

1 Food Insecurity During the First Year of COVID-19:

2 An Analysis of Employment and Sociodemographic Factors Among a Longitudinal Cohort

3 (CHASING COVID)

4
5
6 Authors:

7 Yvette Ng, MS¹, Mindy Chang, DVM, MPH², McKaylee Robertson, PhD², Christian Grov, PhD^{2,3},
8 Andrew Maroko, PhD^{2,4}, Rebecca Zimba, MHS², Drew Westmoreland, PhD², Madhura Rane, PhD²,
9 Chloe Mirzayi, PhD^{2,5}, Angela M. Parcesepe, PhD^{2,6,7}, Sarah Kulkarni, MPH², William Salgado-You,
10 MSPH², Nevin Cohen, PhD¹, Denis Nash, PhD^{2,5}

11
12 ¹Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, Urban Food Policy Institute, City University of
13 New York, New York, NY USA

14 ²Institute for Implementation Science in Population Health (ISPH), City University of New York, New
15 York, NY, USA

16 ³Department of Community Health and Social Sciences, Graduate School of Public Health and Health
17 Policy, City University of New York, New York, NY USA

18 ⁴Department of Environmental, Occupational, and Geospatial Health Sciences, Graduate School of
19 Public Health and Health Policy, City University of New York, New York, NY USA

20 ⁵Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy,
21 City University of New York, New York, NY USA

22 ⁶Gillings School of Public Health, University of North Carolina, 427 Rosenau Hall, CB, #7445, Chapel
23 Hill, NC 27599-7445, USA

24 ⁷Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

25 Corresponding author:

26 Yvette Ng, MS

27 Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy, Urban Food Policy Institute, City University of
28 New York, New York, NY USA

29 55 W 125th Street, New York City, NY, 10027, United States

30 (201) 240-7438

31 Yvetteng80@sphmail.cuny.edu

32
33
34 Keywords: COVID-19, food security, racial disparities, ethnic disparities, employment

35 Total word count: 2996

36 2 tables, 3 figures

37 Appendix: 2 tables

38

39 **Abstract**

40 **Objectives**

41 While much has been reported about the impact of COVID-19 on U.S. food insecurity, longitudinal data
42 and the variability experienced by people working in different industries are limited. This study aims to
43 further characterize individuals experiencing food insecurity during the pandemic in terms of
44 employment and sociodemographic characteristics and degree of food insecurity.

45 **Methods**

46 The study sample consisted of people enrolled in a U.S. prospective cohort study (CHASING COVID)
47 who completed all food insecurity questionnaires from Visit 1 (April-July 2020) through Visit 7 (May-
48 June 2021). Descriptive statistics and logistic regression models were used to determine employment
49 and sociodemographic correlates of food insecurity (using a screening question from the USDA
50 HFSS). Patterns of food insecurity and utilization of food benefit programs were also examined.

51 **Results**

52 Thirty-one percent (1251/4019) of the sample were food insecure. Black and Hispanic respondents,
53 households with children, and those with lower income and education levels had a higher odds of food
54 insecurity. People employed in construction, leisure/hospitality and trade/transportation industries had
55 the highest burden of both food insecurity and income loss. Among those reporting food insecurity,
56 40% were persistently food insecure (≥ 4 consecutive visits), and 46% did not utilize any food benefit
57 programs.

58 **Conclusions**

59 The pandemic resulted in widespread food insecurity in our cohort, much of which was persistent. In
60 addition to addressing sociodemographic disparities, future policies should focus on the needs of those
61 working in vulnerable industries and ensure those experiencing food insecurity can easily participate in
62 food benefit programs for which they are eligible.

63

64 **Introduction**

65 Much research has been published which indicates that food insecurity rose in 2020 due to the
66 widespread economic disruption during the COVID-19 pandemic.¹⁻⁷ In contrast, the reported percentage
67 of U.S. households experiencing food insecurity in 2020, as defined by the Household Food Security
68 Survey (HFSS) data from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) was 10.5%, which is
69 unchanged from 2019.⁸ Examining the USDA data by race/ethnicity, the percentage food insecure
70 decreased for White non-Hispanic households, while it increased for Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic
71 households from 2019 to 2020. This had the effect of maintaining the overall food insecurity rate at
72 10.5%, while widening the difference between Black non-Hispanic and White households, where Black
73 non-Hispanic household experienced food insecurity at approximately three times the rate of White
74 households in 2020. This widening disparity has been observed in other studies.^{1, 9-13}

75 The federal government passed legislation including the Families First Coronavirus Response Act
76 (FFCRA) and the Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security Act (CARES) in March 2020 to help
77 provide economic relief by increasing unemployment benefits, providing direct payments (“stimulus
78 checks”) to eligible individuals, and increasing support for child nutrition programs and the
79 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).^{14,15} Given the widening racial/ethnic disparities,
80 not everyone may have benefited equally from this additional legislation. It is critical to further
81 understand and characterize the experience of those facing food insecurity during the pandemic to
82 address their needs more effectively and to implement policy that can better serve individuals who are
83 most in need in future crises.

84 Public health measures enacted to prevent spread of COVID-19 had a huge impact on businesses and
85 employment, resulting in job losses or decreased income.¹⁶⁻²⁰ The leisure/hospitality sector accounted
86 for 39% of all job losses from February to April 2020 due to business closures required by COVID
87 mitigation policies. Although this industry has recovered to some extent, there were 1.7 million fewer
88 jobs in July 2021 compared to January 2020.¹⁸ U.S. households continue to experience economic
89 hardship and income loss due to unemployment across many industries. Data are limited on the
90 longitudinal view of how and among whom the rates of food insecurity changed over the course of the
91 first year of the COVID pandemic, and how people were faring at the end of the first pandemic year.
92 Given the limited longitudinal data, we lack a clear understanding of whether people who experienced
93 food insecurity during the COVID pandemic experienced temporary or more persistent food insecurity
94 throughout the year and to what extent those who are food insecure utilized food support programs. The

95 objective of this study was to characterize the level of food insecurity and participants who experienced
96 food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S. This study adds to the literature by
97 examining occupational data, income loss, and patterns of food insecurity in a large, diverse U.S. cohort
98 over a time span of approximately one year.

99

100 **Methods**

101 This study utilized data from the CHASING COVID Cohort study, a prospective U.S. national study of
102 6,740 adults (18 years of age or older). Online recruitment began in March 2020, and once enrolled,
103 study participants completed online questionnaires (a “visit”) every one to three months. Additional
104 details on eligibility and enrollment have been previously described.²¹ The analytic population was
105 restricted to the N=4,019 participants who had completed all food security questions though the first
106 year of the pandemic, from Visit 1 (V1, April-July 2020) through Visit 7 (V7, May-June 2021).

107

108 Study Variables

109

110 *Food insecurity*

111 The following question from the USDA’s HFSS was asked at each visit beginning with Visit 1 using a
112 30-day reference period: *The food that we bought just didn’t last, and we didn’t have money to get more*
113 (response options: ‘often true,’ ‘sometimes true,’ or ‘never true’). An affirmative answer (‘often true’ or
114 ‘sometimes true’) is an appropriate screen for food insecurity as detailed in prior
115 literature.²² Participants were dichotomized into two categories: food insecure (response of ‘often true’
116 or ‘sometimes true’ at any visit, V1-V7), or food secure (response of ‘never true’ at every visit, V1-V7).

117

118 *Food insecurity patterns*

119 To understand patterns of food insecurity, the following three patterns were examined: 1) the number of
120 assessments (out of 7 total) in which each participant reported being food insecure, 2) newly food
121 insecure (participants reporting food insecurity for the first time during the study), and 3) persistent or
122 temporary food insecurity. A participant was considered temporarily food insecure if they reported food
123 insecurity in 3 or fewer consecutive visits and considered persistently food insecure if they reported food
124 insecurity in 4 or more consecutive visits. These cutoffs were based on the median number of visits
125 participants in the food insecure group experienced food insecurity.

126 *Food support programs*

127 To understand to what extent participants were using various food support programs, the following
128 question was included at Visit 6 : *Since the pandemic began, have you used any of the following?*
129 (response options: ‘food pantry,’ ‘soup kitchen,’ ‘SNAP,’ ‘Pandemic EBT,’ ‘emergency food support,’
130 ‘Other food support not listed above,’ ‘none’). Multiple responses were permitted. SNAP refers to the
131 federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and Pandemic EBT (P-EBT) refers to the federal
132 program implemented in response to the pandemic which provided funds to children who would
133 normally receive free or reduced meals in schools.

134

135 *Income loss*

136 Participants were asked at each visit beginning with Visit 1: *In the past month, have you experienced a*
137 *significant personal loss of income as a result of the new coronavirus?* (response options: ‘Yes,’ ‘No,’
138 or ‘NA’). Respondents were considered to have ever experienced income loss if they responded yes at
139 any visit to this question.

140

141 *Occupation / Industry*

142 Occupational data were collected at Visit 6. Respondents were asked to select one occupation from a
143 list of 30+ choices that best described their job. These choices were largely based on the North
144 American Industry Classification System (NAICS) used in the Census. These occupations were then
145 categorized into one of the eleven NAICS Supersectors, hereafter referred to as the industry variable.²³

146

147 *Sociodemographic Variables*

148 Participants reported other sociodemographic variables (age and gender) at Visit 1.

149

150 Statistical analysis

151 Descriptive statistics were generated to examine the relationship between food security status groups
152 (main outcome of interest) and sociodemographic variables (age, gender, race/ethnicity, education,
153 employment, and income), presence of children in the household, region of residence (grouped into 4
154 regions as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau,²⁴ and a 5th region for U.S. territories), if area of residence
155 is rural, urban or suburban, and reported income loss. Differences between the groups across variables of
156 interest were assessed using chi-squared tests and post hoc analyses for significant chi-square values
157 were carried out by calculating the significant adjusted residuals. To identify correlates of food
158 insecurity, we ran a logistic regression model with the following independent variables:
159 sociodemographics, presence of children in household, region of residence, rural/urban residence, and

160 income loss. Variables found to be significant in these individual models were included in the final
161 adjusted model. Differences in sociodemographic variables between the study cohort and the full
162 CHASING COVID cohort were assessed using chi-squared tests and estimates from univariate and
163 adjusted logistic regression models were compared qualitatively. The burden of food insecurity in the
164 study cohort was further characterized by calculating per visit percent reporting food insecurity, percent
165 newly reporting food insecurity and persistence of food insecurity. We used a scatter plot to display the
166 percentage food insecure (Y) and percentage with any income loss (X) by industry type. Any p-value of
167 < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) was used for
168 all analyses.

169

170 **Results**

171 Cohort characteristics

172 Overall, 4,019 (60% of N=6740 enrolled into longitudinal follow-up) study participants completed the
173 food insecurity question at each visit and were included in this analysis. Participants were enrolled from
174 all 50 states, with 64.8% identifying as non-Hispanic White, 15.3% Hispanic, 9.4% non-Hispanic Black,
175 7.5% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 3.0% Other. 52.6% of participants identified as female, 44.7% male,
176 and 2.8% non-binary. The majority of participants did not have children in the household (71.1%), were
177 college graduates (65.9%), and were employed (62.4%). Descriptive statistics are presented in Table
178 1. Differences between the full CHASING COVID cohort and the study cohort are noted in Appendix
179 A.

180 Characteristics of People Experiencing Food Insecurity

181 In total, 31.3% of the cohort responded at least once during the study that the food they bought just
182 didn't last and they didn't have money to get more, and are thus categorized as food insecure. Food
183 insecurity varied widely based on race and ethnicity, with 57% of Black respondents and 49% of
184 Hispanic respondents being food insecure compared to 27% of Asian/Pacific Islanders and 23% of
185 White respondents. Food insecurity was more common among 18-29 year-olds, those with less than a
186 high school education, income less than \$35,000/year, and those reporting being out of work or being
187 homemakers. Prevalence of food insecurity varied by region, with 40% seen in the South and 23% seen
188 in the Northeast. The majority of those who were food insecure also reported having experienced a
189 significant income loss as a result of the pandemic (69.9%).

190 Table 2 presents results from the crude and adjusted logistic regression models examining the
191 relationship of food insecurity and various sociodemographic characteristics. In the adjusted model,
192 Black (aOR=2.61, 95% CI 1.99-3.42) and Hispanic (aOR=1.93, 95% CI 1.56-2.41) participants had
193 approximately two-fold increased odds of being food insecure compared to White
194 participants. Households with children had 2.3 times (95% CI 1.95, 2.84) the odds of being food
195 insecure compared to those without children. Those residing in areas considered rural had 1.22 times
196 the odds (95% CI 1.00, 1.50) of being food insecure compared to those residing in urban areas. Those
197 reporting significant income loss had 3.8 times the odds (95% CI 3.21, 4.52) of being food insecure
198 compared to those who did not report income loss. The odds of experiencing food insecurity decreased
199 with increasing age and education level. The estimates from the study cohort are directionally similar to
200 the estimates from the full CHASING COVID cohort (Appendix B).

201 Patterns of Food Insecurity

202 Although approximately one-third of participants reported being food insecure at any time during the
203 first year of the pandemic, the percentage food insecure at any given visit was 15-19%, with the highest
204 percentage observed at Visit 1 and declining after Visit 3 (Figure 1). Participants who experienced food
205 insecurity did so at a median of 4 visits (IQR: 1,6), with 23% of the food insecure group reporting being
206 food insecure at all 7 visits. Among participants who experienced food insecurity, 40% were
207 persistently food insecure and 60% were temporarily food insecure. At all visits, there were participants
208 considered newly food insecure.

209 Food Insecurity, Income Loss, and Industry/Occupation

210 As shown in Figure 2a, the percentage food insecure increased with percentage of any income loss due
211 to the pandemic by industry type. Participants working in the construction, leisure/hospitality and
212 trade/transportation industries had the highest percentages of persistent (29%, 19% and 19%
213 respectively) and temporary food insecurity (25%, 25% and 24% respectively), whereas those in
214 government had the lowest percentages (1% and 14% for persistent and temporary food insecurity
215 respectively) (Figure 2b). Across all industries, 73-100% of those who reported persistent food
216 insecurity and 48-84% of those who reported temporary food insecurity reported income loss at any
217 visit.

218 Use of Food Support Programs

219 To address their food needs, 75% of participants in the persistently food insecure group, 40% in the
220 temporarily food insecure group, and 9% in the food secure group indicated using some form of food

221 support program (Figure 3). The most common programs used were SNAP and food pantries, with
222 those who were persistently food insecure reporting greater use of all food support programs.

223 **Discussion**

224 This study adds new evidence to the literature on COVID's impact on food insecurity by reporting not
225 just overall prevalence of food insecurity but illuminating the extent to which people suffered from food
226 insecurity. Almost one-third of our cohort was food insecure during the first year of the pandemic,
227 consistent with existing reports indicating widespread food insecurity^{3,5,25-26}. What is notable from our
228 longitudinal data is that 40% of those reporting food insecurity were persistently food insecure,
229 indicating that for many people, there were prolonged difficulties in obtaining sufficient food and
230 nutrition. In addition, this study shows that food insecurity was strongly related to income loss
231 experienced as a result of the pandemic, and that there was wide variability seen across different
232 industries.

233 Industries in which employees are not able to work remotely and not designated essential (construction,
234 leisure/hospitality and trade/transportation) had the highest percentages of food insecurity.
235 Unsurprisingly, sectors where participants had high percentages food insecurity also had high
236 percentage with any income loss due to the pandemic, as seen in several other studies.^{4,26,30-31} Many
237 occupations within these industries commonly have lower wages and minimal or no benefits such as
238 sick leave and health care, further compounding the impact of the pandemic. A study based on the
239 Census Household Pulse Survey found an inverse relationship between pre-pandemic income levels and
240 financial hardship during the pandemic, which disproportionately affected Black and Hispanic
241 Americans.²⁷ The higher financial hardship seen among this population was associated with a greater
242 risk of food insufficiency. Consistent with other research,^{2,4,5,11,13,19,27-29} our study showed that food
243 insecurity during the pandemic disproportionately affected Black and Hispanic individuals/households,
244 with approximately half of all Black and Hispanic participants reporting food insecurity (compared to
245 31% overall). Our data also indicated that Black and Hispanic respondents within the most affected
246 industries tended to have lower incomes (as reported in Visit 1) than White respondents, which
247 combined with lost income during the pandemic may have exacerbated the disparity.

248 To address food insecurity resulting from the pandemic, federal legislation like the FFCRA and the
249 CARES Act expanded government support programs like SNAP (via expanded eligibility and increased
250 benefits), implemented P-EBT, and provided funding for states to better support local food pantries.
251 Among our cohort, a quarter of those who were persistently food insecure and more than half of those

252 who were temporarily food insecure did not utilize any of these programs to alleviate their food
253 insecurity, while only 43% of those persistently food insecure and 24% of those temporarily food
254 insecure used SNAP. A study of Latino college students who became food insecure during the
255 pandemic highlighted that a key barrier to food support programs was that they may not have met
256 eligibility criteria or did not know how to access the resources.³² Studies conducted during the pandemic
257 showing that less than half of those who lost employment income applied for unemployment benefits²⁷
258 and that increases in food insecurity were not accompanied by similar increases in SNAP participation,⁵
259 suggesting that barriers to food assistance exist for those who are food insecure. Similarly, the level of
260 assistance may not be adequate to prevent food insecurity. Forty percent of those in our study reporting
261 participation in SNAP were persistently food insecure. Our data show participants experiencing food
262 insecurity for the first time one year into the pandemic, indicating that current methods of addressing
263 food insecurity are not sufficient and/or the impacts of the pandemic may not be felt by all immediately.
264 The re-evaluation of the Thrifty Food Plan in August 2021, which increased monthly SNAP benefits an
265 average of 21%, is a step in the right direction, but it is largely offset by the expiration of other benefit
266 increases implemented during the pandemic.³³ Further analyses using this dataset are planned to
267 examine how availability and timing of various benefits (e.g., unemployment insurance, regional
268 differences in policies) impacted food insecurity.

269 Our study has several limitations. Information collected to assess food insecurity did not consist of the
270 fully validated USDA HFSS (6 or 18 question version), thus our data cannot be directly compared. A
271 single question from the HFSS was used as a proxy to determine food insecurity as a binary variable,
272 and USDA-defined levels of food insecurity (i.e., low, very low) could not be calculated. We did not
273 collect information on food insecurity status prior to the start of the pandemic, therefore, we cannot
274 assess if or by how much food insecurity changed as a result of the pandemic. We restricted our study to
275 the 4,019 participants who completed the question at each visit as opposed to the 6,740 who completed
276 the question at 1 or more visits, which could be a source of selection bias, but regression models using
277 both groups produced similar findings. Finally, our approach to identifying correlates of food insecurity
278 was based on a predictive model that includes all significant variables. The model identifies correlates
279 and should not be used to inform causal inference. However, we believe the results of this descriptive
280 study are useful for hypothesis generation. Strengths of our study include the composition of our study
281 sample, from a large U.S. cohort (>4000 respondents) that is diverse among a variety of characteristics
282 (race, age, geographic location). This study includes participants followed longitudinally for over one
283 year over the course of the pandemic, with data captured at seven time points.

284 **Conclusions**

285 Our study showed that a large proportion of people experiencing food insecurity during the first year of
286 the pandemic did so on a persistent basis, and that certain populations, such as those working in
287 vulnerable industries and those who experienced income loss, were much more likely to report food
288 insecurity. In addition, a quarter of those who experienced persistent food insecurity did not seek
289 assistance from either government or emergency food programs. The results illustrate the importance of
290 targeted policies that help workers in industries most affected by pandemic-related income loss. It is
291 also critical to publicize the availability of such assistance and make it easily accessible to those for
292 whom it is intended. Policies and programs should focus on outreach to communities to ensure people
293 are aware of the benefits for which they are eligible and entitled. Government agencies, working with
294 community organizations as applicable, should minimize administrative and logistical burdens wherever
295 possible to facilitate enrollment.

296

297 References

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

1. Food Research & Action Center. FRAC ResearchWire. In: FRAC, ed. Vol April2021.
2. Schanzenbach DW, Pitts A. How much has food insecurity risen? Evidence from the Census Household Pulse Survey. 2020.
3. Harper K, Acciai F, Josephson A, et al. Experiences of households with new and persistent food insecurity during the first four months of the COVID-19 pandemic. National Food Access and COVID Research Team;2020.
4. Clay LA, Rogus S. Food Access Worries, Food Assistance Use, Purchasing Behavior, and Food Insecurity Among New Yorkers During COVID-19. *Front Nutr.* 2021;8:647365.
5. Ohri-Vachaspati P, Acciai F, DeWeese RS. SNAP participation among low-income US households stays stagnant while food insecurity escalates in the months following the COVID-19 pandemic. *Prev Med Rep.* 2021;24:101555.
6. Owens MR, Brito-Silva F, Kirkland T, et al. Prevalence and Social Determinants of Food Insecurity among College Students during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Nutrients.* 2020;12(9).
7. Siddiqi S. SNAP Participants and High Levels of Food Insecurity in the Early Stages of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Public Health Reports.* 2021.
8. Coleman-Jensen A, Rabbitt M, Gregory C, Singh A. *Household food security in the United States in 2020.* US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service;2021.
9. Rachidi A. *Food insufficiency during the pandemic.* American Enterprise Institute; August 2020.
10. Dubowitz T, Dastidar MG, Troxel WM, et al. Food Insecurity in a Low-Income, Predominantly African American Cohort Following the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Am J Public Health.* 2021;111(3):494-497.
11. Janda KM, Ranjit N, Salvo D, et al. Correlates of Transitions in Food Insecurity Status during the Early Stages of the COVID-19 Pandemic among Ethnically Diverse Households in Central Texas. *Nutrients.* 2021;13(8).
12. Kimani ME, Sarr M, Cuffee Y, Liu C, Webster NS. Associations of Race/Ethnicity and Food Insecurity With COVID-19 Infection Rates Across US Counties. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021;4(6):e2112852.
13. Lauren BN, Silver ER, Faye AS, et al. Predictors of households at risk for food insecurity in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Public Health Nutr.* 2021;24(12):3929-3936.
14. H.R.6201 - Families First Coronavirus Response Act (2020). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/6201/text>
15. H.R.748 - CARES Act (2020). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/748>
16. Terrel K. 8 occupations hit hardest by the pandemic in 2020. *AARP.* January 11, 2021. <https://www.aarp.org/work/job-search/info-2020/job-losses-during-covid.html>
17. Supplemental data measuring the effects of the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic on the labor market. 2020. <https://www.bls.gov/cps/effects-of-the-coronavirus-covid-19-pandemic.htm>.
18. Falk G, Romero PD, Nicchitta IA, Nyhof EC. *Unemployment Rates During the COVID-19 Pandemic.* Congressional Research Service;2021.
19. Clay LA, Rogus S. Impact of Employment, Essential Work, and Risk Factors on Food Access during the COVID-19 Pandemic in New York State. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.*

- 344 20. Niles MT, Bertmann F, Belarmino EH, Wentworth T, Biehl E, Neff R. The Early Food
345 Insecurity Impacts of COVID-19. *Nutrients*. 2020;12(7).
- 346 21. Robertson MM, Kulkarni SG, Rane M, et al. Cohort profile: a national, community-based
347 prospective cohort study of SARS-CoV-2 pandemic outcomes in the USA-the CHASING
348 COVID Cohort study. *BMJ open*. 2021;11(9):e048778.
- 349 22. Hager ER, Quigg AM, Black MM, Coleman SM, Heeren T, Rose-Jacobs R, et al.
350 Development and validity of a 2-item screen to identify families at risk for food insecurity.
351 *Pediatrics*. 2010;126(1):e26-32.
- 352 23. State and Metro Area Employment, Hours, & Earnings / NAICS Supersectors: U.S Bureau of
353 Labor Statistics; [updated September 3, 2002. Available from:
354 <https://www.bls.gov/sae/additional-resources/naics-supersectors-for-ces-program.htm>.
- 355 24. U.S Census. Census regions and divisions of the United
356 States. https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/maps/reference/us_regdiv.pdf, 2021.
- 357 25. Adams EL, Caccavale LJ, Smith D, Bean MK. Longitudinal patterns of food insecurity, the
358 home food environment, and parent feeding practices during COVID-19. *Obes Sci Pract*.
359 2021.
- 360 26. Niles MT, Beavers AW, Clay LA, et al. A Multi-Site Analysis of the Prevalence of Food
361 Insecurity in the United States, before and during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Current*
362 *developments in nutrition*. 2021;5(12):nzab135.
- 363 27. Kim D. Financial hardship and social assistance as determinants of mental health and food
364 and housing insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States. *SSM -*
365 *population health*. 2021;16:100862.
- 366 28. Altman CE, Dondero M, Heflin CM, Nusbaum D. Current and Future Food Insufficiency
367 During Covid-19: Examining Disparities by Race/Ethnicity and Recent Work Loss. *J Racial*
368 *Ethn Health Disparities*. 2021.
- 369 29. Morales DX, Morales SA, Beltran TF. Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Household Food
370 Insecurity During the COVID-19 Pandemic: a Nationally Representative Study. *J Racial*
371 *Ethn Health Disparities*. 2021;8(5):1300-1314.
- 372 30. Reimold AE, Grummon AH, Taillie LS, Brewer NT, Rimm EB, Hall MG. Barriers and
373 facilitators to achieving food security during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Prev Med Rep*.
374 2021;23:101500.
- 375 31. Fang D, Thomsen MR, Nayga RM, Jr., Yang W. Food insecurity during the COVID-19
376 pandemic: evidence from a survey of low-income Americans. *Food security*. 2021:1-19.
- 377 32. Manboard M, Johnson CM, Thornton H, Biediger-Friedman L. The HOME Study:
378 Understanding How College Students at a Hispanic Serving Institution Coped with Food
379 Insecurity in a Pandemic. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(21).
- 380 33. USDA Modernizes the Thrifty Food Plan, Updates SNAP Benefits: U.S. Department of
381 Agriculture; 2021 [updated August 16, 2021. Available from:
382 <https://www.fns.usda.gov/news-item/usda-0179.21>.
- 383
384

385 Table 1. Baseline demographics of overall cohort and those who are food secure and food insecure

| | Food insecure, No. (%) | Food secure, No. (%) | Total, No. (%) | P value (chi sq) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Total | 1251 (31.13) | 2768 (68.87) | 4019 (100.00) | |
| Age group | | | | |
| 18-29 | 316 (25.26) | 501 (18.10) | 817 (20.33) | <0.001 |
| 30-39 | 427 (34.13) | 737 (26.63) | 1164 (28.96) | |
| 40-49 | 262 (20.94) | 484 (17.49) | 746 (18.56) | |
| 50-59 | 140 (11.19) | 423 (15.28) | 563 (14.01) | |
| 60+ | 106 (8.47) | 623 (22.51) | 729 (18.14) | |
| Gender | | | | |
| Male | 538 (43.01) | 1257 (45.41) | 1795 (44.66) | 0.31 |
| Female | 680 (54.36) | 1433 (51.77) | 2113 (52.58) | |
| Non-binary | 33 (2.64) | 78 (2.82) | 111 (2.76) | |
| Race | | | | |
| Hispanic | 299 (23.90) | 314 (11.34) | 613 (15.25) | <0.001 |
| Black Non-Hispanic | 216 (17.27) | 161 (5.82) | 377 (9.38) | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander Non-Hispanic | 80 (6.39) | 221 (7.98) | 301 (7.49) | |
| White Non-Hispanic | 592 (47.32) | 2014 (72.76) | 2606 (64.84) | |
| Other Non-Hispanic | 64 (5.12) | 58 (2.10) | 122 (3.04) | |
| Children in household | | | | |
| No | 716 (57.23) | 2183 (77.42) | 2859 (71.14) | <0.001 |
| Yes | 535 (42.77) | 625 (22.58) | 1160 (28.86) | |
| Education level | | | | |
| Less than HS | 46 (3.68) | 9 (0.33) | 55 (1.37) | <0.001 |
| HS | 200 (15.99) | 137 (4.95) | 337 (8.39) | |
| Some college | 442 (35.33) | 535 (19.33) | 977 (24.31) | |
| College grad | 563 (45.00) | 2087 (75.40) | 2650 (65.94) | |
| Employment status | | | | |
| Employed | 730 (58.35) | 1776 (64.16) | 2506 (62.35) | <0.001 |
| Out of work | 238 (19.02) | 255 (9.21) | 493 (12.27) | |
| Homemaker | 112 (8.95) | 109 (3.94) | 221 (5.50) | |
| Student | 98 (7.83) | 212 (7.66) | 310 (7.71) | |

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

| | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------|
| Retired | 73 (5.84) | 416 (15.03) | 489 (12.17) | |
| Income | | | | |
| <\$35K | 585 (46.76) | 459 (16.58) | 1044 (25.98) | <0.001 |
| \$35-49,999 | 200 (15.99) | 256 (9.25) | 456 (11.35) | |
| \$50-69,999 | 164 (13.11) | 435 (15.72) | 599 (14.90) | |
| \$70-99,999 | 145 (11.59) | 565 (20.41) | 710 (17.67) | |
| \$100K | 157 (12.55) | 1053 (38.04) | 1210 (30.11) | |
| Region | | | | |
| Northeast | 276 (22.06) | 914 (33.02) | 1190 (29.61) | <0.001 |
| Midwest | 237 (18.94) | 487 (17.59) | 724 (18.01) | |
| South | 447 (35.73) | 676 (24.42) | 1123 (27.94) | |
| West | 291 (23.26) | 687 (24.82) | 978 (24.33) | |
| US territories | 0 (0.00) | 4 (0.14) | 4 (0.10) | |
| Designation | | | | |
| Rural | 432 (34.53) | 760 (27.46) | 1192 (29.66) | <0.001 |
| Suburban | 311 (24.86) | 737 (26.63) | 1048 (26.08) | |
| Urban | 508 (40.61) | 1271 (45.92) | 1779 (44.26) | |
| Income loss | | | | |
| No | 376 (30.06) | 1876 (67.77) | 2252 (56.03) | <0.001 |
| Yes | 875 (69.94) | 892 (32.23) | 1767 (43.97) | |

386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396

397 Table 2. Correlation of demographic factors with food insecurity

| | Univariable Analysis | | Multivariable Analysis | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|
| | OR (95% CI) | P value | OR (95% CI) | P value |
| Age group | | | | |
| 18-29 (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| 30-39 | 0.92 (0.7, 1.11) | <0.001 | 1.03 (0.81, 1.32) | <0.001 |
| 40-49 | 0.86 (0.70, 1.06) | <0.001 | 0.90 (0.68, 1.18) | 0.03 |
| 50-59 | 0.53 (0.41, 0.67) | 0.01 | 0.60 (0.44, 0.82) | 0.04 |
| 60+ | 0.27 (0.21, 0.35) | <0.001 | 0.40 (0.28, 0.58) | <0.001 |
| Gender | | | | |
| Male (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Female | 1.11 (0.97, 1.27) | 0.35 | - | - |
| Non-binary | 1.00 (0.65, 1.50) | 0.76 | - | - |
| Race | | | | |
| NH white (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Hispanic | 3.24 (2.70, 3.89) | <0.001 | 1.93 (1.56, 2.41) | 0.20 |
| Black | 4.56 (3.65, 5.71) | <0.001 | 2.61 (1.99, 3.42) | <0.001 |
| Asian/PI | 1.23 (0.94, 1.62) | <0.001 | 1.12 (0.81, 1.54) | 0.002 |
| Other | 3.75 (2.60, 5.42) | 0.001 | 2.55 (1.63, 3.97) | 0.03 |
| Children in household | | | | |
| No (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Yes | 2.56 (2.22, 2.96) | <0.001 | 2.35 (1.95, 2.84) | <0.001 |
| Education level | | | | |
| Less than HS (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| HS | 0.29 (0.14, 0.60) | 0.04 | 0.23 (0.10, 0.55) | 0.35 |
| Some college | 0.16 (0.08, 0.33) | 0.003 | 0.20 (0.09, 0.46) | 0.02 |
| College grad | 0.05 (0.03, 0.11) | <0.001 | 0.11 (0.05, 0.25) | <0.001 |
| Employment status | | | | |
| Employed (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Out of work | 2.27 (1.87, 2.76) | <0.001 | 1.05 (0.82, 1.34) | 0.31 |
| Homemaker | 2.50 (1.89, 3.30) | <0.001 | 1.27 (0.88, 1.83) | 0.04 |
| Student | 1.13 (0.87, 1.45) | 0.43 | 0.55 (0.40, 0.77) | <0.001 |

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|
| Retired | 0.43 (0.33, 0.56) | <0.001 | 0.99 (0.67, 1.46) | 0.75 |
| Income | | | | |
| <\$35K (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| \$35-49,999 | 0.61 (0.49, 0.77) | <0.001 | 0.67 (0.52, 0.87) | <0.001 |
| \$50-69,999 | 0.30 (0.24, 0.37) | 0.12 | 0.33 (0.26, 0.43) | 0.05 |
| \$70-99,999 | 0.20 (0.16, 0.25) | <0.001 | 0.27 (0.21, 0.35) | <0.001 |
| \$100K | 0.12 (0.10, 0.14) | <0.001 | 0.17 (0.13, 0.22) | <0.001 |
| Region | | | | |
| Northeast (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Midwest | 1.61 (1.31, 1.98) | 0.24 | 1.04 (0.81, 1.33) | 0.98 |
| South | 2.19 (1.83, 2.62) | <0.001 | 1.21 (0.97, 1.52) | 0.03 |
| West | 1.40 (1.16, 1.70) | 0.31 | 0.93 (0.73, 1.17) | 0.12 |
| Designation | | | | |
| Urban | - | - | - | - |
| Rural | 1.42 (1.22, 1.66) | <0.001 | 1.22 (1.00, 1.50) | 0.10 |
| Suburban | 1.06 (0.89, 1.25) | 0.12 | 1.09 (0.89, 1.34) | 0.89 |
| Income loss | | | | |
| No (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Yes | 4.89 (4.24, 5.66) | <0.001 | 3.81 (3.21, 4.52) | <0.001 |

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405


406

407

408

409

410 Figure 1: Percent food insecure by visit (and by level/category of food insecurity)



411


412

413 Figure 2: Food Insecurity, Income Loss, and Industry/Occupation

414 Figure 2a: Percentage reporting income loss and percentage reporting food insecurity, by industry.

415 Figure 2b: Percentage reporting income loss according to level of food insecurity, and percentage of
416 each level of food insecurity, by industry.

417




418

419 Note: Category of “Other” includes students, homemakers, disabled, religious, self-employed, other

420

421 Figure 3: Utilization of Food Support Programs

422



423

424

425 Appendix A. Baseline demographics of full Chasing COVID cohort (C3) and comparison to study
426 cohort

| | C3 cohort | | | Comparison C3 cohort vs study cohort | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| | Food insecure, No. (%) | Food secure, No. (%) | Total, No. (%) | p value (chi sq) | p value (chi sq) |
| Total | 2661 (39.48) | 4079 (60.52) | 6740 (100) | | |
| Age group | | | | | |
| 18-29 | 935 (35.14) | 868 (21.28) | 1803 (26.75) | <0.001 | <0.001 |
| 30-39 | 862 (32.39) | 1094 (26.82) | 1956 (29.02) | | |
| 40-49 | 467 (17.55) | 696 (17.06) | 1163 (17.26) | | |
| 50-59 | 220 (8.27) | 572 (14.02) | 792 (11.75) | | |
| 60+ | 177 (6.65) | 849 (20.81) | 1026 (15.22) | | |
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 1156 (43.44) | 1887 (46.26) | 3043 (45.15) | 0.064 | 0.7225 |
| Female | 1439 (54.08) | 2087 (51.16) | 3526 (52.31) | | |
| Non-binary | 66 (2.48) | 105 (2.57) | 171 (2.54) | | |
| Race | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 774 (29.09) | 535 (13.12) | 1309 (19.42) | <0.001 | <0.001 |
| Black | 583 (21.91) | 322 (7.89) | 905 (13.43) | | |
| Asian/PI | 149 (5.60) | 323 (7.92) | 472 (7.00) | | |
| NH white | 1035 (38.9) | 2811 (68.91) | 3846 (57.06) | | |
| Other | 120 (4.51) | 88 (2.16) | 208 (3.09) | | |
| Children in household | | | | | |
| No | 1361 (51.15) | 3028 (74.23) | 4389 (65.12) | <0.001 | <0.001 |
| Yes | 1300 (48.85) | 1051 (25.77) | 2351 (34.88) | | |
| Education level | | | | | |
| Less than HS | 104 (3.91) | 19 (0.47) | 123 (1.82) | <0.001 | <0.001 |
| HS | 570 (21.42) | 305 (7.48) | 875 (12.98) | | |
| Some college | 1018 (38.26) | 871 (21.35) | 1889 (28.03) | | |
| College grad | 969 (36.41) | 2884 (70.70) | 3853 (57.17) | | |
| Employment status | | | | | |
| Employed | 1618 (60.80) | 2608 (63.94) | 4226 (62.70) | <0.001 | 0.018 |
| Out of work | 495 (18.60) | 386 (9.46) | 881 (13.07) | | |
| Homemaker | 192 (7.22) | 163 (4.00) | 355 (5.27) | | |

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

| | | | | | |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------|--------|
| Student | 228 (8.57) | 354 (8.68) | 582 (8.64) | | |
| Retired | 128 (4.81) | 568 (13.92) | 696 (10.33) | | |
| Income | | | | | |
| <\$35K | 1279 (48.06) | 749 (18.36) | 2028 (30.09) | <0.001 | <0.001 |
| \$35-49,999 | 378 (14.21) | 398 (9.76) | 776 (11.51) | | |
| \$50-69,999 | 371 (13.94) | 611 (14.98) | 982 (14.57) | | |
| \$70-99,999 | 312 (11.72) | 786 (19.27) | 1098 (16.29) | | |
| \$100K | 321 (12.06) | 1535 (37.63) | 1856 (27.54) | | |
| Region | | | | | |
| Northeast | 563 (21.16) | 1331 (32.63) | 1894 (28.10) | <0.001 | 0.041 |
| Midwest | 445 (16.72) | 693 (16.99) | 1138 (16.88) | | |
| South | 1023 (38.44) | 1040 (25.50) | 2063 (30.61) | | |
| West | 629 (23.64) | 1008 (24.71) | 1637 (24.29) | | |
| xterr | 1 (0.04) | 7 (0.17) | 8 (0.12) | | |
| Designation | | | | | |
| Rural | 910 (34.20) | 1135 (27.83) | 2045 (30.34) | <0.001 | 0.54 |
| Suburban | 678 (25.48) | 1107 (27.14) | 1785 (26.48) | | |
| Urban | 1073 (40.32) | 1837 (45.04) | 2910 (43.18) | | |
| Income loss | | | | | |
| No | 864 (32.47) | 2786 (68.30) | 3650 (54.15) | <0.001 | 0.058 |
| Yes | 1797 (67.53) | 1293 (31.70) | 3090 (45.85) | | |

427

428

429

430

431

432

433 Appendix B. Correlation of demographic factors with food insecurity among full Chasing COVID
434 cohort (C3)

| | Univariable Analysis | | Multivariable Analysis | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|
| | OR (95% CI) | P value | OR (95% CI) | P value |
| Age group | | | | |
| 18-29 (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| 30-39 | 0.73 (0.64, 0.83) | <0.001 | 0.85 (0.72, 1.00) | <0.001 |
| 40-49 | 0.62 (0.54, 0.72) | <0.001 | 0.74 (0.61, 0.90) | 0.02 |
| 50-59 | 0.36 (0.30, 0.43) | <0.001 | 0.45 (0.36, 0.57) | <0.001 |
| 60+ | 0.19 (0.16, 0.23) | <0.001 | 0.34 (0.26, 0.45) | <0.001 |
| Gender | | | | |
| Male (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Female | 1.13 (1.02, 1.25) | 0.23 | - | - |
| Non-binary | 1.03 (0.75, 1.41) | 0.84 | - | - |
| Race | | | | |
| NH white (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Hispanic | 3.93 (3.45, 4.49) | <0.001 | 2.07 (1.77, 2.44) | 0.002 |
| Black | 4.92 (4.22, 5.74) | <0.001 | 2.44 (2.02, 2.94) | <0.001 |
| Asian/PI | 1.26 (1.02, 1.54) | <0.001 | 1.16 (0.91, 1.48) | <0.001 |
| Other | 3.71 (2.79, 4.93) | <0.001 | 2.25 (1.60, 3.17) | 0.03 |
| Children in household | | | | |
| No (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Yes | 2.76 (2.48, 3.06) | <0.001 | 2.21 (1.94, 2.53) | <0.001 |
| Education level | | | | |
| Less than HS (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| HS | 0.34 (0.21, 0.57) | <0.001 | 0.27 (0.15, 0.48) | 0.38 |
| Some college | 0.21 (0.13, 0.35) | 0.009 | 0.23 (0.13, 0.41) | 0.004 |
| College grad | 0.06 (0.04, 0.10) | <0.001 | 0.12 (0.07, 0.21) | <0.001 |
| Employment status | | | | |
| Employed (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Out of work | 2.07 (1.79, 2.39) | <0.001 | 1.05 (0.87, 1.26) | 0.02 |
| Homemaker | 1.90 (1.53, 2.36) | <0.001 | 1.04 (0.78, 1.38) | 0.12 |
| Student | 1.04 (0.87, 1.24) | 0.60 | 0.47 (0.37, 0.59) | <0.001 |

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|
| Retired | 0.36 (0.29, 0.44) | <0.001 | 0.95 (0.70, 1.29) | 0.47 |
| Income | | | | |
| <\$35K (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| \$35-49,999 | 0.56 (0.47, 0.66) | <0.001 | 0.66 (0.54, 0.80) | <0.001 |
| \$50-69,999 | 0.36 (0.30, 0.42) | 0.97 | 0.43 (0.36, 0.52) | 0.36 |
| \$70-99,999 | 0.23 (0.20, 0.27) | <0.001 | 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) | <0.001 |
| \$100K | 0.12 (0.11, 0.14) | <0.001 | 0.21 (0.18, 0.26) | <0.001 |
| Region | | | | |
| Northeast (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Midwest | 1.52 (1.30, 1.77) | 0.91 | 1.07 (0.89, 1.30) | 0.76 |
| South | 2.33 (2.04, 2.65) | <0.001 | 1.33 (1.13, 1.57) | <0.001 |
| West | 1.47 (1.28, 1.69) | 0.56 | 1.00 (0.84, 1.19) | 0.11 |
| Designation | | | | |
| Urban | - | - | - | - |
| Rural | 1.37 (1.22, 1.54) | <0.001 | 1.19 (1.03, 1.38) | 0.04 |
| Suburban | 1.05 (0.93, 1.18) | 0.05 | 1.07 (0.92, 1.24) | 0.74 |
| Income loss | | | | |
| No (ref) | - | - | - | - |
| Yes | 4.49 (4.04, 4.98) | <0.001 | 3.72 (3.29, 4.22) | <0.001 |

435

436