

1 **Present knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear level of Bangladeshi**
2 **people towards covid-19 after a year of the pandemic situation: a**
3 web-based cross-sectional study.

4
5 **Short title:** Present knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear level of
6 Bangladeshi people towards covid-19 after a year of the pandemic
7 situation.

8

9 **Authors and affiliations:**

10 1. Tahsin Ahmed Rupok**, Email: tahsinahmedrupokpharmru9176@gmail.com

11 Department of Pharmacy, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi-6205, Bangladesh.

12

13 2. Sunandan Dey, Email: sunandandeypharmacy@gmail.com

14 Department of Pharmacy, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi-6205, Bangladesh.

15

16 3. Rashni Agarwala, Email: rashniagarwala@gmail.com

17 Department of Pharmacy, Islamic University, Kushtia-7003, Bangladesh.

18

19 4. Md. Nurnobi Islam, Email: nurnobi6329@gmail.com

20 Department of Chemistry, Shahjalal University of Science & Technology, Sylhet-
21 3114, Bangladesh.

22

23 5. Bayezid Bostami, Email: bayezidpharm.ru@gmail.com

24 Department of Pharmacy, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi-6205, Bangladesh

25

26 **Corresponding author: tahsinahmedrupokpharmru9176@gmail.com

27 **Abstract**

28 In the earlier phase of the pandemic situation, the governments of Bangladesh
29 badly suffered to adhere their people to preventive measures probably due to less
30 knowledge and attitude towards covid-19. To tackle the second wave of
31 coronavirus, the governments again enforced an array of preventive measures, but
32 still encountering the same problem after a year of the pandemic situation. In an
33 attempt to find out the reasons behind this, our study aimed to assess the present
34 knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear level of the people. A cross-sectional study
35 was conducted from 15th to 25th April 2021. A total of 402 participants met all the
36 inclusion criteria and were considered for performing all statistical analyses
37 (Descriptive statistics, Mann-Whitney U test, Kruskal-Wallis H test, Multiple
38 logistic regression, Spearman rank-order correlation). Out of 402 participants,
39 more than 90% participants were students and all were adults aged 16 to 30.
40 84.6%, 65.7%, 54%, and 21.6% participants had more adequate knowledge, more
41 positive attitude, more frequent practice, and moderate to high fear towards covid-
42 19, respectively. Knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear were interrelated directly
43 or indirectly. It was found knowledgeable participants were more likely to have
44 more positive attitude (OR = 2.12, 95% CI = 1.14-3.95, P < 0.05) and very less
45 fear (OR = 1.98, 95% CI = 1.02-3.82, P < 0.05). More positive attitude was found
46 as a good predictor of more frequent practice (OR = 4.33, 95% CI = 2.66-7.04, P <

47 0.001), and very less fear had same negative impact on both attitude (OR = 0.48,
48 95% CI = 0.25-0.91, P < 0.05) and practice (OR = 0.48, 95% CI = 0.27-0.85, P <
49 0.05). Our findings reflect that knowledge level has elevated but attitude level
50 subsided, and practice level stayed same as was in the earlier phase of pandemic
51 and people are no longer panicked.

52

53 **Keywords:** Knowledge, Attitude, Practice, Fear, Covid-19, Bangladesh.

54

55 **Introduction**

56 In Bangladesh, both infection and death rates have started to burgeon again from
57 the second week of March 2021 with a small dip in late April, which has been
58 further instigated due to the entrance of highly transmissible Delta variant of
59 coronavirus in May this year (1). As of June 29, 2021, 7,666 new cases were
60 detected with a positivity rate of 23.97, and 112 people lost their life (2). Infectious
61 disease experts, Dr. Be-Nazir Ahmed, a former director at the Directorate General
62 of Health Services (DGHS) predicted that if this Delta variant starts to escalate
63 vehemently as it did in India and Nepal, people stay lackadaisical in maintaining
64 public health hygiene, and governments continue to develop an ill-conceived plan
65 of action and fail to ensure proper implementation of preventive measures, then,
66 the number of cases detected per day could rise to 20,000 or even more to 40,000

67 in July. He also added if the country records over 10,000 cases for some weeks it
68 will be difficult to control the situation as it does not have sufficient hospital beds,
69 oxygen production, ICUs, doctors, nurses, and other facilities and equipment to
70 take care of such a huge number of patients (3). Besides, there are still no
71 acceptable treatments that can warrant a short period of hospitalized conditions.
72 So, the government should take the necessary steps to prevent any grim situation. It
73 is worth mentioning that prevention is the best and comparatively less costly
74 method to the most effective protection against the virus. Only adequate preventive
75 measures can keep the infection rate under control, which will truncate both the
76 number of patients and death tallies. As a preventive measure, the government
77 decided to go for countrywide strict lockdown again from 1st July of this year but it
78 is worth remembering that lockdowns are effective only if they are accompanied
79 by other preventive measures (4,5). However, Bangladesh's governments badly
80 suffered to adhere their population to preventive measures in the earlier phase of
81 the pandemic situation probably due to people's less knowledge and less attitude to
82 embrace the measures taken by the governments. A review of some previous
83 studies conducted in Bangladesh reflected the truth that last year Bangladeshi
84 people were comparatively less knowledgeable, had a less positive attitude toward
85 covid-19, and as a consequence had less frequent practice, which was consistent
86 with a study of Pakistan but inconsistent with China and Saudi Arabia. Indeed,

87 there are also exceptions such as one article (Bangladesh 4) showed people
88 (78.9%) had a comparatively more positive attitude towards covid-19. Moreover,
89 another article (Bangladesh 5) reported that people had more frequent practice
90 (94.3%) along with positive attitude (93.0%) (Figure 01) [Bangladesh 1 (6),
91 Bangladesh 2 (7), Bangladesh 3 (8), Bangladesh 4 (9), Bangladesh 5 (10), Pakistan
92 (11), Saudi Arabia (12), China (13)].

93 However, one thing to remember, adhering people to preventive measures is not
94 straightforward, takes intensive efforts over a length of time as well as depends on
95 what extent people can perceive the import of those measures. So, proper
96 implementation of these preventive measures warrants adequate well-planned
97 initiatives to scale up people's knowledge and awareness towards covid-19 and its
98 preventive measures, which will ultimately alter their behavior as well as attitude
99 positively towards covid-19 preventive practice. Several studies published last year
100 (2020) outlined that adequate knowledge regarding covid-19 is a potential
101 predictor of attitude towards its preventive practice (8,14). To speak the truth, it is
102 indefinite when the coronavirus will go away from the world. Therefore, people
103 must be resilient to this new situation, learn all fundamental information regarding
104 covid-19, and change their attitude positively towards practicing all safety
105 guidelines stipulated by their government.

106

107 **Fig 1 Diagram reflecting different countries and their peoples' knowledge,**
108 **attitude, and practice level towards covid-19.**

109

110 Our study aimed to bring up the present KAP level of Bangladeshi people after a
111 year of the pandemic situation and how prepared they are to confront any future
112 onslaught of covid-19. So, the objectives of this present study were-

113 -To explore the present knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear level of the
114 Bangladeshi population and their associated potential factors.

115 -To find out whether knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear are related to each
116 other.

117 -To find out the most probable reasons why people are digressed from maintaining
118 preventive measures enforced by the governments.

119 **Materials and Methods**

120 **Participants and Data recruitment procedure**

121 This web-based cross-sectional survey was conducted on Bangladeshi people using
122 online facilities amid the second wave of coronavirus in Bangladesh, continued for
123 10 days from 15th to 25th April in 2021. A structured questionnaire was prepared in
124 a Google Form and a link was generated, shared with all authors and other
125 volunteers who were instructed properly as to how well they can use this form to

126 recruit data with adequate consent from the participants. A face-to-face
127 community-based survey was not possible as the Bangladesh government
128 implemented their second strict lockdown from 14th April being one day ahead of
129 our data collection initiated (15), all data were therefore assembled through online
130 approaches. This survey included subjects aged 16 years old or above, being
131 Bangladeshi residents, having internet access and ability to communicate, having
132 no intellectual disability. Subjects living in foreign countries, having no or less
133 interest to participate in were excluded from the survey. A total of 407 subjects
134 successfully submitted their data and all completed the questionnaire adequately as
135 they were recommended.

136 **Survey Instrument**

137 The questionnaire prepared after a thorough review of some literature published
138 last year had six sections. The first section with a brief delineation of the objectives
139 of the survey and some instructions on how to complete the questionnaire properly
140 entailed a question asked to take consent of the respondents. The second section
141 embodied 7 questions asked to gather socio-demographic information of a
142 participant. Socio-demographic information included gender, age, education,
143 occupation, location, family type, Social status (family income) which was
144 categorized as follows “Lower class” (<20,000 BDT), “Middle class” (20,000-
145 40,000 BDT), “High class” (>40,000 BDT). The third section (Knowledge scale)

146 had 12 questions where each question had three options “Right”, “Wrong”, and
147 “Not sure”. The fourth section (Attribute scale) had 8 questions where each
148 question had three options “Yes”, “No”, and “Maybe” except one question having
149 “Not possible” instead “Maybe” in three options. The fifth section (Practice
150 section) also had 8 questions where each question had three options “Yes”, “No”,
151 and “Sometimes”. The sixth section (Fear scale) included a fear measuring tool
152 which was reported as a valid and reliable instrument to assess covid-19 related
153 fear among respondents (16). Each question had five Likert options. This section
154 also had two extra questions. The first question having binary options “Yes”, “No”
155 asked if or not they are maintaining preventative measures properly stipulated by
156 the governments. The second question was asked to those who answered “No” to
157 account for their reasons why they are aberrant than those who answered “Yes”.
158 There were 17 possible responses and multiple responses could be selected.

159 As to scoring, in the knowledge scale, the correct answer (Right) was coded as 1
160 and the incorrect answer (Wrong/Don’t know) was coded as 0. The total score
161 ranged from 0 to 12 where those who obtained 83% score or greater (≥ 10) were
162 considered to have more accurate knowledge otherwise considered having less
163 accurate knowledge.

164 In the attitude scale, four kinds of options were coded as follows, 0 (No/ Not
165 possible for work), 1 (Maybe), and 2 (Yes). The total score ranged from 0 to 16.

166 Those who had an 81% score or greater (≥ 13) were considered to have a positive
167 attitude otherwise considered to have a less positive attitude.

168 Three options of the practice scale were coded as follows, 0 (No), 1 (Sometimes),
169 and 2 (Yes). The total score ranged from 0 to 16. Those who had an 81% score or
170 greater (≥ 13) were considered to have more frequent practice otherwise
171 considered having less frequent practice.

172 The fear scale had 7 items where each item had five Likert options which were
173 coded as follows, 0 (Strongly disagree), 1 (Disagree), 2 (Neutral), 3 (Agree), 4
174 (Strongly Agree). The total score ranged from 0 to 28. Fear scores greater or equal
175 to 21 were cut-points for high fear. Scores between 20-14 were cut points for
176 moderate fear and scores equal to or less than 13 were cut points for less fear.

177 Reliability tests were performed using field data to determine the validity and
178 reliability of those scales mentioned above. Cronbach's alpha for knowledge,
179 attitude, practice, and fear scale were 0.47, 0.61, 0.81, and 0.83. Due to a shortage
180 of time, we could not conduct a pilot study.

181 **Ethical considerations**

182 This study was conducted in accordance with the institutional Research Ethics and
183 the declaration of Helsinki. Besides, this study had been approved by the ethical
184 review committee of Rajshahi University. Anonymity and confidentiality were

185 strictly maintained. All respondents gave full informed consent to participate and
186 consent for their data to be used in the publication.

187

188 **Data Management and Analysis**

189 All submitted data were automatically stored in a dynamic Microsoft excel sheet
190 which was made available offline after completion of data collection for primary
191 data processing including data duplication-checking, data cleaning, data coding,
192 etc. In this stage, three data fallen out of inclusion criteria of age (below 15 years
193 of old), and two data got duplicated were discard from the preliminary dataset.
194 After accomplishment of data cleaning and coding, the final dataset having data of
195 402 respondents was entered into Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS)
196 version 26.0 for further data processing and doing all statistical analysis which
197 included descriptive statistics, Mann-Whitney U test, Kruskal Wallis H test,
198 Multiple logistic regression, Spearman rank-order correlation. Non-parametric
199 Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis H test, and Spearman rank-order
200 correlation were performed as data under continuous dependent variables were not
201 normally distributed. To check that, besides visual inspection of histograms,
202 Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were conducted. Both tests were
203 statistically significant at 0.01 for those continuous dependent variables and

204 histograms of them looked left-skewed, which confirmed well that data under these
205 variables were not normally distributed. For all statistical analyses noted above, the
206 statistical significance level was set to 0.05 (Alpha value).

207 **Results**

208 **Demographic characteristics of the sample**

209 This study considered a total of 402 participants for final statistical analysis.

210 Among them majority were male (74.2%), studying in honors and masters

211 (71.6%). More than 90% of participants were students while 37.8% were students

212 and self-employed. About 75% and 56% of participants were from nuclear and

213 lower class family respectively. About 36% of participants informed their location

214 (for at least 3 months) village. This study inclined towards the adult population as

215 all participants had ages of 16 to 30 years of old. (Table 01) tabulated detailed

216 information about the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents.

217

Table 01

Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Characteristics		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	300	74.2
	Female	102	25.4
Education	HSC	114	28.4
	Honors/Masters/Above	288	71.6
Occupation	Student and self-employed	152	37.8
	Student only	230	57.2
	Jobs/Business	20	5.0
Family type	Nuclear	304	75.6
	Extended	98	24.4
Social status	Lower class	228	56.7

	Middle class	135	33.6
	High class	39	9.7
Location (At least 3 months)	Village	145	36.1
	Sub-district town	41	10.2
	District town	107	26.6
	Dhaka	36	9.0
	Divisional district town	73	18.2
HSC- Higher Secondary School Certificate			

218

219 **Knowledge and its factors**

220 Participants' Overall correct answer rate was 89.6% [Mean Score (MS) \pm Standard
221 Deviation (SD) = 10.75 \pm 1.20 out of 12] while the correct answer rate was 65% to
222 100%, indicating participants had appreciable knowledge on covid-19. 84.6% of
223 participants had more accurate knowledge while only 15.4% had less adequate
224 knowledge. The distribution of responses for each question of the knowledge scale
225 was presented in (Table 02). Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests showed that
226 knowledge scores do not vary with no socio-demographic variables included in our
227 study, indicating all the groups of a variable had quite similar knowledge on covid-
228 19 disease (Table 04). Multiple logistic regression analysis identified attitude and
229 fear as significant factors that can predict if an individual would have more
230 accurate knowledge on covid-19 rather than having less accurate knowledge (Table
231 05).

232 **Attitude and its factors**

233 On average, participants had an 82% score on the attitude scale (MS \pm SD = 13.12
234 \pm 2.21 out of 16). Approximately 66% of participants had a more positive attitude.
235 Only 34.6% of participants had confidence that Bangladesh can win the battle

236 against covid-19 and only 43.8% agreed that covid-19 will finally be controlled.
237 The distribution of responses for each question of the attitude scale was presented
238 in (Table 02). Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests showed attitude scores vary
239 with only social status ($P < 0.05$). It was found that participants who came from a
240 lower-class family had significantly less attitude than those who came from a
241 middle-class family ($P < 0.05$) while other combinations were statistically
242 insignificant (Lower class vs High class; Middle class vs High class) (Table 04).
243 Multiple logistic regression analysis identified social status, knowledge, practice,
244 fear, as significant factors that can predict if an individual would have a more
245 positive attitude rather than a less positive attitude. It was found that participants
246 who came of a lower class family were 71% less likely to have more positive
247 attitude than those who came of a high-class family (OR = 0.29, 95% CI = 0.10-
248 0.82, $P < 0.05$) and participants came of a lower class family were 65% less likely
249 to have more positive attitude than those came of a high-class family (OR = 0.35,
250 95% CI = 0.12-1.01, $P < 0.05$) (Table 05).

251 **Practice and its factors**

252 On average, participants had a 74.5% score on the practice scale ($MS \pm SD = 11.92$
253 ± 3.77 out of 16). 55% of participants had more frequent practice. The distribution
254 of responses for each question of the practice scale was presented in (Table 02).
255 Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests uncovered that Practice scores vary with

256 gender ($P < 0.001$), social status ($P < 0.001$), and location ($P < 0.01$). It was found
 257 that females had significantly higher practice score than males ($P < 0.001$);
 258 Participants came of both higher class family ($P < 0.01$) and middle-class family (P
 259 < 0.01) had significantly higher practice score than those came of a lower class
 260 family; Participants living in Dhaka ($P < 0.05$) and in any district town ($P = 0.01$)
 261 for at least three months had significantly higher score on practice scale than those
 262 living in a village for the same duration of time (Table 04). Multiple logistic
 263 regression analysis identified gender, location, attitude, fear, as significant factors
 264 that can predict if an individual would have more frequent practice rather than less
 265 frequent practice. It was found that males were less likely to have more frequent
 266 practice than females by 51% ($OR = 0.49$, $95\% CI = 0.28-0.86$, $P \leq 0.01$).
 267 Participants living in any district town were 85% more likely to have more
 268 frequent practice than those living in a village ($OR = 1.85$, $95\% CI = 1.03-3.34$, P
 269 ≤ 0.05) while Participants living in Dhaka were 5.04 times more likely to have
 270 more frequent practice than those living in a village ($OR = 5.04$, $95\% CI = 1.93-$
 271 13.2 , $P \leq 0.001$) (Table 05).

Table 02

Participants' knowledge, attitude, and practice towards covid-19 (N = 402) (Distribution of Responses)

Knowledge Questions (Correct Answer)	Right n (%)	Wrong n (%)	Not Sure n (%)
Covid-19 disease is deadly but preventable as well as curable. (Right)	381 (94.8)	8 (2.0)	13 (3.2)
Fever, fatigue, dry cough, and breathing difficulty are the main clinical symptoms of covid-19. (Right)	376 (93.5)	12 (3.0)	14 (3.5)

Elderly people having chronic illnesses and other complications are more likely to be seriously affected. (Right)	390 (97.1)	2 (0.5)	10 (2.5)
This disease can be prevented with antibiotics and other medications. (Wrong)	95 (23.6)	198 (48.3)	109 (27.1)
A person with covid-19 having no symptoms (fever) cannot spread the virus to others. (Wrong)	36 (9.0)	326 (81.1)	40 (10.0)
Coronavirus can spread via respiratory droplets (from coughing, sneezing) of infected people. (Right)	389 (96.8)	9 (2.2)	4 (1.0)
Taking measures is not necessary for children and young adults to prevent infections by the coronavirus. (Wrong)	7 (1.7)	379 (94.3)	16 (4.0)
Isolation and treatment of people with covid-19 are effective ways to reduce the spread of the virus. (Right)	373 (92.8)	14 (3.5)	15 (3.7)
People who have contact with someone infected with the COVID-19 virus or came from an infected area/country should be immediately isolated for 14 days. (Right)	393 (97.8)	5 (1.2)	4 (1.0)
Covering the mouth and nose with a bent elbow or tissue paper or handkerchief when coughing or sneezing can reduce the spread of this virus. (Right)	377 (93.8)	16 (4.0)	9 (2.2)
This disease could be asymptomatic. (Right)	344 (85.6)	26 (6.5)	32 (8.0)
Individuals should avoid going to crowded places such as markets and public transportations to prevent infection. (Right)	394 (98.0)	6 (1.5)	2 (0.5)

Table 02 (Continued)

Attitude Questions	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	Maybe/Not Possible for work n (%)
Do you like to stay at home for a certain period (2 weeks) to prevent coronavirus spread if the government will order so? **	345 (85.8)	25 (6.2)	32 (8.0)
Do you think that social distancing (e.g. stay 1-2 m apart, avoid crowds, etc.) can prevent the spread of this virus?	338 (84.1)	9 (2.2)	51 (13.7)
Do you agree that we should cancel business/ recreational trips at this time?	266 (66.2)	80 (19.9)	56 (13.9)
Do you believe that working from home can help to control covid-19?	298 (74.1)	32 (8.0)	73 (17.9)
Do you agree that government should have taken preventive measures when new variants were first reported in Bangladesh?	383 (95.3)	3 (0.7)	16 (4.0)
Do you think health education can play an important role in covid-19 prevention?	376 (93.5)	7 (1.7)	19 (4.7)
Do you agree that COVID-19 will finally be successfully controlled?	176 (43.8)	26 (6.5)	200 (49.8)
Do you have confidence that Bangladesh can win the battle against the COVID-19 disease?	139 (34.6)	51 (12.7)	212 (52.7)

Table 02 (Continued)

Practice Questions	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	Sometimes n (%)
Do you wash hands with water and soap frequently?	251 (62.4)	32 (8.0)	119 (29.6)
Do you always use a mask?	322 (80.1)	20 (5.0)	60 (14.9)
Do you maintain the rules of using a mask?	320 (79.6)	23 (5.7)	59 (14.7)
Do you maintain social distance (or home quarantine)?	241 (60.0)	69 (17.2)	92 (22.9)
Do you use tissues or hanker chips during coughing/sneezing?	240 (59.7)	92 (22.9)	70 (17.4)
Do you eat healthy food or maintain a healthy lifestyle focusing on outbreaks?	269 (66.9)	42 (10.4)	91 (22.6)
Do you avoid public transports (like buses, trains, planes, etc.)?	183 (45.5)	127 (31.6)	92 (22.9)

Do you avoid handshaking, hugging when you meet with your friends?	238 (59.2)	84 (20.9)	80 (19.9)
--	---------------	--------------	--------------

** This question had "Not possible for work" instead of "Maybe" in its three options. n- Number of respondents, %- Percentage of respondents, N- Total number of respondents

272

273

274 **Fear and its factors**

275 On average, participants had a 35.5% fear score ($MS \pm SD = 9.87 \pm 4.78$ out of
276 28). 78.4% (315) participants had less fear, 19.7% (79) had moderate fear, and
277 only 2.0% (8) participants had high fear. And 78.4% (315) participants had very
278 less fear (less than 50% fear score) while only 21.6% (87) participants had high to
279 moderate fear (equal or more than 50% fear score). The distribution of responses
280 of all fear-related questions was presented in (Table 03). Mann-Whitney and
281 Kruskal-Wallis tests unfolded that fear score among participants varies with gender
282 and occupation. It was reported that females had a significantly high fear score
283 than males ($P < 0.001$); Participants doing job or business had significantly low
284 fear than both those who are student only ($P = 0.05$) and those who are students as
285 well as self-employed ($P < 0.01$) (Table 04). Multiple logistic regression analysis
286 detected gender, knowledge, attitude, practice, as significant factors that can
287 predict whether an individual would have very little fear rather than high to
288 moderate fear. It was found that male participants were 92% more likely to have
289 very less fear than female participants ($OR = 1.92$, $95\% CI = 1.08-3.41$, $P < 0.05$)
290 (Table 05).

291

292

Table 03

Fear related to covid-19 among respondents (N= 402) (Distribution of responses).

Fear Questions	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Neutral n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
I am most afraid of coronavirus-19.	48 (11.9)	106 (26.4)	127 (31.6)	92 (22.9)	29 (7.2)
It makes me uncomfortable to think about coronavirus-19.	38 (9.5)	126 (31.3)	97 (24.1)	114 (28.4)	27 (6.7)
My hands become clammy when I think about coronavirus-19.	127 (31.6)	228 (56.7)	29 (7.2)	15 (3.7)	3 (0.7)
I am afraid of losing my life because of coronavirus-19.	53 (13.2)	143 (35.6)	102 (25.4)	84 (20.9)	20 (5.0)
When watching news and stories about coronavirus-19 on social media, I become nervous or anxious.	50 (12.4)	126 (31.3)	106 (26.4)	88 (21.9)	32 (8.0)
I cannot sleep because I'm worried about getting coronavirus-19.	140 (34.8)	216 (53.7)	32 (8.0)	13 (3.2)	1 (0.2)
My heart races or palpitates when I think about getting coronavirus-19.	135 (33.6)	190 (47.3)	51 (12.7)	24 (6.0)	2 (0.05)

n- Number of respondents, %- Percentage of respondents, N- Total number of respondents

293

294 **Relationship among knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear**

295 Spearman rank-order correlation tests explored that knowledge score is
 296 significantly correlated with attitude score ($P < 0.01$) although it was
 297 insignificantly correlated with other scores (practice and fear score). However,
 298 attitude score was correlated with both practice score ($P < 0.001$) and fear score (P
 299 < 0.001). Along with attitude score, practice score and fear score was correlated
 300 with each other ($P < 0.01$) (Table 06). Multiple logistic regression analysis
 301 uncovered that participants who had more accurate knowledge were 2.12 times
 302 more likely to have a more positive attitude (OR = 2.12, 95% CI = 1.14-3.95, $P <$

303 0.05) and 1.98 times more likely to have very little fear (OR = 1.98, 95% CI =
 304 1.02-3.82, P < 0.05) than those who had less accurate knowledge; Participants who
 305 had a more positive attitude were 4.33 times more likely to have more frequent
 306 practice than those who had less positive attitude (OR = 4.33, 95% CI = 2.66-7.04,
 307 P < 0.001). Moreover, participants who had very less fear were 52% less likely to
 308 have more positive attitude (OR = 0.48, 95% CI = 0.25-0.91, P < 0.05) at the same
 309 time 52% less likely to have more frequent practice (OR = 0.48, 95% CI = 0.27-
 310 0.85, P < 0.05) than those who had high to moderate fear (Table 05).

311

Table 04
 Association of socio-demographic characteristics with knowledge, attitude, fear, and Practice score.

Socio-demographic characteristics (n)	Knowledge		Attitude		Fear		Practice	
	Median Mean	U/H test P-value	Median Mean	U/H test P-value	Median Mean	U/H test P-value	Median Mean	U/H test P-value
Gender								
Male (300)	11.00 10.76	14548.5 0.60 0.438	14.00 12.98	13596.5 2.90 0.089	9.00 9.29	10743.5 20.29 <0.001	12.00 11.39	10635.0 21.48 <0.001
Female (102)	11.00 10.71		14.00 13.54		12.00 11.58		14.00 13.48	
Education								
ISC (114)	11.00 10.65	15030.0 1.91 0.167	14.00 13.26	15633.0 0.571 0.450	9.50 10.27	15385.5 0.97 0.325	13.50 12.29	14845.0 2.27 0.132
Bachelors/Bachelors/Masters/Above(288)	11.00 10.78		14.00 13.06		10.00 9.72		13.00 11.77	
Occupation								
Student and self-employed (152)	11.00 10.80	N/A 1.45 0.484	13.00 12.90	N/A 4.71 0.484	10.00 9.51	N/A 10.24 0.006	12.00 11.53	N/A 3.16 0.206
Student only (230) (b)	11.00 10.73		14.00 13.30		10.00 10.37		13.00 12.10	
Jobs/Business (20) (a)	11.00 10.50		13.00 12.65		7.00 6.90		13.50 12.70	
Family type								

nuclear (304)	11.00 10.72	14053.0 0.78 0.378	14.00 13.02	13500.5 2.00 0.157	9.00 9.77	13962.5 0.88 0.350	13.00 11.79	4563.5 0.11 0.738
extended (98)	11.00 10.84		14.00 13.43		10.00 10.19		13.00 11.79	
Social status								
lower class (228) (e)	11.00 10.68	N/A 1.27 0.530	13.00 12.87	N/A 6.249 0.044	10.00 10.07	N/A 1.35 0.508	12.00 11.25	N/A 16.13 <0.001
middle class (135) (f)	11.00 10.83		14.00 13.39		9.00 9.55		14.00 12.57	
high class (39) (g)	11.00 10.82		14.00 13.64		9.00 9.87		14.00 13.54	
Location(at least 3 months)								
village (145) (h)	11.00 10.65	N/A	14.00 13.10	N/A	9.00 9.59	N/A	11.00 10.88	N/A
sub-district town (41)	11.00 10.98		14.00 13.39		8.00 9.37		13.00 12.29	
district town (107) (i)	11.00 10.72	4.26 0.372	14.00 13.31	2.804 0.591	10.00 10.15	3.31 0.507	14.00 12.65	14.92 0.005
thaka (36) (j)	11.00 10.94		14.00 13.08		10.00 9.28		13.00 13.31	
divisional district town (73)	11.00 10.75		13.00 12.74		10.00 10.60		13.00 12.01	
Overall Mean	10.75		13.12		9.82		11.92	
Overall Median	11.00		14.00		10.00		13.00	

DT - Bangladesh Taka (Currency symbol of Bangladesh taka), HSC = Higher Secondary School Certificate, p- Significance value, U = Mann-Whitney U, H = Kruskal-Wallis H

(a) vs (b) and (a) vs (c) were significant at 0.006 and 0.05 level respectively in fear (Bonferroni corrected), (e) vs (f) and (e) vs (g) were significant at 0.007 and 0.004 level respectively in practice (Bonferroni corrected), (e) vs (f) was significant at 0.03 level in attitude. (without Bonferroni correction), (h) vs (i) and (h) vs (j) were significant at 0.01 and 0.04 level respectively in practice (Bonferroni corrected).]

312

313

314

315

Table 05

Results of multiple logistic regression on factors associated with knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear. (Adjusted model)

Variables (D)	More Accurate knowledge		More Positive attitude		More frequent practice		Very little fear	
	n (%)	OR (95% CI)	n (%)	OR (95% CI)	n (%)	OR (95% CI)	n (%)	OR (95% CI)
Gender								
Male (300)	254 (84.7)	1.02 (0.51-2.04)	189 (63.0)	1.12 (0.63-2.01)	148 (49.3)	0.49** (0.28-0.86)	246 (82.0)	1.92* (1.08-3.41)
Female (102)	86 (84.3)	ref	75 (73.5)	ref	73 (71.6)	ref	69 (67.6)	ref
Education								
HSC (114)	98 (85.9)	ref	80 (70.2)	ref	68 (59.6)	ref	89 (78.1)	ref
Bachelors/Masters/Above (288)	242 (84.0)	0.85 (0.43-1.66)	184 (63.9)	0.81 (0.47-1.40)	153 (53.1)	0.891 (0.53-1.50)	226 (78.5)	0.87 (0.48-1.57)
Occupation								
Student and self-employed	130	1.95	93	1.69	74	0.89	124	0.37

152)	(85.5)	(0.53-7.12)	(61.2)	(0.55-5.20)	(48.7)	(0.29-2.72)	(81.6)	(0.07-1.91)
student only (230)	194 (84.3)	1.77 (0.51-6.12)	159 (69.1)	1.82 (0.62-5.37)	135 (58.7)	1.03 (0.35-3.02)	173 (75.2)	0.31 (0.06-1.53)
Job/Business (20)	16 (80.0)	ref	12 (60.0)	ref	12 (60.0)	ref	18 (90.0)	ref
Family type								
Nuclear (304)	256 (84.2)	0.84 (0.43-1.64)	194 (63.8)	0.70 (0.41-1.22)	168 (55.3)	1.09 (0.65-1.83)	241 (79.3)	1.46 (0.82-2.60)
Extended (98)	84 (85.7)	ref	70 (71.4)	ref	53 (54.1)	ref	74 (75.5)	ref
Social status								
Lower class (288)	188 (65.3)	0.93 (0.30-2.82)	138 (47.9)	0.29* (0.10-0.82)	106 (36.8)	0.55 (0.23-1.34)	182 (63.2)	0.56 (0.22-1.44)
Middle class (135)	118 (87.4)	1.26 (0.40-3.93)	93 (68.9)	0.35* (0.12-1.01)	85 (63.1)	0.88 (0.35-2.17)	102 (75.6)	0.55 (0.22-1.40)
High class (39)	34 (87.2)	ref	33 (84.6)	ref	30 (76.9)	ref	31 (79.5)	ref
Location (at least 3 months)								
Village (145)	116 (80.0)	ref	93 (64.1)	ref	64 (44.1)	ref	118 (81.4)	ref
Sub-district town (41)	38 (92.7)	2.99 (0.84-10.68)	28 (68.3)	0.92 (0.41-2.10)	21 (51.2)	1.09 (0.50-2.40)	33 (80.5)	0.96 (0.37-2.49)
District town (107)	91 (85.0)	1.44 (0.70-2.96)	77 (72.1)	0.99 (0.53-1.85)	68 (63.5)	1.85* (1.03-3.34)	81 (75.7)	0.76 (0.39-2.49)
Thaka (36)	32 (88.9)	2.23 (0.63-7.33)	23 (63.9)	0.44 (0.18-1.07)	28 (77.8)	5.04*** (1.93-13.2)	28 (77.8)	0.77 (0.29-2.04)
Divisional district town (73)	63 (86.3)	1.71 (0.75-3.91)	43 (59.0)	0.55 (0.28-1.07)	40 (55.1)	1.53 (0.80-2.94)	55 (75.3)	0.60 (0.29-1.24)
Knowledge								
More accurate knowledge (340)	-	-	231 (76.1)	2.12* (1.14-3.95)	188 (61.8)	0.85 (0.45-1.60)	271 (89.1)	1.98* (1.02-3.82)
Less accurate knowledge (98)	-	-	33 (33.7)	ref	33 (33.7)	ref	44 (44.9)	ref
Attitude								
More positive attitude (264)	231 (87.5)	2.16* (1.16-4.02)	-	-	178 (67.4)	4.33*** (2.66-7.04)	194 (73.5)	0.46** (0.24-0.86)
Less positive attitude (138)	109 (79.0)	ref	-	-	43 (31.2)	ref	121 (87.7)	ref
Practice								
More frequent practice (221)	188 (85.1)	0.85 (0.45-1.61)	178 (80.5)	4.31*** (2.64-6.99)	-	-	157 (71.0)	0.47* (0.27-0.84)
Less frequent practice (181)	152 (84.0)	ref	86 (47.5)	ref	-	-	158 (87.3)	ref
Fear								
High to moderate fear (87)	69 (79.3)	ref	70 (80.5)	ref	64 (73.6)	ref	-	-
Very little fear (315)	271 (86.0)	1.97* (1.01-3.82)	194 (61.6)	0.48* (0.25-0.91)	157 (49.8)	0.48** (0.27-0.85)	-	-
Total	340 (84.6%)		264 (65.7%)		221 (55.0%)		315 (78.4%)	

n = Number of respondents in each category of independent variables, n = Number of respondents in category of dependent variables, OR = Odd ratio, Reference category = ref, P ≤ 0.05, **P ≤ 0.01, ***P ≤ 0.001, High to moderate fear = equal or more than 50% fear score, Very less fear = less than 50% fear score.

316

317

Table 06

Results of spearman's rank-order correlation among knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear score.

	1	2	3	4
--	---	---	---	---

1. Knowledge	1			
2. Attitude	0.139 ^a 0.005 ^b	1		
3. Practice	0.046 ^a 0.357 ^b	0.358 ^a < 0.001 ^b	1	
4. Fear	-0.049 ^a 0.329 ^b	0.243 ^a < 0.001 ^b	0.138 ^a 0.006 ^b	1

a = Correlation coefficient, b = Significance level (Two tailed)

318 **Possible reasons of an individual behind failing to maintain all**
 319 **safety rules stipulated for covid-19 prevention**

320 When asked to observe participants' thoughts as to whether they are maintaining
 321 safety rules for covid-19, 25.6% (103) participants assured that they are
 322 maintaining safety rule completely while 74.4% (299) reported "No" and
 323 mentioned their possible reasons why they were detached from maintaining safety
 324 rules properly. Among those who mentioned "No", 57.5% participants mentioned
 325 they cannot maintain a social distance because they need to go out for many
 326 reasons and need to use public transports where social distance maintaining is not
 327 possible while 44.8% participants mentioned they need to go market for daily
 328 groceries or many things where they cannot maintain social distance. 29.1% of
 329 participants think of themselves as social butterflies and meet with many friends
 330 while they do not maintain social distance. 22.4% of participants reported that they
 331 can't wash their hands regularly while 33.1% mentioned that very few times a day,
 332 they wash their hands as recommended by WHO. The further analysis explored
 333 that among participants who mentioned they wash their hands regularly, 23.3% do
 334 not wash their hands maintaining rules recommended by WHO while 76.7% wash
 335 their hands regularly as recommended by WHO and among those who mentioned

336 they do not wash their hands regularly, 32.8% maintain rules recommended by
 337 WHO when they wash their hands. However, 37.5% of participants don't use hand
 338 sanitizers when staying outside the home and 23.4% of participants have bad habits
 339 of touching eyes, nose, mouth, frequently. 21.4% Of participants reported that they
 340 have not seen anyone from their relatives or relatives of relatives or neighbors got
 341 infected by a coronavirus and that is why they do not give importance to
 342 maintaining safety rules of covid-19. (Figure 02) depicted all the other reasons
 343 graphically with the frequency of responses for each reason and (Table 07)
 344 tabulated all the supportive information.

345

346 **Fig 1 Graphical representation of reasons behind failure to maintain safety**
 347 **guidelines of covid-19. (Table 07) tabulated all the supportive information.**

348

349

Table 07
<i>Possible reasons why people cannot maintain safety rules of covid-19 completely.</i>
▪ Beliefs that I will not be infected by the coronavirus. (C01)
▪ Things related to corona seem to me as media-created rumors. (C02)
▪ No one having been identified as corona virus-positive yet from my relatives or relatives of relatives or neighbors makes maintaining safety rules less important to me. (C03)
▪ I am less panicked about coronavirus. (C04)
▪ I have no clear conception about safety rules for covid-19. (C05)
▪ It is not always possible for me to wash hands coming from outsides. (C06)
▪ Very few times in a day, hands are washed up to the elbow for (20-30) min as recommended by WHO. (C07)
▪ I do not use hand sanitizer when staying outside. (C08)
▪ Trying but I can't give up the bad habit of touching eyes, face, nose frequently. (C09)
▪ I am to go to the market often for daily groceries or other things where maintaining social distance is not possible. (C10)
▪ I am to go out for many reasons and use public transports where maintaining social distance is not possible. (C11)
▪ I am a social butterfly and hang out with friends very often while social distance is not maintained. (C12)
▪ I don't maintain social distance thinking about the benefit of maintaining social distance when people around me don't maintain social distance. (C13)
▪ I don't use medical masks because of having any confidence in a normal medical mask (5 BDT) as well as no

money for buying expensive masks. (C14)
▪ When wearing a mask, I feel very uneasy and it's very hard to stay with. (C15)
▪ I don't use a mask because it looks ugly. (C16)
▪ I don't know any reason. (C17)
BDT-Bangladesh Taka (Currency symbol of Bangladeshi taka)

350

351

352 **Discussion**

353 To fulfill the goals of this present study, several statistical analyses had been
354 conducted and their outcomes had been presented sequentially in the result section.
355 In this section, these outcomes have been discussed collaboratively with other
356 previously published studies.

357 **Knowledge level of Participants**

358 The findings showed that participants' overall correct answer rate was 89.6%,
359 indicating participants had appreciable Knowledge on covid-19. This outcome was
360 consistent with some previous studies conducted last year (2020) in Bangladesh
361 (80.8%) (17), China (90%) (18), in Malaysia (80.5%) (19), in Saudi Arabia
362 (81.6%) (20), in Iran (90% & 85%) (21), in Nepal (60% to 98.7%) (22).
363 Moreover, 84.6% of participants had more accurate knowledge which was larger
364 compared to that reported by some previous Bangladeshi investigations (6–10),
365 indicating knowledge level has elevated among Bangladeshis.

366 Our study reported that knowledge scores do not significantly vary with gender,
367 education, occupation, location, social status, family type, which was inconsistent
368 with some studies (6–10,18,23).

369 **Attitude level of Participants**

370 Approximately 66% of participants had a more positive attitude towards covid-19,
371 which was commensurate with (7). But when compared to the other two
372 Bangladeshi articles, it seems attitude level among people has alleviated to some
373 extent (9,10). Compared to overseas investigations, our finding was consistent with
374 a study from Pakistan (65.4%) (11), while inconsistent with studies from Saudi
375 Arabia (95%) (24), China (73.8%) (13). Our findings suggested that Bangladeshi
376 adults might have lost their confidence towards controlling the rapid escalation of
377 coronavirus as only 34.6% of participants took it confidently that Bangladesh can
378 win the battle against covid-19 and concomitantly, only 43.8% of participants were
379 confident that covid-19 will finally be controlled. Last year, Rabbani et al., (2020)
380 reported that 55.3% of their participants were confident as to Bangladesh would
381 win the battle against covid-19 which was also consistent with Kundu et al., n.d.
382 (2020), and 68.5% were confident that covid-19 would be finally controlled which
383 was somewhat lower compared to Banik et al., (2020) (8,9,25). On the other hand,
384 a Malaysian, Chinese, Saudi Arabian, Indonesian, Nepali article published last year
385 (2020) reported that they respectively obtained 83.1%, 90.8%, 94%, 94.3%, and

386 71.5% positive responses regarding whether covid-19 would successfully be
387 controlled, and 95.9%, 97.1%, 97%, 95.5%, and 80% positive response regarding
388 whether their country would be able to win the battle against covid-19 (18–
389 20,23,26). On the whole, it is obtrusive that attitude level among the populace has
390 noticeably subsided. The reason behind obtaining such ominous outcomes might
391 be the long duration of uncertainties which has been appeared due to emerging of
392 new variants of SARS-COV-2 with the function of time.

393 Moreover, our study explored that attitude levels significantly vary with only the
394 social status of the participants, not with other socio-demographic variables
395 included in our scrutiny, which was somewhat inconsistent with several studies.
396 (6,7,9).

397 **Fear level of Participants**

398 On average, participants had a 35.5% fear score which was lower compared to M.
399 A. Hossain et al., (2020) (27). Besides, only 2% of participants had very high fear
400 while 78.4% had very less fear. These outcomes indicate that Bangladeshi people
401 are no longer panicked. Furthermore, the fear score was significantly associated
402 with the gender and occupation of participants. Females had significantly high fear
403 than males and participants doing a job or business had significantly low fear than
404 both those who are student only and those who are student as well as self-
405 employed. M. A. Hossain et al., (2020) reported that the fear score significantly

406 differs with gender, education, and geography, when female, urban-dwelling, and
407 higher educated participants had high fear, which was partially similar to our
408 findings (27).

409

410 **Practice level of Participants**

411 On average, participants had a 74.5% practice score and 55% participants had
412 more frequent practice, which was consistent with some studies from Bangladesh
413 (6,7,9,25). So, our study indicates that the preventive practice level remains similar
414 to what was in last year. However, compared to a study from Bangladesh (24%)
415 (8) and from Pakistan (36.5%) (11), our participants had more frequent practice but
416 seems to have much lower frequent practice when compared to studies from Saudi
417 Arab (81% & 81.9%) (12,24) and South Korea (87.9%) (13). Indeed, our study
418 found that more frequent practice is greatly influenced by gender and location.
419 However, the more frequent practice could also be influenced by other socio-
420 demographic factors such as education, occupation, age, family income, etc. (7–
421 10).

422 **Relationship among knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear**

423 The finding showed knowledge has an indirect effect on preventive practice
424 mediated by attitude as knowledge has a positive impact on attitude and
425 concomitantly, an attitude has a positive impact on preventive practice, indicating

426 the more knowledge on covid-19, the more attitude towards covid-19, and the
427 more frequent practice towards covid-19 prevention. Similar outcomes were
428 reported in some other studies (8,10,14,24,28,29). Moreover, our study uncovered
429 that knowledge has a significant inverse effect on fear, indicating the more
430 accurate knowledge, the less fear. This outcome was parallel with some other
431 studies (17,24,27,30). Our study also revealed that like attitude, fear has also a
432 positive impact on preventive practice, indicating the more fear, the more
433 preventive practice. A similar outcome was reported by (27,31). Ostensibly, this
434 outcome could seem controversial but it represents the significant influence of fear
435 on changing someone's behavior or attitude towards preventive practice. Our study
436 also substantiates the immediate statement reporting that fear has a positive and
437 mysteriously same impact on attitude as was on preventive practice. However, we
438 cannot expect high fear among the populace to have more practice because fear has
439 some shortcomings too. For instance, Covid-19 fear is significantly associated with
440 anxiety and psychological distress could also trigger stress and mental illness (30).
441 Besides, there is an instance of suicidal death due to the fear of covid-19 in
442 Bangladesh (27,32). (Figure 03) depicted all the factors and their impact on
443 preventive practice.

444 **Fig 3 Diagram showing the direct and indirect impact of knowledge, attitude,**
445 **fear, and socio-demographic factors (Ellipse) on preventive practice.**

446

447 Moreover, Our study reported that the majority of the participants thought they
448 cannot adhere to preventive measures because of not maintaining social distance
449 properly, followed by reluctance in hand washing as recommended by WHO. We
450 had no sufficient data to support these reasons.

451

452 **Limitations, Strength, and Recommendation**

453 Our study had several limitations. First, our study sample could not reflect all
454 populations throughout the country. Second, our study could not include
455 participants of all ages. Third, the study sample size was comparatively small.
456 Fourth, our study followed a web-based cross-sectional study that excluded
457 underprivileged people especially those who were not accessible to internet-based
458 facilities. Five, we had to conduct comparatively less sensitive statistical analysis
459 as our data were not normally distributed. As to the strength of our study, to the
460 best of our knowledge, this is the first study that attempted to find out possible
461 reasons why people are deflected from maintaining preventive measures. Future
462 investigations should follow both community-based and web-based cross-sectional
463 studies, collecting data from all sectors, all divisions, attempting to find out the
464 most probable reasons behind failure to maintain all preventive measures for
465 covid-19 prevention in a more structured way.

466 **Conclusion**

467 Our study attempted to bring up the present knowledge, attitude, practice, and fear
468 level of Bangladeshi people. According to our study, participants had appreciable
469 knowledge and very little fear but disappointedly had average attitude and practice.
470 Besides, Participants had a lack of confidence on Bangladesh would win the battle
471 against covid-19. Therefore, it is time for public health policymakers to be more
472 focused to scale up people's confidence and attitude towards covid-19. To do so,
473 they must be more dogmatic to develop rules and regulations and more austere in
474 implementing and maintaining those to combat any new onslaught of the deadly
475 coronavirus. Besides, providing public health educations arranging viable public
476 health campaigns, promoting accurate information regarding covid-19, counseling
477 general people with regards to preventive practices, must be continued till the end
478 of this unprecedented condition.

479

480 **Acknowledgments**

481 The authors acknowledge all the participants who participated in the study and all
482 the volunteers who helped in data collection. The authors are also grateful to Dr.
483 Md. Abdul Rafi for his support in the overall improvement of the manuscript.

484

485 **Author contributions**

486 **Conceptualization:** Tahsin Ahmed Rupok, Sunandan Dey

487 **Data curation:** Tahsin Ahmed Rupok, Rashni Agarwala, Md. Nurnobi Islam,
488 Sunandan Dey, Bayezid Bostami.

489 **Formal Analysis:** Tahsin Ahmed Rupok, Rashni Agarwala.

490 **Investigation:** Tahsin Ahmed Rupok, Rashni Agarwala, Md. Nurnobi Islam,
491 Sunandan Dey.

492 **Methodology:** Tahsin Ahmed Rupok, Bayezid Bostami.

493 **Project Administration:** Tahsin Ahmed Rupok, Sunandan Dey.

494 **Supervision:** Tahsin Ahmed Rupok, Sunandan Dey.

495 **Writing – original draft:** Tahsin Ahmed Rupok.

496 **Writing – review & editing:** Tahsin Ahmed Rupok, Md. Nurnobi Islam,
497 Sunandan Dey, Rashni Agarwala, Bayezid Bostami.

498

499

500 **Reference**

- 501 1. Correspondent S. Country logs the highest Covid cases in a day. Daily Star
502 [Internet]. 2021 Jul 1; Available from:
503 [https://www.thedailystar.net/news/bangladesh/news/country-logs-highest-](https://www.thedailystar.net/news/bangladesh/news/country-logs-highest-covid-cases-day-2121453)
504 [covid-cases-day-2121453](https://www.thedailystar.net/news/bangladesh/news/country-logs-highest-covid-cases-day-2121453)
- 505 2. Correspondent S. 112 more die, 7,666 get Covid. Daily Star [Internet]. 2021
506 Jun 30; Available from: [https://www.thedailystar.net/bangladesh/news/112-](https://www.thedailystar.net/bangladesh/news/112-more-die-7666-get-covid-2120757)
507 [more-die-7666-get-covid-2120757](https://www.thedailystar.net/bangladesh/news/112-more-die-7666-get-covid-2120757)
- 508 3. Bangladesh could face severe Covid-19 surge by June-end if Indian variant
509 spreads: experts. Daily Star [Internet]. 2021 May 25; Available from:
510 [https://www.thedailystar.net/coronavirus-deadly-new-](https://www.thedailystar.net/coronavirus-deadly-new-threat/news/bangladesh-could-face-severe-covid-19-surge-june-end-if-indian-variant-spreads-experts-2098725)
511 [threat/news/bangladesh-could-face-severe-covid-19-surge-june-end-if-](https://www.thedailystar.net/coronavirus-deadly-new-threat/news/bangladesh-could-face-severe-covid-19-surge-june-end-if-indian-variant-spreads-experts-2098725)
512 [indian-variant-spreads-experts-2098725](https://www.thedailystar.net/coronavirus-deadly-new-threat/news/bangladesh-could-face-severe-covid-19-surge-june-end-if-indian-variant-spreads-experts-2098725)
- 513 4. Majumdar BA. How do we tackle this new onslaught of the coronavirus?
514 Daily Star [Internet]. 2021 Jun 28; Available from:
515 [https://www.thedailystar.net/opinion/news/how-do-we-tackle-new-onslaught-](https://www.thedailystar.net/opinion/news/how-do-we-tackle-new-onslaught-the-coronavirus-2119313)
516 [the-coronavirus-2119313](https://www.thedailystar.net/opinion/news/how-do-we-tackle-new-onslaught-the-coronavirus-2119313)
- 517 5. Correspondent S. Lockdown now from Thursday. Daily Star [Internet]. 2021

- 518 Jun 27; Available from:
519 [https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/news/lockdown-now-thursday-](https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/news/lockdown-now-thursday-2119017)
520 [2119017](https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/news/lockdown-now-thursday-2119017)
- 521 6. Paul A, Sikdar D, Hossain MM, Amin MR, Deebea F, Mahanta J, et al.
522 Knowledge, attitudes, and practices toward the novel coronavirus among
523 Bangladeshis: Implications for mitigation measures. PLoS One [Internet].
524 2020;15(9 September 2020):1–18. Available from:
525 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238492>
- 526 7. Ferdous MZ, Islam MS, Sikder MT, Mosaddek ASM, Zegarra-Valdivia JA,
527 Gozal D. Knowledge, attitude, and practice regarding COVID-19 outbreak in
528 Bangladesh: An online-based cross-sectional study. PLoS One [Internet].
529 2020;15(10 October):1–17. Available from:
530 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239254>
- 531 8. Rabbani MG, Akter O, Hasan MZ, Samad N, Mahmood SS, Joarder T.
532 Knowledge, Attitude and Practice towards COVID-19 among people in
533 Bangladesh during the pandemic: a cross-sectional study. medRxiv [preprint]
534 [Internet]. 2020; Available from:
535 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.22.20198275>
- 536 9. Banik R, Rahman M, Sikder M, Rahman QM, Pranta MUR. Investigating
537 knowledge, attitudes, and practices related to COVID-19 outbreak among
538 Bangladeshi young adults: A web-based cross-sectional analysis. J Public
539 Heal [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Mar 31]; Available from:
540 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-020-01432-7>
- 541 10. Hossain MB, Alam MZ, Islam MS, Sultan S, Faysal MM, Rima S, et al. Do
542 knowledge and attitudes matter for preventive behavioral practices toward
543 the COVID-19? A cross-sectional online survey among the adult population
544 in Bangladesh. Heliyon. 2020;6(12); Available from:
545 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e05799>
- 546 11. Salman M, Ul Z, Noman M, Abbas H, Khalid Z. Knowledge, attitude and
547 preventive practices related to COVID □ 19□: a cross-sectional study in two
548 Pakistani university populations. Drugs Ther Perspect [Internet].
549 2020;36(7):319–25. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/s40267-020-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40267-020-00737-7)
550 [00737-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40267-020-00737-7)
- 551 12. Alhazmi A, Hamed M, Ali M, Mohieldin A, Aziz F, Osman OB, et al.
552 Knowledge, attitudes and practices among people in Saudi Arabia regarding
553 COVID-19□: A cross-sectional study. J Public health Res [Internet].

- 554 2020;9(3):345–53. Available from:
555 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7520855/>
- 556 13. Peng Y, Pei C, Zheng Y, Wang J, Zhang K, Zheng Z, et al. A cross-sectional
557 survey of knowledge, attitude, and practice associated with COVID-19
558 among undergraduate students in China. BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2020;
559 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09392-z>
- 560 14. Lee M, Kang BA, You M. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) toward
561 COVID-19: a cross-sectional study in South Korea. BMC Public Health.
562 2021;21(1):1–10; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10285-y>
- 563
- 564 15. Tayeb T. Bangladesh’s Covid lockdown conundrum. Daily Star [Internet].
565 2021 Apr 18; Available from: <https://www.thedailystar.net/opinion/closer-look/news/bangladeshs-covid-lockdown-conundrum-2079065?amp>
- 566
- 567 16. Ahorsu DK, Lin C, Imani V, Saffari M, Griffiths MD, Pakpour AH. The Fear
568 of COVID-19 Scale: Development and Initial Validation. Int J Ment Health
569 Addict [Internet]. 2020; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00270-8>
- 570
- 571 17. Ali M, Uddin Z, Banik PC, Hegazy F, Zaman S, Ambia ASM, et al.
572 Knowledge, attitude, practice and fear of COVID-19: A cross-cultural study.
573 medRxiv [preprint]. 2020;1–27; Available from:
574 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.26.20113233>
- 575 18. Zhong B, Luo W, Li H, Zhang Q, Liu X, Li W, et al. Knowledge, attitudes,
576 and practices towards COVID-19 among Chinese residents during the rapid
577 rise period of the COVID-19 outbreak: a quick online cross-sectional
578 survey. Int J Biol Sci. 2020;16(10); Available from:
579 <https://doi.org/10.7150/ijbs.45221>
- 580 19. Azlan AA, Hamzah MR, Jen T, Id S, Hadi S, Id A. Public knowledge,
581 attitudes and practices towards COVID-19: A cross-sectional study in.
582 PLoS One [Internet]. 2020;15(5):1–15. Available from:
583 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233668>
- 584 20. Al-Hanawi MK, Angawi K, Alshareef N, Qattan AMN, Helmy HZ,
585 Abudawood Y, et al. Knowledge, Attitude and Practice Toward COVID-19
586 Among the Public in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: A Cross-Sectional Study.
587 Front Public Heal. 2020;8(May):1–10; Available from:
588 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00217>

- 589 21. Erfani A, Shahriarirad R, Ranjbar K, Mirahmadizadeh A, Moghadami M.
590 Knowledge, attitude and practice toward the novel coronavirus (COVID-19)
591 outbreak- A population-based survey in Iran. Bull World Health Organ
592 [Internet]. 2020; Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2471/BLT.20.256651>
- 593 22. Hussain A, Garima T, Singh BM, Ram R, Tripti RP. Knowledge, attitudes, and
594 practices towards COVID-19 among Nepalese Residents: A quick online
595 cross-sectional survey. Asian J Med Sci. 2020;11(3):6–11; Available from:
596 <https://doi.org/10.3126/ajms.v11i3.28485>
- 597
- 598 23. Paudel S, Shrestha P, Karmacharya I, Pathak OK. Knowledge, attitude, and
599 practices (KAP) towards COVID-19 among Nepalese residents during the
600 COVID-19 outbreak: An online cross-sectional study. 2020; Available from:
601 <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-31044/v1>
- 602
- 603 24. Alahdal H, Basingab F, Alotaibi R. An analytical study on the awareness,
604 attitude, and practice during the COVID-19 pandemic in Riyadh, Saudi
605 Arabia. J Infect Public Health [Internet]. 2020;13(10):1446–52. Available
606 from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2020.06.015>
- 607 25. Kundu S, Sayeed A, Banna MH Al, Begum MR, Kormoker T, Brazendale K,
608 et al. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices towards measures for prevention of
609 the spread of COVID-19: An online cross-sectional survey among
610 Bangladeshi residents. PsyArxiv [Preprints] [Internet]. :1–22. Available
611 from: <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/cxp8n>
- 612 26. Muslih M, Susanti HD, Rias YA. Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice of
613 Indonesian Residents toward COVID-19 □: A Cross-Sectional Survey. Int J
614 Environ Res Public Health [Internet]. 2021; Available from:
615 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18094473>
- 616 27. Hossain MA, Hossain KMA, Walton LM, Uddin Z, Haque MO, Kabir MF, et
617 al. Knowledge, attitudes, and fear of COVID-19 during the rapid rise period
618 in Bangladesh. medRxiv [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Mar 31]; Available
619 from:
620 <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0239646>
- 621 28. Lau LL, Hung N, Go, DJ, Ferma J, Choi M, Dodd W, et al. Knowledge,
622 attitudes and practices of COVID-19 among income-poor households in the
623 Philippines: A cross-sectional study. J Glob Health. 2020;10(1); Available

- 624 from: <https://doi.org/10.7189/JOGH.10.011007>
- 625 29. Gao H, Hu R, Yin L, Yuan X, Tang H, Luo L, et al. Knowledge, attitudes
626 and practices of the Chinese public with respect to coronavirus disease
627 (COVID-19): An online cross-sectional survey. BMC Public Health. 2020;1–
628 8; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-40292/v1>
- 629 30. Saravanan C, Mahmoud I, Elshami W, Taha MH. Knowledge, Anxiety, Fear,
630 and Psychological Distress About COVID-19 Among University Students in
631 the United Arab Emirates. Front Psychiatry. 2020;11(October):1–10;
632 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2020.582189>
- 633 31. W/Mariam TG, Kassie BA, Asratie MH, Abate AT. The Effects of Fear and
634 Knowledge of COVID-19 on Preventive Practice Among Pregnant Women
635 Who Attend Antenatal Care in Northwest Ethiopia, 2020: Institution-Based
636 Cross-Sectional Study. Int J Womens Health. 2021; Volume 13:95–100;
637 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2147/ijwh.s286088>
- 638 32. Mamun MA, Gri MD. First COVID-19 suicide case in Bangladesh due to
639 fear of COVID-19 and xenophobia□: Possible suicide prevention strategies.
640 Asian J Psychiatr. 2020;51(April):2–3; Available from:
641 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102073>
- 642




Fig 1 Diagram reflecting different countries and their peoples' knowledge, attitude, and practice level towards covid-19.




Fig 1 Graphical representation of reasons behind failure to maintain safety guidelines of covid-19. (Table 07) tabulated all the supportive information.




Fig 3 Diagram showing the direct and indirect impact of knowledge, attitude, fear, and socio-demographic factors (Ellipse) on preventive practice.