

# 1 **Frontline healthcare workers' knowledge and perception of** 2 **COVID-19 and willingness to work during the pandemic in** 3 **Nepal: a nationwide cross-sectional web-based study** 4

5 Dipak Prasad Upadhyaya<sup>1,2¶</sup>, Rajan Paudel<sup>2¶</sup>, Daniel J. Bromberg<sup>3,4</sup>, Dilaram Acharya<sup>5</sup>, Kaveh  
6 Khoshnood<sup>6</sup>, Kwan Lee<sup>5</sup>, Ji-Huyuk Park<sup>5</sup>, Seok-Ju Yoo<sup>5</sup>, Archana Shrestha<sup>7</sup>, Bom BC<sup>8</sup>, Sabin  
7 Bhandari<sup>9</sup>, Ramgyan Yadav<sup>8</sup>, Ashish Timalina<sup>8</sup>, Chetan Nidhi Wagle<sup>8</sup>, Brij Kumar Das<sup>8</sup>,  
8 Ramesh Kunwar<sup>8</sup>, Binaya Chalise<sup>10</sup>, Deepak Raj Bhatta<sup>8</sup>, and Mukesh Adhikari<sup>8,11¶</sup>  
9

- 10 1. School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University, Euclid Ave, Cleveland USA.
- 11 2. Central Department of Public Health, Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University,  
12 Kathmandu, Nepal
- 13 3. Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Yale School of Public Health, Yale  
14 University, New Haven, CT, USA
- 15 4. Yale Center for Interdisciplinary Research on AIDS, Yale School of Public Health, New  
16 Haven, CT, USA
- 17 5. Department of Preventive Medicine, College of Medicine, Dongguk University, South  
18 Korea
- 19 6. Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, Yale  
20 University, New Haven CT, USA
- 21 7. Department of Public Health, Kathmandu University, Kathmandu, Nepal
- 22 8. Ministry of Health and Population, Kathmandu, Nepal
- 23 9. B.P Koirala Institute of Health Sciences, Dharan, Nepal
- 24 10. Hiroshima University, Graduate School for International Development and Cooperation,  
25 Hiroshima, Japan
- 26 11. Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health, Yale  
27 University, New Haven CT, USA

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 **Corresponding Author**

35 1. Mr. Dipak Prasad Upadhyaya

36 Central Department of Public Health, Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University  
37 Kathmandu, Nepal; School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University, Euclid Ave,  
38 Cleveland USA.

39 Email: [dipakprasad.upadhyaya@gmail.com](mailto:dipakprasad.upadhyaya@gmail.com) Phone: +977 9851121268

40 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

## 65 **Abstract**

## 66 **Background**

67 The health sector's effectiveness during a pandemic primarily depends on the availability,  
68 knowledge, skills, perceptions, and motivations of frontline healthcare workers. In this study, we  
69 aimed to investigate the contextual factors associated with the knowledge, perceptions, and the  
70 willingness of frontline healthcare workers to work during the COVID-19 pandemic in Nepal.

## 71 **Methods**

72 A total of 1051 frontline health-workers from all seven Nepalese provinces were included in this  
73 web-based cross-sectional study, which was conducted in May 2020. Using a 5-point Likert  
74 scale questionnaire, we collected information on knowledge, perceptions, and the willingness of  
75 frontline healthcare workers to work during the COVID-19 pandemic. Multivariable logistic  
76 regression was applied to identify independent associations between predictors and outcome  
77 variables.

## 78 **Results**

79 Of the 1051 frontline health-workers, 17.2% were found to have inadequate knowledge on  
80 COVID-19, 63.6% reported unsatisfactory perceptions of government response, and 35.9%  
81 showed an unwillingness to work during the pandemic. Health workers at local health facilities  
82 (AOR: 0.35; 95% CI: 0.17-0.68) and those with chronic diseases were less likely to have  
83 adequate knowledge of COVID-19. Nurses (AOR: 2.10; 95% CI: 1.38-3.18), health-workers  
84 from Karnali Province (AOR: 2.62; 95% CI: 1.52-4.53), and those who had adequate knowledge  
85 of COVID-19 (AOR: 3.86; 95% CI: 2.51-6.16) were more likely to have satisfactory perception

86 towards government response to COVID-19. In addition, laboratory-workers, health workers  
87 from Karnali province, and those with adequate knowledge (AOR: 1.81; 95% CI: 1.27-2.58)  
88 were more likely to work during the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 89 **Conclusions**

90 We concluded that frontline healthcare workers have some gaps in knowledge-related to  
91 COVID-19; about two-thirds of them had a negative perception of government response, and  
92 nearly one-third of them were unwilling to work. These observations demonstrate that prompt  
93 actions are required to improve health-worker knowledge of COVID-19, address negative  
94 perceptions to government responses, and motivate them to provide healthcare services during  
95 the pandemic.

96 **Keywords:** COVID-19, Health-workers, Knowledge, Perception, Willingness

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

## 110 **Introduction**

111 In December 2019, an outbreak of a pneumonia-like illness was first detected in Wuhan, Hubei  
112 Province of China[1], and subsequently, faced with an escalating number beyond China, the  
113 World Health Organization (WHO) declared the outbreak a pandemic[2]. Based on available  
114 evidence, the disease is transmitted between individuals via nasopharyngeal droplets or saliva.  
115 Furthermore, no vaccine or effective treatment for COVID-19 is currently available[3]. Nepal is  
116 a small country in South Asia that shares a border with China and observed its first case of  
117 COVID-19 on January 25, 2020 [4]. In the first half of May 2020, Nepal experienced an  
118 explosive increase in cases; more than three-fourths of all cases recorded do date occurred during  
119 this period. As of May 24, 2020, Nepal reported 603 cases and three fatalities [5]. To tackle the  
120 COVID-19 pandemic, Nepal first sealed its border with China, and then suspended all  
121 international flights and, on March 23, implemented a country-wide comprehensive lock-down.  
122 On April 3, after encountering its first case of local transmission, Nepal began to utilize its  
123 resources more systematically [6].

124  
125 Concern has been expressed that health systems in low-income countries like Nepal are not  
126 sufficiently resilient to tackle a crisis like that presented by COVID-19. Due to resource  
127 constraints and a weak health system structure, rapid diagnosis of suspected cases and contact  
128 tracing are challenging[6]. Studies have shown that knowledge of infectious diseases is greatest  
129 among doctors and nurses[7,8]. In addition, age, sex, educational status, and preexisting medical  
130 conditions have been shown to affect health worker (HW) knowledge of Middle East Respiratory  
131 Syndrome (MERS), and Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS)[9,10]. The primary  
132 sources of information about COVID 19 are international health organizations such as the Center

133 for Disease Control (CDC), WHO and Ministry of Health, and social media. Moreover, the  
134 effectiveness of healthcare sectors during public health emergencies primarily depends on the  
135 availability, motivation and skills of frontline healthcare workers, and thus knowledge, their  
136 perceived willingness to work during uncertain times is essential [11], because appropriate  
137 perceptions and willingness to work during a pandemic are prerequisites of HW motivation to  
138 provide necessary treatment and to take the preventive actions required to reduce pandemic's  
139 impact. Studies have shown that factors such as perceived personal risks, availability of  
140 personal protective equipment, family care obligations, HW gender, type of employment,  
141 personal confidence, defined role, dissemination of timely information, appropriate training, and  
142 personal health problems, influence perceptions and willingness to work during pandemics [11–  
143 14]. In the present study, frontline Healthcare Workers were defined as doctors, nurses,  
144 paramedics, laboratory workers, pharmacists, pathologist, technical personnel, public health  
145 workers, and others directly involved in COVID-19 prevention and treatment that have direct  
146 contact with confirmed or suspected cases during patient intake, screening, inspection, testing,  
147 transport, treatment, nursing, specimen collection, or pathogen detection.

148 To provide healthcare services effectively, it is essential to assess and update HW' knowledge  
149 and improve motivation, and willingness, which depends on various factors at the individual, and  
150 to system levels. The present study describes the actual HW scenarios factors associated with  
151 their knowledge of COVID-19, their reactions to government interventions, and, most  
152 importantly, their perceived willingness to work during the pandemic. This study also provides  
153 valuable and actionable information to Nepal's policymakers to allow the judicious allocation of  
154 scarce resources in the short run. In the long term, this study guides for those developing policies  
155 and programs. That might be instrumental in ensuring preparedness to meet the challenges posed

156 by similar crises. Given this background, we aimed to investigate the contextual factors  
157 associated with the perceptions and willingness to work among Nepalese front-line healthcare  
158 workers during the COVID-19 pandemic to improve the prevention and management of future  
159 similar outbreaks.

160

## 161 **Methods**

### 162 **Study participants and Sampling**

163 We conducted a cross-sectional study using an online questionnaire from May 2020, among  
164 HWs in Nepal in accord with the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet Surveys  
165 (CHERRIES) [15]. All participating HWs were aged 18 to 60 years old and ranged from high-  
166 level officials of the Ministry of Health and Population to paramedics working at the grassroots  
167 level in all seven provinces on Nepal. The research questionnaire was distributed to HWs using  
168 the health workers' network. As an initial step, we first appointed a doctor or public health  
169 professional in each of the seven provinces to act as a coordinator and co-investigator in the  
170 team. These seven coordinators then sent HWs known to them a link to our questionnaire and  
171 asked that these individuals send a Google link to other HWs they knew. Fischer's arctanh  
172 transformation as a power of 90% and a minimum correlation of 0.1[16], showed that the  
173 minimum sample size required was  $n=1046$ .

### 174 **Survey Instrument and data collection**

175 The online questionnaire included 33 questions on socioeconomic characteristics, HWs'  
176 knowledge of COVID-19, perception toward government response to COVID-19, and perceived  
177 willingness to work during the pandemic. The Responses were rated using a 5-point Likert Scale  
178 ("Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Neutral," "Disagree" to "Strongly Disagree").

179  
180 The socio-demographic characteristics investigated included age, gender, ethnicity, and marital  
181 status. This section of the questionnaire also included questions about chronic diseases of HWs,  
182 their caretaking responsibilities for dependent family members, nature of the employment, and  
183 type of health facility at which they worked. Knowledge of COVID-19 was rated as "adequate"  
184 and "inadequate," perception of government response as "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" and  
185 willingness to work as "willing" and "unwilling." Knowledge of COVID-19 was assessed based  
186 on knowledge of the causative agent, mode of transmission, proper use of PPE, infection  
187 prevention measures, and public health impact of the pandemic. Reaction to government  
188 response was determined by assessing response effectiveness, timeliness of information  
189 provided, provision of supplies, support received from administrative staff, and elected  
190 representatives. Factors influencing willingness to work during the pandemic were risk of self  
191 infection, healthcare service rationing, the requirement to work overtime, working with untrained  
192 HWs, deployment to another duty station, family risk, and ability to choose whether to work or  
193 not during the pandemic.

194  
195 The questionnaire was prepared based on national COVID-19 guidelines issued by the Ministry  
196 of Health and Population of Nepal[17] and World Health Organization resource center guidelines  
197 for HWs on COVID-19 [18]. A team of medical doctors, public health workers, and an academic

198 assessed the questionnaire for validity and relevance. Before conducting the survey, we  
199 conducted a pilot study on 30 participants to assess the reliability of the questionnaire items. The  
200 analysis revealed an overall Cronbach's alpha score of 0.77, indicating higher internal  
201 consistency[19]. The questionnaire was prepared as a Google Form, and Facebook Messenger  
202 was used to sending the Google form link to participants [20,21]. The questionnaire took  
203 approximately 10 minutes to complete. To maintain data confidentiality, only two research team  
204 members had access to the data repository, stored on a password-protected computer.

205

## 206 **Data Management and Statistical Analysis**

207 The data collected was downloaded in the form of a spreadsheet and checked for duplications  
208 and technical errors. After confirming the completeness, we exported the data to R Studio  
209 Software for full analysis [22]. Socio-demographic characteristics were subjected to descriptive  
210 analysis using the `table1` package in R software, and results are presented as frequencies,  
211 percentages, or as means and standard deviations [23].

212

213 Univariate logistic regression analysis was used to assess factors associated with adequate  
214 knowledge, satisfaction with the government response, and willingness to work using  
215 the *finalfit* package in R [24]. Parsimonious multivariate models were created for each dependent  
216 variable and included independent variables found to be significant (p-value <0.05) by univariate  
217 analysis. Coefficients in the regression models were transformed into odds ratios with 95 %  
218 confidence intervals. P-values of <0.05 were considered significant.

219

220

## 221 **Ethics statement**

222 Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Nepal Health Research Council (approval  
223 no: 329/2020 P). The first page of the questionnaire detailed the study objective, benefits, and  
224 harm. HWs provided e-consent prior to participating in the study. Participants were informed  
225 that they could leave the study at any time. Participation was voluntary and anonymous.

226

## 227 **Results**

### 228 **Socio-demographic characteristics**

229 A total of 1051 HWs participated in the study, 725 (68%) men and 326 (31%) women. The  
230 response rate was 79%. Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of health care  
231 workers who participated in the study. Nearly 49% of the participants were aged between 20 to  
232 30 years. More than half (57.4%) of the HWs were Brahmin or Chhetri. The majority of the  
233 participants were doctors (35.3 %) and nurses or midwives (16.5%). Highest percentage response  
234 was from Bagmati Province (19.4%), which contains the capital city Kathmandu. Detailed  
235 information about the provinces of Nepal is explained in Additional File. Nearly 60% of HWs  
236 were permanent employees. More than 25% worked in local-level public health facilities, such as  
237 health posts, primary health care centers, community health units, and urban health centers. More  
238 than 50% worked in hospitals, public hospitals (22.8%) followed by teaching hospitals and  
239 private hospitals. Nearly 20% of respondents used a health-related managerial agency at the

240 federal, provincial, or local levels. 13.5% of HWs reported having a chronic disease; the most  
241 common of which were diabetes, heart disease, and chronic respiratory disease and 64% of HWs  
242 had family members of less than five years or more than 60 years who needed their care and  
243 support. [Please insert Table 1 here].

244

## 245 **Health Worker’ Knowledge of COVID-19**

246 More than 80% of HWs had adequate knowledge of COVID-19 (See Table 2), and the  
247 percentage of men with adequate knowledge was higher than that of women. No significant  
248 difference in knowledge was observed among ethnic groups. However, significant differences  
249 were observed among health professionals. More than 90% of public health workers had  
250 adequate knowledge, while only 61.5% of other health workers such as Ayurveda—an ancient  
251 medical system prevalent in Nepal [25] and pharmacists had adequate knowledge. No provincial  
252 differences in COVID-19 knowledge were observed. However, knowledge of COVID-10  
253 differed among HWs employed at different health facility types. No difference in COVID-19  
254 related knowledge was found between those with or without chronic diseases or caretaking  
255 responsibilities. Multivariate logistic regression analysis showed that gender, professional  
256 category, and type of healthcare facility were associated with adequate knowledge of COVID-19,  
257 as shown in Table 2. Males were more likely to have adequate knowledge (OR: 1.60; 95 % CI:  
258 1.02-2.47) than females. HWs in“other” professional categories such as pharmacists, and  
259 Ayurveda—had less adequate knowledge than doctors (OR: 0.33; 95 % CI: 0.14-0.80). HWs  
260 working at local health facilities were more likely to have inadequate knowledge about COVID-

261 19 than those working at federal or provincial agencies (OR: 0.35; 95 % CI 0.17-0.68). [Please  
262 insert Table 2 here].

263

## 264 **Health Workers' reactions to government response to COVID-19**

### 265 **Pandemic**

266 More than 60% of HWs considered government response to COVID-19 Pandemic was  
267 unsatisfactory (Table 3). Gender and ethnicity were not found to influence perceptions of  
268 government response significantly. Nearly 74% of doctors reported government response to be  
269 unsatisfactory, while only 43 % of public health workers thought so. About 72 % of HWs from  
270 Bagmati Province and Province 2 were dissatisfied with the government response. Chronic  
271 disease and caretaking responsibility did not influence reactions to government response.

272

273 Multivariate logistic regression showed the reactions of HWs to government response were  
274 associated with a professional category, province, type of health facility, and adequacy of  
275 knowledge about COVID-19 (Table 3). Nurses were more likely to consider government  
276 response satisfactory than doctors (OR: 2.10; 95 % CI: 1.38-3.18). Similarly, public health  
277 professionals were more likely to consider government response to COVID-19 was satisfactory  
278 than doctors (OR: 1.83; CI 1.07 – 3.11). HWs from Province 6 (OR:2.62; 95 % CI: 1.52-4.53)  
279 and Province 7 (OR: 1.72; CI: 1.06-2.80) were more likely to consider government response  
280 satisfactory than those from Bagmati Province. Those working in public and teaching hospitals  
281 and local public health facilities were less likely to consider government response satisfactory  
282 than HW working from federal and provincial-level agencies. Interestingly, HWs with adequate

283 knowledge of COVID-19 were more likely to consider government response satisfactory (OR:  
284 3.86; 95 % CI 2.51-6.16) [Please insert Table 3 here].

285

## 286 **Health workers' willingness to work during the COVID-19**

### 287 **Pandemic**

288 About 64 % of HWs reported a willingness to work under the challenging conditions created  
289 during the COVID-19 Pandemic (Table 4). No significant difference was observed between men  
290 and women with respect to willingness to work. About 74 % of laboratory workers were willing  
291 to work whereas, only 48.5 % of doctors were willing to do so. Furthermore, differences were  
292 observed between the seven provinces;  $\approx$ 85 % of HWs in Karnali Province, but only 54.5 % of  
293 HWs from Province 2 were willing to work.

294

295 Multivariate analysis showed a willingness to work was associated with the professional  
296 category, province, presence of chronic disease, caregiving responsibility, and knowledge of  
297 COVID-19. Laboratory staffs (OR: 3.54; 95 % CI: 1.77-7.61), paramedics (OR: 2.52; 95 % CI:  
298 1.79 – 3.58), public health workers (OR: 2.40; 95 % CI: 1.47-4.01), and nurses/midwives (OR:  
299 2.09; 95 % CI: 1.40-3.47), were more willing to work during the pandemic than doctors. HWs  
300 from Karnali Province (OR: 2.96; 95 % CI: 1.62-5.64), and Sudurpaschim Province (OR: 2.10;  
301 95 % CI: 1.28- 3.48) were more likely to report willingness to work than those from Bagmati  
302 Province. HWs with responsibility for dependent family members were less willing to work than  
303 those without these responsibilities (OR: 0.72; 0.54-0.95). Finally, the HWs with adequate

304 knowledge of COVID-19 were more prepared to work than those with inadequate knowledge  
305 (OR: 1.81; 1.27- 2.55). [Please insert Table 4 here]

306

## 307 **Discussion**

308 This is the first nationwide study on knowledge and perception of COVID-19 among frontline  
309 healthcare workers and their willingness to work during the pandemic in Nepal. About two in ten  
310 frontline healthcare workers (17.2%) had inadequate knowledge of COVID-19, which is higher  
311 than that reported in a Chinese study, in which  $\simeq$  11 % demonstrated insufficient knowledge[26].  
312 On the other hand, a study conducted by Bhagavathula S.A et al. reported that 61% of health  
313 workers had poor knowledge about COVID-19 transmission [27]. These differences between  
314 rates may have been due to variations in the level of knowledge accessed. Furthermore, the latter  
315 study was conducted in the first week of March 2020, and the Chinese study was conducted in  
316 the third week of May, when more information regarding COVID 19 was available and  
317 disseminated through different media. Knowledge is crucial for establishing perception and  
318 preventive behavior, which both affect coping interventions to some degree [28].

319 In addition, we found nearly two-thirds healthcare works (63.6%) believed government response  
320 to COVID-19 was unsatisfactory. A slightly higher level of satisfaction with government  
321 response was reported in a survey conducted on the Nepalese general public in April 2020 (71.4  
322 %) [29]. The present stud also showed that most HWs (86%) experienced logistical shortcomings  
323 and reported inadequate supports form administrative (60%) and elected representatives (67.5%),  
324 which concurs with findings of a previous study[30]. Furthermore, our study shows that more  
325 than one in three HW (35.8%) were unwilling to work during the pandemic, which is

326 considerable issues because the health system's workload during the pandemic will be so high  
327 that all available health resources will be required to combat emergencies. In addition, the rate  
328 observed were higher than those reported in several other studies on willingness to work among  
329 health workers during public health emergencies[12–14,31,32]. In the present study, these high  
330 rates may have been due to inadequate knowledge (17%), preexisting chronic disease (13.5%),  
331 shortage of PPE (86%) and other factors [32,33]. The high rates of unwillingness to work during  
332 the pandemic revealed by our study demand the additional efforts be made to rectify the  
333 situation.

334 We also found that male health workers were more likely to report adequate knowledge; which is  
335 consistent with that found in another study conducted in Nepalese [34]. This finding may be due  
336 to greater interaction and socialization by men, and gendered norms, which means men are more  
337 likely to overestimate, and women are likely to underestimate personal knowledge [35–38]. The  
338 study also showed that pharmacists and Ayurveda had inadequate knowledge of COVID-19 rates  
339 as compared with doctors; finding is similar to a survey conducted in Nepal [34]. We also found  
340 that HWs in the local health facilities were less likely to have adequate knowledge than the HWs  
341 in federal or provincial agencies, which was possibly due to weaker implementation of COVID-  
342 19 related governmental interventions at the local level than that at provincial or federal levels.  
343 In addition, HWs with a chronic disease considered they had inadequate knowledge of COVID-  
344 19, perhaps because time limitations imposed by pre-existing conditions restricted studies about  
345 COVID-19.

346 This study shows that the professional category, province, type of health facility, and knowledge  
347 of COVID-19 were significantly associated with frontline health workers' satisfaction with

348 government response to the pandemic. Nurses were found to be more likely to be satisfied with  
349 government response than counterpart frontline doctors. This perception difference might have  
350 been due to the differences between levels of technical knowledge among doctors, nurses, and  
351 public health workers. Furthermore, health workers from Karnali and Sudurpaschim Provinces  
352 were more likely to be satisfied with government response than HWs from Bagmati province.  
353 However, the reasons responsible for these provincial variations were not determined. In  
354 addition, HWs from local public health facilities, teaching hospitals, and private hospitals had  
355 unsatisfactory perceptions than managerial level HWs at the ministry level, which we attribute to  
356 different work experiences, as HWs at health service outlets are directly exposed to risks and  
357 better understand the risks posed by logistical shortfalls than managerial level HWs.  
358 Interestingly, HWs with adequate knowledge of COVID-19 were more satisfied with  
359 government response than HWs with inadequate knowledge.

360 Interestingly, health workers professional category, province, presence of chronic disease,  
361 dependent family members, and knowledge about COVID 19 were associated with a willingness  
362 to work during the pandemic, and nurses, paramedics, public health workers, and laboratory staff  
363 were more willing to work than clinicians, which contradicts the results of a systematic review  
364 conducted by Aoyagi et al. [39]. HWs from Karnali and Sudurpaschim provinces were more  
365 willing to work than counterparts from Bagmati province. Similarly, it might be possible that due  
366 to virtually no cases of COVID-19 during the study, the HWs were willing to work in a humane  
367 way. Furthermore, HWs with adequate knowledge about COVID-19 were more willing to work,  
368 which concurs with a study performed on the 2007 influenza pandemic [40]. Our result shows  
369 that HWs with a chronic disease[41] and those that cared for family members[40] were less  
370 willing to work, which is also in line with previous studies [12,39]. It may be caring for family

371 members and that coping with personal chronic health problems diminishes willingness to work  
372 [41].

373 This study was conducted to identify predictors of the willingness of frontline healthcare workers  
374 to work during the COVID-19 pandemic. The findings of this study can be used to inform  
375 various stakeholders and policymakers involved in the drafting of future interventions to improve  
376 the effectiveness of the health sector during public health crises. However, despite our efforts,  
377 this study has several limitations. First, data was obtained using a questionnaire over the web and  
378 health care workers were recruited using their personal networks. Therefore, our results should  
379 not be extended to healthcare workers that do not use the internet. Second, the data used was  
380 self-reported, which makes the study prone to desirability bias and inaccuracies. Furthermore,  
381 participants were asked to consider their willingness to work under hypothetical conditions that  
382 did not exist when Nepal comparatively observed a lower number of cases and fatalities. We  
383 recommend studies of the impacts of HW knowledge, perception, and willingness to work on  
384 health sector efficiency in the context of public health emergencies be undertaken.

385

## 386 **Conclusions**

387 Health workers play an extremely critical role in the battle against pandemics. Therefore, their  
388 knowledge about the disease and their willingness to work are crucially required to prevent  
389 disease transmission and reduce morbidity and mortality. In view of the perceived knowledge  
390 gap of health workers about COVID-19, adequate training provides a means of addressing this  
391 shortcoming. The high-level dissatisfaction of HWs with logistical issues and shortages should  
392 also be at the focus of efforts to improving perceptions of government response. Health

393 managers should be fully aware of the impacts of factors and devise comprehensive approaches  
394 that ensure the safety of HWs and promote coordination to motivate the HWs to work efficiently  
395 and effectively in a sustainable manner throughout the COVID-19 pandemic.

396

## 397 **List of Abbreviations:**

398

399	COVID-19:	Coronavirus Disease 2019
400	CI:	Confidence Interval
401	HWs:	Health Workers
402	MoHP:	Ministry of Health and Population
403	OR:	Odds Ratio
404	SARS-CoV-2:	Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, Coronavirus 2
405	WHO:	World Health Organization

406

## 407 **Declarations:**

408

## 409 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:**

410

411 The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Nepal Health  
412 Research Council (ERB Protocol Registration No. 329/2020 P). Electronic consent was required

413 from all participants prior to completing the online questionnaire. A detailed description of the  
414 study was supplied on the first page of the online questionnaire.

415

#### 416 **Consent for publication:**

417 Not applicable.

418

#### 419 **Competing Interests**

420 The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

421

#### 422 **Availability of data and materials:**

423 Data will be made available upon reasonable request by email to the corresponding author.

424

#### 425 **Author Contributions**

426 DPU, RP and MA conceptualized the study. DPU, RP, MA, AT, BC, and BB developed and  
427 pretested the questionnaire. BB, SB, RGY, RK, CNW, BKD, AT, MA, DRB, DPU, and RP  
428 supported data collection. DPU, MA, DJB, and RP performed the statistical analysis. DPU, MA  
429 and RP wrote the manuscript, and, DJB, KK, RP, KL, AS, JHP, SJY and DA edited, revised and  
430 finalized the manuscript. All authors contributed to the writing, editing, revision, and critical  
431 appraisal of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

432

433 **Acknowledgments:**

434 We authors thank Seema Subedi, a researcher at John Hopkins University, USA, for her  
435 suggestions during the conceptualization of the study. We wish to express our appreciation to all  
436 health workers that participated in the study. More importantly, we salute them for their tireless  
437 efforts to provide health services during the unprecedented challenge posed by COVID-19.

438

439 **Author Information:**

440 DPU is a graduate student at the School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University, Euclid  
441 Ave, Cleveland USA, and faculty at Central Department of Public Health, Institute of Medicine,  
442 Tribhuvan University, Nepal. RP is an Assistant Professor at the Central Department of Public  
443 Health, Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University, Nepal. MA is an employee of the Ministry  
444 of Health and Population, and a graduate student at the Yale School of Public Health, Yale  
445 University, USA. DJB is a graduate student at the Yale School of Public Health, Yale University.  
446 KK is an associate professor at Yale School of Public Health, AS is an associate professor at the  
447 Department of Public Health, Kathmandu University, Nepal. AT, BB, RGY, CNW, BKD, RK,  
448 and DRB are employed by the Ministry of Health and Population, Government of Nepal. SB is  
449 an assistant professor at B.P Koirala Institute of Health Sciences, Dharan, Nepal. BC is a student  
450 at a Graduate School for International Development and Cooperation, Hiroshima University,  
451 Japan. KL, JHP, and SJY are professors at the Department of Preventive Medicine, College of  
452 Medicine, Dongguk University, Gyeongju, South Korea. DA is a recent doctoral graduate from  
453 the Department of Preventive Medicine, College of Medicine, Dongguk University, South  
454 Korea. All authors have read and understood the *ICMJE* criteria for authorship policy.

## 455 **References**

456

- 457 1. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected  
458 with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *The Lancet*. 2020;395: 497–506.  
459 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5
- 460 2. WHO Director-General’s opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March  
461 2020. [cited 4 Jun 2020]. Available: [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)  
462 [general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
- 463 3. Coronavirus. [cited 10 Jul 2020]. Available: [https://www.who.int/westernpacific/health-](https://www.who.int/westernpacific/health-topics/coronavirus)  
464 [topics/coronavirus](https://www.who.int/westernpacific/health-topics/coronavirus)
- 465 4. Shrestha R, Shrestha S, Khanal P, Kc B. Nepal’s first case of COVID-19 and public health  
466 response. *J Travel Med*. 2020;27. doi:10.1093/jtm/taaa024
- 467 5. Corona Info- Ministry of Health and Population. [cited 10 Jul 2020]. Available:  
468 <https://covid19.mohp.gov.np/#/>
- 469 6. health-sector-emergency-response-plan-covid-19-endorsed-may-2020.pdf. Available:  
470 [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/nepal-documents/novel-coronavirus/health-sector-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/nepal-documents/novel-coronavirus/health-sector-emergency-response-plan-covid-19-endorsed-may-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=ef831f44_2)  
471 [emergency-response-plan-covid-19-endorsed-may-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=ef831f44\\_2](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/nepal-documents/novel-coronavirus/health-sector-emergency-response-plan-covid-19-endorsed-may-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=ef831f44_2)
- 472 7. Huynh G, Nguyen TNH, Tran VK, Vo KN, Vo VT, Pham LA. Knowledge and attitude  
473 toward COVID-19 among healthcare workers at District 2 Hospital, Ho Chi Minh City.  
474 *Asian Pac J Trop Med*. 2020;13: 260. doi:10.4103/1995-7645.280396
- 475 8. Olum R, Chekwech G, Wekha G, Nassozi DR, Bongomin F. Coronavirus Disease-2019:  
476 Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices of Health Care Workers at Makerere University  
477 Teaching Hospitals, Uganda. *Front Public Health*. 2020;8. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.00181
- 478 9. Khan MU, Shah S, Ahmad A, Fatokun O. Knowledge and attitude of healthcare workers  
479 about middle east respiratory syndrome in multispecialty hospitals of Qassim, Saudi  
480 Arabia. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14: 1281. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-1281
- 481 10. Deng J-F, Olowokure B, Kaydos-Daniels SC, Chang H-J, Barwick RS, Lee M-L, et al.  
482 Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS): knowledge, attitudes, practices and sources of  
483 information among physicians answering a SARS fever hotline service. *Public Health*.  
484 2006;120: 15–19. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2005.10.001
- 485 11. Watt K, Tippett VC, Raven SG, Jamrozik K, Coory M, Archer F, et al. Attitudes to living  
486 and working in pandemic conditions among emergency prehospital medical care personnel.  
487 *Prehospital Disaster Med*. 2010;25: 13–19. doi:10.1017/s1049023x00007597
- 488 12. Martin SD. Nurses’ ability and willingness to work during pandemic flu. *J Nurs Manag*.  
489 2011;19: 98–108. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01190.x

- 490 13. Hope K, Durrheim D, Barnett D, D'Este C, Kewley C, Dalton C, et al. Willingness of  
491 frontline health care workers to work during a public health emergency. *Aust J Emerg*  
492 *Manag.* 2010;25: 39–47.
- 493 14. Qureshi K, Gershon RRM, Sherman MF, Straub T, Gebbie E, McCollum M, et al. Health  
494 care workers' ability and willingness to report to duty during catastrophic disasters. *J Urban*  
495 *Health Bull N Y Acad Med.* 2005;82: 378–388. doi:10.1093/jurban/jti086
- 496 15. Eysenbach G. Improving the Quality of Web Surveys: The Checklist for Reporting Results  
497 of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES). *J Med Internet Res.* 2004;6: e34.  
498 doi:10.2196/jmir.6.3.e34
- 499 16. *Computational Statistics with R, Volume 32 - 1st Edition.* [cited 10 Jul 2020]. Available:  
500 <https://www.elsevier.com/books/computational-statistics-with-r/rao/978-0-444-63431-3>
- 501 17. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak updates & resource materials – Health  
502 Emergency Operation Center. [cited 10 Jul 2020]. Available:  
503 <https://heoc.mohp.gov.np/update-on-novel-corona-virus-covid-19/>
- 504 18. Technical guidance publications. [cited 10 Jul 2020]. Available:  
505 [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance-publications)  
506 [publications](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance-publications)
- 507 19. Using and Interpreting Cronbach's Alpha | University of Virginia Library Research Data  
508 Services + Sciences. [cited 10 Jul 2020]. Available: [https://data.library.virginia.edu/using-](https://data.library.virginia.edu/using-and-interpreting-cronbachs-alpha/)  
509 [and-interpreting-cronbachs-alpha/](https://data.library.virginia.edu/using-and-interpreting-cronbachs-alpha/)
- 510 20. Google Forms. [cited 10 Jul 2020]. Available:  
511 [https://docs.google.com/forms/u/0/?usp=mkt\\_forms](https://docs.google.com/forms/u/0/?usp=mkt_forms)
- 512 21. Social Media Stats Nepal. In: StatCounter Global Stats [Internet]. [cited 10 Jul 2020].  
513 Available: <https://gs.statcounter.com/social-media-stats/all/nepal>
- 514 22. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing. [cited 10 Jul 2020]. Available: [https://www.r-](https://www.r-project.org/)  
515 [project.org/](https://www.r-project.org/)
- 516 23. Using the table1 Package to Create HTML Tables of Descriptive Statistics. [cited 10 Jul  
517 2020]. Available: [https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/table1/vignettes/table1-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/table1/vignettes/table1-examples.html)  
518 [examples.html](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/table1/vignettes/table1-examples.html)
- 519 24. Harrison E, Drake T, Ots R. finalfit: Quickly Create Elegant Regression Results Tables and  
520 Plots when Modelling. 2020. Available: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=finalfit>
- 521 25. Durkin M. Ayurvedic treatment for jaundice in Nepal. *Soc Sci Med.* 1988;27: 491–495.  
522 doi:10.1016/0277-9536(88)90372-3

- 523 26. Zhang M, Zhou M, Tang F, Wang Y, Nie H, Zhang L, et al. Knowledge, attitude, and  
524 practice regarding COVID-19 among healthcare workers in Henan, China. *J Hosp Infect.*  
525 2020;105: 183–187. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2020.04.012
- 526 27. Bhagavathula AS, Aldhaleei WA, Rahmani J, Mahabadi MA, Bandari DK. Knowledge and  
527 Perceptions of COVID-19 Among Health Care Workers: Cross-Sectional Study. *JMIR*  
528 *Public Health Surveill.* 2020;6: e19160. doi:10.2196/19160
- 529 28. McEachan R, Taylor N, Harrison R, Lawton R, Gardner P, Conner M. Meta-Analysis of the  
530 Reasoned Action Approach (RAA) to Understanding Health Behaviors. *Ann Behav Med*  
531 *Publ Soc Behav Med.* 2016;50: 592–612. doi:10.1007/s12160-016-9798-4
- 532 29. COVID 19, Citizen’s pulse (A National Survey on COVID 19-Nepal) – Participedia. [cited  
533 10 Jul 2020]. Available: <https://participedia.net/case/6543>
- 534 30. Sim MR. The COVID-19 pandemic: major risks to healthcare and other workers on the front  
535 line. *Occup Environ Med.* 2020;77: 281–282. doi:10.1136/oemed-2020-106567
- 536 31. Kaiser HE, Barnett DJ, Hsu EB, Kirsch TD, James JJ, Subbarao I. Perspectives of future  
537 physicians on disaster medicine and public health preparedness: challenges of building a  
538 capable and sustainable auxiliary medical workforce. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep.*  
539 2009;3: 210–216. doi:10.1097/DMP.0b013e3181aa242a
- 540 32. Balicer RD, Barnett DJ, Thompson CB, Hsu EB, Catlett CL, Watson CM, et al.  
541 Characterizing hospital workers’ willingness to report to duty in an influenza pandemic  
542 through threat- and efficacy-based assessment. *BMC Public Health.* 2010;10: 436.  
543 doi:10.1186/1471-2458-10-436
- 544 33. Yonge O, Rosychuk RJ, Bailey TM, Lake R, Marrie TJ. Willingness of university nursing  
545 students to volunteer during a pandemic. *Public Health Nurs Boston Mass.* 2010;27: 174–  
546 180. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1446.2010.00839.x
- 547 34. Knowledge, attitude and practice regarding COVID-19 among healthcare workers in  
548 Chitwan, Nepal. 2020 [cited 15 Jul 2020]. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-26774/v1
- 549 35. Cooper KM, Krieg A, Brownell SE. Who perceives they are smarter? Exploring the  
550 influence of student characteristics on student academic self-concept in physiology. *Adv*  
551 *Physiol Educ.* 2018;42: 200–208. doi:10.1152/advan.00085.2017
- 552 36. Ehrlinger J, Dunning D. How chronic self-views influence (and potentially mislead)  
553 estimates of performance. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 2003;84: 5–17. doi:10.1037/0022-  
554 3514.84.1.5
- 555 37. Beyer S. Gender differences in the accuracy of self-evaluations of performance. *J Pers Soc*  
556 *Psychol.* 1990;59: 960–970. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.59.5.960

- 557 38. Female Medical Students Underestimate Their Abilities And Males Tend To Overestimate  
558 Theirs. In: ScienceDaily [Internet]. [cited 10 Jul 2020]. Available:  
559 <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/10/081003122713.htm>
- 560 39. Aoyagi Y, Beck CR, Dingwall R, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS. Healthcare workers' willingness to  
561 work during an influenza pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Influenza Other*  
562 *Respir Viruses*. 2015;9: 120–130. doi:10.1111/irv.12310
- 563 40. Daugherty EL, Perl TM, Rubinson L, Bilderback A, Rand CS. Survey study of the  
564 knowledge, attitudes, and expected behaviors of critical care clinicians regarding an  
565 influenza pandemic. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2009;30: 1143–1149.  
566 doi:10.1086/648085
- 567 41. (PDF) Factors Related to Essential Workers' Ability and Willingness to Work and Comply  
568 with Personal Infection Control Protocol During a Large Scale Influenza Pandemic in  
569 Hawaii. [cited 16 Jul 2020]. Available:  
570 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256456823\\_Factors\\_Related\\_to\\_Essential\\_Worke](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256456823_Factors_Related_to_Essential_Workers'_Ability_and_Willingness_to_Work_and_Comply_with_Personal_Infection_Control_Protocol_During_a_Large_Scale_Influenza_Pandemic_in_Hawaii)  
571 [rs'\\_Ability\\_and\\_Willingness\\_to\\_Work\\_and\\_Comply\\_with\\_Personal\\_Infection\\_Control\\_Pr](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256456823_Factors_Related_to_Essential_Worke)  
572 [otocol\\_During\\_a\\_Large\\_Scale\\_Influenza\\_Pandemic\\_in\\_Hawaii](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256456823_Factors_Related_to_Essential_Worke)
- 573
- 574
- 575
- 576
- 577
- 578
- 579
- 580
- 581
- 582
- 583
- 584
- 585
- 586
- 587
- 588
- 589
- 590

591

**Tables**

592 Table 1 **Sociodemographic Characteristics of Health workers in Nepal**

<b>Socio-demographic Characteristics</b>	<b>Frequency (%) (n=1051)</b>
<b>Age, in years, Median (IQR)</b>	31.0 (8)
<b>Gender</b>	
Female	326 (31.0)
Male	725 (68.0)
<b>Ethnicity</b>	
Brahmin/Chhetri	603 (57.4)
Madhesi/Muslim	209 (19.9)
Janajati	174 (16.6)
Dalit	34 (3.2)
Other	31 (2.9)
<b>Marital Status</b>	
Married	677 (64.4)
Unmarried	374 (35.6)
<b>Professional Category</b>	
Doctor	371 (35.3)
Paramedics	308 (29.3)
Nurse/Midwife	173 (16.5)
Public Health Workers	122 (11.6)
Lab Worker	51 (4.9)
Other	26 (2.5)
<b>Province <sup>o</sup></b>	
Province 1	193 (18.4)
Province 2	156 (14.8)
Bagmati Province	204 (19.4)
Gandaki Province	69 (6.6)
Province 5	153 (14.6)
Karnali Province	111 (10.6)
Sudurpaschim Province	165 (15.7)
<b>Type of Job</b>	
Permanent	613 (58.3)
Temporary or Contract	438 (41.7)
<b>Types of Health Facility</b>	
Federal and Provincial managerial agencies <sup>o</sup>	134 (12.7)

<b>Socio-demographic Characteristics</b>	<b>Frequency (%) (n=1051)</b>
Teaching Hospital	191 (18.2)
Public Hospital	240 (22.8)
Private Hospital	132 (12.6)
Local public health facilities§	292 (27.8)
Local-level managerial agencies ⊗	62 (5.9)
<b>Presence of Chronic Disease</b>	
No	909 (86.5)
Yes	142 (13.5)
<b>HWs with care-taking responsibility for children less than 5 years or elderly more than 60 years</b>	
No	381 (36.2)
Yes	670 (63.7)

593

594 <sup>o</sup> Details about the provinces of Nepal are explained in Additional File 3.

595 <sup>o</sup> Consists of the Ministry of Health and Population, the Department of Health Services, the Ministry of Social  
596 Development at the province level, Provincial health directorate, and health offices.

597 § Consists of health posts, primary health care centers, community health units, and urban health centers at the local  
598 level.

599 ⊗ Consists of metropolitan, sub-metropolitan, municipalities, and rural municipalities

**Table 2 Factors Associated with Knowledge of COVID-19**

<b>Knowledge about COVID-19</b>	<b>Inadequate Knowledge (n= 181)</b>	<b>Adequate Knowledge (n=870)</b>	<b>OR (univariable) (95% CI; p-value)</b>	<b>OR (multivariable) (95% CI; p-value) <math>\phi</math></b>
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	72 (22.1)	254 (77.9)	-	-
Male	109 (15.0)	616 (85.0)	1.60 (1.15-2.23, p=0.005) **	1.60 (1.02-2.47, p=0.036) *
<b>Professional Category</b>				
Doctor	60 (16.2)	311 (83.8)	-	-
Paramedics	57 (18.5)	251 (81.5)	0.85 (0.57-1.27, p=0.423)	1.06 (0.65-1.75, p=0.809)
Nurse/Midwife	35 (20.2)	138 (79.8)	0.76 (0.48-1.22, p=0.246)	1.21 (0.67-2.18, p=0.537)
Public Health Workers	11 (9.0)	111 (91.0)	1.95 (1.02-4.03, p=0.054)	1.65 (0.78-3.72, p=0.203)
Lab Worker	8 (15.7)	43 (84.3)	1.04 (0.49-2.48, p=0.929)	0.92 (0.42-2.26, p=0.851)
Other	10 (38.5)	16 (61.5)	0.31 (0.14-0.73, p=0.006) **	0.33 (0.14-0.80, p=0.012) *
<b>Type of Health Facility</b>				
Federal and Provincial managerial agencies	12 (9.0)	122 (91.0)	-	-
Teaching Hospital	38 (19.9)	153 (80.1)	0.40 (0.19-0.77, p=0.009) **	0.51 (0.23-1.09, p=0.090)
Public Hospital	38 (15.8)	202 (84.2)	0.52 (0.25-1.01, p=0.064)	0.66 (0.30-1.37, p=0.284)
Private Hospital	15 (11.4)	117 (88.6)	0.77 (0.34-1.70, p=0.516)	0.95 (0.40-2.24, p=0.915)
Local public health facilities	72 (24.7)	220 (75.3)	0.30 (0.15-0.56, p<0.001) ***	0.35 (0.17-0.68, p=0.003) **
Local-level managerial agencies	6 (9.7)	56 (90.3)	0.92 (0.34-2.75, p=0.871)	0.96 (0.34-2.95, p=0.936)
<b>Presence of Chronic Disease</b>				
No	148 (16.3)	761 (83.7)	-	-
Yes	33 (23.2)	109 (76.8)	0.64 (0.42-1.00, p=0.042) *	0.58 (0.37-0.91, p=0.015) *

$\phi$  Odds Ratios were obtained by multivariate logistic regression adjusted for gender, professional categories, health facility types and presence of chronic disease

\* p-value < 0.05 at the 5 % level of significance

\*\* p-value < 0.01 at the 5 % level of significance

\*\*\* p-value < 0.001 at the 5 % level of significance

**Table 3: Factors Associated with Self- reported Perception of Government Response to COVID-19 Pandemic**

Self-reported perception of government response ‡	Unsatisfactory Government response (n=668)	Satisfactory Government response (n=383)	OR (univariable)	OR (multivariable) <sup>ϕ</sup>
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Brahmin/Chhetri	367 (60.9)	236 (39.1)	-	-
Madhesi/Muslim	145 (69.4)	64 (30.6)	0.69 (0.49-0.96, p=0.028) *	1.15 (0.70-1.89, p=0.586)
Janajati	115 (66.1)	59 (33.9)	0.80 (0.56-1.13, p=0.211)	0.96 (0.65-1.42, p=0.846)
Dalit	24 (70.6)	10 (29.4)	0.65 (0.29-1.34, p=0.260)	0.67 (0.29-1.46, p=0.332)
Other	17 (54.8)	14 (45.2)	1.28 (0.61-2.64, p=0.504)	1.13 (0.50-2.49, p=0.770)
<b>Professional Category</b>				
Doctor	274 (73.9)	97 (26.1)	-	-
Paramedics	198 (64.3)	110 (35.7)	1.57 (1.13-2.18, p=0.007)	1.18 (0.78-1.79, p=0.439)
Nurse/Midwife	96 (55.5)	77 (44.5)	2.27 (1.55-3.31, p<0.001) ***	2.10 (1.38-3.18, p<0.001) ***
Public Health Workers	52 (42.6)	70 (57.4)	3.80 (2.49-5.85, p<0.001) ***	1.83 (1.07-3.11, p=0.027) *
Lab Worker	30 (58.8)	21 (41.2)	1.98 (1.07-3.60, p=0.027)	1.52 (0.79-2.90, p=0.207)
Other	18 (69.2)	8 (30.8)	1.26 (0.50-2.89, p=0.606)	1.37 (0.52-3.38, p=0.506)
<b>Province</b>				
Bagmati Province	147 (72.1)	57 (27.9)	-	-
Province 1	136 (70.5)	57 (29.5)	1.08 (0.70-1.67, p=0.726)	0.99 (0.62-1.59, p=0.976)
Province 2	113 (72.4)	43 (27.6)	0.98 (0.61-1.56, p=0.937)	0.88 (0.48-1.61, p=0.680)
Gandaki Province	42 (60.9)	27 (39.1)	1.66 (0.93-2.93, p=0.083)	1.69 (0.92-3.11, p=0.090)
Province 5	96 (62.7)	57 (37.3)	1.53 (0.98-2.40, p=0.062)	1.48 (0.92-2.40, p=0.105)
Karnali Province	46 (41.4)	65 (58.6)	3.64 (2.25-5.96, p<0.001) ***	2.62 (1.52-4.53, p=0.001) **
Sudurpaschim Province	88 (53.3)	77 (46.7)	2.26 (1.47-3.49, p<0.001) ***	1.72 (1.06-2.80, p=0.030) *

Self-reported perception of government response ‡	Unsatisfactory Government response (n=668)	Satisfactory Government response (n=383)	OR (univariable)	OR (multivariable) <sup>ϕ</sup>
<b>Type of Health Facility</b>				
Federal and Provincial managerial agencies	53 (39.6)	81 (60.4)	-	-
Teaching Hospitals	135 (70.7)	56 (29.3)	0.27 (0.17-0.43, p<0.001) ***	0.52 (0.29-0.93, p=0.027) *
Public Hospitals	168 (70.0)	72 (30.0)	0.28 (0.18-0.43, p<0.001) ***	0.41 (0.24-0.70, p=0.001) **
Private Hospitals	90 (68.2)	42 (31.8)	0.31 (0.18-0.50, p<0.001) ***	0.52 (0.28-0.94, p=0.032)
Local public health facilities	196 (67.1)	96 (32.9)	0.32 (0.21-0.49, p<0.001) ***	0.49 (0.30-0.81, p=0.005) **
Local-level managerial agencies	26 (41.9)	36 (58.1)	0.91 (0.49-1.68, p=0.752)	1.12 (0.58-2.20, p=0.742)
<b>Knowledge about COVID-19 †</b>				
Inadequate	154 (85.1)	27 (14.9)	-	-
Adequate	514 (59.1)	356 (40.9)	3.95 (2.61-6.20, p<0.001) ***	3.86 (2.51-6.16, p<0.001) ***

<sup>ϕ</sup> Odds Ratios were obtained by multivariate logistic regression adjusted for Ethnicity, Professional category, Province, type of health facility, and health worker perceived knowledge of COVID-19

<sup>†</sup> Knowledge about COVID-19 was self-reported; a combined score above average was regarded as “Adequate” knowledge and a score below or equal to the average was considered “Inadequate”.

<sup>‡</sup> Self-reported perception of government response during COVID-19 pandemic was self-reported; a combined score above average was regarded as “Satisfactory perception” of knowledge and a score below or equal to the average was considered “Unsatisfactory perception”

\* p-value < 0.05 at the 5% level of significance

\*\* p-value < 0.01 at the 5% level of significance

\*\*\* p-value < 0.001 at the 5% level of significance

**Table 4: Factors Associated with Self- reported Willingness to Work during the COVID-19 Pandemic**

Perceived Willingness to work	Unwilling to work (n=377)	Willing to work (n=674)	OR (univariable) (95% CI, p-value)	OR (multivariable) (95% CI, p-value) <sup>‡</sup>
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Brahmin/Chhetri	203 (33.7)	400 (66.3)	-	-
Madhesi/Muslim	89 (42.6)	120 (57.4)	0.68 (0.50-0.95, p=0.021) *	1.11 (0.69-1.80, p=0.659)
Janajati	69 (39.7)	105 (60.3)	0.77 (0.55-1.10, p=0.145)	0.90 (0.62-1.31, p=0.575)
Dalit	7 (20.6)	27 (79.4)	1.96 (0.88-4.95, p=0.121)	1.74 (0.76-4.53, p=0.215)
Other	9 (29.0)	22 (71.0)	1.24 (0.58-2.89, p=0.595)	0.97 (0.43-2.36, p=0.945)
<b>Professional Category</b>				
Doctor	191 (51.5)	180 (48.5)	-	-
Paramedics	83 (26.9)	225 (73.1)	2.88 (2.09-3.99, p<0.001) ***	2.52 (1.79-3.58, p<0.001) ***
Nurse/Midwife	52 (30.1)	121 (69.9)	2.47 (1.69-3.64, p<0.001) ***	2.09 (1.40-3.17, p<0.001) ***
Public Health Workers	28 (23.0)	94 (77.0)	3.56 (2.26-5.77, p<0.001) ***	2.40 (1.47-4.01, p=0.001) **
Lab Worker	11 (21.6)	40 (78.4)	3.86 (1.98-8.11, p<0.001) ***	3.54 (1.77-7.61, p=0.001) **
Other	12 (46.2)	14 (53.8)	1.24 (0.56-2.79, p=0.600)	1.24 (0.54-2.89, p=0.609)
<b>Province</b>				
Bagmati Province	90 (44.1)	114 (55.9)	-	-
Province 1	72 (37.3)	121 (62.7)	1.33 (0.89-1.99, p=0.168)	1.18 (0.77-1.81, p=0.446)
Province 2	71 (45.5)	85 (54.5)	0.95 (0.62-1.44, p=0.792)	0.83 (0.47-1.45, p=0.510)
Gandaki Province	29 (42.0)	40 (58.0)	1.09 (0.63-1.90, p=0.762)	1.24 (0.69-2.22, p=0.473)
Province 5	64 (41.8)	89 (58.2)	1.10 (0.72-1.68, p=0.666)	0.87 (0.56-1.37, p=0.554)
Karnali Province	17 (15.3)	94 (84.7)	4.37 (2.48-8.06, p<0.001) ***	2.96 (1.62-5.64, p=0.001) **
Sudurpaschim Province	34 (20.6)	131 (79.4)	3.04 (1.92-4.90, p<0.001) ***	2.10 (1.28-3.48, p=0.004) **
<b>Presence of Chronic Disease</b>				
No	313 (34.4)	596 (65.6)	-	-

Perceived Willingness to work	Unwilling to work (n=377)	Willing to work (n=674)	OR (univariable) (95% CI, p-value)	OR (multivariable) (95% CI, p-value) <sup>ϕ</sup>
Yes	64 (45.1)	78 (54.9)	0.64 (0.45-0.92, p=0.015) *	0.67 (0.46-0.99, p=0.043) *
<b>HWs having family members who need care</b>				
No	120 (31.5)	261 (68.5)	-	-
Yes	257 (38.4)	413 (61.6)	0.74 (0.57-0.96, p=0.026) *	0.72 (0.54-0.95, p=0.021) *
<b>Perceived Knowledge about COVID-19<sup>†</sup></b>				
Inadequate	86 (47.5)	95 (52.5)	-	-
Adequate	291 (33.4)	579 (66.6)	1.80 (1.30-2.49, p<0.001) ***	1.81 (1.27-2.58, p=0.001) **
<b>Perception of government response<sup>‡</sup></b>				
Unsatisfactory perception	264 (39.5)	404 (60.5)	-	-
Satisfactory Perception	113 (29.5)	270 (70.5)	1.56 (1.20-2.05, p=0.001) **	1.12 (0.83-1.51, p=0.448)

<sup>ϕ</sup> Odds Ratios were obtained by multivariate logistic regression adjusted for Ethnicity, Professional category, Province, Presence of Chronic Disease, health workers with family members requiring care, perceived knowledge of COVID-19, and perception of government response.

<sup>†</sup> Knowledge about COVID-19 was self-reported; a combined score above average was regarded as “Adequate” knowledge and a score below or equal to the average was considered “Inadequate”.

<sup>‡</sup> Perception of government response during COVID-19 pandemic was self-reported; a combined score above average was regarded as “Satisfactory perception” of knowledge and score below or equal to the average was considered “Unsatisfactory Perception”.

\* p-value < 0.05 at the 5 % level of significance

\*\* p-value < 0.01 at the 5 % level of significance

\*\*\* p-value < 0.001 at the 5 % level of significance