

1 **COVID-19 preventive measures in Rohingya refugee camps: An assessment of knowledge, attitude and practice**  
2 **toward COVID-19**

3 Charls Erik Halder<sup>1\*</sup>, Md Abeed Hasan<sup>1</sup>, Yusuf Mohamed<sup>1</sup>, Marsela Nyawara<sup>1</sup>, James Charles Okello<sup>1</sup>, Md Nahid  
4 Mizan<sup>1</sup>, Md Abu Sayum<sup>1</sup>, Ahmed Hossain<sup>2</sup>

5 Author Byline

6 <sup>1</sup>Migration Health Division, International Organization for Migration (IOM), Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh

7 2. College of Health Sciences, University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

8 <sup>2</sup>Global Health Institute, North South University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

9 \* Corresponding author

10 Email: [cehalder@iom.int](mailto:cehalder@iom.int)

11

12 **Abstract**

13 **Background:** Although many studies were conducted on COVID-19 knowledge, attitude, and practice among the  
14 general population in many countries, very little is known about refugees, particularly Rohingya refugees in Cox's  
15 Bazar. A vast array of Risk Communication and Community Engagement (RCCE) interventions were implemented in  
16 Cox's Bazar with the intent of reducing disease transmission by empowering the community to adopt public health  
17 measures.

18 **Objectives:** The study aimed to evaluate the current state of knowledge, attitude, and practice among Rohingya  
19 refugees as a result of RCCE initiatives.

20

21 **Materials and Methods:** A cross-sectional study was conducted with 500 Rohingya individuals. Participants in the  
22 study were Rohingya refugees residing in five randomly selected camps where IOM health was operating. Using a  
23 structured questionnaire, skilled community health workers surveyed the Rohingya population. In addition to the  
24 survey on knowledge, attitude, and practice, the study gathered information on the perspectives and relevance of  
25 sociodemographic factors that influence KAP.

26 **Results:** The study findings indicate that the mean scores for knowledge, attitude, and practice were 9.93 (out of  
27 14), 7.55 (out of 11), and 2.71 (out of 7) respectively. Association was found between knowledge and practice level  
28 and age group – elderly age group ( $\geq 61$  years) had less level of knowledge (AOR 0.42, P value= 0.05) and the late  
29 mid age group (46 – 60 years) had **better** practice level (AOR 2.67, P value  $<0.001$ ). A significant association was also  
30 found between good knowledge level and medium family size (5 – 6 members) (P value= 0.02).

31 **Conclusions:** The study reveals that the Cox's Bazar Rohingya refugee community has a low knowledge and attitude  
32 score about COVID-19 prevention measures. Especially the KAP scores were found significantly low in elderly  
33 population. Despite RCCE interventions, the practice level of these measures exhibited a considerably low score.  
34 Poor implementation of preventive measures must be identified and remedied, involving the community in future  
35 outbreaks of a similar nature.

36 **Keywords:** COVID-19, Rohingya, Knowledge, Attitude, Practices, Refugee, Bangladesh, Outbreak, KAP, humanitarian  
37 crisis, humanitarian health

## 38 **Introduction**

39 Approximately 883,600 Rohingya refugees are residing in 34 overcrowded refugee camps in Cox's Bazar following  
40 their mass displacement from Myanmar in 2017 [1], preceded in kind by decades of influxes spurred by systematic  
41 discrimination and targeted violence [2]. The refugees are living in overcrowded bamboo-made settlements at hilly  
42 slopes and basins with limited access to livelihood and basic entitlements and are highly vulnerable to natural and  
43 man-made disasters and disease outbreaks [3]. Crowded living conditions, lack of good WASH facilities and practices,  
44 and heavy monsoon in the refugee camps and adjacent host communities increase their susceptibility to infectious  
45 diseases and often result in disease outbreaks [4]. Since 2017, several outbreaks or upsurge of infectious diseases,  
46 like, diphtheria, measles, AWD/cholera and dengue were reported in the Rohingya camps [4]

47 Superimposed on the existing vulnerability to disease outbreaks, COVID-19 appeared as a new threat to this  
48 population. COVID-19 is a highly contagious emerging disease caused by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome  
49 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). The disease was first learnt in December 2019 following a report of a cluster of viral  
50 pneumonia cases in Wuhan [5]. Since then, the disease continued to spread around the world, with more than 500  
51 million confirmed cases and six million deaths reported across around 200 countries [6]. On March 11, 2020. COVID-  
52 19 outbreak was declared by World Health Organization (WHO) as a global pandemic [7]. The first COVID-19 positive  
53 case confirmed in Bangladesh was on March 08, 2020, and the first case from the Rohingya refugee camps was  
54 reported on May 2020 [8, 9]. As of 24 April 2022, 5,922 COVID-19 confirmed cases (out of 99,049 tests) and 42 deaths  
55 were reported from the refugee camps [10].

56 Child health is at risk among Rohingya refugees due to inadequate child protection measures [11, 12]. The high  
57 prevalence of mental health issues among Rohingya refugees further complicates efforts to make them aware of the  
58 danger posed by the virus [13]. Public health guidance for prevention and control of COVID-19 included maintaining  
59 distancing of one meter from others, wearing a mask, cleaning hands, covering cough and sneezes, getting  
60 vaccinated, staying home when sick and seeking medical care when required [14, 15]. Effective implementation of  
61 those measures relies largely on what people know about these, how they think or believe on these and how they  
62 do or experience these, which in summary interpreted as knowledge, attitude, and practice (KAP) [16]. Before  
63 vaccine was widely available for the population, public health and social measures remained as the most important  
64 tool for interrupting the disease transmission [17]. Hence, risk communication and community engagement (RCCE)  
65 were one of the major pillars in COVID-19 response strategy [17]. IOM implemented a vast array of RCCE  
66 interventions in Cox's Bazar with the intent of reducing disease transmission by empowering the community to adopt  
67 public health measures. The interventions included household visits and community meetings by community health  
68 workers, dissemination of audio-visual clips, publication of printed materials, social advocacy through social leaders  
69 and community groups, go and see visits to the service sites. Most messages and contents of the communication  
70 was based on materials developed by CwC working group.

71 Although many studies have been conducted on the knowledge, attitude, and practice of COVID-19 preventive  
72 measures among the general population in various countries, very little is known about the knowledge, attitude, and  
73 practice of refugees, particularly Rohingya refugees in Cox's Bazar. Jubayer et. Al (2022) carried out a KAP survey  
74 COVID-19 among the Rohingya refugees at the very beginning of the outbreak [18]. However, the current status of  
75 the knowledge, attitude and practice is not known after undertaking the RCCE interventions. Different forums and  
76 reports have highlighted the issue of noncompliance among the population with COVID-19 measures; however,  
77 there is no evidence as to what extent the public health measures are not accepted or practiced by the community.  
78 The findings of the study could support the development of a robust strategy on risk communication and community  
79 engagement for the ongoing pandemic as well as future outbreaks of infectious diseases.

## 80 **Materials and Methods**

81 **Study design and participants:** The study was carried out in the refugee camps of Cox's Bazar, where the  
82 International Organization for Migration (IOM) had implemented community health programs. The population of  
83 Rohingya community in Cox's Bazar is around 883,600, with a male to female ratio of 45:55 [1]. Notably, a large  
84 portion of the population resides in makeshift shelters. It was a cross-sectional study. Rohingya refugees in the  
85 selected camps who were 18 years or above were the study participant. The inclusion criteria for this study were  
86 that participants must reside inside the camps, be 18 years or older, consist of both male and female participants  
87 who give their consent, and must be able to understand the questioner, while the exclusion criteria were that  
88 participants cannot belong to the same family. A survey was employed among 500 Rohingya individuals selected  
89 through systemic random sampling. 5 camps of IOM health operation were selected randomly. In each camp, 5 sub-  
90 blocks were randomly selected and at each sub-block, 20 households were selected through systemic random  
91 sampling. At each camp 5 CHWs surveyed 100 beneficiaries of different ages from the selected households; from  
92 each household, a beneficiary was selected using an age-sex table prepared based on camp demographic data.

### 93 **Sample size calculation:**

94 Since it was a cross-sectional study, the following formula used for sample size collection:  $n = \frac{z^2 pq}{d^2}$

95 The equation represents a sample size calculation for our study. The variable "q" is calculated as 1-p, where "p" is  
96 the population proportion, which is assumed to be 50%. The variable "z" represents the confidence level of interest,  
97 which is set at 1.96 for a 95% confidence level. The variable "d" represents the degree of accuracy required, which  
98 is set at 0.05 level for the expected sample size. Using these values, the sample size "n" is calculated using the  
99 equation  $(z^2 * p * q) / d^2$ , resulting in a sample size of approximately 384, rounded up to 500 to account for the risk  
100 of a 25% non-response rate. This sample size will be used to ensure that the study results have a high level of  
101 accuracy and confidence.

### 102 **Data collection instrument and data collection:**

103 The CHWs surveyed each participant using a questionnaire/checklist [Table 2] and by observing the practices in their  
104 day-to-day life. All data were entered into the kobo toolbox against the questionnaire by the CHWs. The  
105 questionnaire was validated by piloting among a small sample of participants to ensure that it is clear, relevant, and  
106 produces consistent and accurate data. The questionnaire comprised 14 questions to assess the respondents'  
107 knowledge. Eleven and seven questions were employed, respectively, to evaluate the attitudes and practices of  
108 respondents regarding COVID-19. Respondents with a score of 9 or higher were deemed to have "good knowledge"  
109 of COVID-19, and an aggregate score was computed (range 0–14). Respondents with a score of 8 or higher were  
110 deemed to have a "positive attitude." Measurements of cautious behavioral practices were based on the following  
111 two categories: (1) preventative measures (such as wearing masks and exercising hand hygiene) and (2) social  
112 isolation (i.e., avoiding crowded places, family staying at home). Using a two-point Likert scale (0 = No, 1 = Yes),  
113 CHWs monitored respondents' actions during the survey period. Respondents with a score of 6 or higher were  
114 deemed to have "good practice" (Table 1a). The questionnaire/checklist was translated into the Bengali language.

### 115 **Data analysis:**

116 To assess the level of knowledge, attitude and practice of COVID-19 preventive measures descriptive analyses of  
117 socio-demographic and exposure factors descriptive statistics were measured for each variable by using a similar  
118 scale developed by Zhong et al., the respondents' knowledge, attitudes, and practices with COVID-19 were evaluated  
119 [16]. All responders were asked to respond "Yes" or "No". Scores were determined by awarding one point for each  
120 appropriate answer, with higher scores signifying a greater proficiency level. The bivariate relationship between the

121 socio-demographic and outcome variables was assessed using the Pearson chi-square test and Fisher exact test.  
122 Multivariable logistic regression was used to evaluate the status and effectiveness of risk communication and  
123 community engagement approaches, inter-activeness, acceptability, and comprehensibility. The logit coefficient is  
124 calculated, as well as the 95% confidence interval. The level of statistical significance was set at 5%. All analyses are  
125 carried out using the STATA (v-16.0).

## 126 **Ethical consideration**

127 The Institutional Review Board (IRB)/Ethical Review Committee (ERC) of North South University, Bangladesh,  
128 authorized the protocol for this study (2021/OR-NSU/IRB/0401). All respondents participated voluntarily. Before  
129 performing the formal interview, each participant provided written informed consent (mainly thumb imprints), and  
130 consent documents were stored separately until the conclusion of the study in a closed filing cabinet. The study  
131 adhered to the “no-harm” principle, and there was no legal risk associated with the involvement of the participants.  
132 Moreover, local rules and regulations were observed during interactions. Each stage of this investigation was  
133 conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration (1964) and its most recent amendment (2013).

## 134 **Results**

### 135 **LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE:**

#### 136 **Sample Characteristics of the study population:**

137 The demographics of the survey respondents in Rohingya refugee camps in Cox’s Bazar are shown in Table 1b. A  
138 total of 500 people participated in this study, with 239 men (47.80%) and 261 women (52.20%) making up the  
139 majority. The participants in the study were on average 43.98 years old. The study participant's age categories are  
140 distinguished by early, prime, mature, and elderly [17]. This age group is classified by comparing the life expectancies  
141 of the host and refugee communities, with the average life expectancy for the Rohingya being 67.36 years and the  
142 Bangladeshi being 72.87 years [18]. In the study population, 20.40% were between the ages of 18 and 30, 35.60%  
143 were between the ages of 31 and 45, 28.80% were between the ages of 46 and 60, and 15.20% were above the age  
144 of 61. 89.20% of the people in the survey were married, 1.80% were single, and 9% were divorced or widowed.  
145 Families with fewer than five members accounted for 38.20% of respondents, followed by 34% for families with  
146 fewer than seven but more than four members, 21.20% for families with fewer than nine but more than six  
147 members, and 6.60% for families with more than nine members. 17.60% of respondents had two children,  
148 23.60% had five or more children, 17% had three children, and 12.60% had one child, which was the same as those  
149 who did not have a child. One or more family members under the age of ten years were reported by 63% of  
150 respondents, while 26% had family members above the age of 60.

151

#### 152 **Level of knowledge, attitude and practice regarding COVID-19 preventive measures:**

153 Table 2 shows the response of the participants on their knowledge, attitude and practice regarding COVID-19  
154 preventive measures. Majority of the participants had understanding of the different preventive measures for  
155 COVID-19. 100% of the participants heard about COVID-19 and more than 90% heard about the COVID-19 vaccine.  
156 More than 80% of the participants could explain some symptoms of COVID-19. Around three fourth of the  
157 participants understood how COVID-19 transmits, the necessity of consultation at the health facility for  
158 respiratory/COVID-19 symptoms, the requirement of wearing masks and cough etiquette. Two third of the  
159 participants knew that they should wear masks around other people and avoid crowded or closed spaces. Knowledge  
160 regarding complications and different severity of COVID-19 was relatively low, around half of the participants

161 positively responded. Around 60% of the participants had knowledge regarding the necessity of providing samples  
162 for testing, isolation of positive cases at the isolation and treatment center, and quarantine of contacts of COVID-  
163 19.

164 More than 70% of the participants perceived COVID-19 as dangerous for them and their families. Two-thirds of the  
165 participants had positive attitudes toward handwashing and wearing masks in public places and maintaining social  
166 distancing. The majority of the participants had positive attitudes toward the essentiality of COVID-19 vaccine (85%)  
167 and administering COVID-19 vaccine (89.8%). Below 60% of the participants agreed to avoid crowded places, giving  
168 sample if having symptoms, admission into an isolation and treatment center and quarantining the family members  
169 in case of a positive result. 80% of the participants agreed that COVID-19 could finally be controlled.

170 In comparison to knowledge and attitude, the practice of COVID-19 different preventive measures among the  
171 participants was found low. Below one-third of the participants frequently washed their hands, wore masks in public  
172 places, stayed home if not critical, and avoided touching their mouth, nose, or eye with uncleaned hands. Only 37%  
173 of participants tried to maintain distance from others and 40% practiced cough etiquette. However, around 70% of  
174 the participants, who were over 55 years, received a dose of COVID-19 vaccine.

175 Table 3 shows the results of the study in terms of level of knowledge, attitude, and practice. The findings suggest  
176 that many respondents (70.80%) had a good understanding of COVID-19, with only a minority (16.0%) had poor  
177 knowledge level. Only 22.20% of respondents had a good level and 37.02% had an average level of attitude toward  
178 maintaining COVID-19 preventive measures. One-fifth of the participants (22%) had a poor level of attitude. In terms  
179 of practice level, it was also found that only 7.00% of the respondents had a good level of preventive practices, while  
180 the majority of respondents (61.80%) had a poor level of practice. In summary, the majority of the community had  
181 a good level of knowledge or awareness on COVID-19 and an average to good level of attitude, however, a  
182 significantly low level of practice toward the preventive measures.

183 Table-4 illustrates the association of the socio-demographic distribution of the respondents and knowledge,  
184 attitude, and practice regarding COVID-19 preventive measures. In terms of age, except for elderly people, almost  
185 all age groups had nearly the same percentage of responders (60~70%) with good awareness of COVID-19 infection,  
186 prevention, and control strategies. Good attitude toward COVID-19 preventive measures was found similar among  
187 all age groups, between 38 – 44%. While the prevalence of the good practice of COVID-19 preventive measures was  
188 found low in all age groups (2 ~ 11%), it is lower (3.92%) among the early working age group (18-30 year) and lowest  
189 (2.63%) among elderly (>= 61 years). It was found that almost an identical proportion (~62%) of the male and female  
190 participants have a good level of knowledge. In terms of the gender distribution of good level of practice and  
191 attitude, a bit lower prevalence was found among female participants in comparison to male.; 38.08% of the female  
192 participants had good attitude which is lower in comparison to the male (42.15%), and 6.28% of the female  
193 participants had good practice level which is lower in comparison to male (7.66%). We found that those who were  
194 separated/widowed (53.33%) had less understanding of COVID-19 than the single (77.78%) or married respondents  
195 (62.33%). Single respondents (66.67%) had a more positive attitude than married (39.91%) or separated/widowed  
196 respondents (37.78%). Positive attitudes toward preventive measures were found lower among married (39.91%)  
197 individuals and divorced/separated/widowed in comparison to singles (66.67%). Good practice level was also found  
198 lower among married (7.40%) and lowest among divorce/separated/widowed (2.22%) in comparison to singles  
199 (11.11%). We observed that 56.02% of respondents from small/nuclear families had a good level of knowledge, while  
200 84.50% of respondents from very big families had a good level of knowledge. Good attitude level remains within 38  
201 – 45% among respondents from different family sizes. However, good practice level was noted among 9.42% of  
202 respondents from small families and 3 – 4 % among large and very large families. Through bivariate analysis, the

203 study found a significant association between family size and knowledge level (Fisher's exact 0.02), however, no  
204 statistical association of knowledge, attitude and practice were found with gender and marital status.

205 The scores of KAP were separated into three classes and placed as the dependent variable using the quartile as a  
206 cutoff point. The model is comprised of three continuous processes that aid in the explanation of human behavior  
207 residing in the camps. Table 5 illustrates in the multivariable logistic regression analyses, there is no statistical  
208 relevance with gender and marital status on KAP scale in terms of knowledge, attitude and practice regarding COVID-  
209 19 preventive measures. Association was found between knowledge and practice level and age group – elderly age  
210 group ( $\geq 61$  years) had less level of knowledge (AOR 0.42, P value 0.05) and the late mid age group (46 – 60 years)  
211 had **better** practice level (AOR 2.67, P value 0.00). A significant association was also found between good knowledge  
212 level and medium family size (5 – 6 members) (P value, 0.02).

## 213 **Discussions**

214 This study aimed to assess the level of knowledge, attitude, and practice concerning COVID-19, as well as the  
215 perceptions and importance of sociodemographic characteristics that influence KAP. With an unbiased distribution  
216 of gender, age, family size and marital status, this study aims to correlate with social determinants of health factors  
217 associated with people's COVID-19 preventive measure-related knowledge, attitude, and practice. Studies regarding  
218 COVID-19 preventive measures in another geographical area might not mimic the same weight for these factors as  
219 it was done in the Rohingya refugee camps. According to the author's knowledge, this is the second study that  
220 evaluates the KAP of Rohingya refugees in relation to COVID-19, allowing us to assess and compare our findings with  
221 those of a previous study conducted in Rohingya refugee camps and other refugee-related KAP studies. The results  
222 of this study indicate that the mean scores for knowledge and attitude were 9.93 (out of 14) and 7.55 respectively  
223 (out of 11). This reflects an increase in knowledge and attitude among Rohingya refugees compared to the results  
224 of previous research was done at the beginning of the pandemic [18], which indicated the mean score of 5.8 (out of  
225 10) for knowledge and 2.2 (out of 5) for attitude. When it comes to quantifying the level of practice, our study found  
226 a mean score of 2.71 (out of 7) indicating that practice is not improved as much as knowledge and attitude. The  
227 practice level, however, is better than that found in the prior study; the mean practice score was 0.9. (Out of 5) [15].  
228 The improvement of knowledge, attitude, and practice can be linked to the extensive risk communication and  
229 community engagement (RCCE) activities undertaken by the humanitarian agencies [19, 20]. The RCCE strategies of  
230 IOM and the health sector for COVID-19 include dissemination of information and engagement of community  
231 through household visits (with proper distancing), distribution of promotional materials, small group and courtyard  
232 meetings, and engagement of community leaders [23, 24]. Our study findings revealed that respondents possess  
233 adequate knowledge about COVID-19. In 2019, a survey was conducted on Rohingya people in the Cox's Bazar camps  
234 addressing water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), and identical results were obtained in terms of total knowledge  
235 scores [26]. The study found that over half of the respondents were aware of COVID transmission which is similar to  
236 findings from Syrian refugee settlements [27]. In contrast, a previous study done at Rohingya camps found that the  
237 respondents were unable to answer questions about transmission [18].

238 Multivariable logistic regression analysis revealed a limited number of significant associations as measured by the  
239 adjusted odds ratio. In terms of knowledge level, respondents' knowledge regarding COVID-19 infection prevention  
240 measures decreased with advancing age, and those who are elderly exhibited the lowest levels of knowledge which  
241 is similar to the earlier study conducted by Jubayer et al. [18]. Older persons are disproportionately affected by the  
242 emergencies and may have limited access to information [28]. In 2021, Lebrasseur et al. found that the COVID-19  
243 pandemic had a major impact on vulnerable populations, notably older people, who often experience loneliness,  
244 age discrimination, and anxiety [28]. As a result, it is reasonable to assume that they have less knowledge than  
245 younger adults, which reflects in their degree of poor attitude and or practice, and the majority of elderly Rohingya

246 respondents held a similar view of COVID-19 preventive measures, according to our findings. We found that  
247 participants generally had a positive attitude towards measures such as avoiding crowds, wearing masks in public,  
248 practicing physical distancing, and maintaining hand hygiene. However, it was also found that relatively few people  
249 actually put these attitudes into practice. Additionally, the hygiene practices of the Rohingya participants in the study  
250 seemed to differ from the findings of a previous study conducted in 2020 [22]. A study prior to the COVID-19  
251 outbreak in the Rohingya refugee settlements found that more than 50% of Rohingya refugees had poor hygiene  
252 practices [26]. Our study found a strong correlation between good hygiene practices and family size. However,  
253 another study conducted during the early stages of the pandemic found that family size did not affect the hygiene  
254 practices of Rohingya people [29].

255 During the study period, we discovered that a significant number of participants over the age of 55, roughly two-  
256 thirds, received COVID-19 vaccine. This can be linked to the fact that to increase vaccine acceptance and uptake,  
257 Community Health Working Group (CHWG) implemented extensive risk communication and community  
258 engagement strategies along with evidence-based initiatives [30-31]. The study found that the participants did not  
259 take sufficient precautions, such as staying home and maintaining social distance, during the upsurge period. This  
260 lack of adherence to safety measures was similarly observed in another study conducted among Rohingya refugees,  
261 which found that over half of the participants did not maintain social distancing and frequently left their homes [22].  
262 Conversely, the mothers of Syrian refugees exhibit a highly optimistic attitude, and they tend to follow social  
263 distancing protocols [27].

#### 264 **Limitations and future directions**

265 The design of this study was cross-sectional; hence, causal inferences may not always be made. The study found  
266 that many of the participants had a good level of knowledge and an average level of attitude, however, a significantly  
267 low level of practice of the COVID-19 preventive measures. While the study provides a numerical analysis, further  
268 qualitative investigations is required to understand the drivers and barriers of this situation. The quantitative findings  
269 of the study on different areas and level of knowledge, attitude and practice together with proposed qualitative  
270 investigation should be taken into consideration for updating the risk communication and community engagement  
271 strategy for COVID-19 and future similar outbreaks.

272

#### 273 **Conclusions**

274 The RCCE interventions improved the knowledge and attitudes of Rohingya refugees in Cox's Bazar on COVID-19  
275 preventative measures, but the results indicate that more effective interventions are required to improve knowledge  
276 and attitudes. It was also found that the score of practice, despite improving in comparison to the baseline, is  
277 significantly inadequate. There was a strong correlation between age group and knowledge level; older and younger  
278 age groups had less knowledge of COVID-19 prevention strategies. Further efforts should be made to determine the  
279 causes of the low level of practice, including the relationship between policies and tactics, the local context,  
280 resources, and social variables. Moreover, The problems of older adults' low levels of knowledge should be  
281 investigated and addressed.

282

283

284

285 **Acknowledgements:** The data for this article arose from the world's largest refugee camps in Cox's Bazar,  
286 Bangladesh. We would like to convey our heartfelt gratitude for the participant's assistance.

287 **Funding:** This research was supported by International Organization for Migration (IOM).

288 **Conflicting interests:** The author(s) declared that they have no conflicts of interest in any steps of this  
289 research.

## 290 **Disclaimer**

291 The views presented in the study are solely those of the authors and do not represent the official stance of the  
292 International Organization for Migration (IOM). This publication was issued without formal editing by IOM.

## 293 **Abbreviations**

294 AWD – Acute Watery Diarrhoea  
295 CHW – Community Health Worker  
296 CI – Confidence Interval  
297 CwC – Communication with Community  
298 ERC – Ethical Review Committee  
299 FDMN – Forcefully Displaced Myanmar Nationals  
300 IOM – International Organization for Migration  
301 IRB – Institutional Review Board  
302 ISCG – Inter Sector Coordination Group (ISCG)  
303 KAP – Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice  
304 MERS-CoV - Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus  
305 NSU – North South University  
306 RCCE – Risk Communication and Community Engagement  
307 SARS-CoV-2 – Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2  
308 WASH – Water, Sanitation and Hygiene  
309 WG – Working Group  
310 WHO – World Health Organization  
311  
312

## 313 **References**

- 314 1. Rohingya refugees population by location at camp and Union Level – cox's bazar [Internet]. Humdata.org.  
315 ISCG; 2021 [cited 2022 May 28]. Available at: [https://data.humdata.org/dataset/site-location-of-rohingya-  
316 refugees-in-cox-s-bazar?msclkid=a8c322b2c5d511eca4e106dbb1c8c7](https://data.humdata.org/dataset/site-location-of-rohingya-refugees-in-cox-s-bazar?msclkid=a8c322b2c5d511eca4e106dbb1c8c7)
- 317 2. 2022 joint response plan: Rohingya humanitarian crisis (January – December 2022) [Internet]. ReliefWeb.  
318 ISCG; 2022 [cited 2022 May 30]. Available at: [https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/2022-joint-  
319 response-plan-rohingya-humanitarian-crisis-january-december-2022](https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/2022-joint-response-plan-rohingya-humanitarian-crisis-january-december-2022)
- 320 3. Health Sector Contingency Plan for Monsoon and Cyclone, Cox's Bazar: Health Sector. Health Sector; 2021.
- 321 4. Polonsky JA, Ivey M, Mazhar MK, Rahman Z, le Polain de Waroux O, Karo B, Jalava K, Vong S, Baidjoe A, Diaz  
322 J, Finger F. Epidemiological, clinical, and public health response characteristics of a large outbreak of  
323 diphtheria among the Rohingya population in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 2017 to 2019: A retrospective study.  
324 PLoS medicine. 2021 Apr 1;18(4):e1003587.



- 325 5. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) [Internet]. Who.int. [cited 2022 Jun 10]. Available from:  
326 [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19)  
327 [detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19)
- 328 6. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) dashboard with Vaccination Data [Internet]. Who.int. [cited 2022 May 30].  
329 Available at: <https://covid19.who.int/?msclkid=153e624bc52a11eca3b5662dab669a83>
- 330 7. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO declares COVID-19 a pandemic. Acta Biomed [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 Jun  
331 6];91(1):157–60. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23750/abm.v91i1.9397>
- 332 8. Islam T, Talukder AK, Siddiqui N, Islam T. Tackling the COVID-19 pandemic: The Bangladesh perspective.  
333 Journal of public health research. 2020 Oct 14;9(4):jphr-2020.
- 334 9. France-Presse A. First coronavirus case at Rohingya refugee camps in Bangladesh. The guardian [Internet].  
335 2020 May 14 [cited 2022 Jun 10]; Available at: [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/14/first-](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/14/first-coronavirus-case-rohingya-refugee-camps-bangladesh)  
336 [coronavirus-case-rohingya-refugee-camps-bangladesh](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/14/first-coronavirus-case-rohingya-refugee-camps-bangladesh)
- 337 10. Health Sector Cox’s Bazar Data and Information Hub [Internet]. Humanitarianresponse.info. [cited 2022  
338 May 25]. Available at: <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/bangladesh/health>
- 339 11. Zeeba Zahra Sultana, Adittyta Arefin, Ahmed Hossain\*, Addressing child protection issues in Bangladesh’s  
340 Rohingya and host community to improve children’s health, The Lancet Regional Health - Southeast Asia,  
341 Volume 5, 2022, 100070, ISSN 2772-3682, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lansea.2022.100070>.
- 342 12. Hossain A, Baten RBA, Sultana ZZ, Rahman T, Adnan MA, Hossain M, Khan TA, Uddin MK. Pre-displacement  
343 Abuse and Post-displacement Factors Associated With Mental Health Symptoms After Forced Migration  
344 Among Rohingya Refugees in Bangladesh. JAMA Netw Open. 2021 Mar 1;4(3):e211801. doi:  
345 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.1801. PMID: 33724392; PMCID: PMC7967081.
- 346 13. Hossain A, Ahmed S, Shahjalal M, Ahsan GU. Health risks of Rohingya children in Bangladesh: 2 years on.  
347 Lancet. 2019 Oct 19;394(10207):1413-1414. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31395-9. PMID: 31631855.
- 348 14. World Health Organization. COVID-19 strategic preparedness and response plan: reinforcing the collective  
349 readiness and response in the WHO Eastern Mediterranean Region. World Health Organization. Regional  
350 Office for the Eastern Mediterranean; 2021.
- 351 15. World Health Organization. Advice for the public on COVID-19. World Health Organization. Available at:  
352 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public>. Accessed. 2020  
353 Mar;22.
- 354 16. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) [Internet]. [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19)  
355 [coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19). 2021 [cited 2022  
356 Jun 10]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19)  
357 [coronavirus-2019/question-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/question-and-answers-hub/q-a-detail/coronavirus-disease-covid-19)
- 358 17. World Health Organization. COVID-19 global risk communication and community engagement strategy,  
359 December 2020-May 2021: interim guidance, 23 December 2020. World Health Organization; 2020.
- 360 18. Jubayer MF, Limon MT, Rana MM, Kayshar MS, Arifin MS, Uddin AM, Mazumder MA. COVID-19 knowledge,  
361 attitude, and practices among the Rohingya refugees in Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh. Public Health in Practice.  
362 2022 Jun 1;3:100227.
- 363 19. Zhong BL, Luo W, Li HM, Zhang QQ, Liu XG, Li WT, Li Y. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices towards COVID-  
364 19 among Chinese residents during the rapid rise period of the COVID-19 outbreak: a quick online cross-  
365 sectional survey. International journal of biological sciences. 2020;16(10):1745.
- 366 20. Data Commons, Place Explorer. [cited 2022 May 30]. Available at: <https://datacommons.org/place/country>
- 367 21. Bangladesh Age structure. Available at: [https://www.indexmundi.com/bangladesh/age\\_structure.html#4](https://www.indexmundi.com/bangladesh/age_structure.html#4)
- 368 22. Lopez-Pena P, Davis CA, Mobarak AM, Raihan S. Prevalence of COVID-19 symptoms, risk factors, and health  
369 behaviors in host and refugee communities in Cox’s Bazar: A representative panel study. Bull World Health  
370 Organ. 2020 May 11;11.
- 371 23. World Health Organization. Risk communication and community engagement readiness and response to  
372 coronavirus disease (COVID-19): interim guidance, 19 March 2020. World Health Organization; 2020.

373 24. Situation Report: Rohingya Crisis - Cox's Bazar [Internet]. reliefweb.int. 2021. Available from:  
 374 [https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/iscg-situation-report-rohingya-refugee-crisis-cox-s-bazar-](https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/iscg-situation-report-rohingya-refugee-crisis-cox-s-bazar-november-2020)  
 375 [november-2020](https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/iscg-situation-report-rohingya-refugee-crisis-cox-s-bazar-november-2020)  
 376 25. Le HT, Nguyen DN, Beydoun AS, Le XT, Nguyen TT, Pham QT, Ta NT, Nguyen QT, Nguyen AN, Hoang MT, Vu  
 377 LG. Demand for health information on COVID-19 among Vietnamese. International journal of  
 378 environmental research and public health. 2020 Jun;17(12):4377.  
 379 26. Hsan K, Naher S, Griffiths MD, Shamol HH, Rahman MA. Factors associated with the practice of water,  
 380 sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) among the Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh. Journal of Water, Sanitation  
 381 and Hygiene for Development. 2019 Dec 1;9(4):794-800.  
 382 27. Hamadneh S, Hamadneh J, Amarin Z, Kassab M, Obeidat R, Rawashdeh H. Knowledge and attitudes  
 383 regarding Covid-19 among Syrian refugee women in Jordan. International Journal of Clinical Practice. 2021  
 384 May;75(5):e14021.  
 385 28. Lebrasseur A, Fortin-Bédard N, Lettre J, Raymond E, Bussièrès EL, Lapierre N, Faieta J, Vincent C, Duchesne  
 386 L, Ouellet MC, Gagnon E. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on older adults: rapid review. JMIR aging. 2021  
 387 Apr 12;4(2):e26474.  
 388 29. Haque MA, Chakraborty S, Ahmed MS. Assessment of knowledge, attitude and practice of WASH and  
 389 nutrition in a human-made emergency: A study on Rohingya community living in the camps of Bangladesh.  
 390 International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology. 2020;29(7):5068-77.  
 391 30. Khan S, Mishra J, Ahmed N, Onyige CD, Lin KE, Siew R, Lim BH. Risk communication and community  
 392 engagement during COVID-19. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction. 2022 May 1;74:102903.  
 393 31. WFP in Cox's Bazar - Perception Analysis - COVID-19 Response [Internet]. <https://www.wfp.org/>. 2020.  
 394 Available from: <https://www.wfp.org/publications/wfp-coxs-bazar-perception-analysis-covid-19-response>  
 395

396  
 397 **TABLES**

398 **TABLE 1A: METHOD OF CALCULATING KAP SCORE**

Variables	Number of Questions	Score to Answers	Level of Variables
Knowledge	14	1= Yes/Correct 0= No/Don't know	Poor: 0-4 (0-33)
			Moderate: 5-8 (34-67)
			Good: 9-14 (68-100)
Attitude	11	1= Yes/Correct 0= No/Don't know	Poor: 0-3 (0-33)
			Moderate: 4-7 (34-67)
			Good: 8-11 (68-100)
Practice	7	1= Good practice 0= Poor practice	Poor: 0-3 (0-33)
			Moderate: 4-5 (34-67)
			Good: 6-7 (68-100)

399  
 400 **TABLE 1B: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS (n= 500)**

Sociodemographic Characteristic	Total (n=500)	
	N	%
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	239	47.80
Male	261	52.20

Agegroup (year)		
18-30 year	102	20.40
31-45 year	178	35.60
46-60 year	144	28.80
>=61 years	76	15.20
Residence		
Camp 13	100	20.00
Camp 15	100	20.00
Camp 20	100	20.00
Camp 21	100	20.00
Camp 24	100	20.00
Marital Status		
Single	9	1.80
Married	446	89.20
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	45	9.00
People at Household		
<= 4 members	191	38.20
5-6 members	170	34.00
7-8 mebers	106	21.20
>= 9 members	33	6.60
Number of Children		
No child	63	12.60
One child	63	12.60
Two children	88	17.60
Three children	85	17.00
Four children	83	16.60
Five or more children	118	23.60
Family Members above 60 years		
Zero	370	74.00
One	108	21.60
Two or more	22	4.40
Family Members below 10 years		
None	185	37.00
One	78	15.60
Two	120	24.00
Three	83	16.60
Four or more	34	6.80

401

402 **TABLE 2: PARTICIPANTS' KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICES ON COVID-19 PREVENTIVE MEASURES**

Knowledge	% Yes	% No
Have they heard about COVID-19?	100	0.00
Can they explain some symptoms of COVID-19? (e.g., fever, cough, respiratory distress, headache, myalgia, runny nose etc.)	82.00	18.00
Do they know dangers/complications of COVID-19? (e.g., respiratory difficulty, death, heart/brain complications etc.)	53.20	46.80

Do they know how COVID-19 transmits? (By coughing, sneezing, contacts, <1 m distancing etc.)	75.20	24.80
Do they know COVID-19 can be presented in varied severity? (e.g., asymptomatic, mild, moderate, severe)	48.20	51.80
Do they know patients with respiratory/COVID-19 symptoms should be consulted at a health facility?	74.20	25.80
Do they know that patients with respiratory/COVID-19 symptoms should give sample (through nasal/oral swab) for testing?	58.80	41.20
Do they know that patients with positive results for COVID-19 should be isolated at a SARI Isolation and Treatment Center?	59.80	40.20
Do they know that contacts (e.g., family members) of a COVID-19 patient should be quarantined (preferably in a Quarantine Facility?)	57.40	42.60
Do they know hand hygiene (using soap and water or alcohol-based hand rub) is one of the measures to prevent transmission?	69.20	30.80
Do they know they should wear mask around other people?	78.20	21.80
Do they know they should avoid crowded or closed spaces?	67.60	32.40
Do they know they should cover their mouth and nose with their bent elbow or tissue when they cough or sneeze?	77.00	23.00
Do they hear about the COVID-19 vaccine?	93.00	7.00
<b>Attitude</b>		
Do you think that COVID-19 can be dangerous for you, your family and neighbors?	71.80	28.20
Do you think that frequent handwashing using soap and water can be an effective measure to prevent or reduce the disease transmission?	66.40	33.60
Do you believe that wearing a mask in public places can be an effective measure to prevent or reduce the disease transmission?	66.20	33.80
Do you think that it is necessary to stay at home and avoid crowded places as much as possible to prevent or reduce the disease transmission?	56.00	44.00
Do you think that it is useful to maintain three feet distance from others not to catch or transmit the disease?	66.00	34.00
Do you agree that you should give sample (via nasal or oral swab), if you are having some symptoms of COVID-19?	58.20	41.80
Do you agree to go to an isolation and treatment center, if you have a positive test result?	58.40	41.60
Do you believe that if some gets positive result for COVID-19, their family should be quarantined to prevent the further transmission?	57.60	42.40

Do you believe the COVID-19 vaccine is essential for us?	85.00	15.00
Are you willing to be vaccinated if the vaccine is offered to you?	89.80	10.20
Do you agree that COVID-19 will finally be successfully controlled?	80.00	20.00
<b>Practice</b>		
Frequently wash their hands with soap and water	30.80	69.20
Wearing a mask in the public place	30.20	69.80
Family is staying at home, if not very critical to go outside	30.00	70.00
Trying to maintain distance with others	37.40	62.60
Not touching mouth, nose, or eye with uncleaned hands	32.20	67.80
Covering mouth by elbow or handkerchief while coughing sneezing	40.80	59.20
Have you been vaccinated? (Applicable if age is >55 Years)	69.60	30.40

403

404 **TABLE 3: KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE REGARDING COVID-19 PREVENTIVE MEASURES**

Variable	Overall Mean (+/- SD)	Poor	Average	Good
Knowledge	9.93 (2.95%)	80 (16.00%)	113 (22.60%)	354 (70.80%)
Attitude	7.55 (2.51%)	111 (22.20%)	186 (37.20%)	111 (22.20%)
Practice	2.71 (1.58%)	309 (61.80%)	201 (40.20%)	35 (7.00%)

405

406 **TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS AND 'KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE' SCORES OF COVID-19**  
 407 **ACROSS DEMOGRAPHICS IN FDMN CAMPS (N=500)**

Variable	Determinants	Knowledge level			Chi-square	p-value
		Poor	Average	Good		
Agegroup	18-30 year	13 (12.75%)	20 (19.61%)	69 (67.65%)	9.37	0.10
	31-45 year	26 (14.61%)	36 (20.22%)	116 (65.17%)		
	46-60 year	23 (15.97%)	33 (22.92%)	88 (61.11%)		
	>=61 years	18 (23.68%)	22 (28.95%)	36 (47.37%)		
Gender	Female	39 (16.32%)	53 (22.18%)	147 (61.51%)	0.03	0.90
	Male	41 (15.71%)	58 (22.22%)	162 (62.07%)		
Marital Status	Single	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	7 (77.78%)	0.09 (Fisher's exact)	
	Married	75 (16.82%)	93 (20.85%)	278 (62.33%)		
	Divorced/Separated/Widowed	4 (8.89%)	17 (37.78%)	24 (53.33%)		

Family Size	<= 4 members	30 (15.71%)	54 (28.27%)	107 (56.02%)	0.02 (Fisher's exact)	
	5-6 members	32 (18.82%)	31 (18.24%)	107 (62.94%)		
	7-8 members	17 (16.04%)	22 (20.75%)	67 (63.21%)		
	>= 9 members	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	28 (84.85%)		
		Attitude level				
		Poor	Average	Good		
Age	18-30 year	21 (20.59%)	36 (35.29%)	45 (44.12%)	8.15	0.20
	31-45 year	31 (17.42%)	76 (42.70%)	71 (39.89%)		
	46-60 year	38 (26.39%)	50 (34.72%)	56 (38.89%)		
	>=61 years	23 (30.26%)	24 (31.58%)	29 (38.16%)		
Gender	Female	49 (20.50%)	99 (41.42%)	91 (38.08%)	3.60	0.10
	Male	64 (24.52%)	87 (33.33%)	110 (42.15%)		
Marital Status	Never married	0.00 (0%)	3 (33.13%)	6 (66.67%)	0.20	
	Married	106 (23.77%)	162 (36.32)	178 (39.91%)		
	Divorced/Separated/Widowed	7 (15.56%)	21 (46.67%)	17 (37.78%)		
Family Size	Small (</= 4)	48 (25.13%)	69 (36.13%)	74 (38.74%)	2.48	0.80
	Medium (5-6)	36 (21.18%)	62 (36.47%)	72 (42.35%)		
	Large (7-8)	24 (22.64%)	42 (39.62%)	40 (37.74%)		
	Very Large (>/= 9)	5 (15.15%)	13 (37.20%)	15 (45.45%)		
		Practice level				
		Poor	Average	Good		
Agegroup	18-30 year	81 (79.41%)	17 (16.67%)	4 (3.92%)	0.09 (Fisher's exact)	
	31-45 year	121 (67.98%)	44 (24.72%)	13 (7.30%)		
	46-60 year	94 (65.28%)	34 (23.61)	16 (11.11%)		
	>=61 years	58 (76.32%)	16 (21.05%)	2 (2.63%)		
Gender	Female	166 (69.46%)	58 (24.27%)	15 (6.28%)	1.34	0.5
	Male	188 (72.03%)	53 (20.31%)	20 (7.66%)		

Marital Status	Single	6 (66.67%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)	0.5 (Fisher's exact)
	Married	316 (70.85%)	97 (21.75%)	33 (7.40%)	
	Divorced/Separated/Widowed	32(71.11%)	12 (26.67%)	1 (2.22%)	
Family Size	<= 4 members	124 (64.92%)	49 (25.65%)	18 (9.42%)	0.3 (Fisher's exact)
	5-6 members	125 (73.53%)	33 (19.41%)	12 (7.06%)	
	7-8 members	81 (76.42%)	21 (19.81%)	4 (3.77%)	
	>= 9 members	24 (72.73%)	8 (24.24%)	1 (3.03%)	

408

409 **TABLE 5: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE REGARDING COVID-**  
 410 **19 PREVENTIVE MEASURES.**

Variable	Traits	aor*	knowledge,		p> z	aor*	attitude, 95%		p> z	aor*	practice, 95%		p> z
			lower	upper			lower	upper			lower	upper	
gender	female	Reference				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Male	1.10	0.65	1.86	0.71	0.81	0.51	1.30	0.39	0.84	0.55	1.28	0.43
agegroup	18-30 year	Reference				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	31-45 year	0.80	0.36	1.77	0.59	1.19	0.60	2.34	0.61	<b>2.56</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>4.86</b>	<0.001
	46-60 year	0.79	0.35	1.73	0.56	0.81	0.42	1.55	0.53	<b>2.67</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>5.08</b>	<0.001
	>/=61 years	0.42	0.17	1.02	0.05	0.63	0.29	1.37	0.24	1.51	0.68	3.36	0.30
marital status	Never married	Reference				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Married	0.28	0.02	2.74	0.27	0.49	0.19	1.23	0.13	0.34	0.07	1.63	0.18
	Divorced/separated/widowed	0.80	0.06	10.29	0.86	-	-	-	-	0.26	0.04	1.52	0.13
family size	<= 4	Reference				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5-6	0.38	0.16	0.90	0.02	0.49	0.22	1.06	0.07	0.65	0.31	1.35	0.25
	7-8	0.71	0.24	2.06	0.53	0.78	0.30	2.01	0.61	0.51	0.20	1.27	0.15
	>/= 9	5.28	0.56	49.90	0.14	1.60	0.42	6.14	0.48	0.67	0.20	2.22	0.52

411

- Adjusted odds ratio

1

## TABLES

2 **TABLE 1A: METHOD OF CALCULATING KAP SCORE**

Variables	Number of Questions	Score to Answers	Level of Variables
Knowledge	14	1= Yes/Correct 0= No/Don't know	Poor: 0-4 (0-33)
			Moderate: 5-8 (34-67)
			Good: 9-14 (68-100)
Attitude	11	1= Yes/Correct 0= No/Don't know	Poor: 0-3 (0-33)
			Moderate: 4-7 (34-67)
			Good: 8-11 (68-100)
Practice	7	1= Good practice 0= Poor practice	Poor: 0-3 (0-33)
			Moderate: 4-5 (34-67)
			Good: 6-7 (68-100)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.21.23286227>; this version posted February 24, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

3

4 **TABLE 1B: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS (n= 500)**

Sociodemographic Characteristic	Total (n=500)	
	N	%
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	239	47.80
Male	261	52.20
<b>Age (year)</b>		
Early working age (18-30 year)	102	20.40
Prime working age (31-45 year)	178	35.60
Mature working age (46-60 year)	144	28.80
Elderly (>/=61 years)	76	15.20
<b>Residence</b>		
Camp 13	100	20.00
Camp 15	100	20.00
Camp 20	100	20.00
Camp 21	100	20.00
Camp 24	100	20.00



Marital Status		
Single	9	1.80
Married	446	89.20
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	45	9.00
People at Household		
Small (<= 4)	191	38.20
Medium (5-6)	170	34.00
Large (7-8)	106	21.20
Very Large (>= 9)	33	6.60
Number of Children		
No child	63	12.60
One child	63	12.60
Two children	88	17.60
Three children	85	17.00
Four children	83	16.60
Five or more children	118	23.60
Family Members above 60 years		
Zero	370	74.00
One	108	21.60
Two or more	22	4.40
Family Members below 10 years		
None	185	37.00
One	78	15.60
Two	120	24.00
Three	83	16.60
Four or more	34	6.80

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.21.23286227>; this version posted February 24, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

5

6 **TABLE 2: PARTICIPANTS' KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICES ON COVID-19 PREVENTIVE MEASURES**

Knowledge	% Yes	% No
Have they heard about COVID-19?	100	0.00

Can they explain some symptoms of COVID-19? (e.g. fever, cough, respiratory distress, headache, myalgia, runny nose etc)	82.00	18.00
Do they know dangers/complications of COVID-19? (e.g., respiratory difficulty, death, heart/brain complications etc)	53.20	46.80
Do they know how COVID-19 transmits? (By coughing, sneezing, contacts, <1 m distancing etc.)	75.20	24.80
Do they know COVID-19 can be presented in varied severity? (e.g., asymptomatic, mild, moderate, severe)	48.20	51.80
Do they know patients with respiratory/COVID-19 symptoms should be consulted at a health facility?	74.20	25.80
Do they know that patients with respiratory/COVID-19 symptoms should give sample (through nasal/oral swab) for testing?	58.80	41.20
Do they know that patients with positive results for COVID-19 should be isolated at a SARI Isolation and Treatment Center?	59.80	40.20
Do they know that contacts (e.g. family members) of a COVID-19 patient should be quarantined (preferably in a Quarantine Facility?)	57.40	42.60
Do they know hand hygiene (using soap and water or alcohol-based hand rub) is one of the measure to prevent transmission?	69.20	30.80
Do they know they should wear mask around other people?	78.20	21.80
Do they know they should avoid crowded or closed spaces?	67.60	32.40
Do they know they should cover their mouth and nose with their bent elbow or tissue when they cough or sneeze?	77.00	23.00
Do they hear about the COVID-19 vaccine?	93.00	7.00
<b>Attitude</b>		
Do you think that COVID-19 can be dangerous for you, your family and neighbors?	71.80	28.20
Do you think that frequent handwashing using soap and water can be an effective measure to prevent or reduce the disease transmission?	66.40	33.60
Do you believe that wearing a mask in public places can be an effective measure to prevent or reduce the disease transmission?	66.20	33.80
Do you think that it is necessary to stay at home and avoid crowded places as much as possible to prevent or reduce the disease transmission?	56.00	44.00
Do you think that it is useful to maintain three feet distance from others not to catch or transmit the disease?	66.00	34.00
Do you agree that you should give sample (via nasal or oral swab), if you are having some symptoms of COVID-19?	58.20	41.80

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.21.23285241>; this version posted February 24, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Do you agree to go to an isolation and treatment center, if you have a positive test result?	58.40	41.60
Do you believe that if some gets positive result for COVID-19, their family should be quarantined to prevent the further transmission?	57.60	42.40
Do you believe the COVID-19 vaccine is essential for us?	85.00	15.00
Are you willing to be vaccinated if the vaccine is offered to you?	89.80	10.20
Do you agree that COVID-19 will finally be successfully controlled?	80.00	20.00
<b>Practice</b>		
Frequently wash their hands with soap and water	30.80	69.20
<b>Wearing a mask in the public place</b>	30.20	69.80
Family is staying at home, if not very critical to go outside	30.00	70.00
Trying to maintain distance with others	37.40	62.60
Not touching mouth, nose or eye with uncleaned hands	32.20	67.80
Covering mouth by elbow or handkerchief while coughing sneezing	40.80	59.20
Have you been vaccinated? (Applicable if age is >55 Years)	69.60	30.40

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.21.23286227>; this version posted February 24, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

7

8 **TABLE 3: KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE REGARDING COVID-19 PREVENTIVE MEASURES**

Variable	Overall Mean (+/- SD)	Poor	Average	Good
Knowledge	9.93 (2.95%)	80 (16.00%)	113 (22.60%)	354 (70.80%)
Attitude	7.55 (2.51%)	111 (22.20%)	186 (37.20%)	111 (22.20%)
Practice	2.71 (1.58%)	309 (61.80%)	201 (40.20%)	35 (7.00%)

9

10 **TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS AND 'KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE' SCORES OF COVID-19**  
 11 **ACROSS DEMOGRAPHICS IN FDMN CAMPS (N=500)**

Variable	Determinants	Knowledge level			Chi-square	p-value
		Poor	Average	Good		
Age	Early working age (18-30 year)	13 (12.75%)	20 (19.61%)	69 (67.65%)	9.37	0.10
	Prime working age (31-45 year)	26 (14.61%)	36 (20.22%)	116 (65.17%)		
	Mature working age (46-60 year)	23 (15.97%)	33 (22.92%)	88 (61.11%)		

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.27.20056006>; this version posted February 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

	Elderly (>=61 years)	18 (23.68%)	22 (28.95%)	36 (47.37%)		
Gender	Female	39 (16.32%)	53 (22.18%)	147 (61.51%)	0.03	0.90
	Male	41 (15.71%)	58 (22.22%)	162 (62.07%)		
Marital Status	Single	1 (11.11%)	1 (11.11%)	7 (77.78%)	0.09 (Fisher's exact)	
	Married	75 (16.82%)	93 (20.85%)	278 (62.33%)		
	Divorced/Separated/Widowed	4 (8.89%)	17 (37.78%)	24 (53.33%)		
Family Size	Small (<= 4)	30 (15.71%)	54 (28.27%)	107 (56.02%)	0.02 (Fisher's exact)	
	Medium (5-6)	32 (18.82%)	31 (18.24%)	107 (62.94%)		
	Large (7-8)	17 (16.04%)	22 (20.75%)	67 (63.21%)		
	Very Large (>= 9)	1 (3.03%)	4 (12.12%)	28 (84.85%)		
		Attitude level				
		Poor	Average	Good		
Age	Early working age (18-30 year)	21 (20.59%)	36 (35.29%)	45 (44.12%)	8.15	0.20
	Prime working age (31-45 year)	31 (17.42%)	76 (42.70%)	71 (39.89%)		
	Mature working age (46-60 year)	38 (26.39%)	50 (34.72%)	56 (38.89%)		
	Elderly (>=61 years)	23 (30.26%)	24 (31.58%)	29 (38.16%)		
Gender	Female	49 (20.50%)	99 (41.42%)	91 (38.08%)	3.60	0.10
	Male	64 (24.52%)	87 (33.33%)	110 (42.15%)		
Marital Status	Single	0.00 (0%)	3 (33.13%)	6 (66.67%)	0.20	

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.12.20022222>; this version posted February 24, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

	Married	106 (23.77%)	162 (36.32)	178 (39.91%)		
	Divorced/Separated/Widowed	7 (15.56%)	21 (46.67%)	17 (37.78%)		
Family Size	Small (<= 4)	48 (25.13%)	69 (36.13%)	74 (38.74%)	2.48	0.80
	Medium (5-6)	36 (21.18%)	62 (36.47%)	72 (42.35%)		
	Large (7-8)	24 (22.64%)	42 (39.62%)	40 (37.74%)		
	Very large (>= 9)	5 (15.15%)	13 (37.20%)	15 (45.45%)		
		Practice level				
		Poor	Average	Good		
Age	Early working age (18-30 year)	81 (79.41%)	17 (16.67%)	4 (3.92%)	0.09 (Fisher's exact)	
	Prime working age (31-45 year)	121 (67.98%)	44 (24.72%)	13 (7.30%)		
	Mature working age (46-60 year)	94 (65.28%)	34 (23.61)	16 (11.11%)		
	Elderly (>=61 years)	58 (76.32%)	16 (21.05%)	2 (2.63%)		
Gender	Female	166 (69.46%)	58 (24.27%)	15 (6.28%)	1.34	0.5
	Male	188 (72.03%)	53 (20.31%)	20 (7.66%)		
Marital Status	Single	6 (66.67%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)	0.5 (Fisher's exact)	
	Married	316 (70.85%)	97 (21.75%)	33 (7.40%)		
	Divorced/Separated/Widowed	32(71.11%)	12 (26.67%)	1 (2.22%)		
Family Size	Small (<= 4)	124 (64.92%)	49 (25.65%)	18 (9.42%)	0.3 (Fisher's exact)	
	Medium (5-6)	125 (73.53%)	33 (19.41%)	12 (7.06%)		

	Large (7-8)	81 (76.42%)	21 (19.81%)	4 (3.77%)
	Very Large (>= 9)	24 (72.73%)	8 (24.24%)	1 (3.03%)

12

13 **TABLE 5: SIGNIFICANT FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE REGARDING COVID-**  
 14 **19 PREVENTIVE MEASURES.**

Variable	Traits	aor*	knowledge,		p> z 	aor *	attitude, 95%		p> z	aor *	practice, 95%		p> z 
			lower	upper			lower	upper			lower	upper	
gender	female*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Male	1.10	0.65	1.86	0.71	0.81	0.51	1.30	0.39	0.84	0.55	1.28	0.43
age	Early working age (18-30 year)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Prime working age (31-45 year)	0.80	0.36	1.77	0.59	1.19	0.60	2.34	0.61	2.56	1.35	4.86	0.61
	Mature working age (46-60 year)	0.79	0.35	1.73	0.56	0.81	0.42	1.55	0.53	2.67	1.40	5.08	0.00
	Elderly (>=61 years)	0.42	0.17	1.02	0.05	0.63	0.29	1.37	0.24	1.51	0.68	3.36	0.30
marital status	Single*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Married	0.28	0.02	2.74	0.27	0.49	0.19	1.23	0.13	0.34	0.07	1.63	0.18
	Divorced/separated/widowed	0.80	0.06	10.29	0.86	-	-	-	-	0.26	0.04	1.52	0.13
family size	Small (<= 4)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Medium (5-6)	0.38	0.16	0.90	0.02	0.49	0.22	1.06	0.07	0.65	0.31	1.35	0.25
	Large (7-8)	0.71	0.24	2.06	0.53	0.78	0.30	2.01	0.61	0.51	0.20	1.27	0.15
	Very large (>= 9)	5.28	0.56	49.90	0.14	1.60	0.42	6.14	0.48	0.67	0.20	2.22	0.52

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.21.23286227>; this version posted February 24, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

15