

1 **Full Title:** Arbovirus risk perception as a predictor of mosquito-bite preventive behaviors in
2 Ponce, Puerto Rico

3

4 **Short Title:** Arbovirus risk perception and preventive behaviors in Puerto Rico

5

6 **Authors:** Josée M. Dussault, MSPH¹, Gabriela Paz-Bailey, MD, PhD², Liliana Sánchez-
7 González, MD, MPH², Laura E. Adams, DVM, MPH², Dania M. Rodríguez, MS², Kyle R.
8 Ryff, MPH², Chelsea G. Major, MPH², Olga Lorenzi, MS², Vanessa Rivera-Amill, PhD³

9 ¹Department of Epidemiology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC,
10 USA; ²Division of Vector-borne Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, San
11 Juan, Puerto Rico; ³Ponce Health Sciences University/Ponce Research Institute, Ponce,
12 Puerto Rico

13

14 **Funding:** All authors who are federal employees have nothing to disclose. VRA received
15 funding from the National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases
16 (U01CK000437 & U01CK000580). JMD received funding from the National Institute of
17 Mental Health (3U19MH113202-03S1) and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
18 Diseases (T32 AI 070114). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and
19 analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

20 **Competing Interests:** All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

21 **Author Contributions:** Study protocol and materials were developed by Gabriela Paz-
22 Bailey, Liliana Sánchez-González, Laura E. Adams, Chelsea G. Major, Olga Lorenzi, and
23 Vanessa Rivera-Amill. Data management was performed by Dania M. Rodríguez and Kyle

24 R. Ryff. Data analysis was performed by Josée Dussault. The first draft of the manuscript
25 was written by Josée Dussault and all authors commented on previous versions of the
26 manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

27 **Data Availability Statement:** Due to data security and confidentiality guidelines, all
28 analyses of COPA data must be formally requested to CDC and PHSU. External
29 researchers can request access to a restricted use dataset after submitting a concept
30 proposal. Data requests related to COPA can be sent to dengue@cdc.gov.

31 **Abstract**

32 Mosquito-borne arboviruses are an important cause of morbidity and mortality in the
33 Caribbean. In Puerto Rico, chikungunya, dengue, and Zika viruses have each caused large
34 outbreaks during 2010–2022. To date, the majority of control measures to prevent these
35 diseases focus on mosquito control and many require community participation. In 2018, the
36 U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention launched the COPA project, a community-
37 based cohort study in Ponce, Puerto Rico, to measure the impact of novel vector control
38 interventions in reducing arboviral infections. Randomly selected households from 38
39 designated cluster areas were offered participation, and baseline data were collected from
40 2,353 households between May 2018 and May 2019. Household-level responses were
41 provided by one representative per home. Cross-sectional analyses of baseline data were
42 conducted to estimate 1) the association between arboviral risk perception and annual
43 household expenditure on mosquito control, and 2) the association between arboviral risk
44 perception and engagement in ≥ 3 household-level risk reduction behaviors. In this study,
45 27% of household representatives believed their household was at high risk of arboviruses
46 and 36% of households engaged in at least three of the six household-level preventive
47 behaviors. Households where the representative perceived their household at high risk
48 spent an average of \$35.9 (95% confidence interval: \$23.7, \$48.1) more annually on
49 mosquito bite prevention compared to households where the representative perceived no
50 risk. The probability of engaging in ≥ 3 household-level mosquito-preventive behaviors was
51 10.2 percentage points greater (7.2, 13.0) in households where the representatives
52 perceived high risk compared to those in which the representatives perceived no risk. Paired
53 with other research, these results support investment in community-based participatory
54 approaches to mosquito control and providing accessible information for communities to
55 accurately interpret their risk.

56 **Author Summary**

57 Mosquito-borne disease is an important cause of illness and death in the Caribbean,
58 including Puerto Rico. Most tactics to prevent these diseases rely on stopping mosquito
59 bites, either by reducing the mosquito population or creating barriers between mosquitos
60 and humans. These methods vary in the degree of community involvement required. This
61 study used data collected from 2,353 households in Ponce, Puerto Rico from May 2018 to
62 May 2019 to understand how household perception of risk of contracting these diseases
63 related to 1) the amount of money households spent annually to prevent mosquito bites, and
64 2) the number of activities their household engaged in to prevent mosquito bites. We found
65 that 27% of households perceived themselves at high risk of contracting these diseases,
66 and 36% of households engaged in at least three activities to reduce their risk. On average,
67 households that perceived themselves at high risk spent more money on mosquito bite
68 prevention and engaged in more activities to prevent mosquito bites, compared to
69 households that perceived no risk. Paired with other research in this area, these results
70 support investment in community-based approaches to mosquito control and ensuring that
71 communities have accessible information to understand their risk of mosquito-borne
72 disease.

73

74

75 Introduction

76 Mosquito-borne illnesses are an important cause of morbidity and mortality in the
77 Caribbean [1]. In Puerto Rico, chikungunya, dengue, and Zika viruses have each caused
78 large outbreaks during 2010–2022. Although chikungunya and Zika viruses were recently
79 introduced to Puerto Rico, dengue is endemic and seasonal, with outbreaks occurring every
80 3–5 years [1,2]. All three viruses are transmitted via *Aedes* species mosquito vectors and
81 can cause acute febrile illness, although each of these diseases has the potential for severe
82 or long-term outcomes [2–4]. Patients with chikungunya can have persistent joint pain for
83 months or years. Perinatal Zika infections are known to cause birth defects [5,6]. Evidence
84 suggests that individuals infected with chikungunya or Zika virus are conferred immunity
85 against the respective virus [5,7]. However, dengue virus has four serotypes, and individuals
86 who have been infected with one serotype have a higher risk of severe dengue if later
87 infected with a different serotype. Severe dengue can be lethal and is characterized by
88 severe plasma leakage, severe hemorrhage, and/or organ impairment [8]. There are no
89 specific treatments for any of these diseases and management is primarily supportive.

90 The lack of treatment options for arboviruses is compounded by the scarcity of
91 pharmaceutical prevention methods. There is currently one vaccine for dengue, CYD-TDV,
92 approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and recommended by the
93 Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) for use in children 9–16 years old
94 who live in an endemic area and who have a lab-confirmed history of a previous dengue
95 infection [9,10]. However, CYD-TDV is only available to a small proportion of the population
96 at risk for dengue [10], and there are no other FDA-approved vaccines to protect people
97 from these arboviruses. Thus, the public health community relies on vector control tools to
98 prevent or reduce arboviral infections in endemic populations. Some of these vector control
99 tools focus on killing adult mosquitos or reducing population growth through methods like

100 disposal of stagnant water to decrease *Aedes* mosquito breeding sites, fumigation, and
101 mosquito traps. Other methods focus on creating barriers between humans and mosquitoes
102 through the use of screens in the doors and windows of buildings, centralized air
103 conditioning, topical mosquito repellents applied to skin or clothing, and bed nets.

104 There are several barriers to mosquito-borne disease prevention, both at the
105 individual and household level. In Puerto Rico, where the median household income was
106 \$20,296 in 2018 [11], the cost of supplies and services to reduce mosquito populations and
107 mosquito bites can represent a considerable financial burden. Moreover, individuals may
108 perceive themselves at low risk of contracting arboviral disease, either because they do not
109 see illnesses in their communities or do not feel that mosquitos are a problem [12]. People
110 who perceive themselves at low risk may be less motivated to protect themselves and other
111 members of their household from contracting an arboviral infection. Whether due to financial
112 capacity or motivation, the underutilization of mosquito prevention techniques and services
113 puts populations at higher risk of arboviral infection.

114 Most models of health behavior generally emphasize the role of risk perception in
115 decision making [13,14], but empirical studies on arboviral risk perception have produced
116 conflicting results [12,15], and there have been few studies investigating arboviral risk
117 perception and health behaviors in Puerto Rico [16]. Understanding the association between
118 risk perception and risk reduction behaviors among people living in Puerto Rico can help
119 guide selection of appropriate public health messaging and interventions to reduce the
120 incidence of arboviral diseases. If risk perception correlates to increased protective
121 behaviors, increasing campaigns to raise community awareness about arboviral disease
122 risks could be beneficial. Alternatively, in the presence of a null relationship between risk
123 perception and engagement in protective behaviors, then public health agencies may find it

124 more effective to focus efforts on disease prevention methods that do not require active
125 community engagement.

126 Accordingly, the objective of this study is to better understand the relationship
127 between risk perception of arboviral diseases and adoption of behaviors to prevent mosquito
128 bites among people living in southern Puerto Rico communities with high historical arboviral
129 disease incidence rates. The central hypothesis is that individuals who perceive themselves
130 at high risk for arboviral infection will be more likely to engage in mosquito-preventive
131 behaviors than those who perceive no risk. Specifically, this study aims to (1) estimate the
132 association between perceived household risk of arboviral infection and annual household
133 expenditure on mosquito control, and (2) estimate the association between perceived
134 household risk of arboviral infection and reported engagement in mosquito-controlling
135 behavior (i.e., spraying insecticide, burning citronella candles/coils, etc.) among households
136 in Ponce, Puerto Rico.

137

138 **Methods**

139 *Parent Study*

140 COPA (Communities Organized to Prevent Arboviruses) is a prospective community-based
141 cohort study in Ponce, Puerto Rico initiated in 2018 to evaluate the impact of novel vector
142 control interventions in reducing arboviral infections. Households were selected randomly
143 from 38 study-defined cluster areas and visited up to three times to invite them to participate
144 in COPA; field-level strategies are detailed elsewhere [17]. From May 2018 to May 2019,
145 2,353 households were enrolled in COPA. Household residents were eligible if they slept an
146 average of four or more nights per week in the home, were 1-50 years old, and did not
147 intend to move in the next six months. Study staff administered a standardized

148 questionnaire to participants in Spanish regarding their knowledge, attitudes, and practices
149 relating to arboviral infections and prevention methods. For each household, we asked one
150 resident (an adult or emancipated minor) present during data collection to act as the
151 household representative and answer an additional series of questions specific to their
152 household. The following is an analysis of cross-sectional interview data from the COPA
153 household representatives.

154

155 *Exposure*

156 The exposure of interest was the household representative's perception of their household's
157 risk of contracting arboviral illnesses in the next 12 months, which was assessed separately
158 for Zika, dengue, and chikungunya. However, as the responses to these questions were
159 highly correlated, dengue was used as a surrogate for all three arboviruses to measure the
160 household representatives' perceived risk of arboviral infection with three levels: high risk,
161 low risk, and no risk. Models were tested in which the exposure was coded as a single 3-
162 level ordinal variable versus as a set of two disjoint indicator (dummy) variables. Disjoint
163 indicator variables allowed the model to relax the assumption of linearity between the three
164 levels of the exposure variable by creating two binary variables that represented the low risk
165 and high risk groups, with no risk as the referent level. The Bayesian information criterion
166 (BIC) and Akaike information criterion (AIC) were used to compare the fit of the two models.
167 Generally, models with lower AIC and BIC values are preferred. Where the values produced
168 different conclusions, the BIC was preferred rather than the AIC because it usually selects
169 the correct model more frequently than the AIC [18].

170

171

172 *Outcomes*

173 There were two outcomes of interest. The first outcome of interest was annual household
174 expenditure on mosquito prevention products and services, reported in United States dollars
175 (USD) by the household representative. The second outcome was regular engagement in
176 three or more mosquito preventive behaviors. In total, there were six possible household-
177 level behaviors that the household representative could report during the baseline interview:
178 (1) Eliminating stagnant water around the house (ex: cleaning containers that collect water
179 like flowerpots and/or gutters; (2) Covering containers that collect water; (3) Emptying trash
180 cans, drums, or in-ground trash cans if they had standing water; (4) Cleaning or removing
181 tires and/or debris from the yard; (5) Spraying insecticide or fumigating indoors or outdoors;
182 and (6) Burning citronella candles and/or mosquito coils. These behaviors were reported as
183 the frequency with which any members of the household engaged in these activities in the
184 previous 12 months, with responses including “daily”, “weekly”, “monthly”, “rarely”, or
185 “never”. To dichotomize each of the six activities, households that reported daily or weekly
186 engagement in these behaviors were counted as engaging in these behaviors regularly, and
187 those who reported performing the activities monthly, rarely, or never were categorized as
188 not conducting these activities regularly. This outcome was then dichotomized as regular
189 engagement in three or more of these behaviors. The cutoff of three behaviors was selected
190 because some activities (e.g., behaviors 1 and 3) appeared to be correlated, likely because
191 it would be easy to accomplish one task while completing the other.

192

193 *Covariates*

194 Covariates included in this study were from the household representatives’ responses to
195 questionnaires from the same study visit. These variables included: mosquito bite

196 frequency, household income, exposure to community educational campaigns, education
197 level, sex, and the community cluster to which the household belonged. Reported mosquito
198 bites was a binary variable produced from a COPA question asking about where the
199 participants most often were bitten. If the participant responded saying that they rarely/never
200 were bitten, this was encoded into the bite frequency variable as “never bitten”. Otherwise,
201 participants were categorized as “bitten”. Household income was reported as one of eight
202 categories and remained an ordinal categorical variable in statistical analyses. Education
203 level was collapsed into five categories due to small counts in some of the original
204 categories. Sex and educational campaign exposure were binary variables, and age was
205 maintained as a continuous variable. Education level and community cluster were modeled
206 as disjoint indicator variables. Rooted in Health Belief Model theory and additional readings
207 [12–16,18–28], we developed directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) that assisted in the
208 identification of mediating paths and confounders [29–32]. Based on these DAGs, the
209 aforementioned covariates included in this study represented a sufficient set of confounders.
210 Because participating households were selected from community clusters, the intra-cluster
211 correlation (ICC) coefficient was calculated to assess the need to use multilevel modeling
212 techniques; the ICC was determined to be small enough (0.02) to include community
213 clusters as disjoint indicator variables rather than using a 2-level model [33].

214

215 *Missing Data*

216 Approximately 11% of participants were missing data on at least one of the covariates, and
217 most missing data came from the household income variable. A complete case analysis of
218 these data could result in loss of precision and validity by not including the full possible
219 sample of households [34–39]. Thus, this analysis used multiple stochastic conditional-

220 mean imputation with coefficient resampling to assign values onto all missing covariates
221 based on each participant's observed characteristics, assuming that data were missing at
222 random, conditional on the additional covariates in the imputation model [37,38,40]. The
223 covariates included as predictive variables in the imputation models were employment
224 status, whether the house had screens on the windows, and the six risk reduction behaviors
225 described in the outcomes section. All exposure, outcome, and confounding variables that
226 would be included in the analysis model were also included in the multiple imputation model.
227 Multiple imputation methods were applied using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method
228 in SAS software, version 9.4.9 [41], with 50 imputed datasets, 500 burn-in iterations, and
229 500 additional iterations between imputations; the method used a single chain. The MCMC
230 method was necessary because the missing data structure was arbitrary, and the number of
231 burn-in iterations, additional iterations, and imputed datasets were selected based on
232 recommendations to reduce Monte Carlo error [42–44]. Because two functional forms for the
233 exposure variable were compared using model fit statistics that are not available in multiple
234 imputation models, complete case models were used to assess the proper functional form of
235 the exposure variable, and the multiple imputation model with that exposure coding was
236 preferred over the complete case model.

237

238 *Analytical approach*

239 1. *Household expenditure*

240 In this analysis, we were interested in understanding the association between arboviral
241 disease risk perception and annual household expenditure on risk reduction products and
242 services as the primary outcome. To estimate the association, we fit a normal linear
243 regression model. To meet the assumption of homoscedasticity in the model residuals [45],

244 five outlier households whose expenditures ranged from \$1800 to \$3600 were set to missing
245 values. For comparison, the sixth-largest expenditure value in the data was \$1440, and the
246 mean expenditure amount was \$185. In the regression model, we included the following
247 potential confounders: reported mosquito bites, household income, exposure to community
248 educational campaigns, sex and education level of the household representative, and the
249 community cluster to which the household belonged.

250

251 2. *Household-level risk reduction*

252 The objective of this analysis was to understand the association between household
253 perception of arboviral disease risk and the prevalence of engaging in household-level risk
254 reduction behaviors. To estimate the prevalence difference, we fit a linear binomial model
255 including the same set of potential confounders as described previously. Missing data on all
256 variables were addressed using multiple imputation as described above. Data were
257 analyzed using SAS software, version 9.4.9 [41].

258

259 *Ethical Consideration*

260 All participants provided written, informed consent. The COPA study was approved by the
261 Institutional Review Boards (IRB) of Ponce Medical School Foundation, Inc., and CDC. An
262 exemption for this secondary statistical analysis was approved by the IRB at the University
263 of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

264

265 **Results**

266 Among 2,353 household representatives who provided responses, 635 (27%)
 267 perceived their household at high risk of contracting dengue in the next 12 months.
 268 Comparatively, 1,249 (53%) believed their households were at low risk, and 425 (18%)
 269 perceived no risk (Table 1). The mean age of household representatives was 37 years
 270 (standard deviation [SD]: 8.8 years), 1,596 (68%) were female, and 1,429 (61%) reported
 271 having completed some postsecondary schooling. Most household representatives reported
 272 that they were bitten by mosquitoes (n=2,304; 98%); few reported that they were rarely or
 273 not bitten (n=45; 2%). The most commonly reported household annual income category was
 274 <\$10,000 (n=915; 39%). Mean annual expenditure on mosquito products was \$185 (SD:
 275 \$225). A majority (n=1,884; 80%) of household representatives perceived at least some risk
 276 of contracting dengue in the next year (Tables 1 & 2).

277 **TABLE 1. Distribution of COPA Household Representatives' Perceived Risk by**
 278 **Arbovirus (N=2,353), 2018-2019**

	Dengue, N (%)	Zika, N (%)	Chikungunya, N (%)
Perceived high risk	635 (28)	606 (26)	613 (27)
Perceived low risk	1249 (54)	1264 (55)	1221 (53)
Perceived no risk	425 (18)	435 (19)	473 (21)
Missing	44	48	46
Total	2309	2305	2307

279

280 **TABLE 2. Characteristics of COPA household representatives by perceived risk of**
 281 **dengue (N=2,353), 2018-2019**

	Perceived high risk (n=635) ^a		Perceived low risk (n=1,249) ^a		Perceived no risk (n=425) ^a		Total (N=2,353) ^a
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Education Level							
< High school GED	41	6	76	6	67	16	184 (8)
Finished high school/GED	171	27	359	29	166	39	704 (30)

Technical/Associate degree	188	30	334	27	90	21	620 (27)
Bachelor's degree	163	26	344	28	77	18	592 (26)
Professional/Post-graduate	69	11	123	10	23	5	217 (9)
Income level							
< \$10,000	253	42	412	36	239	61	915 (39)
\$10,000 - \$19,999	123	21	248	21	58	15	435 (18)
\$20,000 - \$29,999	69	12	202	17	41	11	319 (14)
\$30,000 - \$39,999	60	10	111	10	23	6	199 (8)
\$40,000 - \$49,999	34	6	71	6	8	2	113 (5)
\$50,000 - \$59,999	18	3	41	4	7	2	68 (3)
\$60,000 - \$69,999	15	3	27	2	7	2	50 (2)
≥ \$70,000	25	4	45	4	7	2	78 (3)
Bitten by mosquitos	627	99	1224	98	410	96	2304 (98)
Female	439	69	819	66	307	72	1596 (68)
Exposed to educational campaigns, last 12 months	144	23	300	24	131	31	587 (25)
Engaged in protective behavior:	302	48	547	44	153	36	1018 (44)
#1: Eliminating stagnant water							
#2: Covering containers that collect water	158	25	320	26	95	23	584 (25)
#3: Emptying trash cans if they have standing water	328	52	654	53	175	41	1181 (51)
#4: Cleaning or removing tires and/or debris from yard	151	24	305	25	98	24	565 (25)
#5: Spraying insecticide or fumigate indoors or outdoors	336	54	500	41	155	37	1006 (44)
#6: Burning citronella candles and/or mosquito coils	160	25	182	15	51	12	399 (17)
Household representative wore repellent in the last 30 days	443	70	661	53	206	48	1318 (56)
Household engaged in ≥3 protective behaviors^b	265	42	445	36	114	27	840 (36)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean (SD)
Age	38	8.4	36	8.9	37	8.8	37 (8.8)
Household Expenditure on Mosquito Products	\$211	\$242	\$176	\$206	\$173	\$253	\$185 (\$225)
Number of household mosquito-preventive behaviors reported^b	2.3	1.5	2.0	1.5	1.7	1.5	2.0 (1.5)

282 ^a Percentages presented as proportion of non-missing observations. Total number of missing observations on each variable are
 283 as follows: a) risk perception (exposure variable), 44; b) education level, 36; c) mosquito bite frequency, 4; d) sex, 0; e) income
 284 level, 176; f) exposure to educational campaigns, 51; g) protective behavior #1, 26; h) protective behavior #2, 46; i) protective
 285 behavior #3, 26; j) protective behavior #4, 58; k) protective behavior #5, 44; l) protective behavior #6, 29; m) repellent use in
 286 the last 30 days, 0; n) age, 0; o) household expenditure on products, 20; p) number of household mosquito-preventive
 287 behaviors, 17.

288 ^b Household-level mosquito-preventive behaviors: (1) Eliminating stagnant water around the house (ex: cleaning containers that
 289 collect water like flowerpots and/or gutters; (2) Covering containers that collect water; (3) Emptying trash cans, drums, or in-
 290 ground trash cans if they had standing water; (4) Cleaning or removing tires and/or debris from yard; (5) Spraying insecticide or
 291 fumigate indoors or outdoors (ex: Blackjack, Real Kill, Raid); (6) Burning citronella candles and/or mosquito coils.

292 Household representatives who perceived themselves at no risk of arboviral
 293 diseases generally had lower levels of education compared to the low-risk and high-risk
 294 perception groups. Contrary to expectation, the no-risk perception group was also more
 295 likely to report having seen an educational campaign on mosquito prevention and control in
 296 the last 12 months compared to the other two risk perception groups. In total, 1,318 (56%)
 297 household representatives reported using mosquito repellent in the last 30 days (Table 2).

298 There was generally low uptake of the six household-level preventive behaviors
 299 assessed. About half of household representatives (51%) reported emptying trash cans with
 300 standing water, 44% reported eliminating other sources of stagnant water, and 44%
 301 reported spraying insecticide around the house or fumigating indoors or outdoors. A small
 302 number of households reported covering containers that could collect water (25%), cleaning
 303 debris from around the outside of the house (25%) or burning citronella candles or coils
 304 (17%) (Table 2). In total, 840 (36%) households engaged in at least three of the six
 305 household-level preventive behaviors. Households that were engaged in three or more
 306 preventive behaviors generally had household representatives with higher levels of
 307 education, a larger household income, and spent more money on mosquito products
 308 compared to households that engaged in fewer than three preventive behaviors (Table 3).

309

310 **TABLE 3. Characteristics of COPA household representatives by protective behavior**
 311 **level (N=2,353), 2018-2019^a**

	Engaged in < 3 protective behaviors (n=1,496) ^b		Engaged in ≥ 3 protective behaviors (n=840) ^b		Total (N=2,353) ^b
	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Education Level					
< High school GED	134	9	49	6	184 (8)
Finished high school/GED	485	33	215	26	704 (30)
Technical/Associate degree	370	25	245	30	620 (27)
Bachelor's degree	353	24	235	28	592 (26)

Professional/Post-graduate	134	9	83	10	217 (9)
Income level					
< \$10,000	634	42	281	33	915 (39)
\$10,000 - \$19,999	251	17	184	22	435 (18)
\$20,000 - \$29,999	198	13	121	14	319 (14)
\$30,000 - \$39,999	112	7	87	10	199 (8)
\$40,000 - \$49,999	71	5	42	5	113 (5)
\$50,000 - \$59,999	44	3	24	3	68 (3)
\$60,000 - \$69,999	30	2	20	2	50 (2)
≥ \$70,000	53	4	25	3	78 (3)
Regularly bitten by mosquitoes	1463	98	824	98	2304 (98)
Female	1039	69	547	65	1596 (68)
Exposure to educational campaigns, last 12 months	368	25	219	26	587 (25)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean (SD)
Age	37	8.8	37	8.8	37 (8.8)
Household Expenditure on Mosquito Products	\$151	\$195	\$244	\$259	\$185 (\$225)


312 ^a There were 6 household-level mosquito-preventive behaviors total: (1) Eliminating stagnant water around the house (ex:
313 cleaning containers that collect water like flowerpots and/or gutters; (2) Covering containers that collect water; (3) Emptying
314 trash cans, drums, or in-ground trash cans if they had standing water; (4) Cleaning or removing tires and/or debris from yard;
315 (5) Spraying insecticide or fumigate indoors or outdoors (ex: Blackjack, Real Kill, Raid); (6) Burning citronella candles and/or
316 mosquito coils.
317 ^b Percentages presented as proportion of non-missing observations. Total number of missing observations on each variable are
318 as follows: a) Number of preventive behaviors engaged in (outcome variable), 17; b) education level, 33; c) mosquito bite
319 frequency, 4; d) sex, 0; e) income level, 159; f) exposure to educational campaigns, 35; g) age, 0; h) household expenditure on
320 products, 3.
321

322 The regression models that encoded risk perception as an ordinal exposure variable
323 (Models 1, 3, 5, and 7) produced similar outputs to those in which the exposure was coded
324 as disjoint indicator variables (Models 2, 4, 6, and 8). Nonetheless, the Bayesian information
325 criterion (BIC) and Akaike information criterion (AIC) values (see S1 Table) preferred the
326 models in which the exposure is coded as an ordinal variable (Models 1, 3, 5, and 7). These
327 models also produced estimates with greater precision (Figures 1 & 2, S1 Table). Therefore,
328 the subsequent description of results will focus on reporting model outputs from models that
329 used ordinal coding of the exposure variable and multiple imputation (models 3 and 7).

330 Figure 1 shows the output from the regression analysis for the first outcome of
331 interest, household expenditure on mosquito-preventive products and services. The
332 adjusted linear regression model with ordinal exposure coding (Model 3) demonstrated that
333 a 1-unit increase in dengue risk perception (from no risk perception to low, or from low to
334 high risk perception) was associated with a \$17.9 (95% CI: \$5.8, \$30.1) increase in annual
335 household expenditure to prevent mosquito bites. On average, households where the
336 household representative perceived their household at high risk of contracting dengue in the
337 next year spent \$35.9 (\$23.7, \$48.1) more annually on mosquito bite prevention compared
338 to a household where the household representative considered their household at no risk.
339 Figure 1 provides a graphical representation of the model estimates and 95% confidence
340 intervals. For a detailed comparison of Model 1 – Model 4 outputs, see S1 Table.

341

342 **Figure 1.** Estimates and 95% confidence intervals from four models of the difference in
343 household expenditure (USD) on mosquito-preventive products per risk perception group,
344 COPA, 2018-2019^a




345

346 ^aAll models included the full set of covariates as described in the methods section. Point estimates (dots) represent the
347 average difference in household expenditure (USD) on mosquito preventive products when the household representative
348 perceived their household at either low risk or high risk (based on the x-axis) compared to when the representative perceived
349 their household at no risk. The bands around each dot represents the 95% confidence intervals for each point estimate.
350 Positive values indicate increased spending; negative values indicate decreased spending. Model 1 used an ordinal exposure
351 variable and complete case analysis; Model 2 used disjoint indicator coding for the exposure variable and complete case
352 analysis; Model 3 used ordinal exposure variable and multiple imputation to address missing observations; Model 4 used
353 disjoint indicator coding for the exposure variable and multiple imputation. Model fit statistics can be found in Table 4 in the
354 supplementary material. Based on superior model fit statistics, Model 3 results are reported in the text.
355

356

357 **Figure 2.** Prevalence difference estimates and 95% confidence intervals from four models
358 representing the probability of household engagement in at least three protective behaviors
359 per risk perception group, COPA, 2018-2019^a



360

361 ^aAll models included the full set of covariates as described in the methods section. Point estimates (dots) represent the
362 average difference in probability that the household engaged in 3 or more protective behaviors when the household
363 representative perceived their household at either low risk or high risk (based on the x-axis) compared to when the
364 representative perceived their household at no risk. The bands around each dot represents the 95% confidence intervals for
365 each point estimate. Positive values indicate increased spending; negative values indicate decreased spending. Model 5 used
366 an ordinal exposure variable and complete case analysis; Model 6 used disjoint indicator coding for the exposure variable and
367 complete case analysis; Model 7 used ordinal exposure variable and multiple imputation to address missing observations;
368 Model 8 used disjoint indicator coding for the exposure variable and multiple imputation. Model fit statistics can be found in
369 Table 5 in the supplementary material. Based on superior model fit statistics, Model 7 results are reported in the text.
370

371 The regression model results for the second outcome of interest—the probability of
372 engaging in at least three household-level protective behaviors—are shown in Figure 2. This
373 second set of regression models demonstrated that the probability of engaging in at least
374 three household-level mosquito-preventive behaviors also increased with increasing
375 arboviral disease risk perception. Model 7, which used ordinal exposure coding and multiple
376 imputation, estimated that each 1-unit increase of risk perception was associated with an
377 absolute increase of 5.1 percentage points (95% CI: 0.02, 0.08) in the probability that the
378 household would report engagement in three or more household-level mosquito-preventive
379 behaviors. Thus, households with a household representative who reported a high risk
380 perception had a probability of engaging in three or more household-level mosquito-
381 preventive behaviors that was 10.2 percentage points greater (95% CI: 7.2, 13.0), compared
382 to households in which the representatives perceived their household at no risk of arboviral
383 disease. Figure 2 provides a graphical representation of the model estimates and 95%
384 confidence intervals. For a detailed comparison of Model 5 – Model 8 outputs, see S1 Table.

385

386 **Discussion**

387 This study analyzed a large (N=2,353) sample of households in Ponce, Puerto Rico,
388 with a median annual household income of \$10,000-\$19,999. This analysis found that after
389 adjusting for income and other confounders, households with high perceived risk of
390 contracting arboviruses reported spending \$35.9 more per year (95% CI: \$23.7, \$48.1) on
391 preventive products and services compared to households with no perceived risk. In a
392 population where the median annual household income was less than \$20,000, these
393 results demonstrate that households are willing to invest in mosquito-bite prevention despite
394 potentially limited resources if there is a high perceived risk of arboviral disease. Study data
395 also showed a positive association between the household representative's perception of

396 risk and the household's probability of engaging in at least three risk-reducing behaviors.

397 These findings highlight the role of arboviral risk perception in influencing risk-reducing

398 behaviors and support the continued development of community-based programs to

399 increase awareness of arboviral disease risk across Puerto Rico.

400 The association between heightened arbovirus risk perception and increased
401 prevalence of behaviors to prevent arboviral infections in this study fits well with previous
402 research related to community engagement in mosquito vector control in Puerto Rico. For
403 example, in a CDC case study of dengue control measures during an epidemic in the 1990s,
404 visible public spraying efforts, while largely ineffective, reduced residents' engagement in
405 mosquito bite preventive activities [21]. As residents shifted the responsibility of mosquito
406 control to the government, they perceived themselves at low risk of arboviral infection and
407 were less likely to engage in further protective behaviors. Moreover, a pilot study conducted
408 in Manuel A. Pérez Public Housing in San Juan, Puerto Rico in 2018 demonstrated the
409 potency of community-based participatory campaigns to increase employment of mosquito-
410 control tactics [22]. In that study, community members were directly engaged in the process
411 of planning and implementing a risk communication initiative for their community. After the
412 initiative, there was a significant increase in community members' recognition of personal
413 and community responsibility for the prevention of mosquito-borne disease, and their
414 engagement in preventive behaviors for mosquito control increased [22].

415 Key strengths of this study include its sample size and the detailed information
416 captured for each household, which allowed for comprehensive analyses. Another strength
417 of this analysis is the use of multiple imputation, which allowed us to use all 2,353
418 households in our analysis and mitigate the risk of selection bias introduced by complete
419 case analyses [46,47].

420 As in most studies on attitudes and practices that utilize in-person interviews, there
421 may be some desirability bias in exposure and outcome measurement. Specifically,

422 because the data collection teams visited participants at home after enrolling in a study
423 focused on arboviruses, participants may have overreported protective behaviors,
424 particularly if they felt that these were actions expected or supported by study staff.
425 Likewise, participants who truly perceived themselves at no risk may have reported a low
426 perceived risk of dengue to satisfy perceived interviewer expectations.

427 Another limitation of our study is the cross-sectional nature of the data, which does
428 not allow us to assess the temporal sequence between the exposure and outcomes. While
429 this study assessed whether households perceiving themselves at high risk would
430 participate in preventive behaviors, it is possible that some participants perceived
431 themselves at low or no risk of arbovirus in the upcoming 12 months because of their high
432 engagement in prevention in the previous 12 months. Nevertheless, if this were the
433 overarching trend, we would have expected to see a negative correlation between the
434 exposure and outcome variables named in this analysis [27]. One final limitation in this study
435 is residual confounding bias in the mosquito bite variable. Due to data unavailability, we
436 dichotomized this variable, but there is plausible heterogeneity within the “bitten” category,
437 particularly when compared to the “never bitten” level.

438 Our findings add to the growing body of evidence in support of community education
439 interventions for populations at risk of contracting arboviral diseases. Paired with other
440 findings [19,21,22], our results suggest that key stakeholders should invest in community-
441 based participatory approaches to mosquito control, with particular focus on providing
442 information in an accessible manner for community members to accurately interpret their
443 risk and make more informed choices to reduce their risk of arboviral disease.

444 **References**

- 445 1. Lowe R, Gasparrini A, Meerbeeck CJV, Lippi CA, Mahon R, Trotman AR, et al.
446 Nonlinear and delayed impacts of climate on dengue risk in Barbados: A modelling
447 study. *PLOS Medicine*. 2018;15: e1002613. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002613
- 448 2. Adams LE, Martin SW, Lindsey NP, Lehman JA, Rivera A, Kolsin J, et al. *Epidemiology*
449 of Dengue, Chikungunya, and Zika Virus Disease in the U.S. States and Territories,
450 2017. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2019. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.19-0309
- 451 3. Dengue Virus Infections | 2015 Case Definition. [cited 28 Aug 2019]. Available:
452 [/nndss/conditions/dengue-virus-infections/case-definition/2015/](https://nndss/conditions/dengue-virus-infections/case-definition/2015/)
- 453 4. Petersen LR, Jamieson DJ, Powers AM, Honein MA. Zika Virus. *N Engl J Med*.
454 2016;374: 1552–1563. doi:10.1056/NEJMr1602113
- 455 5. Zika Virus. In: CDC [Internet]. 5 Nov 2014 [cited 29 Apr 2019]. Available:
456 <https://www.cdc.gov/zika/vector/range.html>
- 457 6. Marinho PS, Cunha AJ, Amim Junior J, Prata-Barbosa A. A review of selected
458 Arboviruses during pregnancy. *Maternal Health, Neonatology and Perinatology*.
459 2017;3: 17. doi:10.1186/s40748-017-0054-0
- 460 7. Chikungunya. [cited 28 Aug 2019]. Available: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/chikungunya)
461 [sheets/detail/chikungunya](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/chikungunya)
- 462 8. Soo K-M, Khalid B, Ching S-M, Chee H-Y. Meta-Analysis of Dengue Severity during
463 Infection by Different Dengue Virus Serotypes in Primary and Secondary Infections.
464 *PLoS One*. 2016;11. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0154760
- 465 9. First FDA-approved vaccine for the prevention of dengue disease in endemic regions.
466 In: FDA [Internet]. 11 Sep 2019 [cited 14 Feb 2020]. Available:
467 [http://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/first-fda-approved-vaccine-](http://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/first-fda-approved-vaccine-prevention-dengue-disease-endemic-regions)
468 [prevention-dengue-disease-endemic-regions](http://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/first-fda-approved-vaccine-prevention-dengue-disease-endemic-regions)
- 469 10. Dengue Vaccine. In: CDC [Internet]. 25 Jun 2021 [cited 9 Jul 2021]. Available:
470 <https://www.cdc.gov/dengue/prevention/dengue-vaccine.html>
- 471 11. Puerto Rico | Data USA. [cited 13 Feb 2020]. Available:
472 <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/puerto-rico/>
- 473 12. Raude J, Chinfatt K, Huang P, Betansedi CO, Katumba K, Vernazza N, et al. Public
474 perceptions and behaviours related to the risk of infection with Aedes mosquito-borne
475 diseases: a cross-sectional study in Southeastern France. *BMJ Open*. 2012;2:
476 e002094. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2012-002094
- 477 13. Ferrer R, Klein WM. Risk perceptions and health behavior. *Curr Opin Psychol*. 2015;5:
478 85–89. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.03.012

- 479 14. Brewer NT, Chapman GB, Gibbons FX, Gerrard M, McCaul KD, Weinstein ND. Meta-
480 analysis of the relationship between risk perception and health behavior: The example
481 of vaccination. *Health Psychology*. 2007;26: 136. doi:10.1037/0278-6133.26.2.136
- 482 15. Banneheke H, Paronavitane S, Jayasuriya V, Banneheka S. Perceived Risk of Dengue
483 in Ones' Living Environment as a Determinant of Behavior Change through Social
484 Mobilization and Communication: Evidence from a High Risk Area in Sri Lanka. *J*
485 *Arthropod Borne Dis*. 2016;10: 392–402.
- 486 16. Pérez-Guerra CL, Zielinski-Gutierrez E, Vargas-Torres D, Clark GG. Community
487 beliefs and practices about dengue in Puerto Rico. *Rev Panam Salud Publica*.
488 2009;25: 218–226. doi:10.1590/S1020-49892009000300005
- 489 17. Rodríguez DM, Ryff K, Sánchez-Gonzalez L, Rivera-Amill V, Paz-Bailey G, Adams L.
490 HTrack: A new tool to facilitate public health field visits and electronic data capture.
491 Angkurawaranon C, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2020;15: e0244028.
492 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0244028
- 493 18. Neath AA, Cavanaugh JE. The Bayesian information criterion: background, derivation,
494 and applications: The Bayesian information criterion. *WIREs Comp Stat*. 2012;4: 199–
495 203. doi:10.1002/wics.199
- 496 19. Winch PJ, Leontsini E, Rigau-Pérez JG, Ruiz-Pérez M, Clark GG, Gubler DJ.
497 Community-based dengue prevention programs in Puerto Rico: impact on knowledge,
498 behavior, and residential mosquito infestation. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2002;67: 363–370.
499 doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2002.67.363
- 500 20. Fritzell C, Raude J, Adde A, Dusfour I, Quenel P, Flamand C. Knowledge, Attitude and
501 Practices of Vector-Borne Disease Prevention during the Emergence of a New
502 Arbovirus: Implications for the Control of Chikungunya Virus in French Guiana. *PLOS*
503 *Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2016;10: e0005081. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0005081
- 504 21. Gubler DJ, Clark GG. Community involvement in the control of *Aedes aegypti*. *Acta*
505 *Tropica*. 1996;61: 169–179. doi:10.1016/0001-706X(95)00103-L
- 506 22. Juarbe-Rey D, Pérez AO, Santoni RPCP, Ramírez MR, Vera M. Using Risk
507 Communication Strategies for Zika Virus Prevention and Control Driven by Community-
508 Based Participatory Research. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15.
509 doi:10.3390/ijerph15112505
- 510 23. Piltch-Loeb R, Merdjanoff AA, Bhanja A, Abramson DM. Support for vector control
511 strategies in the United States during the Zika outbreak in 2016: The role of risk
512 perception, knowledge, and confidence in government. *Preventive Medicine*. 2019;119:
513 52–57. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2018.12.019
- 514 24. Miranda E, Santos-Pinto C, Antunes-de-Lima C, Osorio-de-Castro C. Risk Perception
515 of Zika Virus Infection Among Vulnerable Women in Rio de Janeiro. *Prehospital and*
516 *Disaster Medicine*. 2019;34: s36–s37. doi:10.1017/S1049023X19000906
- 517 25. Rosenstock IM. The Health Belief Model and Preventive Health Behavior. *Health*
518 *Education Monographs*. 1974;2: 354–386. doi:10.1177/109019817400200405

- 519 26. Rosenstock IM, Strecher VJ, Becker MH. Social Learning Theory and the Health Belief
520 Model. *Health Education Quarterly*. 1988;15: 175–183.
521 doi:10.1177/109019818801500203
- 522 27. Glanz K. *Health Behavior and Health Education: Theory, Research, and Practice*.
523 Jossey-Bass; 2002.
- 524 28. Jones CL, Jensen JD, Scherr CL, Brown NR, Christy K, Weaver J. The Health Belief
525 Model as an Explanatory Framework in Communication Research: Exploring Parallel,
526 Serial, and Moderated Mediation. *Health Commun*. 2015;30: 566–576.
527 doi:10.1080/10410236.2013.873363
- 528 29. PEARL J. Causal diagrams for empirical research. *Biometrika*. 1995;82: 669–688.
529 doi:10.1093/biomet/82.4.669
- 530 30. Hernán MA, Hernández-Díaz S, Werler MM, Mitchell AA. Causal Knowledge as a
531 Prerequisite for Confounding Evaluation: An Application to Birth Defects Epidemiology.
532 *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2002;155: 176–184. doi:10.1093/aje/155.2.176
- 533 31. Greenland S, Pearl J, Robins JM. Causal diagrams for epidemiologic research.
534 *Epidemiology*. 1999;10: 37–48.
- 535 32. VanderWeele TJ, Robins JM. Directed Acyclic Graphs, Sufficient Causes, and the
536 Properties of Conditioning on a Common Effect. *American Journal of Epidemiology*.
537 2007;166: 1096–1104. doi:10.1093/aje/kwm179
- 538 33. Killip S, Mahfoud Z, Pearce K. What Is an Intracluster Correlation Coefficient? Crucial
539 Concepts for Primary Care Researchers. *Ann Fam Med*. 2004;2: 204–208.
540 doi:10.1370/afm.141
- 541 34. Stuart EA, Azur M, Frangakis C, Leaf P. Multiple Imputation With Large Data Sets: A
542 Case Study of the Children’s Mental Health Initiative. *American Journal of*
543 *Epidemiology*. 2009;169: 1133–1139. doi:10.1093/aje/kwp026
- 544 35. Madley-Dowd P, Hughes R, Tilling K, Heron J. The proportion of missing data should
545 not be used to guide decisions on multiple imputation. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*.
546 2019;110: 63–73. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.02.016
- 547 36. Dong Y, Peng C-YJ. *Principled missing data methods for researchers*. Springerplus.
548 2013;2: 222. doi:10.1186/2193-1801-2-222
- 549 37. Little RJA, Rubin DB. *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*. John Wiley & Sons; 2019.
- 550 38. Sterne JAC, White IR, Carlin JB, Spratt M, Royston P, Kenward MG, et al. Multiple
551 imputation for missing data in epidemiological and clinical research: potential and
552 pitfalls. *BMJ*. 2009;338: b2393. doi:10.1136/bmj.b2393
- 553 39. Greenland S, Finkle WD. A Critical Look at Methods for Handling Missing Covariates in
554 Epidemiologic Regression Analyses. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 1995;142:
555 1255–1264. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a117592

- 556 40. Zhao Y, Long Q. Variable Selection in the Presence of Missing Data: Imputation-based
557 Methods. *Wiley Interdiscip Rev Comput Stat.* 2017;9. doi:10.1002/wics.1402
- 558 41. Copyright 2020 SAS Institute Inc. SAS and all other SAS Institute Inc. product or
559 service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of SAS Institute Inc., Cary,
560 NC, USA.
- 561 42. Yuan Y. Multiple Imputation Using SAS Software. *J Stat Soft.* 2011;45.
562 doi:10.18637/jss.v045.i06
- 563 43. Harel O, Mitchell EM, Perkins NJ, Cole SR, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Sun B, et al.
564 Multiple Imputation for Incomplete Data in Epidemiologic Studies. *American Journal of*
565 *Epidemiology.* 2018;187: 576–584. doi:10.1093/aje/kwx349
- 566 44. Schafer JL. *Analysis of Incomplete Multivariate Data.* CRC Press; 1997.
- 567 45. Schützenmeister A, Jensen U, Piepho H-P. Checking Normality and Homoscedasticity
568 in the General Linear Model Using Diagnostic Plots. *Communications in Statistics -*
569 *Simulation and Computation.* 2012;41: 141–154. doi:10.1080/03610918.2011.582560
- 570 46. Westreich D. Berkson’s bias, selection bias, and missing data. *Epidemiology.* 2012;23:
571 159–164. doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e31823b6296
- 572 47. Perkins NJ, Cole SR, Harel O, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Sun B, Mitchell EM, et al.
573 Principled Approaches to Missing Data in Epidemiologic Studies. *Am J Epidemiol.*
574 2018;187: 568–575. doi:10.1093/aje/kwx348
- 575
- 576
- 577
- 578

579 **S1 Table. Tables 4 & 5.**

580 **Table 4. Model outputs describing the relationship between perceived risk and**
 581 **household expenditure (USD) on mosquito-preventive products, COPA, 2018-2019^a**

	N	Multiple Imputation	Exposure Coding	Low Risk Perception Estimate, β (95% CI) ^b	High Risk Perception Estimate, β (95% CI) ^c	BIC ^d	AIC ^d
Model 1	2088	No	1 ordinal variable	\$15.7 (2.6, 28.7)	\$31.3 (18.3, 44.4)	28210	28040.96
Model 2	2088	No	2 disjoint indicator variables	\$1.6 (-22.1, 25.2)	\$28.1 (1.6, 54.6)	28216	28041.00
Model 3	2353	Yes	1 ordinal variable	\$17.9 (5.8, 30.1)	\$35.9 (23.7, 48.1)	N/A	N/A
Model 4	2353	Yes	2 disjoint indicator variables	\$3.8 (-18.3, 25.9)	\$33.3 (8.7, 57.9)	N/A	N/A

582 ^aAll models included the full set of covariates as described in the methods section.

583 ^bBeta estimates in this column represent the average difference in household expenditure (USD) on mosquito preventive
 584 products when the household representative perceived their household at low risk compared to when the representative
 585 perceived their household at no risk. Positive values indicate increased spending; negative values indicate decreased
 586 spending.

587 ^cBeta estimates in this column represent the average difference in household expenditure (USD) on mosquito preventive
 588 products when the household representative perceived their household at low risk compared to when the representative
 589 perceived their household at no risk. Positive values indicate increased spending; negative values indicate decreased
 590 spending.

591 ^dMultiple Imputation models do not output model fitness statistics. Therefore, the model with the best fit (i.e., lower BIC values)
 592 was determined prior to imputation, and the parallel imputed model was then preferred.

593 **Table 5. Model outputs describing the relationship between perceived arboviral risk**
 594 **and the probability of engaging in at least three household-level protective**
 595 **behaviors^a. COPA, 2018-2019**

	N	Multiple Imputation	Exposure Coding	Low Risk Perception Estimate, β (95% CI) ^b	High Risk Perception Estimate, β (95% CI) ^c	BIC ^d	AIC ^d
Model 5	2093	No	1 ordinal variable	0.05 (0.02, 0.08)	0.11 (0.08, 0.14)	2831.1	2661.7
Model 6	2093	No	2 disjoint indicator variables	0.06 (0.01, 0.11)	0.11 (0.05, 0.17)	2838.6	2663.5
Model 7	2353	Yes	1 ordinal variable	0.05 (0.02, 0.08)	0.10 (0.07, 0.13)	N/A	N/A
Model 8	2353	Yes	2 disjoint indicator variables	0.05 (0.01, 0.10)	0.10 (0.04, 0.16)	N/A	N/A

596 ^aAll models included the full set of covariates as described in the methods section.

597 ^bBeta estimates in this column represent the average difference in probability that the household engaged in 3 or more
 598 protective behaviors when the household representative perceived their household at low risk compared to when the
 599 representative perceived their household at no risk. Positive values indicate increased probability of engaging in household-
 600 level protective behaviors; negative values indicate decreased probability of engaging in household-level protective behaviors.

601 ^cBeta estimates in this column represent the average difference in probability that the household engaged in 3 or more
 602 protective behaviors when the household representative perceived their household at high risk compared to when the
 603 representative perceived their household at no risk. Positive values indicate increased probability of engaging in household-
 604 level protective behaviors; negative values indicate decreased probability of engaging in household-level protective behaviors.

605 ^dMultiple Imputation models do not output model fitness statistics. Therefore, the model with the best fit (i.e., lower BIC values)
 606 was determined prior to imputation, and the parallel imputed model was then preferred.