Original Research Paper



Public Health

COVID-19 RISK ASSESSMENT AMONG THE SUSCEPTIBLE INDIVIDUALS IN CHENNAI: A CASE CONTROL STUDY

| Meenakshi Mohan* | Post Graduate, Department of Epidemiology, The Tamilnadu Dr MGR Medical University, Chennai. *Corresponding Author |
|--------------------------|---|
| Srinivas G | Professor & Head, Department of Epidemiology, The Tamilnadu Dr MGR Medical University, Chennai. |
| Valarmathi S | Research Officer statistics, Department Of Epidemiology, The Tamilnadu Dr MGR Medical University, Chennai |
| Parameswari Srijayath | Associate Professor, Department of Epidemiology, The Tamilnadu Dr MGR Medical University, Chennai. |
| Jasmine S Sundar | Assistant Professor, Department of Epidemiology, The Tamilnadu Dr MGR Medical University, Chennai |
| Kalpana S. | Research Officer , Department of Epidemiology, The Tamilnadu Dr MGR Medical University, Chennai. |
| | |

BACKGROUND The 21st century is facing a long series of scourge from SARS (2003), H1N1 (2009), MERS ABSTRACT (2012), and Ebola (2014) to Zika virus (2015). H1N1 spread by a novel influenza virus in the year 2009, was the first pandemic of the century, which luckily turned out to be not as severe as expected. In contrast COVID-19 pandemic is characterized by a very rapid spread and high fatality. The best way to prevent and slow down the transmission is to be well informed about its causes and spreads. Risk awareness thus prevent and slow-down the transmission of COVID-19.

OBJECTIVES

- To measure the risk of association between parameters of health, exposure, behaviour, social policy and COVID-19 infection
- To evaluate the knowledge gaps on COVID-19 safety measures among the public

METHODS A case control study was conducted among 100 cases and 200 controls. A standard Risk assessment tool was used to assess the risk factors for COVID-19 infection through telephonic interview after obtaining a verbal informed consent.

RESULTS The odds of getting COVID-19 infection is 4.5 times higher with increase in age. The study also shows a positive and strong correlation between age group and total risk, co-morbidities and total risk among both cases and control groups. On the other hand, gender and behaviour showed a negative and negligible correlation among controls and positive but negligible correlation among the cases.

CONCLUSION The risk of getting COVID - 19 disease increases with Age, underlying medical conditions, smoking, hand washing, mask wearing behavior, compliance with social distancing and place of residence. Although the government has laid preventive strategies, the results show unsatisfactory compliance towards social policies. Hence stringent laws should be implemented to scrutinize the population to follow these preventive measures.

KEYWORDS : COVID-19, Pandemic, RIKA, Risk assessment, Risk communication

INTRODUCTION

COVID-19 pandemic, as a public health emergency has brought into picture, the need for a trans-disciplinary view of the current crises through various angles of global governance, technology and risk communication (Zhang & Shaw, 2020). While health organizations and governments advise many preventive measures like social distancing and personal hygiene practices, risk communication and awareness generation is essential to break the chain of spread. Understanding of the risk at the community level goes a long way in enhancing prevention. Risk assessment tools are intended to analyze the probable risk of the respondents based on information provided on current health status and other essential data being collected. Cheng et. al., points out at the role of inter-connecting risk factors such as social behaviour and exposure which contribute to contracting the disease as observed in the case of SARS (Cheng, 2006). As per Shaw et. al., citizen compliance helps in containment of the spread of disease in China and many other countries (Shaw et al., 2020).

Risk assessment involves evaluation of existing vulnerability, hazard, exposure and current capacities for prevention. Risk tools are needed to assess the risk and the relationship among those factors thus producing a sort of template for risk assessors so that it can be used in their assessments. South Korea's successful edge in overcoming crises was communitybased activity, such as aggressive case finding and assisting vulnerable populations (Innovative Responses to COVID-19, n.d.). A high-level "STOP Pandemics 2020 Strategy Committee" among Japan's 26 national resilience working groups released numerous recommendations, especially on risk communication, in order to better integrate pandemic threats into all-hazard national resilience (DeWit, 2020). In comparison to the Arogya Setu App launched by the Government of India, the COVID-19 Risk assessment tool provides information in the form of questions which can be used to assess the risk based on the individual behavior and social compliance. The present study aims to measure the risk of association between parameters of health, exposure, behaviour, social policy and COVID-19 infection

METHODS

A Case control study was conducted over a period of three months among 100 cases and 200 controls after obtaining ethical clearance from the Institutional Ethics Committee (ECMGR0300144). The RTPCR reports of the individuals who were tested for COVID-19 were collected from the COVID-19 RTPCR testing laboratory of The Tamilnadu Dr MGR medical University, Chennai, Tamilnadu. A computer generated random number was used to choose 2 cases and 2 controls every day. The individuals were interviewed over telephone after obtaining a verbal informed consent. When the selected

VOLUME - 11, ISSUE - 01, JANUARY - 2022 • PRINT ISSN No. 2277 - 8160 • DOI : 10.36106/gjra

participant denied consent consecutive number was chosen. The Approximate time taken for each interview was 15 – 20 mins. The data was collected using the Resilience Innovation Knowledge Academy (RIKA) Tool(Chatterjee et al., 2020) and entered was entered in EpiData version 3.1.

Case definition

Case- RTPCR tested COVID-19 positive individuals with or without symptoms.

Control-RTPCR tested COVID-19 Negative individuals with or without symptoms.

RESULTS

A total of 100 cases and 200 controls were interviewed in the study. Analysis and interpretation of the data was done using SPSS Software. Descriptive and inferential statistics was done based on the objective of the study.

1. DESCRIPTIVE

A. Health (H)

A total of 300 respondents were interviewed in total among which 51% of respondents were male and 49% of respondents were female. 54% of the respondents in control group and 44% of the respondents in cases group were male. 23% of the respondents in the control group and 42% of the respondents among the cases had an underlying medical condition. Considering smoking habit among the males, 32 out of 109 (29%) respondents in control group and 18 out of 44 (40%) respondents in control group were smokers. The age distribution of the respondents is tabulated below (Table 1).

Table 1: Distribution of the respondents by age

| | | CASE | CONTROL |
|--------------|-----------|-------|---------|
| Age_interval | | | |
| | 10-39 | 57.0% | 40.0% |
| | 40-49 | 21.0% | 8.0% |
| | 50-59 | 15.5% | 14.0% |
| | 60-69 | 3.0% | 13.0% |
| | 70-79 | 2.5% | 12.0% |
| | 80& above | 1.0% | 13.0% |

B. Behaviour (Be)

The people' compliance to the public norms, use of mask, hand washing and sanitizing practices constitutes the behavioural aspects of the risk for COVID-19. When questioned about the type of mask used a majority of the respondents (67%) used washable cloth masks followed by three ply mask (20%) and respirators (5%). But only 20% of the respondents reported that they cover both their nose and mouth completely all the time whenever they wear a face mask. It is seen that in advertently 95% of the respondents tend to touch their face or adjust their mask while being engaged in other activities. A very few (8%) reported that they always sanitize their hands before touching their eyes, nose or mouth while the rest of the population sometimes or never did it (Table 2).

Table2: Frequency and percentage of Behavior risk factors

| | | Group | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | Case | | Cor | ıtrol |
| | | Freque | Percen | Freque | Percen |
| | | ncy | tαge | ncy | tαge |
| (Bel) Do you | Always | 32 | 32.0% | 100 | 50.0% |
| wear face mask | Sometimes | 62 | 62.0% | 94 | 47.0% |
| every time you step out of the | Never | 6 | 6.0% | 6 | 3.0% |
| house? | | | | | |

44 129 (Be2) Do you Yes 44.0% 64.5% wash your Sometimes 53 53.0% 70 35.0% hands after No 3 3.0% 1 0.5% coming home with soap? (Be3) Do you 6.0% 17 8.5% Always 6 sanitize your Sometimes 66 66.0% 130 65.0% hand before Never 28 28.0% 53 26.5% touching your eyes, nose & mouth? (Be4) Do you Always 26 26.0% 93 46.5% follow social Sometimes 71 71.0% 103 51.5% distancing norm? Never 3 3.0% 4 2.0%

C. EXPOSURE (Ex)

With respect to the respondent data in control group regarding the type of residence, 58.5% reported to stay in apartments, 29.5% in detached houses, 9% in informal settlement and 3% from shared accommodation and among cases, 66% reported to stay in apartments, 12% in detached houses, 19% in informal settlement and 3% from shared accommodation. With regards to the travel history, the history of international travel, travel within India and travel through public transport was recorded. Only 2% of the respondent from the control group had an international travel history (Table 3). The exposure component is also measured in terms of occupation. It is observed that maximum respondents from both the groups did not fall in high-risk occupation types listed in the questionnaire (medical and emergency professionals). Only 14% from each group were from high risk occupation.

Table 3: Frequency and percentage of exposure risk

| | | Group | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | Case Contr | | | ol | |
| | | Frequ Perce | | Frequ | Perce | |
| | | ency | ntage | ency | ntage | |
| (Ex1) Where do | Informal | 19 | 19.0% | 18 | 9.0% | |
| you stay? | settlement | | | | | |
| | Shared | 3 | 3.0% | 6 | 3.0% | |
| | accommodation | | | | | |
| | Apartment | 66 | 66.0% | 117 | 58.5% | |
| | Detached houses | 12 | 12.0% | 59 | 29.5% | |
| (Ex2) What is | Medical | 3 | 3.0% | 10 | 5.0% | |
| your | Law & order | 1 | 1.0% | 4 | 2.0% | |
| occupation? | Essential | 9 | 9.0% | 15 | 7.5% | |
| | service provider | | | | | |
| | others | 87 | 87.0% | 171 | 85.5% | |
| (Ex3) History of | None of these | 80 | 80.0% | 150 | 75.0% | |
| Travel and | Travel history | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 2.0% | |
| attending public Public gathering | | 20 | 20.0% | 40 | 20.0% | |
| gatherings | herings Both | | | | 3.0% | |

D. SOCIAL POLICY (SP)

In terms of effectiveness of lockdown, more than 70% of people had reported that it is followed with maximum compliance in both the groups. In terms of mask wearing and maintenance of social distancing, more than half of the respondents have reported that only some follow it (Table 4).

Table 4: Compliance with Social Policy

| | | Group | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | | Case C | | Contro | ol |
| | | Frequ | Perce | Frequ | Perce |
| | | ency | ntage | ency | ntage |
| | | | | | |
| (Spl) How | A very few are | 2 | 2.0% | 3 | 1.5% |
| effective was the | following | | | | |
| lockdown in | Some people | 18 | 18.0% | 52 | 26.0% |
| your locality? | are following | | | | |
| Most are | | 80 | 80.0% | 145 | 72.5% |
| | following | | | | |

74 ≇ GJRA - GLOBAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH ANALYSIS

| (Sp2) Was people | A very few are | 24 | 24.0 | 36 | 18.0 |
|-------------------|----------------|----|------|-----|------|
| wearing masks | following | | % | | % |
| and following | Some people | 46 | 46.0 | 117 | 58.5 |
| social distancing | are following | | % | | % |
| in your locality? | Most people | 30 | 30.0 | 47 | 23.5 |
| | are following | | % | | % |

2. Association

The significance of association was studied using a Chi square test and the risk of association was estimated using odds ratio. Results showed a statistically significant association (p value <0.05) between age, underlying medical condition, hand washing practices, compliance to social distancing norm, type of residence and COVID-19 disease. Since smoking, mask wearing behavior and occupation are considered clinically significant factors those were included while estimating odds ratio.

Table 5: Adjusted and unadjusted odds ratio of variables

| VARIABLES | UN | IADJUSTED | | ADJUSTED | | |
|----------------|--------|-----------|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|
| | OR | 95% CI | | OR | 95% | 6 CI |
| | | lower | upper | | lower | upper |
| Āge | 4. | 3. | 6. | 4. | 3. | 6. |
| | 697357 | 52909 | 67124 | 566542 | 433768 | 486612 |
| Do you have | 1. | 1. | 2. | 1. | 1. | 2. |
| any | 535469 | 244015 | 321584 | 526531 | 241949 | 28362 |
| underlying | | | | | | |
| medical | | | | | | |
| conditions? | | | | | | |
| Smoking | 2. | 1. | 5. | 2. | 1. | 5. |
| habit | 219854 | 461043 | 350566 | 254144 | 474557 | 479409 |
| Do you wear | 3. | 1. | 10. | 2. | 1. | 9. |
| mask every | 10899 | 722952 | 64364 | 200785 | 314163 | 752839 |
| time you step | | | | | | |
| out of your | | | | | | |
| house? | | | | | | |
| Do you wash | 2. | 1. | 4. | 2. | 1. | 4. |
| your hands | 188839 | 533547 | 200509 | 255707 | 574625 | 295143 |
| with soap | | | | | | |
| after coming | | | | | | |
| home | - | | - | | | |
| Do you | 2. | 1. | 9. | - | - | - |
| sanitize your | 189408 | 312103 | 289839 | | | |
| hand before | | | | | | |
| toucning eyes, | | | | | | |
| nose a mouin : | , | , | | , | , | |
| Do you follow | 1. | 1. | | | 1. | 2. |
| social | 645927 | 29/366 | 292232 | 620336 | 306067 | 563647 |
| aistancing | | | | | | |
| Whore de | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| vou stav? | 367259 | 1. | 1. 979144 | 377275 | 158963 | 4. 00287 |
| What is were | 1 | 104110 | 0 | 1 | 100000 | 00207 |
| what is your | 1. | 1. | 4. | 1. | 102220 | 401474 |
| occupation | 49843 | 19140/ | 544342 | 4/0030 | 103333 | 44214/4 |

The odd's of contracting the COVID-19 infection is 4.5 times higher among cases when compared to the controls with increase in age. The odd's of contracting COVID-19 infection is 2 times higher among cases when compared to the controls due to co-morbidities, smoking habit and hand washing practices.

3. Correlation

The study shows a positive and strong correlation between age group and total risk, and co-morbidities and total risk in both cases and control groups. Gender and behaviour show a negative and negligible correlation among controls and a positive but negligible correlation among the cases. Table6: Correlation between the associated variables using Pearson's correlation analysis

| VARIABLES | CONT | ROL | CASE | | |
|-------------------|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|--|
| | r | Strength of | r | Strength of | |
| | | correlation | | correlation | |
| Age group and co- | 0.529 | Positive & | 0.461 | Positive & | |
| morbidities | | Moderate | | Moderate | |
| | | correlation | | correlation | |
| Age group and | 0.852 | Positive & | 0.922 | Positive & | |
| Total risk | | Strong | | Strong | |
| | | correlation | | correlation | |
| Age group and | 0.130 | Positive & | 0.241 | Positive & | |
| behavior | | Weak | | Weak | |
| | | correlation | | correlation | |
| Co-morbidities | 0.690 | Positive & | 0.695 | Positive & | |
| and total risk | | Strong | | Strong | |
| | | correlation | | correlation | |
| Hand washing | 0.305 | Positive & | 0.208 | Positive & | |
| and compliance of | | Moderate | | Weak | |
| social distancing | | correlation | | correlation | |
| Gender and | -0.028 | Negative & | 0.087 | Positive & | |
| Behavior | | negligible | | negligible | |
| | | correlation | | correlation | |
| Smoking and total | 0.382 | Positive & | 0.266 | Positive & | |
| risk | | Moderate | | Weak | |
| | | correlation | | correlation | |
| Social policy | 0.324 | Positive & | 0.277 | Positive & | |
| compliance | | Moderate | | Weak | |
| (Spl&Sp2) | | correlation | | correlation | |
| Social policy and | -0.070 | Negative & | 0.00 | Negative & | |
| Behavior | | negligible | 6 | negligible | |
| | | correlation | | correlation | |

DISCUSSION

Effective risk communication strategies can raise public awareness and build social trust towards authority (Bruinen de Bruin et al., 2020). Providing the accurate and necessary information can lead to risk avoidance and improved risk governance procedures. The COVID-19 Risk Assessment tool is intended to raise awareness, communicate risks, and assist in decision-making. According to Lin et al., an increase in availability of information from internet searches on handwashing and wearing masks was associated with a decrease in COVID-19 speed (Lin et al., 2020).

The factors assist for Covid risk includes four factors - health (HR), behaviour (Be), exposure (Ex) and social policy (SP). Each of these factors have some parameters. Each of these parameters are assigned linear weights and based on the weightage given in the tool the risk is calculated using the formula: Risk = (HR*0.5) + (Be*0.2) + (Ex*0.2) + (Sp*0.1).

The relationship between age-group and co-morbidities is an important risk factor for Covid-19 disease as it places the elderly population with existing disease at a higher risk of mortality (Divo et al., 2014). As observed, the age-group and total risk depict a strong positive correlation among both cases and controls with coefficient of 0.922 and 0.822 respectively. Similarly, comorbidities and total risk also showed a strong correlation with a coefficient of 0.695 and 0.690 among cases and controls respectively. These two correlation results were in compliance with a descriptive study by Chatterjee et al., (Chatterjee et al., 2020).

With respect to individual behaviour, washing hands and following of social distancing norm has a weak correlation among cases and moderate correlation among controls. This depicts that while one may practice social distancing but might not comply with hand washing behavior or the vice versa. The gender and behaviour show negligible correlation with a coefficient of 0.087 among cases and negative

correlation with a coefficient of -0.028 among controls. This implicates that behaviour factors are not dependent on gender. Similarly, age-group and behaviour showed negligible correlation coefficient among both cases and controls.

There are two components considered in social policy, one being effective lockdown and other is the community compliance of wearing of mask and practicing social distancing. Ideally, the two factors should have a strong positive correlation. However, as observed, there is a positive weak correlation among cases and positive moderate correlation among controls.

CONCLUSION

The risk of getting COVID – 19 disease increases with Age, underlying medical conditions, smoking, hand washing, mask wearing behavior, compliance with social distancing and place of residence. Although the government has laid preventive strategies, the results show unsatisfactory compliance towards social policies. Hence stringent laws should be implemented to scrutinize the population to follow these preventive measures.

Acknowledgement

Our sincere thanks to the staff members of the RT-PCR laboratory of The Tamilnadu Dr MGR Medical University, Chennai, for their valuable assistance.

REFERENCE

- Bruinen de Bruin, Y., Lequarre, A.-S., McCourt, J., Clevestig, P., Pigazzani, F., Zare Jeddi, M., Colosio, C., & Goulart, M. (2020). Initial impacts of global risk mitigation measures taken during the combatting of the COVID-19 pandemic. Safety Science, 128, 104773. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104773
- Chatterjee, R., Bajwa, S., Dwivedi, D., Kanji, R., Ahammed, M., & Shaw, R. (2020). COVID-19 Risk Assessment Tool: Dual application of risk communication and risk governance. *Progress in Disaster Science*, 7, 100109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pdisas.2020.100109
- Cheng, C. (2006). Psychosocial factors predicting SARS-preventive behaviors in four major SARS-affected regions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 222247.
- DeWit, A. (2020). Resource-Efficiency and Critical Raw Materials in Covid-19 and Recovery. 58.
- Divo, M. J., Martinez, C. H., & Mannino, D. M. (2014). Ageing and the epidemiology of multimorbidity. *European Respiratory Journal*, 44(4), 1055–1068. https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00059814
- Innovative Responses to COVID-19: Collection of Approaches from the Republic of Korea. (n.d.). UNDP. Retrieved October 26, 2021, from https://www.undp.org/content/seoul_policy_center/en/home/presscenter/articles/2019/Collection_of_Examples_from_the_Republic_of Korea.html
- Lin, Y.-H., Liu, C.-H., & Chiu, Y.-C. (2020). Google searches for the keywords of "wash hands" predict the speed of national spread of COVID-19 outbreak among 21 countries. Brain, Behavior, and Immunity, 87, 30–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.04.020
- Shaw, R., Kim, Y., & Hua, J. (2020). Governance, technology and citizen behavior in pandemic: Lessons from COVID-19 in East Asia. Progress in Disaster Science, 6, 100900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pdisas.2020.100990
 Zhang, H., & Shaw, R. (2020). Identifying research trends and gaps in the
- Zhang, H., & Shaw, R. (2020). Identifying research trends and gaps in the context of COVID-19. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(10), 3370.