199 The percentage of student respondents was higher in India (21.3%, 135/633) than South
200 Africa (3.0%, 5/166). Unemployment was higher among respondents in India (19.3%,
201 122/163) than in South Africa (7.8%, 13/166), while there were more self-employed (30.1%,
202 50/166) and retired (11.4%, 19/166) respondents in South Africa.

203

204 ***Knowledge and concerns of SARS-CoV-2 transmission and infection***

205 Reported sources of SARS-CoV-2 information, completed by 652 and 172 participants in India
206 and South Africa, respectively, are shown in Figures 1a and 1b. Media and journal publications
207 were the most common sources of information, along with social media, family and friends,
208 and government websites. On social media across both countries, Facebook®, WhatsApp®
209 and YouTube® were the most frequently used sites for information about the pandemic.

210

211 **Figure 1a** Respondents' sources of SARS-CoV-2 information (traditional and social
212 media) in India (n=652)

213

214 **Figure 1b** Respondents' sources of SARS-CoV-2 information (traditional and social
215 media) in South Africa (n=172)

216

217 In Table 2, the respondents' knowledge of SARS-CoV-2 transmission routes, infection course
218 and prevention/management options is summarised. The primary route of SARS-CoV-2
219 transmission identified was nasal/oral droplets, airborne particles, and infected body fluids.
220 More than half of the respondents also demonstrated knowledge of SARS-CoV-2 incubation
221 and symptom manifestation, quarantine objectives, and general duration of isolation for
222 infected patients.

223 **Table 2** Respondent's knowledge and experiences of the pandemic

Knowledge of SARS-CoV-2	Response (%)		
	India	South Africa	Total
Major routes of transmission			
Infected bodily fluids	426/516 (82.6)	55/119 (46.2)	481/635 (75.7)
Nasal or oral droplets	555/591 (93.9)	158/165 (95.8)	713/756 (94.3)
Airborne	352/458 (76.9)	114/147 (77.6)	466/605 (77.0)
Foodborne	113/328 (34.5)	9/101 (8.9)	122/429 (28.4)
Waterborne	119/322 (37.0)	5/98 (5.1)	124/420 (29.5)
Other (please specify)	11/60 (18.3)	5/ 25 (20.0)	16/85 (18.8)
Time to symptom onset	n = 626 (%)	n = 171 (%)	n = 797 (%)
Immediately – there is no delay	42 (6.7)	1 (0.6)	43 (5.4)
0 to 2 weeks	448 (71.6)	152 (88.9)	600 (75.3)
2 to 4 weeks	80 (12.8)	12 (7.0)	92 (11.5)
Over 4 weeks	10 (1.6)	2 (1.2)	12 (1.5)
I don't know	35 (5.6)	4 (2.3)	39 (4.9)
Multiple entries	11 (1.8)	0	11 (1.4)
Perceived reason for quarantine of SARS-CoV-2-positive individuals	n = 625 (%)	n = 171 (%)	n = 796 (%)
To help them get better	22 (3.5)	0	22 (2.8)
To prevent them from infecting others	430 (68.8)	124 (72.5)	554 (69.6)
There is no good reason for that	3 (0.5)	12 (7.0)	15 (1.9)
Other, please specify	1 (0.2)	2 (1.2)	3 (0.4)
I don't know	9 (1.4)	0	9 (1.1)
Multiple entries	159 (25.4)	33 (19.3)	192 (24.1)
Duration of isolation (if not admitted to a healthcare facility)	n = 625 (%)	n = 171 (%)	n = 796 (%)
As soon as coughing stops	5 (0.8)	0	5 (0.6)
10 to 14 days after symptoms first started	314 (50.0)	136 (79.5)	450 (56.5)
As soon as they feel better	36 (5.7)	3 (1.8)	39 (4.9)
21 days after symptoms stop	110 (17.5)	9 (5.3)	119 (14.9)
For asymptomatic cases: as advised by healthcare guidelines	61 (9.7)	10 (5.8)	71 (8.9)
They do not need to be isolated	3 (0.5)	9 (5.3)	12 (1.5)
I don't know	28 (4.5)	4 (2.3)	32 (4.0)
Multiple entries	71 (11.3)	0	71 (8.9)
Changes in hand washing practices	n = 615 (%)	n = 167 (%)	n = 782 (%)
I wash/sanitise my hands more often	561 (91.2)	143 (85.6)	704 (90.0)
I wash/sanitise my hands less often	13 (2.1)	0	13 (1.7)
There is no difference in how often I wash/sanitise my hands	18 (2.9)	23 (13.8)	41 (5.2)
Other, please specify	2 (0.3)	1 (0.6)	3 (0.4)
I don't know	6 (1.0)	0	6 (0.8)
Multiple entries	15 (2.4)	0	15 (1.9)
Avoided visit to healthcare facility because of SARS-CoV-2-	n = 594 (%)	n = 161 (%)	n = 755 (%)
Yes	171 (28.8)	60 (37.3)	231 (30.6)

	No	353 (59.4)	70 (43.5)	423 (56.0)
Not applicable/had no need to visit a healthcare facility		70 (11.8)	31 (19.3)	101 (13.4)
Would you have a SARS-CoV-2 vaccination?		n = 587 (%)	n = 161 (%)	n = 748 (%)
	Yes	482 (82.1)	79 (49.1)	561 (75.0)
	No	36 (6.1)	55 (34.2)	91 (12.2)
	I don't know	69 (11.8)	27 (16.8)	96 (12.8)

224

225

226 More frequent hand washing was reported across both countries (90.0%); however, a higher
 227 percentage of respondents in South Africa (13.8%) than in India (2.9%) noted no difference in
 228 their hand hygiene practices. Overall, 75.0% of all the respondents indicated their willingness
 229 to receive vaccination when it becomes available; however, the percentages were higher in
 230 India (82.1%) than in South Africa (49.1%). The most common reasons cited for apathy to
 231 vaccination were perceptions of rushed vaccine development and the futility of vaccines for
 232 what respondents considered a self-limiting flu-like illness.

233

234 ***Self-efficacy: perceptions of SARS-CoV-2 infection prevention measures***

235 Respondents' perceptions and concerns about their ability to cope with SARS-CoV-2 infection
 236 prevention measures are presented in Figure 2, given their perceived knowledge and
 237 awareness of the pandemic and infection risks. More than half of respondents in each country
 238 reported that they have sufficient knowledge of SARS-CoV-2, understood available
 239 information on the pandemic, would know what to do or questions to ask if they or someone
 240 else contracted SARS-CoV-2, and have access to healthcare were they to become ill with SARS-
 241 CoV-2 infection, and would be able to cope with extended containment measures such as a
 242 lockdown. Compared to South Africa, more respondents in India reported concern over
 243 infection, its financial implications and associated stigma. On the intent to wear a face mask,

244 8.6% and 26.2% of respondents in India and South Africa reported dissatisfaction with this
245 measure while outdoors, respectively.

246
247 **Figure 2:** Respondents' perceptions of self-efficacy in relation to coping with the
248 COVID-19 pandemic in South Africa (SA) and India
249

250 There was no statistical significance between hand washing and water supply (Table 3), as
251 even those without access to water supply reported that they washed their hands more
252 frequently since the pandemic ($p = 0.2168$ and $p = 0.7970$ in India and South Africa,
253 respectively). Water supply showed a mixed relationship with employment as some full-time
254 workers had no access to water. The test highlights a difference between participants in the
255 two countries; $p = 0.008$ and 0.4471 for India and South Africa, respectively.

256

257 **Table 3** Relationships between selected variables

A. Is hand washing affected by water supply?				
Hand wash frequency	India		South Africa	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Wash more	476	79	140	3
Wash less	13	0	0	0
No change	15	2	22	1
Other	2	0	1	0
Don't know	5	1	0	0
Multiple	10	5	0	0
p-value	0.2168		0.797	

B. Is water supply affected by employment?				
Employment Status	India		South Africa	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Student	124	9	5	0
Part time	27	8	11	0
Full time	217	29	62	0
Self-employed	40	7	47	3
Unemployed	101	20	12	1
Retired	18	8	19	0
Other	8	2	1	0

Laid off	4	4	5	0
<i>p-value</i>	<i>0.0008026</i>		<i>0.4471</i>	

C. Is avoidance of healthcare facilities because of fear of COVID-19 contraction influenced by age?

Age	India			South Africa		
	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
<20	11	15	11	2	1	1
20-29	83	147	42	4	4	2
30-39	28	81	9	7	9	4
40-49	24	49	4	21	18	12
50-59	11	31	3	17	19	8
60-69	10	19	1	8	14	3
>=70	2	10	0	1	5	1
<i>p-value</i>	<i>0.001451</i>			<i>0.9008</i>		

D. Is avoidance of health care facilities because of fear of COVID-19 contraction influenced by employment?

Employment Status	India			South Africa		
	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
Student	37	57	27	2	1	1
Part time	12	20	1	5	3	3
Full time	57	137	27	25	21	11
Self-employed	11	28	2	10	26	10
Unemployed	31	79	5	5	6	1
Retired	9	17	0	8	7	2
Other	5	3	1	0	1	0
Laid off	1	4	3	0	2	2
<i>p-value</i>	<i>0.0002084</i>			<i>0.4076</i>		

258

259 Our results show that some respondents avoided healthcare facilities during this pandemic.

260 Some participants in this study, particularly in India, reported avoiding healthcare facilities

261 because of a fear of contracting the COVID-19 virus; this was affected by employment status,

262 more in India ($p = 0.0002$) than in South Africa ($p = 0.4076$).

263

264

265

266

267 **DISCUSSION**

268 This study provides insight into the public's awareness and perspectives of the SARS-CoV-2
269 infection and risks in two middle-income countries hard hit by the pandemic [6]. The aim was
270 to gain some understanding of the knowledge and views about the pandemic, particularly
271 when considering the expected roles that the public have in this pandemic regarding social
272 distancing and infection prevention through hand hygiene, mask use and vaccination uptake.

273 At the time of the study, these two countries were at different phases of the pandemic
274 infection curves with no viable vaccines available. Although these data are somewhat dated,
275 these findings add to the body of knowledge on the public's perceptions of the pandemic.
276 Also, how a better understanding of this information can be leveraged for improved infection
277 prevention and behavioural interventions and promotions for this and the future infectious
278 disease pandemics. Such knowledge will be helpful in infectious disease pandemic control and
279 mitigation, including in the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. The insight from this study can assist
280 with measures to address continued vaccine hesitancy and inequity when many countries are
281 dealing with a fourth or subsequent infection wave.

282 From the onset of the pandemic, efforts have been communicated to inform the public of
283 infection risks and required containment/mitigation measures. The need for public
284 engagement and hygiene intervention, behaviour change, and consideration of socio-cultural
285 aspects in public awareness initiatives in India and South Africa has been noted in the
286 literature [10-14]. The volume of news media dedicated to the pandemic may also have
287 served to provide education and awareness among the public. Conversely, it may have fuelled
288 confusion and panic, particularly on the diverse online channels where unbridled and
289 unverified evidence and opinions compete for attention with information from local and
290 global health authorities.

291 Survey respondents demonstrated awareness of the pandemic, with most identifying the
292 primary routes of transmission, incubation period, symptoms of infection, and recommended
293 measures for infection prevention and management of mild conditions, including the reason
294 for and duration of isolation. Information on the pandemic was generally gained from
295 traditional and social media, family and friends, and government websites. Respondents'
296 reliance on general and social media as sources of pandemic-related information highlights
297 the role played by the media in pandemic containment and mitigation.

298 The information landscape has changed extensively in the last three decades, prompting the
299 need to address not only the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic but also its related infodemic [15]. While
300 the main aspects of an infodemic refer to inaccurate and misleading information shared
301 through digital and physical environments during disease outbreaks, disinformation refers to
302 the deliberate spread of false information. In this pandemic, we are increasingly witnessing a
303 growing infodemic driven by misinformation, including a worrying trend in the escalation of
304 disinformation through traditional and social/digital media [16-18]. The role of the media,
305 traditional and digital alike, in framing and rapidly disseminating information is evident in this
306 pandemic, particularly when related to influencing behaviours and empowering individuals
307 with the accurate information to make informed decisions regarding IPC [15, 19-21].

308 Family and friends were noted as sources of SARS-CoV-2 information by respondents in the
309 survey. Word of mouth presented face-to-face or through various communication channels
310 within families and among friends, though not specifically a media source, is an essential
311 source of information. It is also a key route for spreading misinformation, mainly because of
312 the trust between the source and the recipient. Thus, the prominence of influencers (in the
313 community and on digital platforms alike) in disseminating pandemic-related information is
314 highlighted.

315 The findings of this study underscore the importance of various media as sources of
316 information for informed decision-making among the public. It also draws attention to the
317 relevance of social media, and family and friends, as sources of pandemic-related information
318 for the public. Given the infodemic that has trailed the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic on all media
319 [21, 22], there is a need for evidence-informed and timely communication in continually
320 addressing pandemic-related misinformation and disinformation. Infodemic management is
321 multifaceted, requiring different disciplines to address it. Beyond communication, factors
322 influencing an individual's behaviours may relate to external pressures, including the
323 economy, politics, education, health literacy and religious or cultural beliefs.

324 Some respondents in this study considered SARS-CoV-2 to be food- or water-borne. Such
325 beliefs may impact infection prevention measures; while there has been research into
326 transmission by these routes [23, 24], they have not been noted as primary transmission
327 routes for the viral infection. Droplet and airborne transmission have been noted as some
328 primary transmission routes, with the use of face masks a significant intervention in reducing
329 the spread of the infection [25, 26].

330 Across both countries, some respondents expressed somewhat reluctance to mask-wearing,
331 despite their concern about contracting the infection, which may be related to the stigma or
332 discomfort of masks. Stigma, known to influence/compromise infection prevention
333 behaviours [27, 28], needs to be addressed, locally and globally, not only for the current
334 pandemic but also for future ones, and improved adherence to optimised infection
335 prevention practices.

336 Among other options to reduce infection risk, hand hygiene has been prioritised in public
337 health messages for pandemic mitigation [29]. Access to clean water is critical for hand
338 hygiene and is among the tools to address and mitigate the impact of the pandemic, as

339 highlighted in the literature [29, 30]. While water supply did not affect hand hygiene
340 frequency among respondents, it highlighted a difference between study participants in the
341 two countries. Infection prevention measures such as hand hygiene and physical distancing
342 may pose a challenge in some LMIC (India and South Africa are examples), especially in under-
343 resourced sections of rural areas or densely populated urban settings [29, 30].

344 Isolation and quarantine of infected and exposed individuals are underlying measures for
345 infectious disease control, though this may prove challenging. Responses to SARS-CoV-2-
346 related isolation/quarantine duration reflect respondents' perceptions of SARS-CoV-2
347 incubation. While there was an initial consensus on a 14-day isolation/quarantine period for
348 infected/affected individuals, there have been shifts and debates on the optimum incubation
349 period of the virus, hence, the duration of isolation and quarantine measures [31].
350 Respondents' responses reflected this, more so in India, where discussions about extended
351 isolation periods have been reported [32].

352 Lockdown measures instituted in various parts of the world following the spread of SARS-CoV-
353 2 served as another infectious disease mitigation strategy. With the rise of infection
354 transmission and the attendant lockdown measures, it was expected that individuals would
355 have avoided visiting healthcare facilities. Some participants in this study, particularly in India,
356 reported avoiding healthcare facilities because of a fear of contracting the COVID-19 virus;
357 this was influenced by employment status, more in India than in South Africa. Employed
358 participants may be more likely motivated to maintain good health or hesitant to confirm
359 illness, for fear of losing money or work, resulting in fewer visits to healthcare facilities, than
360 those unemployed. While lockdown measures can reduce patient presentation to healthcare
361 facilities [33, 34], such a decline in presentation may also be associated with later
362 presentations with more severe consequences. Initiatives are required to address gaps in

363 patient care necessitated by public health promotion strategies such as lockdowns in this and
364 future pandemics.

365 Across the two countries, attitudes to the vaccination were positive. However, the country
366 analysis showed this was driven by higher vaccine acceptance in India, with respondents in
367 South Africa more cautious regarding COVID-19 vaccination. Reasons cited for hesitancy or a
368 negative attitude to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination were related to mistrust in the vaccine
369 development process and the futility of vaccines for what respondents considered a self-
370 limiting flu-like illness.

371 This survey was, however, conducted before SARS-CoV-2 vaccines were available. Hesitancy
372 towards the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine had been noted earlier in the pandemic, fuelled by infodemic
373 on communication channels and the public's belief in SARS-CoV-2-related conspiracies [35,
374 36]. The notion that the pandemic has been grossly exaggerated and reported, with
375 unnecessary financial and other stresses on populations, was expressed by some participants
376 who provided additional free text information. As the pandemic evolves, research to better
377 understand infection and vaccine-related concerns among the general population is needed
378 to support targeted and contextually appropriate strategies promoting vaccine uptake and
379 optimised infection prevention behaviours.

380 Among individuals with opposing opinions about vaccination, using social science methods to
381 study underlying reasons and contexts for their views, along with highlighting the individual
382 rather than the collective advantages of vaccination, may provide helpful and relatable insight
383 [36, 37]. This could be particularly important when considered in light of recent research and
384 noted factors that may influence vaccine perception and uptake [38-40]. More recent
385 research has provided insight into dealing with vaccine-hesitancy as well as the challenges
386 associated with anti-vaxxers [41]. Public health campaigns and vaccination promotions should

387 therefore understand and leverage social listening techniques to comprehend public
388 perceptions concerning communication gaps. A similar method of social listening should be
389 developed for community and traditional settings to understand why various beliefs and
390 behaviours related to COVID-19 emerged.

391

392 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS**

393 Our study provides unique insights into the public's attitudes and practices across two LMIC
394 during the early stages of this pandemic. The findings are subject to some limitations, which
395 should be considered in its interpretation.

396 First, being a cross-sectional study, the relevance of the findings may change over time and
397 with interventions, especially as subsequent waves of COVID-19 have been reported. Second,
398 the online distribution of the survey and the limited paper version may have limited its reach,
399 particularly under-representing individuals from diverse socio-economic levels. Third, data
400 collection across both sites did not rely on the same methods, given the COVID-19 restrictions
401 at the time of data collection, which likely influenced the sample sizes across the sites. Sample
402 size may also have been influenced by survey fatigue, challenges with Internet access in LMIC,
403 and other limitations associated with accessing and participating in the survey at the time of
404 the survey roll-out.

405 Survey respondents are therefore not representative of the public in either of the two
406 countries, limiting the generalizability of findings. In addition, this survey was conducted
407 between September and December 2020, when both countries were at different phases of
408 the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. The differences in experiences across the countries may have
409 influenced the responses provided.

410 Nevertheless, this paper fills a gap in the knowledge, awareness and attitudes of the public in
411 India and South Africa towards IPC practices in the context of COVID-19 within the first year
412 of the pandemic. It will be beneficial for charting public understanding and perception of the
413 COVID-19 pandemic and provide informative data that can be employed for public
414 engagement in other infectious disease control and mitigation across both sites and similar
415 contexts. While this research presents the data for each country separately, it is not its
416 intention to make any statistical comparisons between participants in the two countries.
417 Despite that, the individual test on how employment affects water supply and the avoidance
418 of healthcare settings during lockdown provided some insight on differences between
419 participants in the two countries. Thus, the need for pandemic mitigation efforts to consider
420 differences in context and subjects for the delivery of context-specific and appropriate
421 interventions is highlighted.

422

423

424 **CONCLUSIONS**

425 This study presents socio-economic and demographic data, which may influence public
426 awareness and behaviour and further be explored in pandemic mitigation initiatives among
427 the public in both countries. Survey respondents correctly identified public health promotion
428 measures for SARS-CoV-2. Reported disinclination to mask-wearing and reported hesitancy
429 for the uptake of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination highlight gaps that can be addressed for improved
430 pandemic mitigation efforts. Further research to explore the outlook towards mask use and
431 vaccination across both countries can provide more insight on factors influencing infection
432 prevention and vaccine apathy. Vaccination campaigns should consider robust public
433 engagement and more targeted communication strategies using tactics like social listening,

434 with multimodal, participatory online and offline initiatives to address the infodemic that
435 drives public concerns. Furthermore, this can contribute to developing a better understanding
436 of the driving force behind vaccine hesitancy among different populations.

437

438 **Acknowledgements**

439 The authors express appreciation to all survey participants and members of the public who
440 participated in the review of or provided feedback on the survey tool, and to Ms Jean Fourie
441 for review and editing of the manuscript.

442

443 **Author contributions**

444 OM conceptualised and wrote the initial protocol for the study, with additional input and
445 revision from CB, VC, HL, RA, SSingh and overall oversight by EC and MM. OM, SSurendran
446 and EC coordinated the data collection with input from NZ, SSurendran, VN, and FE
447 contributed to data capturing; OM, FE and ES contributed to the data analysis. OM wrote the
448 first draft of the manuscript, with input from SSurendran and oversight from EC and MM. All
449 authors contributed to subsequent revisions and approval of the final draft.

450

451 **Funding sources**

452 The work was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) as part of the
453 Antimicrobial Cross Council Initiative supported by the seven UK research councils, the
454 Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) as part of the ASPIRES project
455 (<https://www.imperial.ac.uk/arc/aspires/>), the National Institute for Health Research, UK
456 Department of Health [HPRU-2012-10047] in partnership with Public Health England and

457 the National Research Foundation of South Africa (Grant Number: 129755). The funders did
458 not have any role in the study design and conduct, review or approval of the manuscript, or
459 the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

460

461 **Declarations**

462 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

463 The study was approved by the relevant human research ethics committees at the Amrita
464 Institute of Health Sciences, Kerala, India (Ref: IRB-AIMS-2020-232) and the University of
465 Cape Town, South Africa (Ref: 311/2020).

466

467 **Competing Interests**

468 The authors declare they have no competing interests.

469

470

471

472 **Patient and public involvement**

473 A patient advocate and public engagement specialist/civil society champion was involved in
474 the design of the study material and also contributed as an author. Members of the public
475 participated in the review of the survey tool and provided feedback for its modification. For
476 the online and paper versions of the survey, consent was indicated by the participant ticking
477 the relevant box for consent on the survey form.

478

479

480 REFERENCES

481

- 482 1. World Health Organization. *COVID- 19 Strategy Up Date*. 2020. Available:
483 [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/covid-strategy-update-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/covid-strategy-update-14april2020.pdf)
484 [14april2020.pdf](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/covid-strategy-update-14april2020.pdf) [accessed 17 August 2020].
- 485 2. Woke FI. Communicating COVID-19 prevention health messages: a case study of
486 South Africa. *WebMed Central*. Published online 2020:11(9): WMC005633. Available:
487 https://www.webmedcentral.com/wmcpdf/Article_WMC005633.pdf [accessed 8
488 August 2021].
- 489 3. Gilmore B, Ndejjo R, Tchetchia A, de Claro V, Mago E, Diallo AA, et al. Community
490 engagement for COVID-19 prevention and control: a rapid evidence synthesis. *BMJ*
491 *Glob Health* 2020;5(10):1-11. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003188
- 492 4. Abdullahi L, Onyango JJ, Mukiira C, Wamicwe J, Githiomi R, Kariuki D, et al. Community
493 interventions in low—and middle-income countries to inform COVID-19 control
494 implementation decisions in Kenya: a rapid systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(12
495 December):1-29. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0242403
- 496 5. World Bank. World Bank Country and Lending Groups – World Bank Data Help Desk.
497 *World Bank*. Published online 2019:1-8. Available:
498 [https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups%0A)
499 [country-and-lending-groups%0A](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups%0A) [accessed 21 June 2021].
- 500 6. World Health Organization (WHO). COVID-19 Weekly Epidemiological Update 54.
501 2021 August 24. Available: [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---24-august-2021)
502 [epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---24-august-2021](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---24-august-2021) [accessed 29 August 2021].
- 503 7. Veepanattu P, Singh S, Mendelson M, Nampoothiri V, Edathadatil F, Surendran S, et al.
504 Building resilient and responsive research collaborations to tackle antimicrobial
505 resistance—lessons learnt from India, South Africa, and UK. *Int J Infect Dis*.
506 2020;100(P278-282). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.08.057>
- 507 8. Singh S, Mendelson M, Surendran S, Bonaconsa C, Mbamalu O, Nampoothiri V, et al.
508 Investigating infection management and antimicrobial stewardship in surgery: a
509 qualitative study from India and South Africa. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. Published online
510 2021:1-27. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.12.013
- 511 9. Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP; STROBE
512 Initiative. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology
513 (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
514 2008;61(4):344-349. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008
- 515 10. Bhatia R. Public engagement is key for containing COVID-19 pandemic. *Indian J Med*
516 *Res*. 2020;151(2):118-120. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_780_20
- 517 11. Fedorowicz M, Arena O, Burrowes K. Community Engagement During The COVID-19
518 Pandemic And Beyond: A Guide For Community-Based Organizations. 2020
519 (September):1-33. Available:
520 [https://www.urban.org/research/publication/community-engagement-during-covid-](https://www.urban.org/research/publication/community-engagement-during-covid-19-pandemic-and-beyond/view/full_report)
521 [19-pandemic-and-beyond/view/full_report](https://www.urban.org/research/publication/community-engagement-during-covid-19-pandemic-and-beyond/view/full_report) [accessed 8 August 2020].
- 522 12. Department of Health (Republic of South Africa). An analysis of social behavioral

- 523 change and the impact on social interactions. *SACoronavirus.co.za*. Published online
524 2020a:1-12. Available: [https://sacoronavirus.co.za/2020/08/20/an-analysis-of-social-](https://sacoronavirus.co.za/2020/08/20/an-analysis-of-social-behavioral-change-and-the-impact-on-social-interactions/)
525 [behavioral-change-and-the-impact-on-social-interactions/](https://sacoronavirus.co.za/2020/08/20/an-analysis-of-social-behavioral-change-and-the-impact-on-social-interactions/)
- 526 13. Malik A, Khan LM, Quan-Haase A. Public health agencies outreach through Instagram
527 during COVID-19 pandemic: crisis and emergency risk communication perspective. *Int*
528 *J Disaster Risk Reduct.* 2021;61, 102346. Available:
529 <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1368&context=fimspub>
- 530 14. Department of Health (Republic of South Africa). COVID-19 national public hygiene
531 strategy and implementation plan. 2020b. Available:
532 [https://www.knowledgehub.org.za/system/files/elibdownloads/2020-04/covid-](https://www.knowledgehub.org.za/system/files/elibdownloads/2020-04/covid-19%20national%20public%20hygiene%20strategy%20and%20implementation%20plan%281%29.pdf)
533 [19%20national%20public%20hygiene%20strategy%20and%20implementation%20pla](https://www.knowledgehub.org.za/system/files/elibdownloads/2020-04/covid-19%20national%20public%20hygiene%20strategy%20and%20implementation%20plan%281%29.pdf)
534 [n%281%29.pdf](https://www.knowledgehub.org.za/system/files/elibdownloads/2020-04/covid-19%20national%20public%20hygiene%20strategy%20and%20implementation%20plan%281%29.pdf) [accessed 8 August 2020].
- 535 15. Lep Ž, Babnik K, Hacin Beyazoglu K. Emotional responses and self-protective behavior
536 within days of the COVID-19 outbreak: the promoting role of information credibility.
537 *Front Psychol.* 2020;11(July):1-8. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01846
- 538 16. Parikh PA, Shah B V, Phatak AG, Vadnerkar AC, Uttekar S, Thacker N, et al. COVID-19
539 pandemic: knowledge and perceptions of the public and healthcare professionals.
540 *Cureus.* 2020;12(5). doi:10.7759/cureus.8144
- 541 17. Wasserman H, Madrid-Morales D. Social Media Users In Kenya And South Africa Trust
542 Science, But Still Share COVID-19 Hoaxes. *The Conversation*, 6 April 2021. Available:
543 [https://theconversation.com/social-media-users-in-kenya-and-south-africa-trust-](https://theconversation.com/social-media-users-in-kenya-and-south-africa-trust-science-but-still-share-covid-19-hoaxes-157894)
544 [science-but-still-share-covid-19-hoaxes-157894](https://theconversation.com/social-media-users-in-kenya-and-south-africa-trust-science-but-still-share-covid-19-hoaxes-157894) [accessed 9 June 2021].
- 545 18. World Health Organization. Social Media & COVID-19: A Global Study of Digital Crisis
546 Interaction among Gen Z and Millennials. 26 March 2021. [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/social-media-covid-19-a-global-study-of-digital-crisis-interaction-among-gen-z-and-millennials)
547 [room/feature-stories/detail/social-media-covid-19-a-global-study-of-digital-crisis-](https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/social-media-covid-19-a-global-study-of-digital-crisis-interaction-among-gen-z-and-millennials)
548 [interaction-among-gen-z-and-millennials](https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/social-media-covid-19-a-global-study-of-digital-crisis-interaction-among-gen-z-and-millennials) [accessed 8 August 2020]
- 549 19. Tarakini G, Mwedzi T, Manyuchi T, Tarakini T. The role of media during COVID-19 global
550 outbreak: a conservation perspective. *Trop Conserv Sci.* 2021;14.
551 doi:10.1177/19400829211008088
- 552 20. Parvin GA, Ahsan R, Rahman MH, Abedin A. Novel coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic:
553 the role of printing media in Asian countries. *Front Commun.* 2020;5(March):1-20.
554 doi:10.3389/fcomm.2020.557593
- 555 21. Dhanani LY, Franz B. The role of news consumption and trust in public health leadership
556 in shaping COVID-19 knowledge and prejudice. *Front Psychol.* 2020;11(October).
557 doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.560828
- 558 22. Loomba S, de Figueiredo A, Piatek SJ, de Graaf K, Larson HJ. Measuring the impact of
559 COVID-19 vaccine misinformation on vaccination intent in the UK and USA. *Nat Hum*
560 *Behav.* 2021;5(3):337-348. doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01056-1
- 561 23. Ceniti C, Tilocca B, Britti D, Santoro A, Costanzo N. Food safety concerns in “COVID-19
562 Era.” *Microbiol Res (Pavia).* 2021;12(1):53-68. doi:10.3390/microbiolres12010006
- 563 24. La Rosa G, Bonadonna L, Lucentini L, Kenmoe S, Suffredini E. Coronavirus in water
564 environments: Occurrence, persistence and concentration methods - A scoping review.
565 *Water Res.* 2020;179:115899. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.115899

- 566 25. Morawska L, Milton DK. It is time to address airborne transmission of coronavirus
567 disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;71(9):2311-2313.
568 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa939
- 569 26. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. COVID-19 transmission—up in the air. *Lancet Respir*
570 *Med*. 2020;8(12):1159. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30514-2
- 571 27. Bhanot D, Singh T, Verma SK, Sharad S. Stigma and discrimination during COVID-19
572 pandemic. *Front Public Health*. 2021;8:5770188. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.577018
- 573 28. Turner-Musa J, Ajayi O, Kemp L. Examining social determinants of health, stigma, and
574 COVID-19 disparities. *Healthcare (Basel)* 2020;8(2):168. doi:
575 10.3390/healthcare8020168
- 576 29. Alzyood M, Jackson D, Aveyard H, Brooke J. COVID-19 reinforces the importance of
577 handwashing. *J Clin Nurs*. 2020;29(15-16):2760-2761. doi:10.1111/jocn.15313
- 578 30. Freeman MC, Caruso BA. Comment on “Global access to handwashing: implications for
579 COVID-19 control in low-income countries”. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2020;128(9):1-2.
580 doi:10.1289/EHP7852
- 581 31. Bikbov B, Bikbov A. Maximum incubation period for COVID-19 infection: do we need to
582 rethink the 14-day quarantine policy? *Travel Med Infect Dis*. 2020;(January):2020-
583 2022. doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2021.101976
- 584 32. Li ZY, Zhang Y, Peng LQ, Gao RR, Jing JR, Wang JL, et al. Demand for longer quarantine
585 period among common and uncommon COVID-19 infections: A scoping review. *Infect*
586 *Dis Poverty*. 2021;10(1):1-9. doi:10.1186/s40249-021-00847-y
- 587 33. Jain R, Dupas P. *The Effects of India’s COVID-19 Lockdown on Critical Non-COVID Health*
588 *Care and Outcomes*. Working Paper Series on Health and Demographic Change in the
589 Asia-Pacific. 23 September 2020. Asia Health Policy Program working paper #60.
590 Available: https://fsi-live.s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/ahpp_wp_60.pdf
591 [accessed 10 June 2021].
- 592 34. Burger R, Day C, Deghaye N, Nkonki L, Rensburg R, Smith A, et al. Examining the
593 Unintended Consequences of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Public Sector Health Facility
594 Visits: The First 150 Days. 2020. Available: [https://cramsurvey.org/wp-](https://cramsurvey.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/16.-Examining-the-unintended-consequences-of-the-COVID-19-pandemic-on-public-sector-health-facility-visits-The-first-150-days-2.pdf)
595 [content/uploads/2020/12/16.-Examining-the-unintended-consequences-of-the-](https://cramsurvey.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/16.-Examining-the-unintended-consequences-of-the-COVID-19-pandemic-on-public-sector-health-facility-visits-The-first-150-days-2.pdf)
596 [COVID-19-pandemic-on-public-sector-health-facility-visits-The-first-150-days-2.pdf](https://cramsurvey.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/16.-Examining-the-unintended-consequences-of-the-COVID-19-pandemic-on-public-sector-health-facility-visits-The-first-150-days-2.pdf)
597 [accessed 10 June 2021].
- 598 35. Kanozia R, Arya R. “Fake news”, religion, and COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in India,
599 Pakistan, and Bangladesh. *Media Asia*. 2021;0(0):1-9.
600 doi:10.1080/01296612.2021.1921963
- 601 36. Schwarzinger M, Luchini S. Addressing COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: is official
602 communication the key? *Lancet Public Heal*. 2021;6(6):e353-e354. doi:10.1016/s2468-
603 2667(21)00108-0
- 604 37. Freeman D. COVID vaccine hesitancy: spell out the personal rather than collective
605 benefits to persuade people — new research. *The Conversation* (13 May 2021).
606 Available: [https://theconversation.com/covid-vaccine-hesitancy-spell-out-the-](https://theconversation.com/covid-vaccine-hesitancy-spell-out-the-personal-rather-than-collective-benefits-to-persuade-people-new-research-160824)
607 [personal-rather-than-collective-benefits-to-persuade-people-new-research-160824](https://theconversation.com/covid-vaccine-hesitancy-spell-out-the-personal-rather-than-collective-benefits-to-persuade-people-new-research-160824)
608 [accessed 10 June 2021].

- 609 38. Parthasarathi A, Puvvada RK, Shankar M, Siddaiah JB, Ganguly K, Upadhyay S et al.
610 Willingness to accept the COVID-19 vaccine and related factors among Indian adults: a
611 cross-sectional study. *Vaccines*. 2022;10(7): doi: [10.3390/vaccines10071095](https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines10071095)
- 612 39. Lazarus JV, Wyka K, White TM, Picchio CA, Rabin K, Ratzan SC et al. Revisiting COVID-
613 19 vaccine hesitancy around the world using data from 23 countries in 2021. *Nature*
614 *Commun*. 2022;13, 3801. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-31441-x>
- 615 40. Dzinamarira T, Nachipo B, Phiri B, Musuka G. COVID-19 vaccine roll-out in South Africa
616 and Zimbabwe: urgent need to address community preparedness, fears and hesitancy.
617 *Vaccines*. 2021;9(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9030250>
- 618 41. Hoare J, Mendelson M, Frenkel L. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and anti-vaxxers –
619 supporting healthcare workers to navigate the unvaccinated: reflections from clinical
620 practice. *SAMJ*. 2022;112(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2022.v112i1.16208>
621
622
623




Figure 1a Respondents' sources of SARS-CoV-2 information (traditional and social media) in India (n=652)




Figure 1b Respondents' sources of SARS-CoV-2 information (traditional and social media) in South Africa (n=172)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.26.22279242>; this version posted August 26, 2022. 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. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



Figure 2 Respondents' perceptions of self-efficacy in relation to coping with the COVID-19 pandemic in South Africa (SA) and India