Responses to Threat of Influenza A(H7N9) and Support for Live Poultry Markets, Hong Kong, 2013

Peng Wu, Vicky J. Fang, Qiuyan Liao, Diane M.W. Ng, Joseph T. Wu, Gabriel M. Leung, Richard Fielding, and Benjamin J. Cowling

We conducted a population survey in Hong Kong to gauge psychological and behavioral responses to the threat of influenza A(H7N9) and support for closure of live poultry markets. We found low anxiety and low levels of exposure to live poultry but mixed support for permanent closure of the markets.

An novel influenza A(H7N9) virus was detected in China in March 2013, and an epidemic of infections in poultry and humans occurred during April and May of that year (1,2). Most persons who had laboratory-confirmed infections reported recent contact with live poultry, and evidence suggests that human-to-human transmissibility of the virus is low (2). Incidence of laboratory-confirmed human cases dramatically decreased following the closure of live poultry markets (LPMs) in affected cities in April 2013 (3). Control of the virus is challenging because its low pathogenicity in poultry (4) requires reliance on laboratory-based surveillance in animals or humans to identify areas where the virus is prevalent and to facilitate interventions to reduce human exposure to infected poultry.

Hong Kong imports live poultry from mainland China only from a few dedicated farms that have adequate biosecurity protection; intensive surveillance for avian influenza is conducted at the border and within Hong Kong. Risk for influenza A(H7N9) virus infection appears to be low in Hong Kong, but 4 infections have been reported in Hong Kong residents since December 2013, and a surge in influenza virus transmission was anticipated in eastern China this winter (2). Prevention and control activities rely on accurate measures of exposure to live poultry, risk perception and psychological and behavioral responses related to the virus, and attitudes toward specific control measures.

We therefore conducted a series of cross-sectional population surveys to monitor these variables in Hong Kong.

The Study

We initiated the first survey in April 2013 (April 10–13 and 25–27), shortly after the first human case of influenza A(H7N9) was announced in mainland China. A second survey was conducted December 4–8, after incidence of human cases began to rise in the winter and the first local infection occurred in Hong Kong. We used methods and survey instruments similar to those used for surveys during the severe acute respiratory syndrome epidemic in 2003 (5), the influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 pandemic (6), and the emergence of avian influenza A(H5N1) (7). For the survey, trained interviewers made telephone calls to land lines by using a computerized, random-digit dialing system; calls were placed during nonworking hours and weekends to avoid overrepresentation of nonworking groups. Within households, adults ≥18 years of age who spoke Cantonese were eligible and were randomly selected on the basis of a Kish grid (8). Up to 4 follow-up calls were made if participants were not available or if calls were unanswered. Verbal informed consent was obtained from all participants. Means and proportions of survey items were directly weighted by sex and age to the general population, and multiple imputation with 10 datasets was used to correct for missing data.

We completed 1,556 interviews during the April survey and 1,000 interviews during the December survey; response rates were 68.9% and 68.0%, respectively. The characteristics of respondents were similar for each survey period (online Technical Appendix, wwwnc.cdc.gov/EID/article/20/5/13-1859-Techapp1.pdf). Figure 1 illustrates the timeline of laboratory-confirmed cases of influenza A(H7N9) compared with the dates of our surveys.

Table 1 shows a summary of the population anxiety and risk perception related to influenza A(H7N9) across the 2 survey periods. The level of general anxiety in the population, measured by the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (5,6), remained low and was comparable to population anxiety during April–May 2009 (6). Most (85%–89%) respondents identified close contact with chickens in an LPM as a risk factor for infection with influenza A(H7N9) virus. Respondents reported perceived susceptibility of infection as low, perceived severity of influenza A(H7N9) as lower than that of severe acute respiratory syndrome, and perceived severity of influenza A(H7N9) as higher than that of influenza A(H5N1) and seasonal influenza. Respondents also expressed that they would experience low levels of worry if influenza-like symptoms were to develop in the respondent the day after the survey (symptom-induced worry).

During the December survey, we also collected data on exposures to live poultry markets (LPMs). A total of 26.7%...
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of respondents reported visiting an LPM in Hong Kong ≥1 time during the previous year; of those, 61.4% and 37.5% reported visiting ≥1 time per month and ≥1 time per week, respectively. In addition, 6.9% of respondents reported visiting an LPM in mainland China ≥1 time during the previous year. Across the population, we estimated the average numbers of annual visits to LPMs in Hong Kong and mainland China to be 17.6 and 0.53 visits per person, respectively. These estimates were based on an assumption of standardized annual numbers of visits for responses 1–2/year, 3–5/year, 6–11/year, 1–3/month, 1–2/week, 3–5/week, almost every day, or never to be 1.5, 4, 8.5, 24, 78, 208, 365, and 0 visits, respectively. Figure 2 shows the distribution of number of visits by age and sex; in a multiple regression model, we found significantly (p<0.01) fewer visits to LPMs among younger adults but no significant differences by sex.

A total of 17.5% respondents reported that they had avoided visiting LPMs in the previous 7 days because of influenza A(H7N9), whereas 35.9% reported that they would support or strongly support permanent closure of LPMs.

Table 1. Generalized anxiety and risk perception among persons surveyed during influenza A(H7N9) epidemic, Hong Kong, April and December 2013*

| Category                      | First survey | Second survey | p value |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|
| Population anxiety†           | 1.81         | 1.79          | 0.35    |
| Risk perception, %            |              |               |         |
| Susceptibility‡               |              |               |         |
| Absolute                      | 12.1         | 9.3           | 0.01    |
| Relative                      | 2.3          | 1.3           | 0.19    |
| Severity compared with seasonal influenza§ | 88.1         | 88.3          | 0.80    |
| Severity compared with SARS§  | 39.5         | 28.8          | <0.01   |
| Severity compared with influenza A(H5N1)§ | 79.1         | 81.6          | 0.10    |
| Symptom-induced worry¶       | 44.8         | 37.3          | <0.01   |

*First survey conducted April 10–13 and 25–27, 2013; second survey conducted December 4–8, 2013. p values were estimated by comparing anxiety and risk perception between the 2 surveys after adjustment for demographics including age, sex, education, place of birth, marital status, and household income. SARS, severe acute respiratory syndrome.
†Measured by 4-point State Trait Anxiety Inventory (5: least anxiety, 4: most anxiety).
‡Absolute susceptibility was examined by asking how likely the survey participant thought it was that he or she would contract influenza A(H7N9) during the next month; relative susceptibility was examined by asking how likely the survey participant thought it was that he or she would contract influenza A(H7N9) during the next month compared with persons outside his or her family with similar age. Answers were given on a 7-point scale and measured as proportion of respondents whose answer was likely, very likely, or certain.
§Perceived severity was examined by asking respondents how the severity of influenza A(H7N9) compared with that of seasonal influenza, SARS, and influenza A(H5N1). Answers were given on a 5-point scale and measured as proportion of respondents whose answer was either a bit higher or much higher.
¶Perceived anxiety level if respondent were to experience onset of influenza-like symptoms in the next day. Answers were given on a 7-point scale and measured as proportion of respondents whose answer was worried more than normal, worried much more than normal, or extremely worried.
We used multivariable logistic regression to examine factors associated with avoiding LPMs or supporting closure of LPMs (Table 2) and found that more symptom-induced worry and higher perceived severity compared with seasonal influenza were associated with avoiding visiting LPMs. Younger age, lower educational attainment, and having visited LPMs >1 time in the preceding year were independently associated with a lower probability of support for permanent LPM closures.

Conclusions

Results from previous studies and our surveys indicate that exposure to poultry measured by LPM visits among the Hong Kong population has declined since 2006 (7) and is lower than that for cities in southern China (9–11). Contact with live poultry or visiting LPMs was reported by most persons with confirmed influenza A(H7N9) in China (2). Four recently reported influenza A(H7N9) cases in Hong Kong were suspected to be imported; all 4 patients reported travel to Shenzhen, the city bordering Hong Kong, which reported 17 new cases during January 1–February 9, 2014. One of the patients in Hong Kong bought live poultry from an LPM in Shenzhen, where 2 LPMs subsequently yielded environmental specimens testing positive for influenza A(H7N9) virus (12).

We previously reported that LPM closure substantially reduced the risk for human infection with influenza A(H7N9) virus in mainland China (3). Control measures in LPMs in Hong Kong have become increasingly stringent during the past decade, and the current policy banning any overnight stay of live poultry in LPMs has substantially decreased avian influenza virus prevalence among poultry (13). This policy might also contribute to the low perceived risk for infection and low levels of symptom-induced worry observed in this study (Table 1).

Our study has limitations. Because participants were recruited on the basis of randomly selected telephone numbers, respondents might not represent the general population in Hong Kong, despite weighting of the sample by age and sex. Responses in the survey were self-reported and might be subject to response biases, including social desirability bias. We also used contact history in the previous year to measure respondents’ live poultry exposure, which could be subject to recall bias.

In conclusion, our survey found generally low anxiety levels among the population in Hong Kong related to the threat of influenza A(H7N9). A higher level of symptom-induced worry and higher perceived severity of influenza A(H7N9) compared with seasonal influenza were associated with avoidance of LPMs. Permanent closure of LPMs is being considered in Hong Kong, but our results suggest that obtaining support from the public might be difficult, particularly among younger adults and adults with lower educational attainment.
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Table 2. Factors affecting behavioral response to influenza A(H7N9) and support for permanent closure of LPMs in Hong Kong, 2013

| Characteristic                              | Avoided visiting LPMs in previous 7 d because of influenza A(H7N9) | Would support permanent closure of LPMs |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| **Sex**                                     |                                                                     |                                        |
| M                                           | Reference                                                           | Reference                              |
| F                                           | 1.07 (0.75–1.53)                                                   | 1.22 (0.92–1.63)                       |
| **Age, y**                                  |                                                                     |                                        |
| 18–34                                       | Reference                                                           | Reference                              |
| 35–54                                       | 0.89 (0.55–1.46)                                                   | 2.28 (1.53–3.40)                       |
| ≥55                                         | 0.81 (0.48–1.36)                                                   | 2.87 (1.86–4.45)                       |
| **Educational attainment**                  |                                                                     |                                        |
| Primary or below                            | Reference                                                           | Reference                              |
| Secondary                                   | 1.63 (0.92–2.89)                                                   | 1.76 (1.17–2.65)                       |
| University or above                         | 1.65 (0.88–3.09)                                                   | 2.99 (1.88–4.76)                       |
| **Visited LPM >1 time in previous year**    |                                                                     |                                        |
| No                                          | Reference                                                           | Reference                              |
| Yes                                         | 1.15 (0.78–1.68)                                                   | 0.60 (0.44–0.83)                       |
| **Median State Trait Anxiety score (5)**    |                                                                     |                                        |
| <1.7                                        | Reference                                                           | Reference                              |
| >1.7                                        | 1.03 (0.72–1.46)                                                   | 0.95 (0.72–1.25)                       |
| **Self-perceived risk for infection with influenza A(H7N9)**† | | | |
| Low                                         | Reference                                                           | Reference                              |
| Evens                                       | 0.68 (0.42–1.11)                                                   | 0.95 (0.64–1.42)                       |
| High                                        | 0.95 (0.49–1.84)                                                   | 1.51 (0.87–2.63)                       |
| **Self-perceived risk for infection with influenza A(H7N9) compared with other persons‡** | | | |
| Low                                         | 1.22 (0.74–1.99)                                                   | 0.93 (0.62–1.38)                       |
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| **Symptom-induced worry§**                  |                                                                     |                                        |
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| As usual                                    | Reference                                                           | Reference                              |
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| **Perceived severity compared with seasonal influenza¶** | | | |
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*Odds ratios adjusted for all variables shown. LPMs, live poultry markets; SARS, severe acute respiratory syndrome.
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‡Respondents were asked, “How likely do you think it is that you will contract H7N9 avian flu over the next 1 month?” Low indicates the answers Never/Very unlikely/Unlikely; medium, the answer Same (50% probability); and high, the answers Likely/Very likely/Certain.
§Respondents were asked, “If you were to develop flu-like symptoms tomorrow, would you be...?” followed by several choices. Low indicates the answers Not at all/Much less/Less; evens, the answer Same (50% probability); and high, the answers Consider/Certain or More/Much more/Certain.
¶Respondents were asked, “What do you think your chances of getting H7N9 avian flu over the next 1 month compared to other people outside your family of a similar age?” Low indicates the answers Not at all/Much less/Less; evens, the answer Same (50% probability); and high, the answers Consider/Certain or More/Much more/Certain.
¶¶Respondents were asked, “What do you think is the severity of infection with H7N9 avian influenza compared to seasonal influenza, SARS, or H5N1 avian influenza?” Low indicates the answers Not at all/Much less/Less; evens, the answer Same (50% probability); and high, the answers Consider/Certain or More/Much more/Certain.
¶¶¶Respondents were asked, “How likely do you think it is that you will contract H7N9 avian flu over the next 1 month?” Low indicates the answers Never/Very unlikely/Unlikely; medium, the answer Same (50% probability); and high, the answers Likely/Very likely/Certain.

3. Yu H, Wu JT, Cowling BJ, Liao Q, Fang VJ, Zhou S, et al. Effect of closure of live poultry markets on poultry-to-person transmission of avian influenza A H7N9 virus: an ecological study. Lancet. 2014;383:541–8. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61904-2
4. Uyeki TM, Cox NJ. Global concerns regarding novel influenza A (H7N9) virus infections. N Engl J Med. 2013;368:1862–4. http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1304661
5. Leung GM, Ho L-M, Chan SK, Ho S-Y, Bacon-Shone J, Choy RY, et al. Longitudinal assessment of community psychobehavioral responses during and after the 2003 outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. Clin Infect Dis. 2005;40:1713–20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/429923
6. Cowling BJ, Ng DM, Ip DK, Liao Q, Lam WW, Wu JT, et al. Community psychological and behavioral responses through the first wave of the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic in Hong Kong. J Infect Dis. 2010;202:867–76. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/655811
7. Liao Q, Cowling BJ, Lam WT, Fielding R. Changing perception of avian influenza risk, Hong Kong, 2006–2010. Emerg Infect Dis. 2011;17:2379–80. http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid1712.110298
8. Kish L. A procedure for objective respondent selection within the household. J Am Stat Assoc. 1949;44:380–7. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1949.10483314
9. Cowling BJ, Freeman G, Wong JY, Wu P, Liao Q, Lau EH, et al. Preliminary inferences on the age-specific seriousness of human A (H7N9) virus infections. N Engl J Med. 2013;368:1862–4. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/655811
disease caused by avian influenza A(H7N9) infections in China, March to April 2013. Euro Surveill. 2013;18:20475.

10. Liao Q, Lam WT, Leung GM, Jiang C, Fielding R. Live poultry exposure, Guangzhou, China, 2006. Epidemics. 2009;1:207–12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2009.09.002

11. Liao Q, Lam WW, Jiang CQ, Ho EY, Liu YM, Zhang WS, et al. Avian influenza risk perception and live poultry purchase in Guangzhou, China, 2006. Risk Anal. 2009;29:416–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2008.01157.x

12. Centre for Health Protection, Department of Health of the Government of Hong Kong. CHP’s response to media enquiries on notification from Guangdong HFPC. 2013 Dec 11 [cited 2013 Dec 16]. http://www.chp.gov.hk/en/content/116/32546.html

13. Leung YH, Lau EH, Zhang LJ, Guan Y, Cowling BJ, Peiris JS. Avian influenza and ban on overnight poultry storage in live poultry markets, Hong Kong. Emerg Infect Dis. 2012;18:1339–41. http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid1808.111879

Address for correspondence: Benjamin J. Cowling, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, 21 Sassoon Road, Pokfulam, Hong Kong; email: bcowling@hku.hk
Responses to Threat of Influenza A(H7N9) and Support for Live Poultry Markets, Hong Kong, 2013

Technical Appendix

Technical Appendix Table. Characteristics of persons surveyed during influenza A(H7N9) epidemic, Hong Kong, April and December 2013

| Characteristic                  | First survey, April 10–13 and 25–27, 2013 (n = 1,556) | Second survey, December 4–8, 2013 (n = 1,000) |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Sex                            |                                                       |                                                 |
| F                              | 62.8%                                                 | 62.6%                                           |
| M                              | 37.2%                                                 | 37.4%                                           |
| Age group, y                   |                                                       |                                                 |
| 18–34                          | 25.4%                                                 | 24.2%                                           |
| 35–64                          | 36.5%                                                 | 33.1%                                           |
| >65                            | 38.1%                                                 | 42.7%                                           |
| Education*                     |                                                       |                                                 |
| Primary or below               | 13.9%                                                 | 15.1%                                           |
| Secondary                      | 48.5%                                                 | 44.8%                                           |
| Tertiary or above              | 37.5%                                                 | 40.1%                                           |
| Place of birth*                |                                                       |                                                 |
| Hong Kong                      | 69.0%                                                 | 67.6%                                           |
| Other places                   | 31.0%                                                 | 32.4%                                           |
| Marital status*                |                                                       |                                                 |
| Single                         | 28.9%                                                 | 27.6%                                           |
| Married/formerly married       | 71.1%                                                 | 72.4%                                           |
| Monthly household income, HK$*†|                                                       |                                                 |
| <$10,000                       | 11.7%                                                 | 12.5%                                           |
| $10,000–$20,000                | 23.4%                                                 | 22.0%                                           |
| $20,000–$40,000                | 38.1%                                                 | 35.0%                                           |
| ≥$40,000                       | 26.8%                                                 | 30.6%                                           |

*Proportions for these demographic variables were weighted by age and sex.
†US$1 = HK$7.8