

1 **Zika Virus Infection Knowledge and Communication Preferences Among Women**
2 **of Reproductive Age in Central Brooklyn, New York: A Thematic Analysis**
3

4 **Russell Dowling¹, Sergios-Orestis Kolokotronis^{2,3,4,5}, Azure B. Thompson¹**

5 1 Department of Community Health Sciences, School of Public Health, SUNY Downstate Health
6 Sciences University, Brooklyn, NY

7 2 Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, SUNY Downstate
8 Health Sciences University, Brooklyn, NY

9 3 Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, College of Medicine, SUNY
10 Downstate Health Sciences University, Brooklyn, NY

11 4 Department of Cell Biology, College of Medicine, SUNY Downstate Health Sciences
12 University, Brooklyn, NY

13 5 Institute for Genomics in Health, SUNY Downstate Health Sciences University, Brooklyn, NY

14 ORCID: Dowling 0000-0001-7509-760X; Kolokotronis 0000-0003-3309-8465; Thompson
15 0009-0005-2639-679X

16
17 Corresponding author contact information: Russell Dowling, RussADowling@gmail.com
18

19 **Author Contributions**

20
21 Russell Dowling: Conceptualization, data collection, data interpretation, writing. Sergios-Orestis
22 Kolokotronis: Reviewing, editing. Azure Thompson: Supervision, reviewing, editing.
23

24 **Acknowledgments**

25
26 We thank Tracey Wilson, PhD for her guidance during the earlier stages of this work.
27

28 **Ethics Statement**

29
30 This study was reviewed by the SUNY Downstate’s Office of Research Administration
31 Institutional Review Board (IRBNet Number 1617142-2). The study received an exemption
32 under Common Rule Exemption Category 2 [45 CFR 46.104 (d) (i) (ii), or (iii)]: “Research that
33 only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude,
34 achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior
35 (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met: Criterion
36 3: [45CFR46.104(d)(2)(iii)]: The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a
37 manner that the identity of the research participants can readily be ascertained, directly or
38 through identifiers linked to the research participants.”
39

40 **Funding Statement**

41
42 This work was supported by the Lenard and Christine Szarek Fellowship conferred on Russell
43 Dowling.

44
45 **Conflict of Interest**

46
47 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

48
49 **Abstract**

50
51 The 2016 outbreak of Zika virus (ZIKV) infected millions and resulted in thousands of infants
52 born with malformations. Though the clusters of severe birth defects resulting from this outbreak
53 have subsided, ZIKV continues to be a concern throughout much of Latin America and the
54 Caribbean. Travel and sexual intercourse remain the dominant transmission risk factors for
55 women of reproductive age and their partners. This is particularly true for communities in
56 Brooklyn, New York, that comprise large immigrant and foreign-born populations. Practitioners
57 of public health understand little about how women at risk for ZIKV are most likely to receive
58 information about the virus or who they trust most to provide that information. In the context of
59 five focus group discussions, this study explored the knowledge and communication preferences
60 of 20 women of reproductive age in Central Brooklyn. Results derived from a thematic analysis
61 suggest that while most women are familiar with mosquitos as ZIKV vectors, knowledge of
62 sexual transmission is considerably lower. Many respondents believe that only women who are
63 pregnant or trying to become pregnant are at risk, and public health agencies, such as the U.S.
64 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, remain the most trusted sources of information.
65 These findings can support more effective communication about the risks of ZIKV infection and
66 other vector-borne diseases to women in New York City and similar urban communities.

67
68 **Keywords**

69
70 Zika virus, urban health, immigrant health, KAP, women, reproduction, qualitative analysis

71
72 **Introduction**

73
74 Zika virus (ZIKV) is the causative agent of a vector-borne disease that is spread primarily
75 by the bite of infected *Aedes aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus* mosquitos and is also sexually
76 transmitted.¹ Most symptoms are generally mild and include fever, rash, muscle and joint pain,
77 and headaches. Complications from ZIKV infection include microcephaly, a severe birth defect
78 involving brain damage in the offspring of infected women, and Guillain-Barré Syndrome, an
79 autoimmune disorder that can lead to peripheral nerve damage and ultimately partial paralysis.²
80 The disease gained international attention in 2015 when the virus infected millions throughout
81 Latin America and the Caribbean, prompting the World Health Organization to declare the
82 outbreak a Public Health Emergency of International Concern in February 2016.³ More than 50
83 countries reported ZIKV cases in a matter of months, and many local epidemics were
84 extraordinarily pervasive. The rapid spread was likely due to a combination of factors including

85 a large susceptible population, a hospitable climate for the mosquito vector, and sexual
86 transmission.⁴

87 ZIKV became a nationally notifiable condition in the United States in 2016.⁵ Health
88 campaigns and education have been ongoing in the United States ever since.⁷ While early
89 interventions included expanded mosquito vector larviciding and adulticiding programs
90 throughout many high-risk communities in the US, most interventions after 2017 have relied
91 solely on risk mitigation via targeted health communication campaigns.^{8,9} The CDC notes
92 several important goals of Zika communication activities including increasing overall awareness
93 of the virus, educating pregnant women, and educating women of reproductive age.¹⁰

94 Numerous studies, however, have demonstrated a clear gap between what was
95 communicated by practitioners of public health and what is known by the public when it comes
96 to engagement in personal protective measures.^{11,12} This is especially true for ZIKV. In one
97 study, researchers found that the vast majority of participants (97%) did not have knowledge of
98 all routes of transmission and nearly three in four people (73%) did know that condom use was a
99 key prevention measure.¹³ Other studies have also identified gaps related to vector habits and
100 environmental controls.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Messages need to be timely, culturally appropriate, and easy to
101 understand for risk communications to be effective. To more effectively communicate what is
102 known to the public, we must improve our communication efforts and prioritize potentially
103 vulnerable populations who are at greater risk of exposure yet can be less likely to engage in
104 preventive practices due to gaps in knowledge.¹⁷ We will not be able to effectively address these
105 issues until we understand how to appropriately tailor communications and public health
106 interventions.

107 The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore the preferred methods, modes, and
108 frequency of communicating about ZIKV among women of reproductive age in central
109 Brooklyn. To guide this research, we posed two research questions: 1) How do women of
110 reproductive age in Central Brooklyn receive information about Zika virus? and 2) How do
111 women of reproductive age in Central Brooklyn prefer to receive information about Zika virus
112 going forward? The study explored several domains. Preferred methods, frequency, and modes
113 of communication to address gaps in ZIKV knowledge were all explored. We aimed to gain
114 meaningful insights on group consensus via participant focus group discussions (FGDs) and in-
115 depth contextual analysis. We conducted this research to explore perceptions and preferences
116 and solicit rich information on ZIKV from the perspective of a group of study participants who
117 are most vulnerable to the disease. We used focus group discussions because we wanted to
118 provide a platform for an exchange of viewpoints and ideas, and assess where agreements and
119 disagreements occurred. Our thematic analysis was guided by the principles in the WHO
120 Strategic Communications Framework including accessibility, trustworthiness, and relevance.

121 The study was among women of reproductive age who reside in Central Brooklyn, in
122 New York City. Central Brooklyn consists of several neighborhoods comprising different ethnic
123 groups. Though the community is situated in one of the most affluent cities in the world,
124 residents of Central Brooklyn tend to be poorer and sicker than their counterparts across New
125 York and the United States in general.^{19,20} This is largely due to various social determinants of
126 health (e.g. income, education, occupation, housing, food stability), and potential travel
127 patterns.²¹⁻²³ More than 75% of the community identifies as Black including West Indian and
128 Afro-Caribbean or Latinx, and approximately 42% – higher than the Brooklyn average of 37.5%
129 – is foreign-born.^{19,20} Women of reproductive age can be particularly vulnerable to the effects
130 of ZIKV, given the risk of birth defects and potential for sexual transmission.²⁴ It is therefore

131 beneficial to learn what this population knows about ZIKV and how they would like to receive
132 information to fill their knowledge gaps. Assessing current and preferred methods of receiving
133 knowledge can cost-effectively inform interventions to reduce the likelihood of future infections
134 and improve population health.

135 136 **Theoretical Framework**

137
138 The World Health Organization's Strategic Communications Framework for effective
139 communications guided this research.¹⁸ The framework posits that there are six guiding
140 principles for effective communications: accessible, actionable, credible and trusted, relevant,
141 timely, and understandable. We focused on four principles from the framework to guide this
142 research: accessibility, credibility and trustworthiness, relevance and timeliness. We aimed to
143 identify the most widely utilized channels and modalities for receiving information about ZIKV
144 to approximate accessibility and the most credible and trusted sources for providing information.
145 We also assessed the relevance and timeliness of messages both during the previous ZIKV
146 epidemic and going forward by asking participants not only what they wanted to learn more
147 about but how often they would like to receive that information. Furthermore, additional
148 information on knowledge and perceived vulnerability were also collected. The research aimed
149 to provide a basis for tailoring messages based on this population's current levels of knowledge
150 to protect a potentially vulnerable population. Recommendations made are based on thematic
151 analysis of qualitative data collected directly from the study population to ensure they are in a
152 preferred format and are easily understandable.

153 154 **Methods**

155 156 *Participant Selection and Recruitment*

157
158 We purposively sampled respondents by considering age and race in an attempt to
159 represent various opinions and attitudes about ZIKV. Participants were eligible to participate if
160 they met the following inclusion criteria: 1) a woman between 18-45; 2) a current resident of
161 Central Brooklyn; 3) had heard of ZIKV; 4) willing to review an information sheet about the
162 research; 5) had stable internet connection at home; 6) had access to a laptop or phone with a
163 camera; and 7) had access to a private space to conduct the interview. A potential participant was
164 ineligible to participate if they did not meet all inclusion criteria.

165 Facebook's paid advertising feature was used to reach respondents from the study
166 population. Advertisements were targeted to women 18-45 who reside in Central Brooklyn. The
167 advertisements mentioned the purpose of the research and a cash incentive participated in a focus
168 group discussion. The advertisements also contained a link to a screening questionnaire housed
169 in REDCap that collected self-reported information confirming each respondent met the
170 aforementioned inclusion criteria. Focus group discussion participants were initially contacted by
171 email after expressing interest through the REDCap screening questionnaire.

172 173 *Data Collection*

174
175 Once the participant confirmed interest, we gathered additional information on
176 race/ethnicity, age, and place of birth. Potential participants were offered three timeslots to

177 choose from and were asked to select their top two. We aimed to have an average of four
178 respondents per discussion – a recommended amount for Computer Mediated Communication
179 (CMC)-led focus group discussions.²⁵ We scheduled five participants per timeslot, assuming one
180 might not be able to make it at the last minute. A final reminder was sent out on the morning of
181 each discussion that contained a link to a Doxy.me account.²⁶ If a respondent missed their initial
182 timeslot, they were given the option to sign up one more time only. Each discussion lasted
183 approximately one hour and a thank you email was sent within one day of the discussion that
184 contained confirmation of a \$30 incentive payment and a link to more information about ZIKV
185 from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Audio recordings of each session were
186 obtained and stored in a password-protected cloud-based server.

187 188 *Study Design*

189
190 A semi-structured focus group discussion (FGD) guide was informed by the research
191 questions and reviewed in consultation with qualitative research and infectious disease experts
192 during the piloting phase. Topics explored in the FGDs were: 1) what respondents have heard
193 about ZIKV including knowledge of transmission and prevention; 2) how respondents have
194 received information about ZIKV in the past; 3) who they trust most to provide information
195 about ZIKV; 4) how and how often they would like to receive information about ZIKV
196 transmission and its risks going forward. Sessions were moderated by one of the authors of this
197 study and we obtained audio recordings of each FGD. Participants received a \$30 incentive for
198 their participation.

199 200 *Data Management and Analysis*

201
202 Once all focus groups were completed, we utilized a transcription service to convert
203 audio recordings to text verbatim including pauses, laughter, and nonverbal cues when available
204 (e.g., nodding when verbally acknowledged by the facilitator). The final transcribed documents
205 were separated into twenty unique documents, one corresponding to each participant. This
206 allowed us to attach demographic characteristics to each participant in Dedoose v8.0.42
207 (<https://www.dedoose.com>) for qualitative analysis—a feature that is otherwise unavailable for
208 group transcripts.²⁷ This also allowed us to compare across individuals rather than across focus
209 groups, which were assigned at random.

210 A thematic analysis was then conducted to assess patterns of meaning in the participants’
211 receipt of knowledge in addition to their communication and intervention preferences. Initial root
212 codes were created based on each of the semi-structured open-ended interview questions posed
213 during the FGDs. Emerging codes (subcodes in Dedoose), on the other hand, were largely
214 created in the analysis phase of the study directly from the data.

215 Data were interpreted via thematic analysis guided by important concepts for analysis
216 found in WHO’s Strategic Communications Framework for effective communications. Interview
217 questions were informed by the research questions and connected to the four principles of
218 interest from the strategic communications framework: accessibility, credibility and
219 trustworthiness, relevance, and timeliness. Codes and root codes were then established using the
220 interview questions. Codes were counted using Dedoose and weighted according to the
221 importance of the response; responses that were categorized by the coder as ‘particularly
222 important, interesting or relevant’ were given an additional point to ensure the findings were not

223 biased toward the thoughts of more talkative respondents. Those codes with the greatest
224 weighted counts were then considered for inclusion in the thematic analysis, and appropriate
225 quotes were identified to support each theme.

227 *Ethics Statement*

228
229 This study was reviewed by the SUNY Downstate's Office of Research Administration
230 Institutional Review Board (IRB) and received an exemption.

232 **Results**

233
234 In total, 59 respondents expressed interest in participating in a focus group discussion.
235 All 59 were screened and 30 that met the inclusion criteria were contacted. Focus group
236 discussion participants were recruited from December 2020 to January 2021. A sample size of 20
237 was finalized when data saturation was reached. Five focus groups with an average of four
238 participants (range: 3-5) each were held between December 2020 and January 2021 (Table 1).

239
240 Sixty codes were created and applied 634 times to 207 unique excerpts. Based on the
241 patterns identified in the analysis, six concepts were analyzed: 1) knowledge of ZIKV; 2) past
242 receipt of information; 3) perceived susceptibility or vulnerability; 4) trusted sources of
243 information; 5) preferred medium/modes of communication for receiving information going
244 forward; and 6) preferred frequency for receiving information going forward. The themes that
245 emerged from these concepts are discussed below.

247 *ZIKV Knowledge*

248
249 We explored knowledge of ZIKV by asking about transmission, prevention, and
250 population vulnerability. Knowledge as an important theme often included information on where
251 the virus first emerged, where it is currently circulating, and the 2016-2017 epidemic in NYC.
252 Several participants also discussed information on vaccines and therapeutics.

253 *"Women that were pregnant were... giving birth to children and I think that I recall the*
254 *most, they were mentioning that women that were infected with Zika virus were giving birth to*
255 *children that had oddly shaped heads."*

256 *"I remember that it really affected pregnant women, and, if you were infected,*
257 *there was a high chance that you could miscarry, or your child might be born with deformities."*

258 *"I remember that it spread by mosquito bites and how they were spraying in Brooklyn*
259 *for it."*

260 When it comes to knowledge of ZIKV, the respondents most often agree that the virus
261 affects pregnant women, is associated with travel, and is transmitted by mosquitos. Respondents
262 demonstrated knowledge on a range of topics including transmission, environmental controls,
263 personal protective measures, health outcomes, and vulnerable populations. Most respondents
264 talked about microcephaly and birth defects in general. Knowledge of sexual transmission in this
265 series of focus groups, not mentioned in the above excerpts, appeared less common than
266 knowledge of vector-borne and vertical transmission, as it was mentioned many fewer times and
267 numerous participants reported that they had never heard of this mode of transmission. The
268 simplest theme emerging from the findings was that knowledge of adverse health outcomes was

269 commonplace among participants. Though arguably less important than knowledge of
270 transmission or personal protective measures, discussions of associated birth defects dominated
271 most of the conversations. This implies that knowledge, which was largely tied to memories of
272 the last Zika epidemic, was linked to the more graphic outcomes of ZIKV often focused on by
273 the media.

274

275 *Sources of ZIKV Information*

276

277 We asked how participants have received information about ZIKV in the past by probing
278 on two concepts: from whom they received the information and how the knowledge was
279 transferred. Most responses for the “who” fell into the following categories: CDC or Department
280 of Health, a doctor, nurse, or other healthcare professional, a family member or friend,
281 professors, or the media. The theme of information receipt was often directly linked to the
282 perceived credibility of the source of information. The “how” was often through television or
283 online advertisements, social media, print media (e.g. newspapers), or physical advertisements
284 (e.g. pamphlets, posters).

285

286 “I [remember hearing about it in] the New York Post and Huffington Post and USA Today...and
287 CNN. So those are the outlets that I use on a daily basis.”

288

289 “A few years ago, I was having my third child, and I remember seeing in the midwife office that
290 I go to, there would always be posters about Zika virus and traveling.”

291

292 “When you’re going to the airport to fly, you would see a poster all the time like just telling you
293 to beware, coming to and from the airport.”

294

295 “I got information from a reproductive endocrinologist, or a fertility specialist, because that who
296 I was seeing at the time.”

297

298 Most respondents reported that they have received information about ZIKV from the
299 news, physical advertisements, and/or healthcare professionals (including friends who work in
300 healthcare). Accessibility and media preferences largely dictated receipt of information, as did
301 personal circumstances at the height of the epidemic. Participants who were pregnant at that time
302 largely sought out or received information from personal OB/GYN’s or fertility specialists,
303 whereas frequent travelers would often turn to official government sanctioned websites for
304 information. The type of information sought out was often closely linked to the personal risk
305 profile of the recipient.

306

307 *Perceived ZIKV Infection Susceptibility*

308

309 Perceived susceptibility to ZIKV was explored by asking who the participants thought
310 was at the greatest risk of infection or severe health outcomes. The prompt was intentionally left
311 vague to leave room for interpretation. Participants could have provided responses that looked at
312 differences by gender, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, geography and more.

313 “For me, I always perceived the information as ‘if you are not a pregnant woman, you do not
314 need to worry about this virus’”.

315
316 “It didn’t fit my demographics, because I wasn’t a pregnant woman. So, I didn’t really pay that
317 much attention to it.”

318
319 “I was thinking of getting pregnant [at the time], and I was looking to travel with my husband.
320 So, we had a long conversation about the Zika virus and countries I should be thinking of
321 traveling to.”

322
323 “I feel like women were more concerned than men.”

324
325 “We weren’t at [childbearing] age. And even if we were at the age, if you’re not pregnant, or
326 you’re not thinking about being pregnant, you don’t feel concerned because it doesn’t have a
327 direct impact on [you].”

328
329 The general consensus among the participants was that you did not need to worry about
330 ZIKV unless you were a woman who was pregnant or looking to become pregnant. Several
331 participants also mentioned risk by geography, specifically related to Latin America, the
332 Caribbean, and Africa. No participants discussed risks by race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic
333 status. This suggests the media’s focus on microcephaly might have inadvertently altered
334 perceived susceptibility to the virus. Though severe, birth defects are considered a rare outcome
335 of ZIKV. Even so, many participants focused on these outcomes and their connection to new
336 mothers when discussing susceptibility. More common outcomes like headaches, joint pain, and
337 rashes were often overlooked.

338 339 *Trusted Sources of Information*

340
341 Trust is paramount in risk communications, especially when working with vulnerable
342 populations. The concept of ‘trust’ was gauged by asking participants who they trusted most to
343 provide information about ZIKV. Responses included groups of people such as medical
344 personnel, specific individuals like personal physicians, or health agencies like the US CDC.

345
346 “I definitely [trust] CDC. Although I wasn’t looking for guidance on Zika. [But] I do now for
347 COVID. So, I definitely—CDC’s my bible.”

348
349 “There’s national information given by the CDC, but I wanna know a little bit more. Because
350 New York City is definitely very unique, so I would say I trust DOHMH, a great amount as well
351 as New York City Health and Hospitals.”

352 “I personally trust only either medical professionals or you know websites or sources coming
353 directly from a reputable medical background.”

354
355 “I trust my doctor only.”

356
357 When asked who they trusted the most to provide information about ZIKV, participants
358 most often mentioned public health agencies including the United States Centers for Disease
359 Control and Prevention (US CDC) or a local department of health. Many of the above excerpts
360 and several others highlight the importance of federal and local government in providing clear

361 and credible risk communications during an epidemic. This was followed closely by doctors,
362 nurses, or other healthcare personnel. The common theme among trusted sources of information
363 was expertise. Participants often relied on media sources that referred to an array of experts
364 including public health, medical, and laboratory scientists.

365
366 *Receiving Information*

367
368 Messages should not only be tailored to a study population, but also channeled through
369 an appropriate mode of communication that will be both widely available and accepted by the
370 study population. Receipt of preferred modalities for information on ZIKV in the going forward
371 was therefore explored to understand the channels through which the participants would like to
372 receive specifically unsolicited information now and in the future. We made no mention of the
373 rates of infection or potential messenger. Instead, we allowed participants to widely interpret the
374 prompt and provide feedback on whichever modalities they think would be most effective to
375 reaching them personally.

376
377 “I think having a text is the most in my face kind of thing, because everything else is so easy to
378 ignore.”

379 “I think getting up to date information either via text message or through an app [would be best].
380 I have the Citizen App, and I certainly use that when I’m looking at what’s going on in my
381 neighborhood. It doesn’t require me to seek anything out or have to remember to look for the
382 information, it just, you know comes to me. And I think that’s ideal... as long as it’s coming
383 from a reputable source that I can trust.”

384
385 “I know we’re very paperless, and I may be traditional this way, but I think I look more at things
386 that come in the mail, like than email.”

387
388 “[Having] ads come on Twitter...and medical Instagram pages, or Facebook pages is best.
389 Because a lot of people, especially like in our generation, are always on social media.”

390
391 There was no one consensus about how the respondents would like to receive information
392 about ZIKV going forward. Text, email, printed materials, online or television advertisements,
393 and the news were all frequently mentioned potential modalities. Participants were fairly evenly
394 split between typical modes of health communication such as printed materials sent from
395 doctors’ offices or health departments and more technology-driven materials such as messages
396 from health-based apps. Information receipt will have to be varied and include a diverse array of
397 modalities.

398
399 *Frequency of Information*

400
401 Finally, preferred frequency of unsolicited communications about ZIKV was explored by
402 asking how much participants would like to hear about the virus going forward. Regular (e.g. bi-
403 monthly, quarterly) updates about an emerging virus can be useful to help update the public on
404 important information and synthesize pertinent lessons learned.

405

406 “[Not] unless there’s something that I personally need to like follow up on. Like if there’s,
407 additional precautionary things that I should be doing.”

408
409 “[Not] unless there’s been a change in something. Like if it’s in a year from now and... it’s on
410 the rise. Other than that, we’re just gonna get blindness to it.”

411
412 “I feel like if there’s a drastic spike, like there’s an increased number of cases. Or even when
413 there’s a dramatic decrease, I feel like that’s the time when you should alert individuals.”

414
415 “I would say I would wanna hear about it if there was a significant change. So if there’s a drastic
416 spike, or if it’s the opposite. If there’s been some sort of change for the positive, that it’s no
417 longer a concern, or there’s been some sort of medical discovery that’s helped with preventing it.
418 Anything like that I don’t think I would think it’s information overload.”

419
420 There was a consensus on the frequency of future communications about Zika, with
421 participants overwhelmingly preferring to only receive information where there were notable
422 updates about Zika, good or bad (e.g., an increase in the prevalence of Zika, new research
423 findings, a lifting of travel warnings). While numerous studies have assessed current methods
424 and modes of receiving information and most trusted sources of information, few, if any, have
425 explicitly asked respondents how frequently they would prefer to receive information about
426 ZIKV going forward. There was a general sense that participants were subject to information
427 overload given recent epidemics and public health emergencies of international concern
428 including COVID-19, Ebola, MERS, H1N1, SARS and more. Though regular updates on
429 diseases like ZIKV can empower recipients of the information and improve population
430 knowledge, communications should be infrequent and focused on transfer of new and notable
431 information only.

432 433 **Discussion**

434
435 In this study, we found that most participants would like to receive information about
436 ZIKV via text, email, and printed materials only when there is some sort of notable update about
437 the virus. Healthcare staff and leading health agencies such as the US Centers for Disease
438 Control and Prevention are the most trusted providers of information, and participants believe
439 that women who are pregnant or trying to become pregnant are not only at greatest risk from
440 ZIKV but often the only group at risk. Knowledge of sexual transmission was considerably
441 lower than that of mosquito transmission. Generally, the FGD participants presented
442 considerable knowledge of mosquito and vertical transmission of Zika. This appears largely
443 consistent with findings from other studies assessing knowledge, attitudes, and practices in or
444 around New York City.^{13,28,29} Knowledge of sexual transmission was less common, though
445 results from published research vary.

446 When it comes to past receipt of information, the news and healthcare professionals were
447 preferred sources of information, though important differences were uncovered by age and
448 behaviors. While there have only been a few studies that published data on how people receive
449 information about ZIKV, this research appears to echo the findings from a seminal study
450 published by Piltch-Loeb and Abramson in 2017.³³ One notable difference is that current
451 respondents appeared less willing to receive information about ZIKV from family, friends, or

452 social media unless they were in some way connected to a medical pursuit. Our findings are also
453 consistent with the findings of a community-based participatory research study by Juarbe-Rey et
454 al. in 2019, which found that nearly three in four respondents had received information about
455 ZIKV through television including the news.³⁴ In general, younger respondents (e.g. those in
456 their twenties) were more likely to have received information through the internet—especially
457 social media sites including Facebook and Twitter. This is consistent with findings from Guo et
458 al., which found that 71.1% of respondents in a sample of 492 pregnant women first heard about
459 the virus from the internet.³⁵ The median age in that sample was 30 years. These findings were
460 also echoed in another article by Ramisetty-Mikler and Boyce, which found that 65% of
461 respondents used the internet as the main source of information for ZIKV.¹⁷ The issue of
462 misinformation on social media did arise in at least two of the FGDs. In general, younger
463 participants appeared more confident in their abilities to detect and navigate around sources of
464 misinformation when compared to older participants.

465 The majority of studies on ZIKV were published between 2017 and 2019, immediately
466 following the declaration from the World Health Organization that ZIKV was a ‘Public Health
467 Emergency of International Concern’. Since that time, concern for the virus has fallen
468 precipitously in nearly all groups studied. For example, our findings are consistent with those of
469 Ellingson, Bonk, and Chamberlain (2017), which found reduced concern and fewer self-set
470 travel restrictions over time.³⁶ Numerous studies have also found that pregnant women are more
471 knowledgeable and likely to engage in preventive practices when compared to non-pregnant
472 women, which has a similar conclusion to the findings outlined above.¹³ Furthermore, the study
473 by Plaster et al. (2018) confirmed these findings, with 73.1% of respondents agreeing that ‘Zika
474 virus is a serious health condition for women’, and only 30% of respondents agreeing that ‘Zika
475 virus is a serious health condition for men’.³⁰ Given the increase in news coverage surrounding
476 the large clusters of children with microcephaly born between 2016 and 2017, it is unsurprising
477 that many FGD participants saw pregnant women and their unborn children as most vulnerable
478 to infection or adverse health outcomes from Zika. The participants generally agreed that men
479 were not considered vulnerable populations, though this is likely due to the fact that many were
480 unaware that ZIKV could be sexually transmitted. Discussions of race or socioeconomic status as
481 they pertain to vulnerabilities did not arise in any of the focus groups.

482 When it comes to considering which sources of information they trust most, most FGD
483 participants mentioned healthcare professionals and federal or local health agencies such as the
484 US CDC or the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. While it is
485 encouraging to see how many people in these focus groups trust the US CDC and the New York
486 City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH), this is in direct contrast to findings
487 from a study by Berenson et al. (2017), which found that only 20% of U.S. born respondents and
488 9.6% of respondents born in countries with ongoing ZIKV transmission trusted government
489 announcements.²² This also differs considerably from another study by Poorasingh et al.³⁷ That
490 study, which interviewed 91 respondents in antenatal care clinics in Trinidad and Tobago, found
491 that fewer than one in four (23.1%) listed health agencies such as the Pan American Health
492 Organization as a top trusted source of information. It is possible that, given the rise in COVID-
493 19 throughout much of 2020 and the general public’s reliance on federal and local health
494 authorities, my findings are biased. Furthermore, the rise of misinformation over the past five
495 years could be driving this move toward more official sources of information. Fortunately, we
496 did identify one study that validated our findings, with 73% of respondents turning to the CDC’s
497 website as their trusted source of information.³⁸

498 Several studies have assessed preferred modalities for receiving information about
499 ZIKV.^{17,36,38} Like many of these studies, our research did not identify one specific modality that
500 was favored by all participants. Rather, several preferred modes of communication were
501 discussed consistently throughout the focus group discussions, including texts, emails, and
502 printed materials like educational brochures or flyers. This highlights the importance of utilizing
503 a diverse approach to communication modalities. One study by Ellingson, Bonk, and
504 Chamberlain (2018), found that educational brochures were the preferred source of
505 information.³⁸ Emails and websites were also considered preferred sources, though this study did
506 not explicitly ask about health-based apps. Medical Facebook or Twitter pages were perceived as
507 undesirable sources of information, which differs slightly from the findings in our research.
508 There appeared to be the greatest interest in physical advertisements such as subway posters or
509 health center pamphlets that were specifically developed or endorsed by trusted medical or
510 healthcare groups like a family practice or the New York City Department of Health and Mental
511 Hygiene. Many FGD participants agreed that auto-generated texts or emails would likely be
512 missed due to information overload, particularly given the COVID-19 pandemic. Though
513 initially surprised by the desire to receive educational brochures when most people have the
514 capability to receive information digitally, our findings are consistent with findings from
515 Ellingson, Bonk, and Chamberlain.³⁸

516 This article had several limitations. Our FGD participants could be slightly
517 demographically different than the residents of Central Brooklyn. While we did not explicitly ask
518 about ethnicity, education, or socioeconomic status, white participants represented a
519 disproportionately large share of the racial breakdown. Furthermore, participants were recruited
520 solely via Facebook advertisements, omitting the perspectives of those without an account and
521 leading to documented selection bias.³⁹ Participants also needed to have a stable internet
522 connection and a private space to be included in a focus group, potentially limiting comparability
523 with Central Brooklyn residents who are lower income. Finally, FGDs were held only in English,
524 though many Brooklyn residents speak Spanish, French, Haitian Creole, and other languages.

525 This study also has several strengths. We received more interest in the research than was
526 expected, which allowed for a purposeful selection of participants to ensure we had a wide age
527 range represented. Race and age, in particular, were considered when selecting participants.
528 Conducting the focus groups remotely resulted in high (20/21) participation rates among
529 scheduled participants. To our knowledge, this is the first study that assessed unsolicited
530 communication frequency preferences related to ZIKV in the published literature. Furthermore,
531 the results can apply not only to similar populations but also to similar vector-borne diseases
532 such as Dengue. Finally, while studies utilizing CMC as a platform to hold focus group
533 discussions have encountered participants who have technical challenges accessing the
534 discussion, there is often broad agreement that CMC allows for greater anonymity and ease of
535 scheduling when compared to in-person discussions.⁴⁰ Furthermore, comparisons of in-person
536 versus CMC focus groups have found that perceived anonymity across the internet can stimulate
537 group discussion and disclosure, often allowing for even greater sharing of ideas during CMC.⁴¹

538

539 **New Contribution to the Literature**

540

541 We were unable to identify any study that specifically explored the preferred frequency
542 for receiving information about ZIKV going forward. However, these findings are likely
543 consistent with the population at large for two reasons. First, numerous studies have

544 demonstrated decreasing concern in ZIKV over the past few years. This would also certainly
545 translate to a reduced desire to receive information about ZIKV. Finally, participants in this
546 study were nearly unanimous in their desire to receive information only when there was a
547 notable change in Zika, such as an increase in cases.

548 We recommend that future public health communications about ZIKV go beyond these
549 topics to include important and often overlooked modes of transmission like sexual contact, even
550 among partners of women of reproductive age who have traveled to Zika-endemic regions.
551 Messages should also focus on preparedness and engagement in personal protective measures
552 rather than threat or fear-based messaging by trusted messengers such as medical professionals
553 or local health agencies, as they have been demonstrated to be more effective in producing
554 increased levels of public engagement.^{43,44} Finally, it is important to ensure that we are not only
555 communicating through the appropriate channels and sources but also highlighting the correct
556 messages. It was noted in 2017 that the New York City subway system was filled with posters
557 showing big mosquitoes, but nearly all cases in New York were travel-associated or sexually
558 transmitted.⁴⁵

559

560 **Conclusions**

561

562 While most respondents are familiar with mosquito transmission of Zika, fewer were
563 aware of sexual transmission, and many respondents believed that only women who are pregnant
564 or trying to become pregnant are at risk. Additionally, medical professionals and public health
565 agencies remain the most trusted sources of information, and communications should be tailored
566 through several modalities such as texts, emails, and brochures to account for the wide range of
567 communication preferences. Public health practitioners can utilize this information to effectively
568 communicate about the risks of ZIKV and other vector-borne diseases to women in Central
569 Brooklyn and similar urban immigrant communities by channeling messages through trusted
570 messengers and widely accepted modalities. These findings can guide public health practitioners
571 to more effectively communicate with existing vulnerable populations who either travel or have
572 spouses who travel to areas with ongoing ZIKV transmission. Additionally, it can provide
573 important insights into this population or comparable at-risk urban populations for future ZIKV
574 epidemics or similar vector-borne diseases such as Dengue. Further studies are needed to design
575 and test future messages and educational materials to ensure that they are culturally appropriate
576 and impactful.

577

578 **References**

579 1. Zika virus. World Health Organization. Published July 20, 2018. Accessed April
580 10, 2021. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/zika-virus>

581 2. Sharp TM. Dengue and Zika Virus Diagnostic Testing for Patients with a
582 Clinically Compatible Illness and Risk for Infection with Both Viruses. *MMWR Recomm Rep*.
583 2019;68. doi:10.15585/mmwr.rr6801a1

584 3. WHO Director-General summarizes the outcome of the Emergency Committee
585 regarding clusters of microcephaly and Guillain-Barré syndrome. Accessed August 5, 2019.
586 [https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/01-02-2016-who-director-general-summarizes-the-](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/01-02-2016-who-director-general-summarizes-the-outcome-of-the-emergency-committee-regarding-clusters-of-microcephaly-and-guillain-barré-syndrome)
587 [outcome-of-the-emergency-committee-regarding-clusters-of-microcephaly-and-guillain-barré-](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/01-02-2016-who-director-general-summarizes-the-outcome-of-the-emergency-committee-regarding-clusters-of-microcephaly-and-guillain-barré-syndrome)
588 [syndrome](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/01-02-2016-who-director-general-summarizes-the-outcome-of-the-emergency-committee-regarding-clusters-of-microcephaly-and-guillain-barré-syndrome)

589 4. Lowe R, Barcellos C, Brasil P, et al. The Zika Virus Epidemic in Brazil: From
590 Discovery to Future Implications. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(1).
591 doi:10.3390/ijerph15010096

592 5. Hall V. Update: Noncongenital Zika Virus Disease Cases — 50 U.S. States and
593 the District of Columbia, 2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2018;67.
594 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6709a1

595 6. Zika Virus: 2016 case counts in the US. US CDC. Published April 24, 2019.
596 Accessed April 10, 2021. <https://www.cdc.gov/zika/reporting/2016-case-counts.html>

597 7. Zika Virus Communication Toolkits. US Centers for Disease Control and
598 Prevention. Published November 5, 2014. Accessed May 15, 2021.
599 <https://www.cdc.gov/zika/comm-resources/toolkits.html>

600 8. Know Zika Virus. NYCDOHMH. Published 2019. Accessed April 10, 2021.
601 https://www.health.ny.gov/diseases/zika_virus/

602 9. Mosquito Control - NYC Health. NYCDOHMH. Published 2021. Accessed April
603 10, 2021. <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/doh/health/health-topics/west-nile-virus-spray.page>

604 10. Zika: How to Communicate Effectively. Presented at the: US CDC.
605 <https://www.cdc.gov/zika/zap/pdfs/presentations/zap-how-to-communicate-effectively.pdf>

606 11. Earle-Richardson G, Prue C, Turay K, Thomas D. Influences of Community
607 Interventions on Zika Prevention Behaviors of Pregnant Women, Puerto Rico, July 2016–June
608 2017 - Volume 24, Number 12—December 2018 - *Emerging Infectious Diseases journal* - CDC.
609 Published online December 2018. doi:10.3201/eid2412.181056

610 12. Chan M-PS, Winneg K, Hawkins L, Farhadloo M, Jamieson KH, Albarracín D.
611 Legacy and social media respectively influence risk perceptions and protective behaviors during
612 emerging health threats: A multi-wave analysis of communications on Zika virus cases. *Soc Sci*
613 *Med* 1982. 2018;212:50-59. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.07.007

614 13. Samuel G, DiBartolo-Cordovano R, Merriam A. A survey of the knowledge,
615 attitudes and practices on Zika virus in New York City. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18(98).
616 doi:10.1186/s12889-017-4991-3

617 14. Nelson EJ, Luetke MC, McKinney C, Omodior O. Knowledge of the Sexual
618 Transmission of Zika Virus and Preventive Practices Against Zika Virus Among U.S. Travelers.
619 *J Community Health*. 2019;44(2):377-386. doi:10.1007/s10900-018-0594-x

620 15. Mouchtouri VA, Papagiannis D, Katsioulis A, Rachiotis G, Dafopoulos K,
621 Hadjichristodoulou C. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices about the Prevention of Mosquito
622 Bites and Zika Virus Disease in Pregnant Women in Greece. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.
623 2017;14(4). doi:10.3390/ijerph14040367

624 16. Argüelles-Nava VG, Alvarez-Bañuelos MT, Córdoba-Suárez D, et al.
625 Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices about Zika among a University Community Located in an
626 Endemic Zone in Mexico. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(11).
627 doi:10.3390/ijerph15112548

628 17. Ramisetty-Mikler S, Boyce L. Communicating the risk of contracting Zika virus
629 to low income underserved pregnant Latinas: A clinic-based study. *PLOS ONE*.
630 2020;15(11):e0241675. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0241675

631 18. *WHO Strategic Communications Framework for Effective Communications*.
632 World Health Organization; 2017. Accessed April 20, 2021.
633 [https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/documents/communication-](https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/documents/communication-framework.pdf?sfvrsn=93aa6138_0)
634 [framework.pdf?sfvrsn=93aa6138_0](https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/documents/communication-framework.pdf?sfvrsn=93aa6138_0)

635 19. Community Health Profile: Flatbush and Midwood. New York City Department
636 of Health and Mental Hygiene. Published 2018. Accessed December 10, 2019.
637 <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/data/2018chp-bk14.pdf>

638 20. Community Health Profile: South Crown Heights and Lefferts Gardens. New
639 York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. Published 2018. Accessed December 10,
640 2019. <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/data/2018chp-bk9.pdf>

641 21. Braveman P, Egerter S, Williams DR. The Social Determinants of Health:
642 Coming of Age. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2011;32(1):381-398. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-
643 031210-101218

644 22. Berenson AB, Trinh HN, Hirth JM, Guo F, Fuchs EL, Weaver SC. Knowledge
645 and Prevention Practices among U.S. Pregnant Immigrants from Zika Virus Outbreak Areas. *Am*
646 *J Trop Med Hyg*. 2017;97(1):155-162. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.17-0062

647 23. Zika Virus. New York State Department of Health. Published February 2017.
648 Accessed May 17, 2021. https://www.health.ny.gov/diseases/zika_virus/

649 24. CDC. Women Trying to Become Pregnant | Zika and Pregnancy | CDC. Centers
650 for Disease Control and Prevention. Published March 24, 2021. Accessed May 17, 2021.
651 <https://www.cdc.gov/pregnancy/zika/women-and-their-partners.html>

652 25. UXalliance. Conducting remote online focus groups in times of COVID-19.
653 Medium. Published April 15, 2020. Accessed May 23, 2020.
654 [https://medium.com/@UXalliance/conducting-remote-online-focus-groups-in-times-of-covid-19-
655 ee1c66644fdb](https://medium.com/@UXalliance/conducting-remote-online-focus-groups-in-times-of-covid-19-ee1c66644fdb)

656 26. The Simple, Free, and Secure Telemedicine Solution | Doxy.me. Doxy.me.
657 Accessed May 21, 2021. <https://doxy.me/>

658 27. Home | Dedoose. Dedoose. Accessed May 21, 2021. <https://www.dedoose.com/>

659 28. Teich A, Lowenfels AB, Solomon L, Wormser GP. Gender disparities in Zika
660 virus knowledge in a potentially at-risk population from suburban New York City. *Diagn*
661 *Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2018;92(4):315-318. doi:10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2018.07.003

662 29. Whittemore K, Tate A, Illescas A. Zika Virus Knowledge among Pregnant
663 Women Who Were in Areas with Active Transmission. Published online January 1, 2017.
664 Accessed July 16, 2019. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5176227/>

665 30. Plaster AN, Painter JE, Tjersland DH, Jacobsen KH. University Students'
666 Knowledge, Attitudes, and Sources of Information About Zika Virus. *J Community Health*.
667 2018;43(4):647-655. doi:10.1007/s10900-017-0463-z

668 31. Katler Q, Godiwala P, Macri C, et al. Evolution of Knowledge, Awareness, and
669 Practices regarding Zika Virus from 2016 to 2017. *Infect Dis Obstet Gynecol*. 2017;2017.
670 doi:10.1155/2017/6350602

671 32. Heitinger K, Thoroughman DA, Porter KA. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices
672 of women of childbearing age testing negative for Zika virus in Kentucky, 2016. *Prev Med Rep*.
673 2018;10:20-23. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2018.01.002

674 33. Piltch-Loeb R, Abramson D. Risk salience of a novel virus: US population risk
675 perception, knowledge, and receptivity to public health interventions regarding the Zika virus
676 prior to local transmission. *PLOS ONE*. Published online December 27, 2017. Accessed April
677 13, 2021. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0188666>

678 34. Juarbe-Rey D, Pérez AO, Santoni RPCP, Ramírez MR, Vera M. Using Risk
679 Communication Strategies for Zika Virus Prevention and Control Driven by Community-Based

680 Participatory Research. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(11).
681 doi:10.3390/ijerph15112505

682 35. Guo F, Norton AR, Fuchs EL, Hirth JM, Garcia-Blanco MA, Berenson AB.
683 Provider-patient communication about Zika during prenatal visits. *Prev Med Rep*. 2017;7:26-29.
684 doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2017.05.003

685 36. Ellingson M, Chamberlain A. Zika Virus Communication Preferences of Pregnant
686 Women: Beyond the Verbal. *J Ga Public Health Assoc*. 2017;7(1):88. doi:10.21633/jgpha.7.146

687 37. Pooransingh S, Parasram R, Nandram N, Bhagwandeem B, Dialsingh I. Zika virus
688 disease-knowledge, attitudes and practices among pregnant women-implications for public
689 health practice. *Public Health*. 2018;165:146-151. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2018.09.025

690 38. Ellingson MK, Bonk CM, Chamberlain AT. A survey-based study of Zika virus
691 communication preferences among pregnant women in Georgia, United States. *BMC Pregnancy*
692 *Childbirth*. 2017;17(325). doi:10.1186/s12884-017-1516-0

693 39. Choi I, Milne DN, Glozier N, Peters D, Harvey SB, Calvo RA. Using different
694 Facebook advertisements to recruit men for an online mental health study: Engagement and
695 selection bias | Elsevier Enhanced Reader. 2017;8:27-34. doi:10.1016/j.invent.2017.02.002

696 40. Wirtz AL, Cooney EE, Chaudhry A, Reisner SL. Computer-Mediated
697 Communication to Facilitate Synchronous Online Focus Group Discussions: Feasibility Study
698 for Qualitative HIV Research Among Transgender Women Across the United States. *J Med*
699 *Internet Res*. 2019;21(3). doi:10.2196/12569

700 41. Reid DJ, Reid FJM. Online Focus Groups: An In-depth Comparison of Computer-
701 mediated and Conventional Focus Group Discussions. *Int J Mark Res*. 2005;47(2):131-162.
702 doi:10.1177/147078530504700204

703 42. Ophir Y, Jamieson KH. The Effects of Zika Virus Risk Coverage on Familiarity,
704 Knowledge and Behavior in the U.S. – A Time Series Analysis Combining Content Analysis and
705 a Nationally Representative Survey. *Health Commun*. 2020;35(1):35-45.
706 doi:10.1080/10410236.2018.1536958

707 43. Lwin MO, Lu J, Sheldenkar A, Schulz PJ. Strategic Uses of Facebook in Zika
708 Outbreak Communication: Implications for the Crisis and Emergency Risk Communication
709 Model. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(9):1974. doi:10.3390/ijerph15091974

710 44. Guidry JPD, Carlyle KE, LaRose JG, Perrin P, Messner M, Ryan M. Using the
711 Health Belief Model to Analyze Instagram Posts about Zika for Public Health Communications.
712 *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2019;25(1):179-180. doi:10.3201/eid2501.180824

713 45. Allen MP. Chronicling the Risk and Risk Communication by Governmental
714 Officials During the Zika Threat. *Risk Anal Off Publ Soc Risk Anal*. 2018;38(12):2507-2513.
715 doi:10.1111/risa.13232

716
717