
Psychological and social impact of COVID-19 in Pakistan: Need for Gender Responsive Policies

Fauziah Rabbani^{1*}, Hyder Ali Khan², Suneel Piryani³, Areeba Raza Khan⁴, Fahad Abid⁵

1. Associate Vice Provost, Department of Community Health Sciences, Office of Research & Graduate Studies, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

2. Senior Research Coordinator, Department of Community Health Sciences, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

3. Research Specialist, Department of Community Health Sciences, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

4. Assistant Manager – Office of Research & Graduate Studies, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

5. Specialist Early Intervention in Psychosis Pakistan

*Corresponding Author: Dr. Fauziah Rabbani (MBBS, MPH, FCPS, FRCP, PhD)

The Noordin M. Thobani Professor Dept of Community Health Sciences and Associate Vice Provost Research and Graduate Studies

Aga Khan University, PO Box 3500, Stadium Road, Karachi, Pakistan.

E-mail : fauziah.rabbani@aku.edu , Tel: (9221) 34864801, 34930051 Ext.4801, 4800, fax: (9221) 34934294, 3493-2095

3 **ABSTRACT**

4 **BACKGROUND:**

5 COVID-19 has rapidly crossed borders, infecting people throughout the world. Women may be
6 especially vulnerable to depression and anxiety due to the pandemic,

7 **AIMS:** This study attempted to assess how gender impacts risk perceptions, anxiety levels
8 behavioral responses to the COVID 19 pandemic in Pakistan in order to recommend gender
9 responsive health policies

10 **METHODS:** A cross-sectional online survey was conducted. Participants were asked to
11 complete a sociodemographic data form, the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS),
12 and questions on their risk perceptions, preventive behavior and information exposure.
13 Regression analysis was used to assess effects of factors such as age, gender and household
14 income on anxiety levels.

15 **RESULTS:** Of the 1390 respondents, 478 were women, and 913 were men. Women considered
16 their chances of survival to be relatively lower than men (59 % women vs 73% men). They were
17 also more anxious (62% women vs 50% men), and more likely to adopt precautionary behavior,
18 such as avoiding going to the hospital (78% women vs. 71% men), not going to work (72%
19 women and 57% men), and using disinfectants (93% women and 86% men). Men were more
20 likely to trust friends, family and social media as reliable sources of COVID-19 information,
21 while women were more likely to trust doctors.

22 **CONCLUSION:** Women experience a disproportion burden of the psychological and social
23 impact of the pandemic compared to men. Involving doctors in healthcare communication
24 targeting women, might prove effective. Social media and radio programs may be effective in
25 disseminating information related to COVID among men.

26 **Keywords**

27 risk perception, anxiety, gender , COVID 19

28

29 **Background**

30 The occurrence of novel Coronavirus Disease 2019 was first detected in December, 2019 in
31 Wuhan, China (1). On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization declared the outbreak of
32 the disease as a global pandemic. Within two weeks of this announcement, COVID-19 cases
33 outside of China had increased 13-fold with the number of affected countries rising by 3-fold (2).
34 Since its emergence, there are more than 15.2 million confirmed global cases of the virus with
35 the number of deaths exceeding 623,000 as of 23 July, 2020. In the initial stages of the outbreak,
36 most cases of COVID-19 that were exported internationally had a history of prior travel to
37 Wuhan (3). Despite its close geographic proximity with China and Iran, the first two cases of
38 COVID-19 in Pakistan were reported on February 26, 2020 (4). To curb the spread of the virus,
39 Provincial Governments in Pakistan initiated partial and subsequent, complete lockdowns in their
40 respective administrative territories. These measures however, were taken in phases, with
41 educational institutions across the country closing on 13 March, 2020 in response to the
42 pandemic (5). As of 23 July, 2020, Pakistan has over 260,000 confirmed cases of COVID-19,
43 and approximately 5,700 deaths (1).

44

45 Exposure to a traumatic event, such as a global health crisis, is associated with an increased
46 incidence of anxiety and depression (6). Moreover, the stigma and isolation due to infectious
47 diseases could generate anxiety (7). A study conducted on a sample of Severe Acute Respiratory
48 Syndrome (SARS) survivors in Hong Kong revealed increased levels of psychological distress
49 and anxiety, not only during the epidemic but also one year following the outbreak (8). Another
50 research concluded that SARS had long-term psychiatric effects on survivors, with post

51 traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and depressive disorders being the most prevalent conditions
52 recorded (9). Moreover, a US survey conducted during the H1N1 pandemic, with 7236
53 participants, suggests an increase in the prevalence of anxiety (10). Similarly, one internet
54 survey conducted in China (n=7,236) reported that over one third participants exhibit symptoms
55 of anxiety disorders during the COVID-19 outbreak while, one fifth recently experienced sleep
56 issues and depressive symptoms (11).

57

58 Past research during large epidemics/pandemics, such as during the Ebola outbreak of 2014-
59 2016 in West Africa suggests that women may be disproportionately impacted during public
60 health emergencies. The COVID-19 pandemic is also expected to affect women's health and
61 increase their short-term and long-term needs for livelihood support, and health (12). One study
62 in the heavily impacted areas around Wuhan, highlighted an increase of 7% in prevalence of
63 posttraumatic stress symptoms (PTSS), and women had significantly higher levels of PTSS than
64 men (13). One study conducted in Turkey revealed that the pandemic had a greater
65 psychological impact on women than men. In this study of 343 respondents, women had
66 significantly higher depression and anxiety scores (14). During the SARS epidemic, people with
67 higher levels of anxiety were frequently found to adopt precautionary behaviours (15). Studies
68 conducted in Singapore and Hong Kong also report that women were more likely to adhere to
69 precautionary behaviours during SARS than men (16). Similarly, women in the UK were found
70 to practice precautionary behaviours such as hand washing and disinfecting surfaces more often
71 than men (17).

72

73 Female responses to stress and trauma may be contributing factors towards anxiety. Studies also
74 indicate that gendered responses to trauma contribute to the greater onset of depression and
75 PTSD in women (18,19). Evidence attributes this to women’s belief that worry is uncontrollable,
76 and may cause anxious thoughts (20). The manner in which young boys and girls are socialised
77 into their gender roles has an impact on these perceptions. A review discussed how mothers are
78 more likely to converse about their emotional condition with their daughters as compared to with
79 their sons (21). Further, young boys are conditioned to exercise problem-solving skills for
80 managing their emotions, girls are traditionally granted less autonomy. This increases their
81 dependency on others, and reduces the capability to effectively cope with anxious thoughts (21).

82

83 This study aims to assess gender differences in perceived risk, anxiety levels and behavioural
84 responses to COVID 19. This study uses sociocultural patterns to examine the effect of age,
85 gender, and household income on anxiety levels, and develops gender responsive policy options
86 for grappling with the pandemic in Pakistan .

87 **METHOD**

88 **Study design**

89 This is a cross-sectional study, with the survey tool disseminated online. The survey in Pakistan
90 was conducted eleven weeks after the first case was reported on February 26, 2020; during a
91 government-imposed lockdown.

92

93 **Study Participants**

94 A convenience sampling strategy was used to recruit participants. The questionnaire was
95 launched for two weeks on the social media pages of a Karachi based university hospital.
96 Potential study participants were encouraged to share the link on their social media platforms.
97 People aged 18 and above, residing in Pakistan for the last month, with access to internet and
98 willingness to participate in the study were included. Participants who could not respond to the
99 study tool in either English or Urdu, and those who reported having filled the questionnaire at
100 least once before were excluded. A total of 1406 respondents filled the online questionnaire.
101 Fifteen respondents preferred not to disclose their gender. Thus 1391 participants were included
102 in this study.

103

104 **Data Collection**

105 Data was collected through an online self-administered structured questionnaire developed on
106 Google Forms. Respondents were inquired about their gender, age, level of education,
107 household income, and city of permanent residence. They were asked how likely it is that they or
108 their families might be infected with COVID-19 if no preventive measures were taken. Further
109 questions assessed how participants perceived the severity of the symptoms caused by COVID-

110 19, their likelihood of survival if infected, and their adoption of precautionary measures.
111 Respondents also rated the reliability of various sources of COVID-19 information.
112 Subsequently, the psychological impact of COVID-19 on respondents' job, personal life, sleep
113 pattern, and eating habits was assessed. Participants' anxiety and depression levels were assessed
114 using the validated Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). This consists of 14-items
115 (7-items of anxiety and 7-item of depression) scored on a four-point Likert scale. The lowest
116 possible scores for anxiety and depression are 0, and the highest possible score is 15 for anxiety
117 and 21 for depression. The scale defines a normal score as ≥ 7 , borderline abnormal score as 8-
118 10, and abnormal score as ≤ 11 . Higher scores imply the severity of anxiety or depression (22-
119 24).

120

121 **Data Analysis**

122 Data collected from respondents was stored in Google Spreadsheets then imported to Microsoft
123 Excel and SPSS version 21 (IBM Corp). Data was cleaned, coded, and analysed using SPSS
124 Version 21. A descriptive analysis was performed. Results were tabulated as number
125 (percentage) for qualitative variables and mean (\pm standard deviation) for quantitative variables.
126 Independent t-test or Mann Whitney U test or Pearson Chi-square test was applied to assess the
127 differences between women's and men's perception of susceptibility and severity towards
128 COVID-19, anxiety and depression, psychological impact of COVID-19, adoption of
129 precautionary measures, and reliability of information sources. Bivariate and multivariate binary
130 logistic regression analyses were performed to identify predictors (age, gender, and household
131 income) of anxiety and depression. Initially, a single predictor at a time was entered; crude odds
132 ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) were computed using bivariate analysis.

133 Multivariate analysis with all predictors entered at the same time was completed to adjust for the
134 effect of confounding, and adjusted OR and 95% CI were computed. All statistical tests were
135 two sided and p-value of ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

136

137 **Ethical Considerations**

138 Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethical Review Committee (ERC) of the Aga Khan
139 University, Pakistan. Prior to filling the online questionnaire, each respondent was asked to
140 provide consent for participation in the survey.

141

142 **Results**

143 A total of 1391 participants' responses were included in the analysis. Table 1 shows the
144 sociodemographic characteristics (age, education, and household income) of women and men
145 which are comparable. Majority of the respondents were aged between 25-34 years (69% women
146 and 66% men) and possessed a Bachelor's Degree or above (75% women and 79% men). About
147 29% of women and 17% men preferred not to disclose their household income. Around one-third
148 of women (32%) and two-fifths of men (40%) mentioned that their household income is below
149 PKR 60,000. More women (69%) than men (40%) from Karachi participated in the survey
150 (Table 1).

151
152 Around three-fourths of respondents perceived that they (strongly agree/agree: 71% women vs.
153 73% men) and their family (strongly agree/agree: 74% women vs. 73% men) might be infected
154 with COVID-19 if no preventive measures were taken. However, significantly more women than
155 men considered symptoms of COVID-19 (if infected) as severe (very severe/severe: 46% women
156 and 39% men, p-value: 0.045). On probing regarding, 59% women vs. 73% men perceived
157 themselves likely to survive an infection (Table 2).

158
159 Women were also reported to have a higher anxiety score (Mean \pm SD: 6.80 \pm 3.61 in women,
160 and 5.93 \pm 3.58 in men, p-value: <0.001).. Furthermore, the depression score was high among
161 women (Mean \pm SD: 8.39 \pm 3.93 in women 8.01 \pm 3.69 in men, p-value: <0.079). More women
162 were found to be depressed compared to men, with 58% of women and 54% of men scoring
163 above the depression cut-off point(\geq 8).Around three-fifths of the respondents (strongly
164 agree/agree: 58% women and 61% men) mentioned that COVID-19 had affected their jobs.

165 About three-fourths of the respondents (strongly agree/agree: 73% women and 74% men) also
166 expressed concerns that the current pandemic is impacting their personal life. About two-fourths
167 of the respondents believed that their sleeping pattern (strongly agree/agree: 40% women and
168 39% men) and eating habits (strongly agree/agree: 36% both women and men) have been
169 disturbed due to COVID-19. Significantly more men compared to women mentioned that they
170 might start/increase cigarette consumption (strongly agree/agree: 6% women vs. 11% men, p-
171 value: <0.001), and might resort to the use of recreational drugs such as marijuana, crystallised
172 methamphetamines, cocaine or opium products etc. (strongly agree/agree: 4% women vs. 6%
173 men) (Table 3).

174
175 Significant differences were identified between women and men in adopting several
176 precautionary measures such as washing their hands with soap/sanitizer frequently (100%
177 women vs. 98% men, p-value: 0.012), wearing masks (93% women vs. 92% men, p-value:
178 0.025), covering nose and mouth while sneezing or coughing (98% women vs. 95% men, p-
179 value: 0.043), avoiding contacting people who have fever or respiratory symptoms (95% women
180 and 91% men), avoiding going out (87% women vs. 71% men, p-value: <0.001), avoiding
181 crowded areas (96% women and 92% men, p-value: 0.003), refraining from going to hospital or
182 clinic (78% women and 71% men, p-value: <0.001), avoiding to go to work (72% women and
183 57% men, p-value: <0.001), avoiding social events (97% women and 93% men, p-value: 0.046),
184 and avoiding domestic travel (93% women and 86% men, p-value: <0.001). (Table 4.)

185
186 Information about COVID-19 provided by the doctor was considered reliable by significantly
187 more women compared to men (very reliable/reliable: 91% women and 88% men, p-value:

188 0.041). Most of the respondents (very reliable/reliable: 81% women and 82% men) thought that
189 the information provided through official websites such as those run by the government is
190 reliable. Significantly more men than the women believed that the radio (very reliable/reliable:
191 46% women vs. 55% men, p-value: 0.014), and family or friends (very reliable/reliable: 46%
192 women vs. 55% men, p-value: 0.003) are reliable sources for gaining information about COVID-
193 19. Furthermore, television (very reliable/reliable: 57% women vs. 61% men), newspaper (very
194 reliable/reliable: 56% women vs. 58% men), magazine (very reliable/reliable: 39% women and
195 44% men), social media such as Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram (very reliable/ reliable: 28%
196 women vs. 32% men) and unofficial websites (very reliable/reliable: 22% women and 31% men)
197 were considered as reliable information sources by more men than women. (Table. 5)

198
199 Table 6 demonstrates the predictors of anxiety. Gender, age, and household income had a
200 significant positive association with anxiety. Women were nearly two times more likely to be
201 anxious than men (aOR: 1.70, 95% CI: 1.26-2.28). Moreover, respondents of a younger age (25-
202 34 years) (aOR 2.30, 95% CI: 1.26-4.18) were nearly two times more likely to have anxiety than
203 respondents above 55 years of age. Respondents with a household income between PKR 60,000
204 and PKR 120,000 were more likely to have anxiety than respondents with a household income of
205 >PKR 120,000 (aOR: 1.84; 95% CI: 1.27-2.67).

206
207 Table 7 shows the predictors of depression. Only household income was found have a
208 significantly positive association with depression in multivariate analysis. Respondents having a
209 household income of PKR 60,000 – PKR 120,000 were more likely to have anxiety in

210 comparison with respondents who had a household income of >PKR 120,000 (aOR: 1.99; 95%
211 CI: 1.38-2.87).

212

213 **Discussion**

214 This study assessed how gender roles in Pakistan can impact anxiety levels and behavioural
215 responses among men and women during the COVID-19 pandemic. Both men and women were
216 found to be mildly anxious due to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, compared to men, more
217 women perceived the disease to be fatal, and were more likely to engage in preventive behavior.
218 These results highlight a greater need to develop gender-responsive policies in the fight to
219 contain COVID-19.

220 Overall, fewer women than men responded to the questionnaire. This may be due to a prominent
221 male dominated access to internet facilities in Pakistan. Indeed, several reports on internet
222 penetration found that, at least three-fourths of internet and social users in the country are male
223 (25). In Pakistan, cellular devices remain the most frequent means of accessing internet facilities,
224 and there is a gender gap of 38% in mobile phone ownership (26).

225 There were also significant differences in respondents' city of permanent residence. Three-fifths
226 of all the female participants, and two-fifths of the males were from Karachi. This was expected,
227 as the survey tool was disseminated over a Karachi-based university hospital's Facebook page.
228 The remaining respondents were from Punjab and Sindh. There are significant provincial
229 disparities in access to internet facilities. Islamabad Capital Territory has the highest internet
230 penetration, followed by Punjab and Sindh (27). The fewest respondents were from Balochistan,
231 further reflecting the province's poor internet accessibility. One-third of the male respondents
232 were from smaller cities and towns throughout the country, compared to one-tenth of women.
233 Differences in the nature of Pakistani men in smaller towns/cities may impact mobile phone

234 ownership and social media usage, and explain why fewer women were from these towns and
235 cities (28).

236 Although men and women considered themselves equally susceptible to a COVID-19 infection,
237 women were more likely to perceive the disease to be fatal. This is a misperception, as gender-
238 disaggregated data (until 24 June) on COVID-19 in Pakistan shows that three-quarters of
239 diagnosed cases and deaths were among males, compared to a quarter among females (29).
240 Gender-specific patterns of smoking are implicated as a significant contributor to disease
241 severity among men (30). Indeed, this study also suggested that men were twice as likely as
242 compared to women in reporting that either they might start smoking cigarettes and using
243 recreational drugs or their usage might increase. These gender disparities in use of tobacco and
244 narcotics are frequently seen in Pakistan (31–33). Furthermore, men are more likely to suffer
245 from non-communicable diseases (34). Research suggests that excess mortality during the
246 pandemic is higher than if these surplus deaths were caused by COVID-19 alone, particularly
247 among cancer or heart disease patients and are attributable to delays in seeking or obtaining
248 lifesaving care (35,36). Furthermore, women, particularly working mothers, tend to spend more
249 time than men focused on medical issues related to their family's healthcare, as well as their own
250 (37). This could explain why women are more likely to believe that the disease symptoms are
251 severe, with a low likelihood of survival.

252 Despite at being lower risk, women were more likely to conform to preventive measures. This
253 included practicing social distancing measures, such as avoiding going to meat shops/market,
254 going out, and going to work. One digital ethnographic study suggests that the majority of the
255 population in Pakistan was in favor of continuing prayers in mosques while 1 in 4 men reported
256 to have attended Friday prayers (38). Other studies also demonstrate men's priorities during the

257 pandemic. A comparison of COVID-19-related content shared on Twitter by men and women
258 based in the U.S. found that women were more likely to tweet about family, social distancing
259 and healthcare whereas men were more likely to tweet about sports cancellations and politics
260 (39).

261 While this finding might imply that men are considerably less interested in social distancing
262 practices, only one-fifth of the Pakistani women contribute to the labor force and wherein men
263 constitute a majority of waged and salaried workers in cities and women contribute to over 70%
264 of share of work in agriculture and informal sectors (40). These differences in employment could
265 explain why men are less likely to conform to social distancing practices than women. In order to
266 improve the labor forces' capacity to work from home, initiatives should be taken to improve
267 telecommunication facilities (including improving internet service provision).

268

269 Differences were also seen in practicing hygiene measures, such as disinfecting floors and tables
270 at home (with phenyl products). School closure, lockdown and work-from-home orders have
271 resulted in women carrying a double shift of home-schooling and working responsibilities. This
272 increases the proportion of paid and unpaid labour in women's work (41). Working mothers
273 spend more hours engaged in household work and child care than their husbands (42). One study
274 conducted in the United Kingdom during the lockdown estimates that, on average, mothers
275 spend 11 more hours weekly on childcare than fathers. Single parents have less time to spend on
276 childcare than partnered mothers, as they are single-handedly forced to bear the brunt of the
277 shifts in the job market (43). This additional housework could result in women permanently

278 exiting from the labor market. These developments are concerning, and emphasize the urgent
279 need to develop labour policies which protect women in the workforce.

280 Women were more likely to report that they avoid going to hospitals. Furthermore, they were
281 also more likely to perceive that doctors were a reliable source of information. It may be too
282 soon to estimate the impact of COVID-19 on maternal and child health services, but one study
283 estimates that a modest decline of 10% in coverage of pregnancy-related and newborn health
284 care in lower-middle income countries could result in an additional, 1.7 million women who give
285 birth, and 2.6million newborns who need urgent medical care (44). Studies conducted during the
286 2013–2016 Ebola outbreak in Western Africa show how sexual and reproductive health was
287 adversely impacted by strains on health care systems, which often resulted in interruptions of
288 care, and redirected resources (45–49). Similar reduction in access can be seen during the current
289 pandemic. Clinics operated by Marie Stopes International, which is the largest private provider
290 of family planning services in India, had to halt operations due to the country-wide lockdowns
291 (50). Similarly, Marie Stopes International reports that its activities have been reduced by up to
292 40% in Pakistan due to the pandemic (51). Furthermore, some studies noted how diversion of
293 staff and funding from maternal, neonatal and child health programmes to the front-line of the
294 COVID-19 response has also decreased the quality of services available to women (52–54)

295
296 A larger number of men than women considered radio to be a reliable source of information.
297 Pakistan has a considerable audience of radio programming. One study found that radio has the
298 largest listeners in Sindh (60%), followed by Balochistan (53%), KPK (52%) and Punjab (19%),
299 particularly in rural areas and small towns (55). Therefore, this gendered difference in trusting

300 radio could be explained by the significantly larger proportion of men who came from smaller
301 cities and towns. Furthermore, men in this study were more likely to trust friends and family than
302 women. Pakistanis are considered to be a collectivistic society, with an emphasis on men
303 engaging in commitments to the members of their ‘group’, friends and family (56). Similarly,
304 men were more likely to trust social media sources than women. The lockdown enforced due to
305 COVID pandemic has resulted in online activity substituting social activity between families,
306 and may be considered as representative of a given person’s public interactions (38,39). While
307 one study found that the public was often skeptical of official figures on COVID-19, but most
308 polling suggests that Pakistanis in general are confident in the government’s management of the
309 crisis (4,5). This is in contrast with Syria, where experiences of war, and propaganda campaigns
310 by the state and its opponents, meant that Syrians were very distrustful of official news sources
311 (38). Facebook users were much more likely to share official news sources. Therefore, radio
312 content, as well as shareable social media content might be an appropriate avenue to provide
313 targeted health information to men and improve their risk perceptions and subsequent indulgence
314 in precautionary measures

315
316 In this study, women depicted higher levels of anxiety and depression in comparison with men,
317 which suggests that they hold a greater psychiatric burden of the COVID-19 pandemic. One
318 study conducted in India found that 33% of the respondents had experienced either depression or
319 anxiety as a result of COVID-19 (57). Another study in China established that 54% of
320 respondents suffered some psychological impact from the outbreak (58). In both studies, women
321 were found to have suffered a greater psychological impact due to the pandemic as compared to
322 men. Similarly, our findings corroborate with data from Turkey, where women had significantly

323 higher scores of depression and anxiety (14). Research conducted in China also reports that
324 women may be three times more anxious than their male counterparts because of COVID-19
325 (11,54,58). These results align with previous studies which show that women have a higher
326 vulnerability for developing anxiety disorders (59)

327 There are many possible sources of this concern. Apart from their professional role, women
328 serve as primary caregivers within their family (57). Women's greater sensitivity towards
329 familial roles and responsibilities was also reflected in a research which noted that pregnant
330 women had heightened stress levels regarding the health status of their older relatives, their
331 children and then their unborn baby during COVID-19 (60). One study found that family income
332 stability and social support networks were protective factors against anxiety (61). Given the
333 difficulties in forming stable social support networks during pandemic-induced lockdowns, as
334 well as women's lower likelihood of seeking medical care, this psychological support could be
335 provided via telemedicine or other online platforms which can connect them to qualified
336 psychiatrists. The timely and effective provision of such psychological support is also imperative
337 for literate women that are already suffering from mental illness and feel that their symptoms
338 have aggravated due to the ongoing pandemic.

339 **Conclusion**

340 This study assessed the gender differences in risk perceptions (susceptibility and severity of the
341 disease), preventive behaviour (social distancing, enhanced hygiene measures), and anxiety. The
342 results highlight the need for gender-responsive policies in mitigating the health and economic
343 impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The global economy has grinded to a stop, and respondents
344 face severe economic uncertainty. Differences in type-of-work, based on gender, may result in

345 men being unable to maintain social distancing. Furthermore, it results in women being burdened
346 with increasing house work, which can impact their ability to engage in professional work. This
347 indicates the urgent need to develop labour laws to protect the workforce, particularly women.
348 Furthermore, the results indicate potential avenues of disseminating gender-specific health
349 communication. Involving doctors in healthcare communication targeting women, focusing on
350 their need to avoid skipping hospital appointments, might prove effective. Research is required
351 to assess strategies of reducing the frequency of in-person MNCH appointments, and the
352 potential of telemedicine in all women to remain in contact with the health system, As men are
353 more likely to trust what they read on social media, especially if it is shared by friends or family,
354 social media campaigns and radio programming may be effective in disseminating information
355 and the latter could be an effective tool to reach towns and cities. This health communication
356 should include messages about men's higher risk of dying, due to COVID-19, a lack of NCD
357 management, and smoking cessation. Most importantly, based on the discussion, policy
358 measures must be taken to ensure the continued provision of quality healthcare to women. This
359 must include provisions to mitigate the growing anxiety among women, and compensate for the
360 loss of social support networks during pandemic times.

361 Differences in type-of-work, based on gender, may result in men being unable to maintain social
362 distancing. Furthermore, it results in women being burdened with increasing house work, which
363 can impact their ability to engage in professional work.

364 **Conflict of Interest**

365 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or
366 financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

367 **Author Contributions**

368 FR conceived the study, guided data collection and reviewed all drafts of the manuscript. HAK
369 and ARK adapted the questionnaires and wrote the manuscript. SP analyzed and narrated the
370 data. HAK and ARK edited and revised multiple drafts of the manuscript. ARK also assisted in
371 adapting the questionnaires and posting it on social media channels of AKU. All authors
372 reviewed and endorsed the final submission.

373 **Funding**

374 The authors did not receive any direct funding for the purpose of this study.

375 **Acknowledgments**

376 The authors would like to thank all the respondents of the survey from across Pakistan

377

378 **References**

- 379 1. Global Cases by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins
380 University (JHU). Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. 19.
- 381 2. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO declares COVID-19 a pandemic. *Acta Bio-Medica Atenei*
382 *Parm.* 2020;91(1):157–60.
- 383 3. Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, Liu Y, Edmunds J, Funk S, et al. Early dynamics
384 of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect*
385 *Dis.* 2020;
- 386 4. Waris A, Khan AU, Ali M, Ali A, Baset A. COVID-19 outbreak: current scenario of
387 Pakistan. *New Microbes New Infect.* 2020;100681.
- 388 5. Nafees M, Khan F. Pakistan's Response to COVID-19 Pandemic and Efficacy of
389 Quarantine and Partial Lockdown: A Review. *Electron J Gen Med.* 2020; 17 (6): em240.
390 2020.
- 391 6. Suliman S, Mkabale SG, Fincham DS, Ahmed R, Stein DJ, Seedat S. Cumulative effect of
392 multiple trauma on symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, anxiety, and depression in
393 adolescents. *Compr Psychiatry.* 2009;50(2):121–7.
- 394 7. Huremović D. *Psychiatry of pandemics: a mental health response to infection outbreak.*
395 Springer; 2019.
- 396 8. Lee AM, Wong JG, McAlonan GM, Cheung V, Cheung C, Sham PC, et al. Stress and
397 psychological distress among SARS survivors 1 year after the outbreak. *Can J Psychiatry.*
398 2007;52(4):233–40.
- 399 9. Mak IWC, Chu CM, Pan PC, Yiu MGC, Chan VL. Long-term psychiatric morbidities
400 among SARS survivors. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry.* 2009;31(4):318–26.
- 401 10. Wheaton MG, Abramowitz JS, Berman NC, Fabricant LE, Olatunji BO. Psychological
402 predictors of anxiety in response to the H1N1 (swine flu) pandemic. *Cogn Ther Res.*
403 2012;36(3):210–8.
- 404 11. Huang Y, Zhao N. Generalized anxiety disorder, depressive symptoms and sleep quality
405 during COVID-19 outbreak in China: a web-based cross-sectional survey. *Psychiatry Res.*
406 2020;112954.
- 407 12. Fuhrman S, Kalyanpur A, Friedman S, Tran NT. Gendered implications of the COVID-19
408 pandemic for policies and programmes in humanitarian settings. *BMJ Glob Health.*
409 2020;5(5):e002624.

- 410 13. Liu N, Zhang F, Wei C, Jia Y, Shang Z, Sun L, et al. Prevalence and predictors of PTSS
411 during COVID-19 outbreak in China hardest-hit areas: Gender differences matter.
412 *Psychiatry Res.* 2020;112921.
- 413 14. Özdin S, Bayrak Özdin Ş. Levels and predictors of anxiety, depression and health anxiety
414 during COVID-19 pandemic in Turkish society: The importance of gender. *Int J Soc*
415 *Psychiatry.* 2020;0020764020927051.
- 416 15. Leung GM, Ho L-M, Chan SK, Ho S-Y, Bacon-Shone J, Choy RY, et al. Longitudinal
417 assessment of community psychobehavioral responses during and after the 2003 outbreak
418 of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2005;40(12):1713–20.
- 419 16. Bish A, Michie S. Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours
420 during a pandemic: A review. *Br J Health Psychol.* 2010;15(4):797–824.
- 421 17. Rubin GJ, Amlôt R, Page L, Wessely S. Public perceptions, anxiety, and behaviour change
422 in relation to the swine flu outbreak: cross sectional telephone survey. *Bmj.*
423 2009;339:b2651.
- 424 18. Holbrook TL, Hoyt DB, Stein MB, Sieber WJ. Gender differences in long-term
425 posttraumatic stress disorder outcomes after major trauma: women are at higher risk of
426 adverse outcomes than men. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg.* 2002;53(5):882–8.
- 427 19. Ditlevsen DN, Elklit A. Gender, trauma type, and PTSD prevalence: a re-analysis of 18
428 nordic convenience samples. *Ann Gen Psychiatry.* 2012;11(1):26.
- 429 20. Bahrami F, Yousefi N. Females are more anxious than males: a metacognitive perspective.
430 *Iran J Psychiatry Behav Sci.* 2011;5(2):83.
- 431 21. McLean CP, Anderson ER. Brave men and timid women? A review of the gender
432 differences in fear and anxiety. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2009;29(6):496–505.
- 433 22. Herrero MJ, Blanch J, Peri JM, De Pablo J, Pintor L, Bulbena A. A validation study of the
434 hospital anxiety and depression scale (HADS) in a Spanish population. *Gen Hosp*
435 *Psychiatry.* 2003;25(4):277–83.
- 436 23. Lodhi FS, Elsous AM, Irum S, Khan AA, Rabbani U. Psychometric properties of the Urdu
437 version of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) among pregnant women in
438 Abbottabad, Pakistan. *Gen Psychiatry.* 2020;33(5).
- 439 24. Spinhoven PH, Ormel J, Sloekers PPA, Kempen G, Speckens AEM, Van Hemert AM. A
440 validation study of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) in different groups
441 of Dutch subjects. *Psychol Med.* 1997;27(2):363–70.
- 442 25. Simon Kemp. Digital 2020: Pakistan [Internet]. DataReportal – Global Digital Insights.
443 [cited 2020 Oct 22]. Available from: <https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2020-pakistan>

- 444 26. Ali, Kalbe. Highest male-female gap on cell-phone ownership registered in Pakistan: report
445 - Newspaper - DAWN.COM [Internet]. dawn.com. [cited 2020 Oct 22]. Available from:
446 <https://www.dawn.com/news/1538756>
- 447 27. EIU Inclusive Internet Index [Internet]. EIU Inclusive Internet Index. [cited 2020 Oct 22].
448 Available from: <https://theinclusiveinternet.eiu.com/explore/countries/PK/>
- 449 28. Malik AA. Of migration, marriage, and men: Rethinking the masculinity of transnational
450 husbands from rural Pakistan. In: Gender and sexuality in Muslim cultures. Routledge;
451 2016. p. 71–88.
- 452 29. The COVID-19 Sex-Disaggregated Data Tracker | Global Health 50/50 [Internet]. [cited
453 2020 Oct 22]. Available from: [https://globalhealth5050.org/the-sex-gender-and-covid-19-](https://globalhealth5050.org/the-sex-gender-and-covid-19-project/the-data-tracker/)
454 [project/the-data-tracker/](https://globalhealth5050.org/the-sex-gender-and-covid-19-project/the-data-tracker/)
- 455 30. Cai H. Sex difference and smoking predisposition in patients with COVID-19. *Lancet*
456 *Respir Med.* 2020;8(4):e20.
- 457 31. Masud H, Oyebode O. Inequalities in smoking prevalence: a missed opportunity for
458 tobacco control in Pakistan. *J Public Health.* 2018;40(2):271–8.
- 459 32. Khubaib MU, Shahid ZY, Lodhi SK, Malik H, Jan MM. Prevalence and associated factors
460 of smoking among final year medical students: a multicentric survey from Pakistan. *Cureus.*
461 2016;8(7).
- 462 33. Smith PH, Bessette AJ, Weinberger AH, Sheffer CE, McKee SA. Sex/gender differences in
463 smoking cessation: a review. *Prev Med.* 2016;92:135–40.
- 464 34. Rafique I, Saqib MA, Munir MA, Qureshi H, Rizwanullah KS, Khan SA, et al. Prevalence
465 of risk factors for noncommunicable diseases in adults: key findings from the Pakistan
466 STEPS survey. *East Mediterr Health J.* 2018;24(1):33–41.
- 467 35. Lai AG, Pasea L, Banerjee A, Denaxas S, Katsoulis M, Chang WH, et al. Estimating excess
468 mortality in people with cancer and multimorbidity in the COVID-19 emergency. *medRxiv.*
469 2020;
- 470 36. Covid CDC, COVID C, COVID C, Chow N, Fleming-Dutra K, Gierke R, et al. Preliminary
471 estimates of the prevalence of selected underlying health conditions among patients with
472 coronavirus disease 2019—United States, February 12–March 28, 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly*
473 *Rep.* 2020;69(13):382.
- 474 37. Greene J. A Health Care Consumer Gender Gap. *Manag Care Langhorne Pa.*
475 2016;25(8):14–7.
- 476 38. Ghadyani M, Hussain H, Odeh W, Wood P. Issue 2: Responses to the COVID-19 Pandemic
477 in Syria, Iran and Pakistan. 2020;

- 478 39. Thelwall M, Thelwall S. Covid-19 tweeting in English: Gender differences. ArXiv Prepr
479 ArXiv200311090. 2020;
- 480 40. Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Statistics, Pakistan Bureau of Statistic. PAKISTAN
481 EMPLOYMENT TRENDS. :35.
- 482 41. McLaren HJ, Wong KR, Nguyen KN, Mahamadachchi KND. Covid-19 and Women's
483 Triple Burden: Vignettes from Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Vietnam and Australia. Soc Sci.
484 2020;9(5):87.
- 485 42. Del Boca D, Oggero N, Profeta P, Rossi M. Women's Work, Housework and Childcare,
486 before and during COVID-19. 2020;
- 487 43. Zhou M, Hertog E, Kolpashnikova K, Kan M-Y. Gender inequalities: Changes in income,
488 time use and well-being before and during the UK COVID-19 lockdown. 2020;
- 489 44. Riley T, Sully E, Ahmed Z, Biddlecom A. Estimates of the potential impact of the COVID-
490 19 pandemic on sexual and reproductive health in low-and middle-income countries. Int
491 Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2020;46:46.
- 492 45. Sochas L, Channon A, Nam S. Counting Indirect Crisis-Related Deaths In The Context Of
493 A Low-Resilience Health System.
- 494 46. Delamou A, El Ayadi AM, Sidibe S, Delvaux T, Camara BS, Sandouno SD, et al. Effect of
495 Ebola virus disease on maternal and child health services in Guinea: a retrospective
496 observational cohort study. Lancet Glob Health. 2017;5(4):e448–57.
- 497 47. Menéndez C, Lucas A, Munguambe K, Langer A. Ebola crisis: the unequal impact on
498 women and children's health. Lancet Glob Health. 2015;3(3):e130.
- 499 48. Harman S. Ebola, gender and conspicuously invisible women in global health governance.
500 Third World Q. 2016;37(3):524–41.
- 501 49. Dynes MM, Miller L, Sam T, Vandi MA, Tomczyk B, Prevention (CDC) C for DC and.
502 Perceptions of the risk for Ebola and health facility use among health workers and pregnant
503 and lactating women—Kenema District, Sierra Leone, September 2014. MMWR Morb
504 Mortal Wkly Rep. 2015;63(51):1226–7.
- 505 50. Stories from the frontline | Marie Stopes International [Internet]. [cited 2020 Oct 22].
506 Available from: <https://www.mariestopes.org/covid-19/stories-from-the-frontline/>
- 507 51. Alefia T. Hussain. Lost protection [Internet]. The News on Sunday (TNS). 2020 [cited 2020
508 Oct 22]. Available from: <https://www.thenews.com.pk/tns/detail/652596-lost-protection>
- 509 52. de Paz C, Muller M, Munoz Boudet AM, Gaddis I. Gender Dimensions of the COVID-19
510 Pandemic. World Bank; 2020.

- 511 53. Wenham C, Smith J, Morgan R. COVID-19: the gendered impacts of the outbreak. *The*
512 *Lancet*. 2020;395(10227):846–8.
- 513 54. Leung TY, Sharma P, Adithipyankul P, Hosie P. Gender equity and public health
514 outcomes: The COVID-19 experience. *J Bus Res*. 2020;
- 515 55. Saleem A, Rizvi WR, Saleem M. Role of Radio Pakistan in Advancing Socio-Economic
516 Development of Rural Areas.
- 517 56. Routamaa V, Hautala TM. Understanding Cultural Differences: The values in a Cross
518 Cultural Context. *Int Rev Bus Res Pap*. 2008;4(5):129–37.
- 519 57. Roy D, Tripathy S, Kar SK, Sharma N, Verma SK, Kaushal V. Study of knowledge,
520 attitude, anxiety & perceived mental healthcare need in Indian population during COVID-
521 19 pandemic. *Asian J Psychiatry*. 2020;102083.
- 522 58. Wang Y, Di Y, Ye J, Wei W. Study on the public psychological states and its related
523 factors during the outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in some regions of
524 China. *Psychol Health Med*. 2020;1–10.
- 525 59. AKU. Study finds high levels of pandemic stress and anxiety [Internet]. [cited 2020 Oct
526 22]. Available from: [https://www.aku.edu/news/Pages/News_Details.aspx?nid=NEWS-](https://www.aku.edu/news/Pages/News_Details.aspx?nid=NEWS-002262)
527 [002262](https://www.aku.edu/news/Pages/News_Details.aspx?nid=NEWS-002262)
- 528 60. Corbett GA, Milne SJ, Hehir MP, Lindow SW, O'connell MP. Health anxiety and
529 behavioural changes of pregnant women during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Eur J Obstet*
530 *Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2020;249:96.
- 531 61. Cao W, Fang Z, Hou G, Han M, Xu X, Dong J, et al. The psychological impact of the
532 COVID-19 epidemic on college students in China. *Psychiatry Res*. 2020;112934.
- 533
- 534

Table 1. Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Respondents by Gender

Characteristics	Female n= 478 No. (%)**	Male n=913 No. (%)**	P-value‡
Age			
18-24years	167 (34.9)	291 (31.9)	0.833
25-34 years	163 (34.1)	315 (34.5)	
35-44 years	89 (18.6)	185 (20.3)	
45-54years	32 (6.7)	72 (7.9)	
55-64 years	19 (4.0)	32 (3.5)	
65-74 years	7 (1.5)	16 (1.8)	
75 years or above	0	1 (0.1)	
Prefer not to disclose	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	
Education			
Intermediate or below	119 (24.9)	188 (20.6)	0.069
Bachelor's or above	358 (74.9)	721 (79.0)	
Prefer not to disclose	1 (0.2)	4 (0.4)	
Household incomes			
PKR 20,000 or below	33 (8.4)	98 (12.0)	0.877
PKR 20,001 – PKR 40,000	53 (13.5)	133 (16.2)	
PKR 40,001 – PKR 60,000	40 (10.2)	99 (12.1)	
PKR 60,001 – PKR 80,000	28 (7.1)	74 (9.0)	
PKR 80,001 – PKR 100,000	28 (7.1)	58 (7.1)	
PKR 100,001 – PKR 120,000	33 (8.4)	85 (10.4)	
> PKR 120,000	63 (16.0)	135 (16.5)	
Prefer not to disclose	115 (29.3)	137 (16.7)	
Permanent residence			

Karachi	329 (68.8)	364 (39.9)	<0.001
Lahore	36 (7.5)	91 (10.0)	
Islamabad	25 (5.2)	56 (6.1)	
Peshawar	8 (1.7)	45 (4.9)	
Quetta	2 (0.4)	13 (1.4)	
Hyderabad	18 (3.8)	34 (3.7)	
Others*	60 (12.6)	310 (34.0)	

**Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

‡Pearson Chi-Square test

Table 2. Perceived Severity and Susceptibility for COVID-19 in women and men

Variable	Female n= 478 No. (%)*	Male n=913 No. (%)*	P-value
Susceptibility			
1. I might contract the disease if no preventive measure is taken			
Strongly agree	175 (36.6)	336 (36.8)	0.489†
Agree	166 (34.7)	329 (36.0)	
Neutral	58 (12.1)	110 (12.0)	
Disagree	25 (5.2)	44 (4.8)	
Strongly Disagree	54 (11.3)	85 (9.3)	
Don't know	0	9 (1.0)	
2. My family might contract the disease if no preventive measure is taken			
Strongly agree	181 (37.9)	352 (38.6)	0.599†
Agree	172 (36.0)	314 (34.4)	
Neutral	40 (8.4)	106 (11.6)	
Disagree	24 (5.0)	46 (5.0)	
Strongly Disagree	60 (12.6)	85 (9.3)	
Don't know	1 (0.2)	10 (1.1)	
3. I might contract COVID-19 if one of my family members tests positive for the disease			
Strongly agree	141 (29.6)	273 (29.9)	0.844†
Agree	187 (39.2)	333 (36.5)	
Neutral	65 (13.6)	132 (14.5)	
Disagree	25 (5.2)	60 (6.6)	
Strongly Disagree	47 (9.9)	84 (9.2)	
Don't know	12 (2.5)	30 (3.3)	
Severity			

1. Seriousness of symptoms caused by SARS-COVID19			
Very severe	68 (14.2)	79 (8.7)	0.045†
Severe	150 (31.4)	275 (30.1)	
Neutral	126 (26.4)	213 (23.3)	
Not severe	39 (8.2)	91 (10.0)	
Not severe at all	25 (5.2)	48 (5.3)	
Don't know	70 (14.6)	207 (22.7)	
2. Chance of survival if infected with COVID-19			
Very high	67 (14.0)	238 (26.1)	<0.001†
High	214 (44.8)	427 (46.8)	
Neutral	137 (28.7)	136 (14.9)	
Not high	27 (5.6)	38 (4.2)	
Not high at all	5 (1.0)	15 (1.6)	
Don't know	28 (5.9)	59 (6.5)	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

† Mann-Whitney test

Table 3. Psychological Impact of COVID-19 among men and women

	Variable	Female No. (%)*	Male No. (%)*	P-value
Anxiety (HADS-A Score)	Normal (<6)	184 (38.5)	455 (49.8)	<0.001 ‡
	Abnormal (≥ 6)	294 (61.5)	458 (50.2)	
	Mean (±SD)	6.80 (3.61)	5.93 (3.58)	<0.001
Depression (HADS-D Score)	Normal (<8)	202 (42.3)	417 (45.7)	0.244‡
	Abnormal (≥ 8)	276 (57.7)	496 (54.3)	
	Mean (±SD)	8.39 (3.93)	8.01 (3.69)	0.079
1. COVID-19 will affect my job	Agree/	278 (58.3)	559 (61.2)	0.242‡
	Neutral	78 (16.4)	149 (16.3)	
	Disagree	102 (21.4)	177 (19.4)	
	Don't know	19 (4.0)	28 (3.1)	
2. COVID-19 will affect my personal life	Agree	301 (63.0)	581 (63.6)	0.263‡
	Neutral	73 (15.3)	171 (18.7)	
	Disagree	97 (20.3)	150 (16.4)	
	Don't know	7 (1.5)	11 (1.2)	
3. COVID-19 has affected my sleeping pattern	Agree	193 (40.4)	352 (38.6)	0.710‡
	Neutral	77 (16.1)	161 (17.6)	
	Disagree	190 (39.7)	372 (40.7)	
	Don't know	18 (3.8)	28 (3.1)	
4. COVID-19 has affected my eating habits	Agree	170 (35.6)	329 (36.1)	0.726‡
	Neutral	90 (18.8)	158 (17.3)	
	Disagree	208 (43.5)	399 (43.8)	
	Don't know	10 (2.1)	26 (2.9)	
5. I might start smoking cigarettes/my smoking cigarette	Agree	28 (5.9)	102 (11.2)	<0.001 ‡

consumption might increase	Neutral	23 (4.8)	95 (10.4)	
	Disagree	411 (86.0)	669 (73.3)	
	Don't know	16 (3.3)	47 (5.1)	
6. I might start/increase the use of recreational drugs (such as marijuana, crystal meth, cocaine or opium products etc.)	Agree	21 (4.4)	51 (5.6)	0.001†
	Neutral	21 (4.4)	69 (7.6)	
	Disagree	417 (87.2)	747 (81.8)	
	Don't know	19 (4.0)	46 (5.0)	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

† Mann-Whitney test ‡ Pearson Chi-square test

Table 4. Adoption of Precautionary measures

Variable	Female	Male	P-value
	No. (%)	No. (%)	
Adoption of Precautionary Measures (frequency of yes response) *			
1. Wear face masks	444 (92.9)	834 (91.3)	0.025 ‡
2. Wash hands frequently (With soap or hand sanitizer)	476 (99.6)	891 (97.6)	0.012 ‡
3. Disinfecting floors and tables at home (with phenyl products)	391 (81.8)	646 (70.8)	<0.001 ‡
4. Cover nose and mouth when sneezing or coughing	468 (97.9)	870 (95.3)	0.043 ‡
5. Avoid contacting people who have fever or respiratory symptoms	452 (94.6)	832 (91.1)	0.040 ‡
6. Avoid contacting people who have been traveling abroad within one month	441 (92.3)	800 (87.6)	0.058‡
7. Avoid going out	417 (87.2)	646 (70.8)	<0.001 ‡
8. Avoid crowded areas	457 (95.6)	840 (92.0)	0.003 ‡
9. Avoid going to meat shops/market	391 (81.8)	580 (63.5)	<0.001 ‡
10. Avoid going to hospital or clinic	373 (78.0)	648 (71.0)	<0.001 ‡
11. Avoid going to work	346 (72.4)	516 (56.5)	<0.001 ‡

*Multiple answers † Mann-Whitney test ‡ Pearson Chi-square test

Table 5. Perceived reliability of information sources in Pakistan by Gender

Variable	Female	Male	P-value†
	n= 478	n=913	
	No. (%)*	No. (%)*	
Reliability of information sources			
a. Newspaper			
Reliable/Very reliable	248 (56.0)	512 (58.2)	0.843
Neutral	150 (33.9)	256 (29.2)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	45 (10.1)	111 (12.6)	
b. Magazine			
Reliable/Very reliable	173 (38.5)	389 (44.0)	0.104
Neutral	186 (41.4)	329 (37.2)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	90 (20.0)	167 (18.9)	
c. Radio			
Reliable/Very reliable	207 (46.0)	486 (54.9)	0.014
Neutral	185 (41.1)	284 (32.1)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	58 (12.9)	115 (13.0)	
d. Television			
Reliable/Very reliable	258 (57.3)	541 (61.1)	0.401
Neutral	117 (26.0)	206 (23.3)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	75 (16.7)	138 (15.6)	
e. Official websites, like the Government			
Reliable/Very reliable	367 (81.4)	727 (82.2)	0.507
Neutral	61 (13.5)	93 (10.5)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	23 (5.1)	64 (7.2)	
f. Unofficial websites			
Reliable/Very reliable	99 (22.0)	271 (30.7)	0.013

Neutral	138 (30.7)	256 (29.0)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	212 (47.3)	357 (40.3)	
g. Social media platforms (WhatsApp, Facebook, Instagram)			
Reliable/Very reliable	131 (29.2)	286 (32.3)	0.459
Neutral	130 (29.0)	236 (26.6)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	188 (41.8)	364 (41.1)	
h. Your doctor			
Reliable/Very reliable	410 (91.1)	775 (87.6)	0.041
Neutral	33 (7.3)	96 (10.8)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	7 (1.6)	14 (1.6)	
i. Your family or friends			
Reliable/Very reliable	206 (46.0)	471 (53.3)	0.003
Neutral	155 (34.6)	288 (32.6)	
Unreliable/Very unreliable	87 (19.4)	125 (14.1)	

*Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding

† Mann-Whitney test

Table 6. Predictors of Anxiety in Pakistan

Characteristics	cOR (95% CI)	P-value	aOR* (95% CI)	P-value
Gender				
Female	1.59 (1.27-1.99)	<0.001	1.69 (1.26-2.27)	<0.001
Male	Reference		Reference	
Age				
18-24years	2.36 (1.65-3.38)	<0.001	2.68 (1.70-4.23)	<0.001
25-34 years	2.57 (1.80-3.68)	<0.001	2.77 (1.82-4.22)	<0.001
35-44 years	2.42 (1.64-3.56)	<0.001	2.53 (1.61-3.99)	<0.001
45 or above	Reference		Reference	
Household incomes				
≤ PKR 60,000	1.69 (1.20-2.36)	0.002	1.49 (1.05-2.11)	0.027
PKR 60,001 – PKR 120,000	1.85 (1.29-2.65)	0.001	1.84 (1.27-2.67)	0.001
> PKR 120,000	Reference		Reference	

*Adjusted for gender, age, education, household income

Table 7. Predictors of Depression in Pakistan

Characteristics	cOR (95% CI)	P-value	aOR (95% CI)	P-value
Gender				
Female	1.15 (0.92-1.44)	0.224	1.28 (0.96-1.71)	0.087
Male	Reference		Reference	
Age				
18-24years	1.48 (1.04-2.09)	0.027	1.26 (0.81-1.95)	0.305
25-34 years	1.34 (0.95-1.89)	0.093	1.32 (0.88-1.97)	0.183
35-44 years	1.42 (0.97-2.07)	0.069	1.44 (0.93-2.24)	0.103
45 or above	Reference		Reference	
Household incomes				
≤ PKR 60,000	1.57 (1.12-2.19)	0.009	1.53 (1.09-2.17)	0.015
PKR 60,001 – PKR 120,000	1.99 (1.39-2.85)	<0.001	1.99 (1.38-2.87)	<0.001
> PKR 120,000	Reference		Reference	

*Adjusted for gender, age, education, household income,