

Chemoprophylaxis of COVID-19 with hydroxychloroquine - a study of health care workers attitude, adherence to regime and side effects

Debajyoti Bhattacharyya¹, Neeraj Raizada², Bharathnag Nagappa³, Arvind Tomar⁴, Prateek Maurya⁵, Dr. Ashok Chaudhary⁶, Mini George⁷, Deepty Katiyal⁸, Srishti Rajora⁹, Nikky Singh¹⁰

¹ Pulmonary Medicine, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi, Delhi, India

² Epidemiology, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi, Delhi, India

³ Epidemiology, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi, Delhi, India

⁴ Pulmonary Medicine, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi, Delhi, India

⁵ Pulmonary Medicine, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi, Delhi, India

⁶ Hepatology, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi, Delhi, India

⁷ College of Nursing, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi, Delhi, India

⁸ Epidemiology, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi, Delhi, India

⁹ Epidemiology, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi, Delhi, India

¹⁰ Epidemiology, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi, Delhi, India

Corresponding Author:

Debajyoti Bhattacharyya¹

D-1, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi, Delhi, 110070, India

Email address: dbhatta.chest@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: There are apprehensions amongst healthcare worker (HCWs) about COVID-19. The HCWs have been given hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) chemoprophylaxis for seven weeks as per Government of India guidelines.

Objectives: To assess the apprehensions amongst HCWs about COVID-19 and to document accessibility, adherence and side effects related to HCQ prophylaxis in HCWs.

Methods: A longitudinal follow up study was conducted in a tertiary care hospital. HCQ was given in the dose of 400 mg twice on day one, and then 400 mg weekly for seven weeks. 391 HCWs were interviewed using semi structured questionnaire.

Results: 62.2% HCWs expressed perceived danger posted by COVID-19 infection. Doctors (54%) showed least acceptance and paramedics (88%) showed highest acceptance to chemoprophylaxis. 17.5% participants developed at least one of the side effects to HCQ. Females and nursing profession were significantly associated with adverse effects. Common side effects were gastro-intestinal symptoms, headache and abnormal mood change. Most of these were mild, not requiring any intervention. Gender, professions and perceived threat of COVID-19 were significantly associated with acceptance and adherence to HCQ prophylaxis.

Conclusion: Two third of HCWs had perceived danger due to COVID-19. Three fourth of the HCWs accepted chemoprophylaxis and four out of five who accepted had complete adherence to prophylaxis schedule. One out of five had developed at least one of side effects; however, most of these were mild not requiring any intervention.

Key words: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, chemoprophylaxis, hydroxychloroquine, side effects

Introduction

The disease caused by SARS-CoV-2 is called COVID-19. It was first described in Wuhan province of China in December 2019,^{1,2} and since then it is spreading rapidly. Scientists are searching for specific anti-viral drug or vaccine against this disease.³ However there are conflicting results that a few drugs are showing promising results.^{4,5} Health care workers exposed to confirmed or suspected case of COVID-19 are at high risk of getting infected with COVID-19.⁶ In view of this, National task force for COVID-19 constituted by Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) under Government of India (GOI) has recommended hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) for adults in a dosage of 400 mg twice a day on first day followed by 400 mg once a week for 7 weeks for chemoprophylaxis for COVID-19 for all health care workers (HCWs) involved in the care of suspected or confirmed cases of COVID-19, and also for household contacts of laboratory confirmed cases.⁷

There are apprehensions amongst healthcare workers (HCWs) about COVID-19 as well as about taking HCQ⁸⁻¹¹ as chemoprophylaxis because of possible side effects.¹²⁻¹⁷ There is currently limited experience related to administration of HCQ as chemoprophylaxis for COVID-19 as the general guidance is based on a small sample of data. This limitation may translate into its low acceptability in HCWs. There are a few clinical trials presently going on in the context of chemoprophylaxis with HCQ in COVID-19.¹³ Also, there have been a few reports of severe side-effects to HCQ in medical journals.¹²⁻¹⁷ These reports may lead to apprehensions in the target population while scaling up this chemoprophylaxis. Hence, it is felt that a study should explore and document experiences in large scale administration of HCQ chemoprophylaxis for COVID-19 in HCWs and also their attitude and confidence level before and after taking chemoprophylaxis. The well documented side effects of HCQ

include gastrointestinal side effects like nausea, vomiting, gastritis, diarrhoea, allergic reactions like itching/rashes, eye problems like loss or decrease in accommodation, burning sensation, abnormal mood changes, giddiness and change in cardiac rhythm.¹²⁻¹⁷ However, adverse effects of HCQ during its application chemoprophylaxis for COVID-19 in the recommended dosages should also be explored. This study was conceived when HCQ chemoprophylaxis administration was initiated for being given to HCWs of our hospital for COVID-19 in response to Indian Council of Medical Research, Government of India guidance on the same.⁷

Materials and Methods

Study Design and setting:

A longitudinal follow up study was conducted in a tertiary care hospital in Delhi. The hospital is a teaching institute with 400 beds, and is providing outpatient care for an average 200 patients a day. The hospital has a total of 689 employees which includes doctors, nurses, paramedic staffs and other supporting staffs.

Study Procedure:

Following the guidance issued by Government of India, recommending the use of HCQ for prophylaxis of COVID-19, HCQ chemoprophylaxis has been offered to all the healthcare staffs of the institute since 28th March 2020. As a part of capacity building they were made aware on various aspects of HCQ prophylaxis, such as, available evidence, rationale, its side effects and asked to report if they developed any symptom for prompt management of the same. Subsequently, the current study was undertaken to assess different modalities associated with administration of this intervention. All the HCWs were invited to participate

in the study, and consent was obtained from all of them who were willing to participate. A trained team of HCWs interviewed the participants with semi structured questionnaire, which included details about socio-demographic details, co-morbidities, perceived threat from COVID-19, source of knowledge regarding HCQ prophylaxis. All participants were followed up to assess the development of side effects (self-reported) and adherence to prophylaxis. All participants who developed the side effects were referred to physician for confirmation and further management of side effects. The data were captured using digital data entry form.

Statistical methods:

Data were extracted in Microsoft Excel and analysed in Statistical Package for Social Science version 22. Continuous variables were expressed with mean with standard deviation (SD). Categorical variables were expressed with proportions. Proportion of HCWs accepted prophylaxis, proportion with poor adherence, and who developed side effects were expressed as percentages with 95% Confidence interval (95% CI). Chi square test was used to test the statistical significance. p value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Ethical Approval:

This study protocol was approved by the institutional ethics committee.

Results

Overall 391 health care workers with mean age of 34 ± 8 years were included in the study. Around 229 (59%) of the participants were males and 147 (38%) were working as nurse.

Around 86 (22%) were very scared, 84 (21%) were minimally scared and 99 (26%) did not express any opinion on perceived danger that was posed by COVID 19. Details on characteristics of study participants are given in table 1.

In total, 297 (75.9%, 95% CI 71.7% - 80.2%) of study participants opted for hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis, among them 254 (85.5%, 95% CI 81.5% - 89.5%) had taken doses as per schedule. The acceptance of hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis was high among males (80%) and also among participants aged less than 30 years (78%) which gradually decreases as age increase, but it was not statistically significant. Among different professions, doctors (54%) showed least acceptance to HCQ prophylaxis and paramedics (88%) showed the highest acceptance and it was statistically significant (p value <0.0001). Details on factors associated with acceptance of hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis are given in table 2. Gender (p value 0.012), profession of study participants (0.003) and perceived danger due to COVID 19 (<0.0001) were significantly associated with compliance to prophylaxis (table 2). Reasons given for not taking prophylaxis are shown in table 3.

Among the participants not accepted the prophylaxis, 22 (23.4%) did so for fear of side effects, 12 (12.8%) were taking other medications and 10 (10.6%) felt that there is no clear evidence supporting the efficacy of prophylaxis in preventing COVID 19. Among study participants who missed the dose or discontinued the prophylaxis, 6 (23%) forgot to take medication, 4 (15%) discontinued after developing adverse effects and 4 (8%) felt there is no clear evidence supporting the efficacy of prophylaxis in preventing COVID 19. Details on reasons for poor compliance to prophylaxis are given in table 3a.

Among the 297 participants taking hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis, 52 (17.5%, 95% CI 13.2% - 21.8%) developed adverse effects due to hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis. Of the

297 participants taking HCQ prophylaxis, 29 (9.8%) reported gastrointestinal adverse effects, 12 (4%) reported mild allergic reactions, 11 (3.7%) developed head ache and 9 (3%) participants reported abnormal mood change. Other side effects reported by study participants are shown in table 4. Females and nursing profession were significantly associated with adverse effects due to prophylaxis (table 5).

Discussion

The present study was aimed to assess the acceptance, adherence and adverse effects related to HCQ chemoprophylaxis to prevent COVID-19 among health care workers. The present study is the first one to study the acceptance and adherence of HCQ prophylaxis for COVID-19. The study found that around 76% of the HCWs had accepted the prophylaxis and taken HCQ at least once as a part of prophylaxis. The finding is comparable with findings of the studies conducted among travellers to assess the acceptance to chloroquine/ mefloquine prophylaxis for malaria, which shows 52% to 89% acceptance rate.¹⁸⁻²¹ However, as the present study was conducted among health workers, we could expect a higher acceptance among our study population. As expressed by study participants, common reasons for not taking prophylaxis were fear of side effects, already on other medication and no existing clear evidence on effectiveness of chemoprophylaxis to prevent COVID-19.²²⁻³⁰ In particular fear of side effects could be attributed to several reports of side effects. These kinds of advices were not issued by reputed health organisations when chloroquine was considered as prophylaxis for malaria. Also, there is no clear evidence of effectiveness of prophylaxis against COVID-19 as it is against malaria. HCWs are well aware of these factors which lead to relatively lesser acceptance

of prophylaxis. These findings further justified by significantly lower acceptance among doctors followed by nurse and higher acceptance among other supporting staff. Doctors were high likely to have knowledge on effectiveness and safety of prophylaxis. In the current era of evidence based medical practice, they are likely to reject prophylaxis due to even negligible uncertainty. Study also shows that the perceived threat due to COVID-19 is very less among doctors compared to other professions (details provided in supplementary table 1) and this may hamper the motivation to take chemoprophylaxis.

Among participants who had accepted the prophylaxis, 85% had shown complete adherence. Females found to have poor adherence compared to males and it is similar to findings reported in systematic review conducted by Ahluwalia et al to assess the factors affecting adherence of chloroquine chemoprophylaxis against malaria.¹⁸ The study also reported that as the severity of perceived threat due to COVID-19 increases, adherence level also increase. This may be due to effect of perceived threat on motivation to adhere to prophylaxis. Fear of getting infected by SARS-CoV-2, could have motivated them to strictly adhere to the prophylaxis. Study participants in nursing category had poor adherence, which may be due side effects (relatively higher proportion of nursing officers reported side effects, compared to others). Common reasons given for poor adherence to prophylaxis were forgetting to take drug and development of side effects and these findings were similar to the literature.¹⁸ Fear of side effects, no clear evidence and no clear knowledge about schedule of prophylaxis were other reasons for poor adherence. These findings suggest the need for awareness activities on safety, effectiveness and schedule of prophylaxis.

The study also found that around 18% of the study participants developed adverse effects related to prophylaxis. Common adverse effects were gastro intestinal related followed by allergic reactions and headache. Carme B et al reported that around 12% of people who had taken chloroquine prophylaxis to prevent malaria, had developed adverse effects which is comparable to our findings.³⁰ Literature also shows that gastrointestinal adverse effects and head ache are the common adverse reactions of HCQ, which is similar to our study.^{12-14,30}

Overall our study found that there is moderately good acceptance for the prophylaxis with good adherence. However still significant number of study participants had expressed fear of side effects and lack of clear evidence on effectiveness of prophylaxis, which should be addressed while giving mass advice. Also clear instructions need to be given to the people about when to stop prophylaxis if they develop adverse effects.

Strength of the present study are: 1) interview was conducted by trained HCWs in research, and data were entered in digital data entry form which would have minimised the error while collecting the data, and 2) all study participants were closely followed up regularly to assess development of any side effects by research team. The study has a few limitations like, 1) participation was entirely voluntary basis which may lead to selection bias, and 2) adherence to chemoprophylaxis was self-reported which may be slightly higher than actual adherence.

Conclusion

Three fourth of the health care workers accepted chemoprophylaxis to prevent COVID 19 and four out of five accepted chemoprophylaxis had complete adherence to prophylaxis

schedule. Gender, profession and perceived threats were significantly associated with acceptance and adherence. One out of five had developed at least one of the side effects with higher rate among females. However, side-effects were largely mild in nature, with less than 2% of the participants requiring to discontinue HCQ prophylaxis due to side effects.

References

1. Cascella M, Rajnik M, Cuomo A, Dulebohn SC, Di Napoli R. Features, Evaluation and Treatment Coronavirus (COVID-19). StatPearls. 2020.<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32150360>(Accessed on 28 May 2020)
2. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;DOI:10.1056/NEJMoa2002032
3. Li H, Zhou Y, Zhang M, Wang H, Zhao Q, Liu J. Updated approaches against SARS-CoV-2. Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy. 2020. DOI:10.1128/AAC.00483-20
4. NCT04304053. Treatment of Mild Cases and Chemoprophylaxis of Contacts as Prevention of the COVID-19 Epidemic. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT04304053>. 2020; (Accessed on 28 May 2020)
5. Division of Viral Diseases - National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases. Therapeutic Options for COVID-19 Patients. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020.www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/therapeutic-options.html(Accessed on 28 May 2020)

6. Heinzerling A, Stuckey MJ, Scheuer T, Xu K, Perkins KM, Resseger H, et al. Transmission of COVID-19 to Health Care Personnel During Exposures to a Hospitalized Patient - Solano County, California, February 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020; DOI:10.15585/mmwr.mm6915e5
7. ICMR- "Recommendation for use of hydroxy-chloroquine for prophylaxis of SARS - CoV - 2 infection"
https://icmr.nic.in/sites/default/files/upload_documents/HCQ_Recommendation_22March_final_MM.pdf (Accessed on 28 May 2020)
8. Shah K, Kamrai D, Mekala H, Mann B, Desai K, Patel RS. Focus on Mental Health During the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic: Applying Learnings from the Past Outbreaks. *Cureus.* 2020;DOI:10.7759/cureus.7405
9. Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, Tan Y, Xu L, Ho CS, et al. Immediate psychological responses and associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) epidemic among the general population in China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;DOI:10.3390/ijerph17051729
10. Li W, Yang Y, Liu ZH, Zhao YJ, Zhang Q, Zhang L, et al. Progression of Mental Health Services during the COVID-19 Outbreak in China. *International journal of biological sciences.* 2020. DOI: 10.7150/ijbs.45120
11. Lima CKT, Carvalho PM de M, Lima I de AAS, Nunes JVA de O, Saraiva JS, de Souza RI, et al. The emotional impact of Coronavirus 2019-nCoV (new Coronavirus disease). *Psychiatry Research.* 2020. DOI:10.1016/j.psychres.2020.112915
13. Noël F, Lima J. Pharmacological aspects and clues for the rational use of

Chloroquine / Hydroxychloroquine facing the therapeutic challenges of COVID-19 pandemic. *Lat Am J Clin Sci Med Technol.* 2020; Apr; 2: 28-34

12. Dan Zhou S-MDQT. COVID-19: a recommendation to examine the effect of hydroxychloroquine in preventing infection and progression | *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* | Oxford Academic. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2020; DOI:10.1093/jac/dkaa114
14. Driggin E, Madhavan M V., Bikdeli B, Chuich T, Laracy J, Biondi-Zoccai G, et al. Cardiovascular Considerations for Patients, Health Care Workers, and Health Systems During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology.* 2020. DOI:10.1016/j.jacc.2020.03.031
15. Ponticelli C, Moroni G. Hydroxychloroquine in systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE). *Expert Opin Drug Saf.* 2017. doi:10.1080/14740338.2017.1269168
16. Ochsendorf FR, Runne U. Chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine: Side-effect profile of important drugs. *Hautarzt.* 1991.
17. Dan Zhou S-MDQT. COVID-19: a recommendation to examine the effect of hydroxychloroquine in preventing infection and progression | *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* | Oxford Academic. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2020.
18. Ahluwalia J, Brooks SK, Weinman J, Rubin GJ. A systematic review of factors affecting adherence to malaria chemoprophylaxis amongst travellers from non-endemic countries. *Malar J.* 2020. doi:10.1186/s12936-020-3104-4
19. Jacquerioz FA, Croft AM. Drugs for preventing malaria in travellers. *Cochrane*

- Database Syst Rev.* 2015. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006491.pub3
20. Tickell-Painter M, Maayan N, Saunders R, Pace C, Sinclair D. Mefloquine for preventing malaria during travel to endemic areas. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2017. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006491.pub4
 21. Drugs to Prevent Malaria in Travellers: A Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Hum Parasit Dis.* 2010. doi:10.4137/hpd.s4223
 22. Gupta A, Kakkar R. Managing a covid 19 patient at different health care and field level settings. *Indian J Community Heal.* 2020.
 23. Patrì A, Fabbrocini G. Hydroxychloroquine and ivermectin: A synergistic combination for COVID-19 chemoprophylaxis and treatment? *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2020. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2020.04.017
 24. Napoli PE, Nioi M. Global Spread of Coronavirus Disease 2019 and Malaria: An Epidemiological Paradox in the Early Stage of A Pandemic. *J Clin Med.* 2020. doi:10.3390/jcm9041138
 25. Al-Kofahi M, Jacobson P, Boulware D, et al. Finding the dose for hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis for COVID-19; the desperate search for effectiveness. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2020. doi:10.1111/gcb.14887
 26. Etienne CHU de Saint, Pasteur I. Chemoprophylaxis of SARS-CoV-2 Infection (COVID-19) in Exposed Healthcare Workers. *ClinicalTrials.* 2020.
 27. Nioi M, Napoli PE. Global Spread of Coronavirus Disease 2019 and Malaria: An Epidemiological Paradox. *SSRN Electron J.* 2020. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3554389

28. Rios P, Radhakrishnan A, Thomas SM, Darvesh N, Straus SE, Tricco AC.
Guidelines for preventing respiratory illness in older adults aged 60 years and above living in long-term care: A rapid review of clinical practice guidelines. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.19.20039180

29. Arshad U, Pertinez H, Box H, et al. Prioritisation of potential anti-SARS-CoV-2 drug repurposing opportunities based on ability to achieve adequate target site concentrations derived from their established human pharmacokinetics. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.16.20068379

30. Carme B, Peguet C, Nevez G. Compliance with and tolerance of mefloquine and chloroquine + proguanil malaria chemoprophylaxis in French short-term travellers to sub-Saharan Africa. *Trop Med Int Health*. 1997;2(10):953-956. doi:10.1046/j.1365-3156.1997.d01-153.x

Table 1: Characteristics of study participants (n=391)

Characteristics	number	%
Age group		
<30 years	134	34.3
30 to 45 years	220	56.3
45 to 60 years	34	8.7
>60 years	3	.8
Gender		
Male	229	58.6
Female	162	41.4
Profession		
Administration	31	7.9
Doctor	57	14.6
Nursing	147	37.6
Paramedical	124	31.7
Others	32	8.1
Chronic diseases		
Liver Disease	5	1.2
Cardiovascular disease	8	1.9
Kidney disease	1	0.3
Respiratory disease	5	1.2
Diabetes mellitus	7	1.9
No co-morbidities	365	93.4

<i>Perceived danger due to COVID 19</i>		
Not scared at all	49	12.5
Minimally scared	84	21.5
Somehow scared	73	18.7
Very scared	86	22.0
No opinion	99	26.3

Table 2: Factors associated with uptake and adherence to hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis for COVID-19 among health care workers

Characteristics	Number	Taken HCQ prophylaxis		P value	Number	Taken doses as per schedule		P value
		n	%			n	%	
Total	391	297	75.9		297	254	85.5	
Age group								
<30 years	134	105	78.4	0.85	105	88	83.8	0.86
30 to 45 years	220	165	75.0		165	142	86.1	
45 to 60 years	34	25	73.5		25	22	88.0	
>60 years	3	2	66.7		2	2	100	
Gender								
Male	229	182	79.5	0.053	182	163	89.6	0.012
Female	162	115	71.0		115	91	79.1	
Profession								
Administration	31	16	64.0	<0.0001	16	15	93.8	0.003
Doctor	57	31	54.4		31	26	83.9	
Nursing	147	116	78.9		116	91	78.4	
Paramedical	124	109	87.9		109	104	95.4	
Others	32	25	78.3		25	18	72.2	

<i>Perceived danger due to COVID</i>								
Minimally scared	84	84	100	<0.000 1	84	72	85.7	<0.000 1
Not scared at all	49	49	100		49	41	83.7	
Somehow scared	73	73	100		73	66	90.4	
Very scared	86	86	100		86	75	87.2	
No opinion	99	5	5.1		5	0	0	

Table 3. Reasons given by health care workers for not taking hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis (n=94)

Characteristics	Frequency*	Proportion (%)
Fear of adverse effect	22	23.4
On other medication	12	12.8
No clear evidence	10	10.6
Pregnant/lactating	7	7.4
Not exposed	7	7.4
Acute illness	6	6.4
Developed side effects	3	3.2
Not interested	2	2.1
Others	10	10.6
No valid reasons given	23	24.5

*categories are mutually inclusive

Table 3a. Reasons given by health care workers for discontinuing hydroxychloroquine prophylaxis (n=26)

Characteristics	Frequency*	Proportion (%)
No reasons	12	46.2
Forgot to take the medicine	6	23
Developed adverse effects	4	15.4
No clear evidence for prophylaxis	2	7.7

Fear of adverse effects	1	3.8
Not aware about prophylaxis schedule	1	3.8
Work from home	1	3.8
*categories are mutually inclusive		

Adverse effects	Frequency*	Proportion (%)
Gastro intestinal side effects (vomiting-10, diarrhoea -12, gastritis-7)	29	9.8
Allergic reaction	12	4.0
Headache	11	3.7
Abnormal mood change	9	3.0
Palpitation	2	0.6
Vertigo	2	0.6
Ocular symptoms	1	0.3
Hypotension	1	0.3
Heaviness in chest	1	0.3
Fever	1	0.3
Total	52	17.5
*categories are mutually inclusive		

Table 5: Factors associated with adverse effects due to hydroxychloroquine among health care workers (n=297)

Characteristics	Number	Side effects		P value
		n	%	
Age group				
<30 years	105	15	15.2	0.45
30 to 45 years	165	33	19.4	
45 to 60 years	25	6	24	
>60 years	2	0	0	
Gender				
Male	182	16	9.3	<0.0001
Female	115	36	32.2	
Profession				
Administration	16	4	25	<0.0001
Doctor	31	4	12.9	
Nursing	116	36	32.8	
Paramedical	109	6	5.5	
Others	25	2	8	

<i>Supplementary table 1: Factors associated with perceived threat from COVID 19 among health care workers (n=391)</i>						
Characteristics	Expressed no opinion	Not scared	Minimally scared	Somewhat scared	Very scared	P value
Gender						
Females	48 30.4%	13 8.2%	36 22.8%	32 20.3%	29 18.4%	0.056
Males	51 22.3%	36 15.7%	44 19.2%	41 17.9%	57 24.9%	
Age groups						
<30 years	31 23.1%	19 14.2%	32 23.9%	24 17.9%	27 20.1%	0.66
30 to 45 years	57 25.9%	23 10.5%	40 18.2%	43 19.5%	54 24.5%	
45 to 60 years	10 29.4%	7 20.6%	6 17.6%	6 17.6%	5 14.7%	
>60 years	1	0	2	0	0	

	33.3%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	
Profession						
Administration	9 36.0%	2 8.0%	5 20.0%	6 24.0%	3 12.0%	<0.0001
Doctor	26 45.6%	10 17.5%	9 15.8%	9 15.8%	3 5.3%	
Nursing	33 22.4%	16 10.9%	35 23.8%	34 23.1%	26 17.7%	
Others	7 30.4%	10 43.5%	1 4.3%	2 8.7%	3 13.0%	
Paramedical	16 12.9%	9 7.3%	28 22.6%	20 16.1%	50 40.3%	