

1 **Public perceptions and preventive behaviours during the early phase of the COVID-19**
2 **pandemic: a comparative study between Hong Kong and the United Kingdom**

3
4 Bowman LR^{*1}, Kwok KO ^{*#3,4,5}, Redd RE², Yi YY³, Ward H^{1,2}, Wei W³, Atchison C^{^#2}, Wong
5 SYS^{^3}

6 * Authors contributed equally

7 ^ Authors contributed equally

8 Joint correspondence: kkokwok@cuhk.edu.hk; christina.atchison11@imperial.ac.uk

9
10 ¹ MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis and Abdul Latif Jameel Institute for Disease
11 and Emergency Analytics (J-IDEA), School of Public Health, Imperial College London, United
12 Kingdom

13 ² Patient Experience Research Centre, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, United
14 Kingdom

15 ³ JC School of Public Health and Primary Care, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong
16 Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

17 ⁴ Stanley Ho Centre for Emerging Infectious Diseases, The Chinese University of Hong Kong,
18 Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China

19 ⁵ Shenzhen Research Institute of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China

20 **ABSTRACT**

21

22 **Background:** In the absence of treatments and vaccines, the mitigation of COVID-19 relies on
23 population engagement in non-pharmaceutical interventions, which is driven by their risk
24 perception, anxiety level and knowledge. There may also be regional discrepancies in these drivers
25 due to different historical exposure to disease outbreaks, government responses and cultures. As
26 such, this study compared psycho-behavioral responses in two regions during the early phase of
27 the pandemic.

28

29 **Methods:** Comparable cross-sectional surveys were administered among adults in Hong Kong
30 (HK) and the United Kingdom (UK) during the early phase of each respective epidemic.
31 Explanatory variables included demographics, risk perception and knowledge of COVID-19,
32 anxiety level and preventive behaviors. Responses were weighted according to census data.
33 Logistic regression models, including interaction terms to quantify regional differences, were used
34 to assess the association between explanatory variables and the adoption of social-distancing
35 measures.

36

37 **Results:** Data of 3431 complete responses (HK:1663; UK:1768) were analysed. Perceived severity
38 differed by region (HK: 97.5%; UK: 20.7%). A large proportion of respondents were
39 abnormally/borderline anxious (HK:64.8%; UK:45.9%) and regarded direct contact with infected
40 individuals as the transmission route of COVID-19 (HK:94.0-98.5%; UK:69.2-93.5%), with HK
41 identifying additional routes. HK reported high levels of adoption of social-distancing (HK:32.4-
42 93.7%; UK:17.6-59.0%) and mask-wearing (HK:98.8%; UK:3.1%). The impact of perceived

43 severity and perceived ease of transmission on the adoption of social-distancing varied by region.
44 In HK, they had no impact, whereas in the UK, those who perceived severity as “high” were more
45 likely to adopt social-distancing (aOR:1.58-3.01), and those who perceived transmission as “easy”
46 were prone to both general social-distancing (aOR:2.00, 95% CI:1.57, 2.55) and contact avoidance
47 (aOR:1.80, 95% CI: 1.41, 2.30). The impact of anxiety on adopting social-distancing did not vary
48 by region.

49
50 **Discussion:** These results suggest that health officials should ascertain and consider baseline levels
51 of risk perception and knowledge in the populations, as well as prior sensitisation to infectious
52 disease outbreaks, during the development of mitigation strategies. Risk communication should be
53 done through suitable media channels - and trust should be maintained - while early intervention
54 remains the cornerstone of effective outbreak response.

55

56 **Word count:** 343

57

58 **KEYWORDS**

59 COVID-19; novel coronavirus; pandemic; behavioural response; risk perceptions; anxiety;

60 comparative; Hong Kong; United Kingdom

61 INTRODUCTION

62

63 In December 2019, a novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) emerged in Wuhan, Hubei province,
64 China, and spread rapidly throughout countries worldwide, forming the second pandemic of the
65 21st century [1]. The disease progression varies by regions. As of 2 August 2020, there have been
66 at least 17 million cases and over 670,000 deaths worldwide [2].

67

68 Prior to the availability of effective treatments and vaccines, strategies to mitigate the impact of the
69 pandemic have been primarily non-pharmaceutical [3], mainly focused on public health promotion
70 of the use of simple but effective preventive measures [4, 5]. Many important control strategies
71 currently promoted by governments need public participation, either through direct adoption of
72 preventative behaviours, such as handwashing or wearing face masks, or through compliance with
73 social distancing policies, such as recommendations to avoid public transport and mass gatherings.

74

75 Previous studies of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) and pandemic influenza have
76 shown that governments should account for risk perception and anxiety when promoting
77 preventative measures. There is evidence that higher perceived risk of infection is associated with
78 increased adoption of precautionary measures against infection [6, 7], while increased anxiety has
79 also been shown to increase the likelihood that people will engage in protective behaviour [8].

80 Moreover, longitudinal data suggest that such perceptions, behaviours and anxieties change with
81 context, and over time, as uncertainty about disease severity reduces, and knowledge of
82 transmission increases [9].

83

84 During the current coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, several studies have
85 examined public risk perceptions and knowledge in various countries, including Finland [10],
86 Israel [11], Italy [12], Nigeria [13], the United States [14] and Vietnam [15], but only few have
87 identified the factors associated with greater adoption of preventative measures, or how these
88 associations vary by context. In HK, both greater understanding of COVID-19 and increased
89 anxiety were associated with greater adoption of social distancing behaviours [5]; whereas in the
90 UK, there was a significant socio-economic gradient in the ability to adopt and comply with social
91 distancing measures, specifically the ability to work from home and ability to self-isolate [16].

92
93 This initial evidence - that there is variation across context in affective responses, risk perceptions,
94 the impact of socio-demographic factors, and their association with uptake of preventative
95 behaviours - has significant implications when tailoring policy to specific circumstances. In order
96 to tease out these relationships, a more thorough, comparative analysis is required. Yet studies in
97 different countries often use slightly different metrics to measure the same behaviour, which can
98 lead to difficulty when interpreting the significance of heterogeneous contexts.

99
100 In this study, we examined and compared public perception and adoption of preventive behaviours
101 in response to the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic in two different regions: HK and the
102 UK. We further investigated the factors associated with greater adoption of different types of
103 social distancing measures. Our results have immediate implications on how health officials plan
104 and communicate the mitigation strategies for the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic to communities.

105

106 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

107

108 *Study design and recruitment*

109

110 In HK and the UK, cross-sectional surveys were conducted during the early phase of the COVID-
111 19 pandemic, when there were only limited government-level interventions in place [5, 16]. The
112 survey period in HK was from 24 January 2020 to 13 February 2020, and in the UK from 17 to 18
113 March 2020. In HK, the first laboratory-confirmed case was reported on 23 January 2020, rising to
114 53 cases by 13 February 2020 [17]; whereas in the UK, the first two laboratory-confirmed cases
115 were reported on 30 January 2020, rising to 3,902 cases by 17 March 2020 [18]. In HK, an online
116 survey was distributed by district councils to their residents. Those individuals aged 18 years or
117 above, who understood Chinese and lived in HK were eligible to participate [5]. In the UK, the
118 online survey was distributed by a market research company to a random sample of an existing
119 panel of 800,000+ adults (aged ≥ 18 years) [16]. Details of the survey design and sampling
120 strategy are described elsewhere [5, 16].

121

122 *Study instrument*

123

124 The questionnaire used was largely similar across the two regions. Sociodemographic variables
125 included age, sex, educational attainment and employment status. Anxiety level was measured
126 using the Hospital, Anxiety and Depression scale - Anxiety (HASD-A) (0-7 = Normal; 8-10 =
127 Borderline abnormal; 11-21 = Abnormal) [19]. Risk perception towards COVID-19 was measured
128 by perceived severity of symptoms if infected with COVID-19. Knowledge of COVID-19 was
129 assessed by asking whether COVID-19 could be transmitted through various routes, including

130 direct human exposure (for example, physical contact or a face-to-face conversation with someone
131 who has coronavirus with or without symptoms) and other types of exposure (for example, visiting
132 wet markets, or consumption of wild animal meat). Respondents were also asked about the sources
133 from which they retrieved information about COVID-19. In addition, they were asked about
134 adoption of preventative behaviours to cope with the transmission of COVID-19. Three types of
135 preventative measures were considered: personal hygiene, social distancing and travel avoidance.

136

137 *Data analysis*

138

139 Descriptive statistics for all variables present the number of respondents and the raw or weighted
140 percentages. The responding samples were weighted to be representative of the UK (UK 2011
141 census data [20]) and HK adult population (HK 2016 census data [21]). Chi-square goodness-of-fit
142 tests were used for comparison of characteristics across regions. Multivariate logistic regression
143 models were used to identify sociodemographic and psychosocial factors associated with the
144 adoption of three types of social distancing: (i) general measures, specified by avoiding crowded
145 places, social events and going out; (ii) contact measures, specified by avoiding contact with
146 individuals who had fever or respiratory symptoms, and who had been to affected areas recently;
147 and (iii) work measure, specified by avoiding going to work.

148

149 Common and comparable sociodemographic factors considered in separate analytical studies [5,
150 16] were included in this comparative analysis. The association between psychosocial factors
151 (including level of anxiety, perceived severity and perceived ease of transmission) and adoption of
152 social-distancing measures was considered a priori to be affected by region. Therefore, we

153 examined the effect modification due to region using interaction terms in the baseline models,
154 which can be interpreted as the difference of the estimated effects of psychosocial factors on
155 adopting social-distancing measures due to different regions. Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) and 95%
156 confidence intervals (CI) were estimated. Associations with a p-value <0.05 in the adjusted
157 analyses were considered to be statistically significant. Analyses were conducted in R (v3.6.3).

158

159 *Ethical Approval*

160

161 The study was approved by Imperial College London Research Ethics Committee (reference
162 number: 20IC5861) and Survey and Behavioral Research Ethics Committee of The Chinese
163 University of Hong Kong (reference number: SBRE-19-625).

164

165 **RESULTS**

166

167 *Demographic differences*

168

169 There were significant differences in the sociodemographic characteristics of study respondents
170 between the two regions. HK respondents were younger, with 26.0% aged 18-24 years, compared
171 with 9.4% for the UK ($P<0.001$) (**Table 1**). The HK sample contained a greater proportion of
172 females (68.6% [HK] vs. 52.9% [UK]; $P<0.01$), and those educated to university degree level or
173 above (63.2% [HK] vs. 33.7% [UK]; $P<0.001$). Employment status reflected the age structure of
174 respondents in each setting, with a greater proportion of the UK respondents in the retired category
175 (2.6% [HK] vs. 27.2% [UK]; $P<0.001$) (**Table 1**).

176

177 *Perceptions and beliefs*

178

179 Higher perceived severity of COVID-19 was observed among HK respondents, with 97.5% rating
180 the symptoms of COVID-19 infection as serious or very serious compared with only 20.7% of the
181 UK respondents. In terms of levels of concern, 94.7% of the HK sample responded as feeling
182 either very worried or fairly worried, compared with 78.8% of the UK sample. The HADS-A
183 scores reflected similar trends, with 64.8% of the HK sample recording an abnormal or borderline
184 abnormal result, compared with 45.9% of the UK sample (**Table 1**).

185

186 *Knowledge and information sources*

187

188 The majority of respondents regarded direct contact with infected individuals or virus-
189 contaminated environments as the primary means of virus transmission (HK: 94.0-98.5%; UK:
190 69.2-93.5%) (**Table 2**). However, respondents from HK identified a far boarder scope of
191 transmission routes. A large proportion of HK respondents (66.5-93.3%) regarded wild animal
192 meat, wet markets and imported goods as potential exposures, compared to 11.3-21.5% in the UK.
193 There was also significant variation across use and reliability of information sources (**Table S1**)/
194 The majority of respondents deemed health professionals reliable (HK, UK: >80%) but few could
195 access them (HK:4.7%; UK:11.5%). In addition, most of the UK respondents (90.7%) considered
196 official websites reliable, compared to 15.5% among HK respondents at the beginning of the
197 pandemic.

198

199 *Adoption of social distancing measures*

200

201 There were variations in the weighted proportion of HK and the UK respondents adopting
202 precautionary measures against COVID-19 (**Figure 1**). HK respondents reported higher levels of
203 adoption across all social distancing and personal hygiene measures. In particular, 98.8% of HK
204 respondents reported wearing a face mask compared to 3.1% among the UK respondents. General
205 measures were adopted by 68.1-87.3 % and 37.8-59.0 % of respondents in HK and the UK,
206 respectively. Contact measures were adopted by 83.9-93.7% and 33.7-50.1 % of respondents in
207 HK and the UK, respectively. Work measure was reported by 32.4% and 22.5% of respondents in
208 HK and the UK, respectively.

209

210 Sociodemographic factors were associated with the three social distancing measures (**Table S2**;
211 **Table 3**). The UK respondents were significantly less likely than their HK counterparts to adopt
212 social distancing measures (**Table S2**, aOR: 0.08-0.53, $P<0.001$; **Table 3**, aOR:0.08-0.70,
213 $P<0.001$). When adjusting for regional differences, general measures were less likely to be adopted
214 by males (aOR:0.82; 95% CI:0.71-0.95) but more likely to be adopted by the unemployed
215 (aOR:1.65; 95% CI: 1.30-2.09) or retired (aOR:1.92; 95% CI: 1.43-2.59). Contact measures were
216 less likely to be adopted by males (aOR:0.74; 95% CI:0.63-0.88) but more likely to be adopted by
217 those retired (aOR:1.40; 95% CI: 1.03-1.91). Finally, work measure was less likely to be adopted
218 by those aged 55 years or above (aOR:0.60; 95% CI: 0.39-0.93).

219

220 The impact of perceived severity of infection and perceived ease of transmission on the adoption
221 of social distancing behaviours vary by region (**Table 4**). In HK, they had no impact, whereas in
222 the UK, those who perceived COVID-19 infection as serious were more likely to adopt all social

223 distancing measures (aOR:1.58-3.01), and those who perceived transmission of SARS-CoV-2 as
224 easy were more prone to adopt both general social distancing measures (Model 4.2, aOR:2.00,
225 95% CI:1.57-2.55) and contact measures (Model 5.2, aOR:1.80, 95% CI:1.41-2.30). On the other
226 hand, the impact of anxiety on the adoption of social distancing behaviours did not significantly
227 differ by region (**Table 4**). Those with borderline abnormal (HK, aOR:1.26-1.62; UK, aOR:1.36-
228 1.48) or abnormal HADS-A (HK, aOR:1.82-2.09; UK, aOR:1.40-2.40) scores were more likely to
229 adopt all three types of social distancing measures compared to those with normal anxiety levels.

230

231 **DISCUSSION**

232

233 *Principal results*

234

235 This study compared the initial public perceptions and preventative behaviours during the COVID-
236 19 pandemic across HK and the UK. The adoption rate of social-distancing measures was higher in
237 HK than in the UK. Risk perception and knowledge of COVID-19 were consistently and
238 significantly higher in HK, but the UK respondents were more likely to alter behaviours to align
239 with these two metrics: where transmission was considered ‘easy’, and perceived severity was
240 considered ‘severe’, they were more likely to adopt preventive behaviours. Anxiety was a
241 consistent driver of behaviour change irrespective of context: those more anxious were more likely
242 to adopt preventative actions. Such behaviour is consistent with the wider literature surrounding
243 the adoption of precautionary measures [6, 7], and in particular, provides further evidence that
244 anxiety drives protective behaviours, such as handwashing [8], an effective intervention against the
245 transmission of respiratory diseases [22].

246

247 *Implications*

248

249 This study has three implications. First, health officials should account for region-specific baseline
250 levels of risk perception and knowledge when designing and promoting mitigation strategies. The
251 evidence presented by this study demonstrates that regional context is important in terms of both
252 how people understand risk, and how risk drives behaviour. While the significant social, historical
253 and cultural heterogeneity between HK and the UK likely contributes to the results observed in this
254 study, the importance of additional intrinsic factors, such as population sensitisation via past
255 infectious disease outbreaks, and state-led health promotion campaigns, should not be
256 underestimated. In studies elsewhere, public perceptions of these factors have been significant
257 drivers of adoption of preventative behaviours during previous epidemics [23], while conceptions
258 of personal risk have been connected to individuals' understanding of local disease prevalence and
259 severity [24-26]. Therefore, assessment of the baseline population knowledge, attitudes and
260 practices (KAP) and subsequent continual monitoring throughout the pandemic are essential to any
261 effective context-specific pandemic preparedness plan.

262

263 Second, risk communication should build upon baseline KAP outcomes and develop trust across
264 suitable media channels. Significant contextual heterogeneity in the public reliance on information
265 sources provides additional insight here. HK reported greater reliance on social media and far less
266 trust in official websites, suggesting that official messaging in HK unlikely drove individual
267 behaviour change; by contrast, the UK results suggested that although the UK government held an
268 effective platform to influence public health behaviour, government health messaging was

269 insufficient to attain similar HK baseline knowledge levels, particularly in the absence of prior
270 population sensitisation to infectious disease outbreaks. Therefore, there is a pressing need to tailor
271 communication approaches, likely on a graduated scale, but as a minimum in a binary fashion to
272 accommodate both “naive” and “experienced” populations.

273
274 Third, the comparative snapshots of initial community responses captured by this study
275 demonstrate the diversity in approach and pandemic response during the early phases. Across
276 many contexts, national lockdowns became commonplace as the true magnitude of transmission
277 became apparent; but the associated indirect costs render blanket strategies untenable in the
278 medium term. As national lockdowns are lifted, countries worldwide face the challenge of
279 resurging cases, and must consider nuanced approaches to prevent additional harm. Driven by
280 anxiety, high perceived severity and knowledge, HK conducted widespread preventative measures
281 early, and en masse. Together with early government actions [27], the strategies adopted by the
282 HK community were successful during the initial phase of the pandemic. Considering this, and that
283 national populations are now highly sensitised to COVID-19 transmission, tailored public health
284 messaging, early regional containment, and increased health capacity should ensure more effective
285 public health responses with less indirect impact on national economies.

286

287 *Study strengths and limitations*

288

289 This study is one of few that compared community responses during a pandemic using similar
290 metrics while adjusting for disease progression. It has two limitations though. First, both samples
291 varied significantly across the demographic spectrum, and while responses were weighted, such

292 convenience sampling is unlikely to be representative of the wider populations. Second, the survey
293 period in HK was three weeks, compared to two days in the UK. Therefore, while the timing of the
294 two surveys relative to each national epidemic was comparable, there may be temporal differences
295 between survey duration, which might lead to some sampling bias, especially during the initial
296 phase of the pandemic when there is much uncertainty about the disease.

297

298 *Conclusions*

299

300 To conclude, this study compared the initial community responses towards COVID-19 in HK and
301 the UK. In line with the high baseline level of risk perception and knowledge, and historical
302 exposure to respiratory disease outbreaks, the adoption of preventive measures was higher in HK.
303 However, the UK sample demonstrated that the adoption rate of preventive behaviours could be
304 improved by heightened risk perception and knowledge, best driven by improved public health
305 campaigns. Together, these results suggest that health officials should ascertain and consider
306 baseline levels of risk perception and knowledge, as well as prior sensitisation to infectious disease
307 outbreaks, during the development of mitigation strategies. Risk communication should be done
308 through suitable media channels - and trust should be maintained - while early intervention
309 remains the cornerstone of effective outbreak response.

310

311 Word count = 2618

312 **CONTRIBUTION**

313 Bowman LR (BLR), Kwok KO (KKO), Ward H (WH), Atchison C (AC) and Wong SYS (WSYS)
314 conceived the study; KKO, Wei WI (WWI) and AC collected the data; KKO, Yi YY (YYY) and
315 WWI analysed the data; BLR, KKO, Redd RE (RRE), WH, WWI, AC and WSYS interpreted the
316 data; BLR wrote the first draft of the manuscript; KKO, RRE, YYY, WH, WWI, AC, and WSYS
317 edited the manuscript.

318

319 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

320 The study was supported by Imperial NIHR Research Capability Funding and the internal funding
321 of The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

322

323 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

324 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal
325 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

326

327 **ABBREVIATIONS**

328 HK: Hong Kong

329 UK: United Kingdom

330 COVID-19: coronavirus disease 2019

331 SARS: severe acute respiratory syndrome

332 HASD-A : Hospital, Anxiety and Depression scale - Anxiety

333 aOR: adjusted odds ratio

334 CI: confidence interval

335 KAP: knowledge, attitudes and practices

336 **REFERENCES**

- 337 1. World Health Organization. Rolling updates on coronavirus disease (COVID-19) (Updated 31
338 July 2020) 2020 [Available from: [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen)
339 [coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen) .
- 340 2. Hong Kong Centre for Health Protection. Countries/areas with reported cases of Coronavirus
341 Disease-2019 (COVID-19) (Last updated on August 2, 2020, 11 am) 2020 [Available from:
342 https://www.chp.gov.hk/files/pdf/statistics_of_the_cases_novel_coronavirus_infection_en.pdf
343 .
- 344 3. Kwok KO, Lai FYL, Wei VWI, Tsoi MTF, Wong SYS, Tang JWT. Comparing the impact of
345 various interventions to control the spread of COVID-19 in twelve countries. *J Hosp Infect*.
346 2020. PMID: 32619456
- 347 4. Prime Minister's Office of The governemnt of the United Kingdom. Prime Minister's
348 statement on coronavirus (COVID-19): 16 March 2020 2020 [Available from:
349 <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-statement-on-coronavirus-16-march-2020> .
- 350 5. Kwok KO, Li KK, Chan HHH, Yi YY, Tang A, Wei WI, et al. Community Responses during
351 Early Phase of COVID-19 Epidemic, Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(7):1575-9.
352 PMID: 32298227
- 353 6. Leung GM, Ho LM, Chan SK, Ho SY, Bacon-Shone J, Choy RY, et al. Longitudinal
354 assessment of community psychobehavioral responses during and after the 2003 outbreak of
355 severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;40(12):1713-20.
356 PMID: 15909256
- 357 7. Bish A, Michie S. Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours during a
358 pandemic: a review. *Br J Health Psychol*. 2010;15(Pt 4):797-824. PMID: 20109274

- 359 8. Jones JH, Salathe M. Early assessment of anxiety and behavioral response to novel swine-
360 origin influenza A(H1N1). *PLoS One*. 2009;4(12):e8032. PMID: 19997505
- 361 9. Bults M, Beaujean DJ, de Zwart O, Kok G, van Empelen P, van Steenberghe JE, et al.
362 Perceived risk, anxiety, and behavioural responses of the general public during the early phase
363 of the Influenza A (H1N1) pandemic in the Netherlands: results of three consecutive online
364 surveys. *BMC Public Health*. 2011;11:2. PMID: 21199571
- 365 10. Lohiniva AL, Sane J, Sibenberg K, Puumalainen T, Salminen M. Understanding coronavirus
366 disease (COVID-19) risk perceptions among the public to enhance risk communication
367 efforts: a practical approach for outbreaks, Finland, February 2020. *Euro Surveill*.
368 2020;25(13). PMID: 32265008
- 369 11. Gesser-Edelsburg A, Cohen R, Hijazi R, Abed Elhadi Shahbari N. Analysis of Public
370 Perception of the Israeli Government's Early Emergency Instructions Regarding COVID-19:
371 Online Survey Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(5):e19370. PMID: 32392172
- 372 12. Motta Zanin G, Gentile E, Parisi A, Spasiano D. A Preliminary Evaluation of the Public Risk
373 Perception Related to the COVID-19 Health Emergency in Italy. *Int J Environ Res Public*
374 *Health*. 2020;17(9). PMID: 32349253
- 375 13. Olapegba PO, Ayandele O. Survey data of COVID-19-related Knowledge, Risk Perceptions
376 and Precautionary Behavior among Nigerians. *Data Brief*. 2020:105685. PMID: 32391411
- 377 14. McFadden SM, Malik AA, Aguolu OG, Willebrand KS, Omer SB. Perceptions of the adult
378 US population regarding the novel coronavirus outbreak. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(4):e0231808.
379 PMID: 32302370
- 380 15. Huynh TLD. Data for understanding the risk perception of COVID-19 from Vietnamese
381 sample. *Data Brief*. 2020;30:105530. PMID: 32322641

- 382 16. Atchison CJ, Bowman L, Vrinten C, Redd R, Pristera P, Eaton JW, et al. Perceptions and
383 behavioural responses of the general public during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-
384 sectional survey of UK Adults. 2020.
- 385 17. Hong Kong Centre for Health Protection. Latest situation of cases of COVID-19 (as of 2
386 August 2020) 2020 [Available from:
387 https://www.chp.gov.hk/files/pdf/local_situation_covid19_en.pdf.
- 388 18. Department of Health and Social Care and Public Health England. Coronavirus cases in the
389 UK: daily updated statistics 2020 [Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-information-for-the-public)
390 [covid-19-information-for-the-public](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-information-for-the-public).
- 391 19. Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety And Depression Scale. Health Qual Life Outcomes.
392 2003;1:29. PMID: 12914662
- 393 20. Office for National Statistics. 2011 Census 2011 [Available from:
394 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>.
- 395 21. The Census and Statistics Department. By-census Results 2016 [Available from:
396 <https://www.bycensus2016.gov.hk/en/>.
- 397 22. Rabie T, Curtis V. Handwashing and risk of respiratory infections: a quantitative systematic
398 review. Trop Med Int Health. 2006;11(3):258-67. PMID: 16553905
- 399 23. SteelFisher GK, Blendon RJ, Ward JR, Rapoport R, Kahn EB, Kohl KS. Public response to
400 the 2009 influenza A H1N1 pandemic: a polling study in five countries. Lancet Infect Dis.
401 2012;12(11):845-50. PMID: 23041199
- 402 24. Funk S, Salathe M, Jansen VA. Modelling the influence of human behaviour on the spread of
403 infectious diseases: a review. J R Soc Interface. 2010;7(50):1247-56. PMID: 20504800

- 404 25. de Zwart O, Veldhuijzen IK, Elam G, Aro AR, Abraham T, Bishop GD, et al. Perceived
405 threat, risk perception, and efficacy beliefs related to SARS and other (emerging) infectious
406 diseases: results of an international survey. *Int J Behav Med.* 2009;16(1):30-40. PMID:
407 19125335
- 408 26. Bults M, Beaujean DJ, Richardus JH, Voeten HA. Perceptions and behavioral responses of the
409 general public during the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic: a systematic review. *Disaster
410 Med Public Health Prep.* 2015;9(2):207-19. PMID: 25882127
- 411 27. Wong SYS, Kwok KO, Chan FKL. What can countries learn from Hong Kong's response to
412 the COVID-19 pandemic? *CMAJ.* 2020;192(19):E511-E5. PMID: 32332040

FIGURES AND TABLES

Table 1. Hong Kong and United Kingdom study respondent characteristics

Characteristics	UK (n = 1768)		HK (n = 1663)		P-value ^a
	Number	%	Number	%	
Age					
18-24	166	9.4	433	26.0	<0.001
25-34	243	13.7	535	32.2	
35-44	335	18.9	370	22.2	
45-54	300	17.0	193	11.6	
55+	724	41.0	132	7.9	
Sex					
Female	936	52.9	1141	68.6	<0.001
Male	832	47.1	522	31.4	
Education attainment					
No formal qualification/ lower secondary or below	100	5.7	53	3.2	<0.001
Secondary level qualification/ higher secondary	738	41.7	292	17.6	
Post-secondary but below degree	334	18.9	267	16.1	
Degree or above	596	33.7	1051	63.2	
Employment status					
Employer/Employee	1025	58.0	1135	68.3	<0.001
Full-time student	90	5.1	278	16.7	
Unemployed/Not working	172	9.7	206	12.4	
Retired	481	27.2	44	2.6	
Perceived severity ^b					
Level 1	96	5.4	1071	64.4	<0.001
Level 2	270	15.3	550	33.1	
Level 3	1058	59.8	32	1.9	
Level 4	320	18.1	7	0.4	
Level 5	24	1.4	3	0.2	
Worry about COVID-19					
Very worried	536	30.3	852	51.2	<0.001
Fairly worried	858	48.5	723	43.5	
Neutral/ Don't know	5	0.3	40	2.4	
Not very worried	295	16.7	1	0.1	
Not at all worried	74	4.2	47	2.8	
Anxiety level					
Normal	956	54.1	586	35.2	<0.001
Borderline abnormal	336	19.0	512	30.8	
Abnormal	476	26.9	565	34.0	

^a Chi-square goodness-of-fit test

^b Level 1 = very serious (HK) / life-threatening (UK); Level 2 = serious (HK) / severe (e.g. may need care and treatment in hospital) (UK); Level 3 = neutral (HK) / moderate (e.g. may need self-care and rest in bed) (UK); Level 4 = not serious (HK) / mild (e.g. can go about daily tasks normally) (UK); Level 5 = not serious at all (HK) / no symptoms (UK)

Table 2. Knowledge of COVID-19 transmission

Are the following transmission routes of COVID-19?	Number of respondents answering "yes" (weighted %)	
	UK (n=1768)	HK (n=1663)
Contact		
Face-to-face conversation (no physical contact) with someone who has coronavirus but no symptoms	1234 (69.2)	1564 (94.0)
Face-to-face conversation (no physical contact) with someone who has coronavirus with symptoms	1398 (78.7)	1616 (96.7)
Physical contact with someone who has coronavirus but no symptoms	1580 (89.0)	1635 (98.1)
Physical contact with someone with coronavirus who has symptoms	1657 (93.5)	1644 (98.5)
Transmission mode		
Droplets	-	1649 (99.2)
Aerosol when infected people cough or sneeze	-	1478 (91.3)
Being in close contact (i.e. within 2 meters) to someone who has coronavirus when they cough or sneeze	1604 (90.4)	-
Being further away (i.e. further than 2 meters away) to someone who has coronavirus, when they cough or sneeze	615 (34.8)	-
Others		
Contact with virus-contaminated environment	1411 (79.5)	1594 (96.2)
Consumption of wild animal meat	199 (11.3)	1546 (93.3)
Visiting wet market	374 (21.5)	1342 (80.9)
Consumption of seafood imported from specific regions ^a	258 (14.8)	1199 (70.7)
Consumption/use of products imported from specific regions ^a	209 (12.1)	1101 (66.5)

^a Specific regions refer to Wuhan (HK)/ China (UK).

Table 3. Factors associated with the adoption of different types of social distancing

Factors	Types of social distancing					
	General ^a (n=3431) (Model 1)		Contact ^b (n=3431) (Model 2)		Work ^c (n=2160) (Model 3)	
	aOR (95% CI)	P-value	aOR (95% CI)	P-value	aOR (95% CI)	P-value
Age						
18-24	-	-	-	-	-	-
25-34	1.54 (1.16, 2.05)	0.003	0.96 (0.68, 1.35)	0.81	1.00 (0.72, 1.39)	0.99
35-44	1.25 (0.93, 1.68)	0.13	0.74 (0.53, 1.05)	0.09	0.95 (0.68, 1.33)	0.77
45-54	1.30 (0.95, 1.79)	0.10	0.67 (0.47, 0.97)	0.03	0.72 (0.49, 1.05)	0.09
55+	0.99 (0.70, 1.41)	0.97	0.81 (0.55, 1.19)	0.28	0.60 (0.39, 0.93)	0.02
Sex						
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	0.82 (0.71, 0.95)	0.01	0.74 (0.63, 0.88)	<0.001	0.95 (0.78, 1.16)	0.62
Education attainment ^d						
No formal qualification/ lower secondary or below	-	-	-	-	-	-
Secondary level qualification/ higher secondary	0.99 (0.68, 1.44)	0.94	0.96 (0.64, 1.44)	0.85	1.04 (0.46, 2.34)	0.92
Post-secondary but below degree	1.06 (0.72, 1.55)	0.78	1.12 (0.74, 1.71)	0.58	1.09 (0.48, 2.47)	0.83
Degree or above	1.27 (0.87, 1.83)	0.21	0.98 (0.66, 1.47)	0.94	1.94 (0.88, 4.28)	0.10
Employment status						
Employed	-	-	-	-	-	-
Full-time student	1.35 (0.98, 1.85)	0.07	1.08 (0.73, 1.59)	0.70	-	-
Unemployed	1.65 (1.30, 2.09)	<0.001	1.20 (0.91, 1.58)	0.20	-	-
Retired	1.92 (1.43, 2.59)	<0.001	1.40 (1.03, 1.91)	0.03	-	-
Region						
HK	-	-	-	-	-	-
UK	0.35 (0.30, 0.41)	<0.001	0.08 (0.07, 0.10)	<0.001	0.70 (0.57, 0.87)	<0.001

^a "General" refers to avoiding going to: (i) crowded areas; (ii) social events; and (iii) going out.

^b "Contact" refers to avoiding contacting individuals who (i) had a fever or respiratory symptoms; and (ii) had been to affected areas (UK) / Wuhan (HK) in the past 14 days (UK) / past month (HK).

^c "Work" refers to avoiding going to work.

Table 4. Region-specific effect and the effect modification (by regions) of selected variables on the adoption of social distancing

Region	Selected variables	Types of social distancing					
		General ^a (n=3431)		Contact ^b (n=3431)		Work ^c (n=2160)	
		aOR (95% CI)	p-value	aOR (95% CI)	p-value	aOR (95% CI)	p-value
	Perceived severity ^d	(Model 4.1) ^e		(Model 5.1) ^e		(Model 6.1) ^e	
HK	Not serious	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Serious	0.93 (0.50, 1.74)	0.82	1.71 (0.85, 3.47)	0.13	0.63 (0.30, 1.30)	0.21
UK	Not serious	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Serious	3.01 (2.35, 3.86)	<0.001	1.90 (1.48, 2.43)	<0.001	1.58 (1.06, 2.37)	0.03
	Effect modification ^f	3.24 (1.65, 6.35)	<0.001	1.11 (0.52, 2.34)	0.79	2.52 (1.09, 5.80)	0.03
	Perceived ease of transmission ^g	(Model 4.2) ^e		(Model 5.2) ^e		(Model 6.2) ^e	
HK	Difficult	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Easy	1.15 (0.77, 1.74)	0.50	1.00 (0.58, 1.71)	0.99	0.61 (0.37, 1.03)	0.07
UK	Difficult	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Easy	2.00 (1.57, 2.55)	<0.001	1.80 (1.41, 2.30)	<0.001	1.34 (0.96, 1.87)	0.09
	Effect modification ^f	1.73 (1.07, 2.79)	0.02	1.81 (1.00, 3.28)	0.05	2.18 (1.18, 4.04)	0.01
	Anxiety level	(Model 4.3) ^e		(Model 5.3) ^e		(Model 6.3) ^e	
HK	Normal	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Borderline abnormal	1.62 (1.27, 2.06)	<0.001	1.26 (0.93, 1.70)	0.14	1.51 (1.10, 2.06)	0.01
	Abnormal	2.09 (1.64, 2.66)	<0.001	1.85 (1.34, 2.56)	<0.001	1.82 (1.34, 2.48)	<0.001
UK	Normal	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Borderline abnormal	1.48 (1.11, 1.96)	0.007	1.36 (1.02, 1.80)	0.03	1.37 (0.92, 2.02)	0.12
	Abnormal	2.40 (1.87, 3.09)	<0.001	1.76 (1.37, 2.27)	<0.001	1.40 (0.99, 1.98)	0.06
	Effect modification (borderline abnormal) ^f	0.91 (0.63, 1.33)	0.64	1.08 (0.71, 1.63)	0.71	0.91 (0.55, 1.49)	0.70
	Effect modification (abnormal) ^f	1.15 (0.82, 1.62)	0.42	0.95 (0.63, 1.42)	0.80	0.77 (0.48, 1.21)	0.26

^a "General" refers to avoiding going to: (i) crowded areas; (ii) social events; and (iii) going out.

^b "Contact" refers to avoiding contacting individuals who (i) had a fever or respiratory symptoms; and (ii) had been to affected areas (UK) / Wuhan (HK) in the past 14 days (UK) / past one month (HK).

^c "Work" refers to avoiding going to work.

^d For perceived severity, "serious" refers to levels 1-2; whereas "not serious" refers to levels 3-5. (Refer to footnote b in Table 1)

^e The models have been adjusted for all covariates in Table 4.

^f It measures the "difference of the effect being considered" due to "difference in region", and its value is the ratio of the two region-specific effects.

^g For perceived ease of transmission, 'ease' refers to that the virus can be transmitted by having face-to-face conversation with someone who has coronavirus but no symptoms; otherwise, the perceived ease of transmission is 'difficult'.




Figure 1. Adoption of precautionary measures against COVID-19

^a Affected areas refer to China (HK) / affected areas in the world (UK).

^b 'Specific regions in a limited period' refer to affected areas (UK) / Wuhan (HK) in the past 14 days (UK) / past one month(HK).

^c Only included respondents who were employees or employers (n = 2160).

^d Only included respondents who were full-time students or have at least one child (n = 1239).