



33 <sup>16</sup>Department of Nutrition, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston,  
34 Massachusetts, United States of America

35 <sup>17</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston,  
36 Massachusetts, United States of America

37

38 <sup>¶</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work as first authors.

39 [abbasism2003@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:abbasism2003@yahoo.co.uk) (AI); [imadzorera@berkeley.edu](mailto:imadzorera@berkeley.edu) (IM)

40 <sup>&</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work as last authors.

41 [mina@hsph.harvard.edu](mailto:mina@hsph.harvard.edu) (WF); [yemaneberhane@gmail.com](mailto:yemaneberhane@gmail.com) (YB)

42 <sup>\*</sup>Corresponding authors

43 [imadzorera@berkeley.edu](mailto:imadzorera@berkeley.edu) (IM); [mina@hsph.harvard.edu](mailto:mina@hsph.harvard.edu) (WF)

44

45

46 **Short title: COVID-19 impacts on prices and diet quality in Africa**

47 **Conflict of Interest and Funding Disclosure:** No conflicts of interest are reported for all

48 authors

49 **Funding Source:** This work was supported by institutional support from Harvard T.H. Chan  
50 School of Public Health, Boston, MA; Harvard University Center for African Studies, Boston,  
51 MA; Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, Germany, and the George Washington University  
52 Milken Institute of Public Health, Washington, DC.

53

54

55

56

57

## 58 **Abbreviations**

ARISE	African Research, Implementation Science and Education Network
DDS	Dietary diversity score
DUCS	Dar es Salaam Urban Cohort Study
HDSS	Health and Demographic Surveillance System
MDD-W	Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women
PDQS	Prime Diet Quality Score
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
SSBs	sugar-sweetened beverages

59

60

61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82

## Abstract

**Background:** Sub-Saharan Africa faces prolonged COVID-19 related impacts on economic activity, livelihoods, nutrition, and food security, with recovery slowed down by lagging vaccination progress.

**Objective:** This study investigated the economic impacts of COVID-19 on food prices, consumption and dietary quality in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, and Tanzania.

**Methods:** We conducted a repeated cross-sectional study and used a mobile platform to collect data. Data collected from round 1 (July-November, 2020) and round 2 (July-December, 2021) were considered. We assessed participants' dietary intake of 20 food groups over the previous seven days. The study's primary outcome was the Prime Diet Quality Score (PDQS), with higher scores indicating better dietary quality. We used linear regression and generalized estimating equations to assess factors associated with diet quality during COVID-19.

**Results:** Most of the respondents were male and the mean age ( $\pm$ SD) was 42.4 ( $\pm$ 12.5) years. Mean PDQS ( $\pm$ SD) was low at 19.1 ( $\pm$ 3.8) before COVID-19, 18.6( $\pm$ 3.4) in Round 1, and 19.4( $\pm$ 3.8) in Round 2. A majority of respondents (80%) reported higher than expected prices for all food groups during the pandemic. Secondary education or higher (estimate: 0.73, 95% CI: 0.32, 1.15), older age (estimate: 30-39 years: 0.77, 95% CI: 0.35, 1.19, or 40 years or older: 0.72, 95% CI: 0.30, 1.13), and medium wealth status (estimate: 0.48, 95% CI: 0.14, 0.81) were associated with higher PDQS. Farmers and casual laborers (estimate: -0.60, 95% CI: -1.11, -

83 0.09), lower crop production (estimate: -0.87, 95% CI: -1.28, -0.46) and not engaged in farming  
84 (estimate: -1.38, 95% CI: -1.74, -1.02) associated with lower PDQS.

85

86 **Conclusion:** Diet quality which had declined early in the pandemic had started to improve.

87 However, consumption of healthy diets remained low, and food prices remained high. Efforts

88 should continue to improve diet quality for sustained nutrition recovery through mitigation

89 measures, including social protection.

90

91 Word count: 300

92

93 **Keywords:** COVID-19, Diet quality, Prime Diet Quality Score, food prices, food consumption,

94 food security, Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women, Sub-Saharan Africa,

95

96

## Introduction

97           The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) continues to affect the social, economic and  
98 health status of individuals and communities globally and has exposed significant inequalities by  
99 income, socio-demographic factors and geographic locations (1). Despite the persistent  
100 improvement of global health, some settings continue to face greater threats to health and well-  
101 being during public health emergencies due to prevailing social, economic, political, and  
102 environmental conditions, and the COVID-19 pandemic is not an exception with greater impacts  
103 on the socially disadvantaged, including on the African continent (2, 3).

104           The absolute number of reported cases and mortality due to COVID-19 in Africa has been  
105 lower than in other regions, with 8.4 million cases and 170,300 deaths reported by March 2022  
106 (4). However, challenges with emerging variants are likely to continue in the region due to vaccine  
107 hesitancy and low vaccination coverage (5), in contrast to declining global cases and recovery of  
108 economies (5, 6). Further, Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) was already grappling with economic and  
109 health challenges before the pandemic, so the impacts of COVID-19 could be more long-lasting  
110 than in developed regions (7). Poverty had been increasing globally before the COVID-19  
111 pandemic and 768 million people were hungry in 2020 (8). The African continent contributed more  
112 than one-third (282 million) of the hungry (8). It has been projected that hunger will increase  
113 globally due to the COVID-19 pandemic and even more in SSA (8). Additionally, further increases  
114 in child stunting and wasting in SSA are anticipated (9).

115           Further, the impact of COVID-19 on economic growth and food security in SSA remains  
116 severe (8). SSA economies are expected to experience recession and to continue to experience  
117 slower economic growth, with more disruptions of agriculture and production and trade-related

118 constraints if efforts to control COVID-19 remain limited (10). This and resulting trade and fiscal  
119 deficits are likely to further adversely affect health and nutrition (11).

120 Countries and communities in SSA will also likely continue to face COVID-19 related  
121 disruptions to economic activity, livelihoods, and access to key nutrition and food security services  
122 (12). The continent has already reported an increase in prices for many staple crops (14),  
123 contributing to food insecurity. In our previous work in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Nigeria, we  
124 found evidence of increasing prices for key food items early during the COVID-19 pandemic,  
125 which may have contributed to lower dietary intake (13). In addition, we found that higher pulse  
126 prices during the COVID-19 pandemic were associated with the consumption of less diverse diets  
127 in the study countries (13). The potential impacts of COVID-19 can range from impacts on food  
128 availability, quality and prices, and impacts on vendors, markets and regulation during this time  
129 of the pandemic. On the other hand, restricted geographical access, changes in affordability due to  
130 the influence of global and local markets, desirability and convenience, and other factors could  
131 influence the food environment during the COVID-19 pandemic (14). Therefore, it is important  
132 that as the COVID-19 pandemic persists we continue to assess its impact on the nutrition and  
133 health of the households in SSA (12).

134 In this study, we investigated the continued impacts of COVID-19 on food consumption,  
135 food prices, dietary diversity, and quality using data collected during two rounds in five sub-  
136 Saharan African countries, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria and Tanzania. We employed  
137 cross-sectional analysis using data collected from both rounds of the African Research,  
138 Implementation Science and Education (ARISE) Network COVID-19 surveys.

139

140

## Material and Methods

### 141 Study setting

142 This survey was a repeated cross-sectional study with two rounds of data collection. The  
143 first round of the survey took place between July and November 2020. The study included six  
144 study sites from three countries, namely Nouna and Ouagadougou in Burkina Faso, Kersa and  
145 Addis Ababa in Ethiopia, and Ibadan and Lagos in Nigeria. In each country, one rural site and one  
146 urban site were selected. Rural sites included Nouna and Kersa, and a rural sub-area in Ibadan.  
147 The second round of the survey took place between July and December 2021 and involved all sites  
148 involved in round 1 and an additional three sites from two countries, namely the rural sites of  
149 Kintampo in Ghana, a rural subarea of Dodoma in Tanzania, and an urban area of Dar es Salaam  
150 in Tanzania. All nine sites from the five countries were included in the second round of data  
151 collection. The survey sites are shown in Figure 1.

152

### 153 Figure 1: Map of ARISE sites for Round 2 of the COVID-19 studies

154

155 The study countries and areas were selected based on existing collaborations and  
156 infrastructure available through the ARISE Network (15) and represent diverse settings across sub-  
157 Saharan Africa. More detailed information on the geographical and socio-demographic  
158 characteristics of the ARISE Network sites has been provided elsewhere (15, 16).

159

### 160 Study design



161 The study used a mobile phone platform and computer-assisted telephone interviewing  
162 (CATI) to collect data. Research assistants obtained verbal informed consent before starting the  
163 interview. They conducted the interviews from study call centers.

164 Each country surveyed a minimum of 300 healthcare workers, 600 adults and 600  
165 adolescents (except Ghana, where we surveyed 300 adults and 300 adolescents) in round 2. This  
166 analysis involved data from the adult surveys. We randomly selected a larger number of phone  
167 numbers of households from the sampling frame, to allow non-response, refusal or dropout. For  
168 the household surveys, 2,500 households were selected from each urban and rural site in Round 1,  
169 assuming that 60% of the households would respond to the survey. The assumption allowed us to  
170 reach the minimum number of 300 adults per site. From each household, an adult aged 20 years  
171 and above was selected for the interview.

172 The second round of data collection targeted the same adults previously surveyed in Round  
173 1 (for Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Nigeria) and additional new respondents to account for non-  
174 response and drop-outs. For new countries, the sample was obtained from existing sampling  
175 frames. The sampling frames were obtained from existing surveillance systems, the Health and  
176 Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) in Burkina Faso, Ghana, Nigeria and rural Ethiopia  
177 (Kersa), and from a household survey in urban Ethiopia (Addis Ababa) that was established in the  
178 first round of data collection. In Tanzania, the sampling frames were obtained from the Dar es  
179 Salaam Urban Cohort Study (DUCS) and HDSS and the Dodoma HDSS.

180 The detailed design and field methods of the round 1 ARISE Network COVID-19 rapid  
181 monitoring survey have been published elsewhere (16). The design and methods of the round 2  
182 survey are detailed on the Harvard University Center for African Studies website

183 ([https://africa.harvard.edu/files/africanstudies/files/arise\\_covid\\_survey\\_round\\_2\\_methods\\_brief](https://africa.harvard.edu/files/africanstudies/files/arise_covid_survey_round_2_methods_brief_final.pdf)  
184 [final.pdf](https://africa.harvard.edu/files/africanstudies/files/arise_covid_survey_round_2_methods_brief_final.pdf)).

185 Standardized tools used for the first survey round were updated for the second survey  
186 round. The local teams from each site reviewed the tools and updated the questions accordingly.  
187 Questionnaires were translated into the local languages. The sites recruited male and female  
188 research assistants who then received extensive training on data collection procedures, including  
189 the use of telephones and tablets to obtain verbal informed consent and input participant data into  
190 an electronic data collection system (Open Data Kit). Research assistants collected information on  
191 socio-demographic characteristics, including age, sex, head of household, household size,  
192 education, and occupation of respondents. Questions regarding food pricing, food security, and the  
193 dietary intake of respondents were also asked.

194

## 195 **Outcome Variables**

196 The primary outcome of interest for this study was the Prime Diet Quality Score (PDQS).  
197 We also computed the diet diversity score (DDS) as a secondary outcome. The computation of the  
198 dietary indices, the PDQS, and DDS considered both Rounds of data collection. Briefly,  
199 respondents were asked about their frequency of consumption of 20 food groups commonly  
200 consumed in study areas over the preceding seven days.

201

### 202 **Prime diet quality score (PDQS)**

203 We computed the PDQS, a measure of diet quality based on reported dietary intake.  
204 Previous studies have found associations between PDQS and birth outcomes, pregnancy-related  
205 morbidities, diabetes and cardiovascular disease (17-20). We classified foods into 20 food groups

206 for the PDQS, including 14 healthy food groups (dark green leafy vegetables, other vitamin A-rich  
207 vegetables including carrots, cruciferous vegetables, other vegetables, whole citrus fruits, other  
208 fruits, fish, poultry, legumes, nuts, low-fat dairy, whole grains, eggs and liquid vegetable oils) and  
209 6 unhealthy food groups (red meat, processed meats, refined grains and baked goods, sugar-  
210 sweetened beverages (SSBs), desserts and ice cream and fried foods obtained away from home  
211 and potatoes) based on criteria determined by previous studies (21, 22). Points were assigned for  
212 consumption of healthy food groups as: 0–1 serving/week (0 points), 2–3 servings/week (1 point),  
213 and  $\geq 4$  servings/week (2 points). Scoring for unhealthy food groups was assigned as: 0–1  
214 serving/week (2 points), 2–3 servings/week (1 point) and  $\geq 4$  servings/week (0 points). Points for  
215 each food group were then summed to give an overall score (maximum score of 40).

216

### 217 **Dietary diversity score (DDS)**

218 We also computed the Dietary diversity score (DDS) based on the classification suggested  
219 for the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)'s Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women  
220 (MDD-W) index. The MDD-W has been evaluated and considered a good measure of  
221 micronutrient adequacy among women (23, 24). We grouped the food consumed by study  
222 participants into 10 food groups as follows: 1) grains, white roots and tubers and plantains, 2)  
223 legumes (beans, peas and lentils), 3) nuts and seeds, 4) dairy, 5) meats, poultry and fish, 6) eggs,  
224 7) vitamin A rich dark green vegetable, 8) other vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables, 9) other  
225 vegetables and 10) other fruits. We divided the reported weekly consumption of the food groups  
226 by seven to obtain the daily frequency of consumption. If the food was eaten at least once daily  
227 during the previous week, it was considered to contribute to DDS, with a higher number indicating  
228 higher dietary diversity.

## 229 **Exposure Variables**

230 We considered as exposures of interest changes in food pricing by comparing the time  
231 before and late during the COVID-19 pandemic for staples (maize, rice, cassava and teff), pulses  
232 (beans, lentils, peas, chickpeas), fruits (e.g. bananas, oranges, any locally available fruits),  
233 vegetables (e.g. spinach, cabbage, tomatoes, onions, any locally available vegetables) and animal  
234 source foods (e.g. beef, chicken, dairy, eggs, fish). We created a binary indicator indicating an  
235 increase compared to a decrease or no change in food prices (yes or no). The changes in food  
236 pricing were determined before and after March 2020 (first round), when the first case of COVID-  
237 19 was reported and also in the second round. Changes in food prices were self-reported by the  
238 participants.

239 We also considered food security status (e.g. went without eating for a whole day), and the  
240 impact of COVID-19 on income, employment and crop production. We considered respondent age  
241 (20-29, 30-39,  $\geq 40$  years), sex (female or male), education status (none or incomplete primary,  
242 primary school or incomplete secondary, secondary school or higher), head of household (yes or  
243 no), occupation (unemployed, farmer or casual labor, employed, student, self-employed or other),  
244 religion (none, Catholic, Muslim, Orthodox Christian, Protestant or other). Other exposures  
245 included household characteristics such as household size and wealth index score (tertiles). We  
246 computed the wealth index based on factor analysis on ownership of common household assets.

247

## 248 **Statistical Analysis**

249 Descriptive statistics were used to describe numerical, tabular and graphical presentations  
250 of the data. We used means and standard deviations for continuous data and frequencies and  
251 percentages for categorical data to summarize social demographic characteristics, nutrition and

252 food security across sites and rounds. We used Generalized Estimating Equation (GEE) linear  
253 regression models, to assess factors associated with the PDQS at the round 2 endpoint.

254 For those respondents with both round 1 and round 2 data, we evaluated the factors  
255 affecting diet quality in round 2 of the study. We conducted sensitivity analysis and assessed  
256 among respondents with both rounds 1 and 2 if adjusting for diet quality before the COVID-19  
257 pandemic would change observed associations. We used GEE linear regression models, to assess  
258 factors associated with the PDQS at the round 2 endpoint accounting for diet quality at round 1.

259 Predictors of dietary quality were determined based on univariate selection. Variables  
260 associated with the outcomes at  $p < 0.20$  were included in the model. The final models include all  
261 selected covariates. Significance was determined at  $p < 0.05$ . We used SAS version 9.4 for all  
262 analyses.

### 263 **Ethical approval and consent**

264 The study obtained ethical approval from the Institutional Review Board at Harvard T.H.  
265 Chan School of Public Health, the Kintampo Health Research Centre Institutional Ethics  
266 Committee (Ghana), Nouna Health Research Center Ethical Committee and National Ethics  
267 Committee (Burkina Faso), the Institutional Ethical Review Board of Addis Continental Institute  
268 of Public Health (Ethiopia), University of Ibadan Research Ethics Committee and National Health  
269 Research Ethics Committee (Nigeria), and the Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences  
270 and National Institute for Medical Research (Tanzania).

271

272

## Results

273

We analyzed data from 2,829 adults from the five countries. Overall, the study included

274

44% female respondents. Female participation was low in Nouna (15.4%), Ouagadougou (34.3%)

275

and Kersa (14.8%). The mean ( $\pm$ SD) age of the respondents was 42.4 ( $\pm$ 12.5) years. Most of the

276

study respondents had no education or incomplete primary school education (37.9%), and 32.5%

277

had secondary school education or higher. The mean ( $\pm$ SD) household size was 6 ( $\pm$ 4) people.

278

Most respondents were farmers or casual laborers (39.4%) and 32.5% were students or self-

279

employed. A more detailed description of the demographic characteristics of the study individuals

280

can be found in **Table 1**.

281

282

**Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the study individuals and households in Burkina**

283

**Faso, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Tanzania and Ghana (N=2,829)**

284

	Overall	Burkina Faso		Ethiopia		Nigeria		Tanzania		Ghana
		Nouna	Ouagadougou	Kersa	Addis Ababa	Ibadan	Lagos	Dar es Salaam	Dodoma	Kintampo
Location		Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Urban	Rural	Rural
N	2829	324	300	298	289	373	290	307	347	301
<b>Sociodemographic characteristics</b>										
Female sex	1232 (43.6)	50(15.4)	103(34.3)	44(14.8)	202(69.9)	164(44.0)	131(45.2)	146(47.6)	232(66.9)	160(53.2)
Age of respondent (Mean $\pm$ SD) years	42.4 $\pm$ 12.5	47.6 $\pm$ 12.8	47.4 $\pm$ 10.1	36.6 $\pm$ 9.4	38.0 $\pm$ 12.2	40.4 $\pm$ 13.1	39.5 $\pm$ 11.8	48.6 $\pm$ 12.5	43.0 $\pm$ 10.1	40.0 $\pm$ 13.6
20-29	428 (15.1)	15(4.6)	8(2.7)	66(22.1)	72(24.9)	88(23.6)	55(19.0)	16(5.2)	32(9.2)	76(25.3)
30-39	764 (27.0)	66(20.4)	52(17.4)	116(38.9)	112(38.8)	91(24.4)	99(34.1)	53(17.3)	96(27.7)	79(26.3)
$\geq$ 40	1636 (57.9)	243(75.0)	239(79.9)	116(38.9)	105(36.3)	194(52.0)	136(46.9)	238(77.5)	219(63.1)	146(48.5)
<b>Education</b>										
None or incomplete primary	1060 (37.9)	254(79.3)	220(74.1)	207(69.5)	83(28.7)	20(5.5)	5(1.8)	15(4.9)	112(32.3)	144(47.8)
Primary school or incomplete secondary	826 (29.6)	53(16.6)	60(20.2)	61(20.5)	77(26.6)	51(14.1)	18(6.5)	211(69.2)	229(66.0)	66(21.9)
Secondary school or higher	909 (32.5)	13(4.1)	17(5.7)	30(10.1)	129(44.6)	290 (80.3)	254(91.7)	79(25.9)	6(1.7)	91(30.2)
<b>Household</b>										
Head of Household	1868 (66.0)	244(75.3)	237(79.0)	265(88.9)	211(73.0)	187(50.1)	155(53.5)	224(73.0)	184(53.0)	161(53.5)

	Overall	Burkina Faso		Ethiopia		Nigeria		Tanzania		Ghana
		Nouna	Ouagadougou	Kersa	Addis Ababa	Ibadan	Lagos	Dar es Salaam	Dodoma	Kintampo
Household size (Mean ±SD)	6.4±3.9	10.4±5.9	7.9±3.3	6.7±2.6	4.7±2.4	4.7±2.8	4.4±2.7	5.5±2.5	6.3±2.1	7.3±3.9
Occupation										
Unemployed	318(12.2)	18(6.2)	56(22.3)	22(7.4)	118(40.8)	15(5.2)	4(1.6)	50(16.3)	2(0.6)	33(11.1)
Farmer or casual labor	1027 (39.4)	239(82.7)	32(12.8)	250(84.5)	1(0.4)	11(3.8)	5(2.0)	24(7.8)	342(98.6)	123(41.3)
Employed	418(16.0)	13(4.5)	35(13.9)	14(4.7)	59(20.4)	100(34.7)	103(41.9)	49(16.0)	4(0.6)	43(14.4)
Student, self-employed or other	847 (32.5)	19(6.6)	128(51.0)	10(3.4)	111(38.4)	162(56.3)	134(54.5)	183(59.8)	1(0.3)	99(33.2)
Religion										
Catholic	355(12.6)	94(29.0)	83(27.7)	0(0.0)	2(0.7)	22(6.0)	12(4.2)	88(28.7)	20(5.8)	34(11.3)
Muslim	1185(42.0)	203(62.7)	201(67.0)	291(97.7)	36(12.5)	110(29.9)	60(20.8)	153(49.8)	0(0.0)	131(43.5)
Orthodox Christian	653(23.2)	1(0.3)	0(0)	6(2.0)	227(79.0)	175(47.6)	205(71.2)	6(2.0)	12(3.5)	21(7.0)
Protestant	5858(20.0)	23(7.1)	15(4.9)	1(0.3)	19(7.3)	54(14.7)	6(2.1)	59(19.2)	311(89.9)	97(32.2)
None or other	40(1.4)	3(0.9)	1(0.3)	0(0)	2(0.7)	7(1.9)	5(1.7)	1(0.3)	3(0.9)	18(6.0)
PDQS (Median, IQR)	19 (17, 22)	19 (17, 21)	18 (16, 21)	18 (15, 20)	18 (15, 20)	21 (19, 24)	22 (20, 24)	20 (17, 22)	18 (16, 20)	19 (16, 22)

285 Data are shown as mean ±SD or N (percent), IQR: Interquartile range

286

## 287 **Changes in income, employment, crop production and food security status**

288 **Table 2** shows the impact of COVID-19 on income, employment, crop production and  
 289 food security in the round 2 survey. Most respondents (49%) reported no change in income, and  
 290 37% reported loss or reduced income from farming, entrepreneurial activities, or business  
 291 activities during the COVID-19 pandemic. Reported income losses from agriculture,  
 292 entrepreneurial activities, or formal or informal business were highest in Kintampo (58%), Dar es  
 293 Salaam (50%), and Ibadan (42%). Loss of or reduced salaries were reported most in Ouagadougou  
 294 (37%) and Lagos (26%). The majority of respondents, however, reported that COVID-19 had not  
 295 affected their employment status (only 7% reported lost employment). Loss of employment was  
 296 relatively higher in Addis Ababa (16%), Ouagadougou (14%) and Ibadan and Nouna (at least  
 297 10%). Approximately 19% of all respondents across all sites reported lower agriculture production  
 298 during the COVID-19 pandemic, with the highest declines reported in the rural sites of Kersa

299 (64%), Nouna (37%) and Kintampo (27%). Food insecurity also affected respondents, with 45%  
 300 reporting that they worried about food, and 30% said they had skipped a meal. Almost 10% had  
 301 gone for an entire day without eating. The number of people reporting skipping a meal was highest  
 302 in Ibadan (57%), Lagos (52%) and Kintampo (46%). Going for an entire day without eating was  
 303 reported in Lagos (20%) and Ouagadougou (17%). Finally, social protection was limited, with less  
 304 than 1% of the study sample reporting access to food aid, and 2% reporting access to cash transfers  
 305 (not shown).

306 Respondents in rural regions of all sites were less likely to report changes in income or loss  
 307 of salary compared to those residing in urban areas. Rural respondents in Ethiopia and Tanzania  
 308 were also less likely to report reduced income, however, in other sites there were no rural-urban  
 309 differences or income reductions that affected a greater proportion of rural respondents. Across all  
 310 sites except Ethiopia, rural respondents were more likely to report no change in employment status.  
 311 In rural sites more people reported worrying about food (except in Dodoma), however, going for  
 312 an entire day without eating was more frequently reported in urban sites (except in Tanzania).

313

314 **Table 2. Impact of COVID-19 on income, employment, crop production, and food security across 5**  
 315 **countries**

	Overall	Burkina Nouna	Burkina Ouaga	Ethiopia Addis	Ethiopia Kersa	Nigeri a Ibadan	Nigeri a Lagos	Tanzani a Dar es Salaam	Tanzani a Dodoma	Ghana Kintamp o
<b>Impact of COVID-19 on income</b>										
Income is unchanged	49.4	61.6	29.7	48.1	82.1	43.3	37.7	40.9	78.1	34.8
Lost/reduced salary	12.1	4.3	36.8	9.1	0.7	11.9	26.1	7.9	0.6	6.4
Lost/reduced income	36.8	34.1	33.5	36.6	16.9	41.9	33.8	49.6	21.3	57.9
Increased salary	1.7	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.3	2.8	2.5	1.7	0.0	1.0
<b>COVID-19 impact on employment</b>										
None, unemployed	31.1	46.8	30.0	43.9	10.4	16.5	13.6	41.0	55.9	20.7
None, no change in employment status	52.6	42.4	44.6	35.0	83.6	62.3	71.0	21.5	39.7	68.9



	Overall	Burkina Nouna	Burkina Ouaga	Ethiopia Addis	Ethiopia Kersa	Nigeria Ibadan	Nigeria Lagos	Tanzania Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Dodoma	Ghana Kintampo
Lost employment	7.1	10.2	13.5	15.9	0.7	10.6	3.9	3.9	1.2	4.4
Changed occupation	3.1	0.3	2.3	4.8	1.7	3.3	5.2	4.3	1.5	5.0
Other (specify)	6.2	0.3	9.7	0.4	3.7	7.3	6.3	29.3	1.7	1.0
<b>Crop production affected by COVID-19</b>										
No	36.6	44.3	23.7	4.2	32.7	6.5	31.4	67.4	91.9	22.2
Yes, production has decreased	18.6	36.6	9.4	1.0	63.6	11.1	7.7	4.6	8.1	26.9
Yes, production has increased	1.8	1.0	3.2	1.4	0.3	3.5	1.4	0.7	0.0	4.7
No, I don't grow any crops	43.0	18.2	63.7	93.4	3.4	78.9	59.6	27.4	0.0	46.3
<b>Food insecurity</b>										
Worried about food	45.4	22.5	47.0	50.2	82.6	59.3	52.3	21.5	19.7	57.7
Skipped a meal	30.3	2.5	33.6	28.4	21.5	56.7	55.6	14.7	14.1	45.5
Went for entire day without eating	9.8	2.2	17.0	11.8	4.7	10.5	20.3	2.9	8.7	12.0

316

317           Among respondents that were in rounds 1 and 2, reports of disruptions to agricultural  
318 production were more prevalent in round 1 as at least 44% indicated that crop production had  
319 decreased. Additionally, more respondents had worried about running out of food (57%) and  
320 fewer had skipped a meal (21%) in round 1 (results not shown).

321

### 322 **Changes in prices for key food groups**

323           In round 2 of the study, respondents reported that for all food groups, prices reported later  
324 during the COVID-19 pandemic were higher than typical prices in the previous year (Fig 2).  
325 Higher than expected prices were noted for all food groups across all sites for at least 80% of  
326 respondents, except in Dar es Salaam and Dodoma.

327           Among respondents that were in rounds 1 and 2, at least 82% had reported increases in  
328 staple prices in round 1 compared to the time before the COVID-19 pandemic. For pulses, 77%  
329 reported increased prices, for fruits 66% reported higher prices, and 74% and 73% for vegetables  
330 and animal foods respectively. For all food groups except vegetables, higher prices were most

331 frequently reported in round 1 (early during the COVID-19 pandemic) compared to round 2  
332 (results not shown). The food groups where there were the largest differences in prevalence were  
333 fruits and animal-source foods.

334

335 **Fig 2. The proportion of people reporting changes in prices of key food groups during the COVID-**  
336 **19 pandemic, as compared to this time of the year in previous years**

337

### 338 **Food consumption and diet quality**

#### 339 *Consumption of healthy foods*

340 **Table 3** shows the frequency of consumption of healthy PDQS food groups across study  
341 sites in the five countries (Round 2). Consumption of dark green vegetables was high in Dar es  
342 Salaam, Kintampo and Dodoma, where 62%, 44%, and 38% of the respondents reported  
343 consuming these food groups four or more times a week, respectively. However, in Ethiopia, at  
344 least 69% reported consumption of dark green vegetables on one day or not at all in the previous  
345 week. Consumption of other vitamin A-rich vegetables was equally low in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia,  
346 Kintampo and Dodoma. Respondents reported low consumption of citrus and other fruits across  
347 most sites, except in Dar es Salaam, Ibadan, Lagos and Addis Ababa, where at least 22% of  
348 respondents reported citrus fruit consumption four or more times a week. In Addis Ababa, Kersa  
349 and Dodoma, most respondents reported consuming fish only once or not at all in the previous  
350 week. Poultry consumption was also low across the majority of sites, with more than 70% of  
351 respondents reporting consumption less than twice in the prior week, although intake was  
352 relatively higher in Lagos and Kintampo. In Addis Ababa (46%), Dar es Salaam (40%) and  
353 Dodoma (37%), respondents reported legume consumption most frequently ( $\geq 4$  times a week).  
354 Whole-grain intake was higher in rural sites of Dodoma (55%), Kersa (52%), Kintampo (46%)

355 and Nouna (42%). Consumption of nuts and seeds was low, as was dairy intake with at least 58%  
 356 of the respondents reporting very low consumption in Ouagadougou, Addis Ababa, Kintampo and  
 357 Tanzania. Egg consumption was also low in Tanzania, Burkina Faso and Ethiopia with 68% of the  
 358 respondents reporting consumption less than twice in the previous week.

359

360 **Table 3. Frequency of consumption of healthy PDQS food groups in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia,**

361 **Nigeria, Tanzania and Ghana**

	Frequency (%)	Burkina Nouna	Burkina Ouaga	Ethiopia Addis	Ethiopia Kersa	Nigeria Ibadan	Nigeria Lagos	Tanzania Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Dodoma	Ghana Kintampo
Dark green vegetables	<=1 per week	31.4	48.7	86.5	69.1	18.2	22.8	3.9	16.1	28.6
	2-3 times per week	52.2	43.7	11.1	24.2	55.2	50.0	33.9	45.8	27.6
	4 or more times per week	16.4	7.7	2.4	6.7	26.5	27.2	62.2	38.0	43.9
Other Vit A vegetables	<=1 per week	60.2	68.7	60.2	77.5	20.4	36.9	26.1	49.3	67.8
	2-3 times per week	37.0	25.7	29.8	20.5	58.7	42.8	45.9	31.7	20.9
	4 or more times per week	2.8	5.7	10.0	2.0	20.9	20.3	28.0	19.0	11.3
Cruciferous vegetables	<=1 per week	45.4	41.3	63.7	40.9	48.8	43.8	48.2	62.0	71.8
	2-3 times per week	51.5	48.7	31.1	42.3	35.7	36.2	42.7	28.2	16.3
	4 or more times per week	3.1	10.0	5.2	16.8	15.6	20.0	9.1	9.8	12.0
Other vegetable	<=1 per week	9.9	9.7	2.1	6.4	4.8	7.9	15.3	18.7	2.0
	2-3 times per week	49.1	39.3	2.1	14.4	30.6	30.3	30.6	38.3	6.3
	4 or more times per week	41.1	51.0	95.9	79.2	64.6	61.7	54.1	42.9	91.7
Citrus	<=1 per week	65.1	66.3	54.7	89.6	28.4	28.6	42.4	85.0	73.8
	2-3 times per week	32.4	26.0	22.8	9.4	46.1	44.1	35.5	11.2	14.6
	4 or more times per week	2.5	7.7	22.5	1.0	25.5	27.3	22.2	3.8	11.6
Other fruit	<=1 per week	57.5	69.7	65.4	89.9	30.6	34.1	22.5	74.6	70.8
	2-3 times per week	40.1	25.3	24.9	10.1	52.8	43.1	41.7	22.5	19.3
	4 or more times per week	2.5	5.0	9.7	0.0	16.6	22.8	35.8	2.9	10.0
Fish	<=1 per week	5.3	20.3	99.0	99.0	4.8	12.1	47.6	76.7	23.3
	2-3 times per week	56.2	44.7	1.0	0.7	31.1	25.2	39.4	17.8	18.3
	4 or more times per week	38.6	35.0	0.0	0.3	64.1	62.8	13.0	5.5	58.5
Poultry	<=1 per week	85.2	92.3	93.4	99.0	54.7	40.3	70.7	89.6	45.2
	2-3 times per week	14.5	7.3	4.8	1.0	31.6	30.0	26.7	8.9	20.6
	4 or more times per week	0.3	0.3	1.7	0.0	13.7	29.7	2.6	1.4	34.2

	Frequency (%)	Burkina Nouna	Burkina Ouaga	Ethiopia Addis	Ethiopia Kersa	Nigeria Ibadan	Nigeria Lagos	Tanzania Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Dodoma	Ghana Kintampo
Legumes	<=1 per week	57.4	67.3	22.5	69.1	17.7	20.7	13.7	29.7	51.2
	2-3 times per week	41.1	26.0	31.5	22.8	62.2	50.0	45.9	33.4	28.6
	4 or more times per week	1.5	6.7	46.0	8.1	20.1	29.3	40.4	36.9	20.3
Nuts and seeds	<=1 per week	26.9	63.0	89.6	72.2	32.4	31.4	49.2	77.8	27.9
	2-3 times per week	64.5	24.7	7.6	15.8	57.4	44.8	21.5	19.3	30.9
	4 or more times per week	8.6	12.3	2.8	12.1	10.2	23.8	29.3	2.9	41.2
Dairy	<=1 per week	38.0	76.7	58.8	38.9	17.7	22.4	59.3	74.1	61.1
	2-3 times per week	53.4	18.7	20.8	29.2	60.6	43.8	21.5	15.3	18.9
	4 or more times per week	8.6	4.7	20.4	31.9	21.7	33.8	19.2	10.7	19.9
Eggs	<=1 per week	68.2	73.7	73.7	74.5	16.6	19.0	73.0	87.6	52.8
	2-3 times per week	27.2	23.7	19.4	22.5	49.9	34.1	18.6	9.5	24.3
	4 or more times per week	4.6	2.7	6.9	3.0	33.5	46.9	8.5	2.9	22.9
Whole grains	<=1 per week	16.4	41.3	66.4	12.4	26.8	35.5	44.0	34.6	31.9
	2-3 times per week	41.3	37.0	19.4	35.9	53.6	49.7	28.3	10.4	22.3
	4 or more times per week	42.3	21.7	14.2	51.7	19.6	14.8	27.7	55.0	45.9
Liquid vegetable oils	<=1 per week	16.4	42.0	19.0	17.5	4.6	9.3	57.0	9.8	31.2
	2-3 times per week	56.2	28.7	0.7	15.8	23.1	22.8	7.8	25.7	31.6
	4 or more times per week	27.5	29.3	80.3	66.8	72.4	67.9	35.2	64.6	37.2

362 \* Ouga - Ouagadougou; Burkina - Burkina Faso; Addis – Addis Ababa.

363

364 *Consumption of unhealthy foods*

365 **Table 4** describes the frequency of consumption of unhealthy foods. In Kintampo (36%),  
366 Ibadan (29%) and Lagos (27%) respondents reported higher red meat consumption (four or more  
367 times a week). Respondents in urban sites (Addis Ababa 22%, Lagos 22% and Dar es Salaam  
368 18%) had relatively higher consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages, compared to rural sites.  
369 Processed meat was not commonly consumed, and sweets intake was low across all sites except  
370 Nigeria and Dar es Salaam. Finally, intake of refined grains was frequent across all study sites,  
371 and the majority of respondents in Kintampo (67%) reported consuming potatoes, roots and  
372 tubers four or more times a week.

373 **Table 4. Frequency of consumption of unhealthy PDQS food groups in Burkina Faso,**  
 374 **Ethiopia, Nigeria, Tanzania and Ghana**

	Frequency (%)	Burkina Nouna	Burkina Ouaga	Ethiopia Addis	Ethiopia Kersa	Nigeria Ibadan	Nigeria Lagos	Tanzania Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Dodoma	Ghana Kintampo
Red meat	4 or more times per week	6.2	6.3	11.8	0.0	29.0	27.3	6.8	8.9	35.6
	2-3 times per week	59.6	24.3	25.6	0.7	44.2	46.2	34.9	26.5	23.3
	<=1 per week	34.5	69.3	62.6	99.3	26.8	26.6	58.3	64.6	41.2
Processed meats	4 or more times per week	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	3.8	6.9	0.3	0.0	4.0
	2-3 times per week	5.9	0.3	0.0	0.0	27.4	29.0	4.2	0.0	9.6
	<=1 per week	94.1	99.3	100.0	100.0	68.9	64.1	95.4	100.0	86.4
Refined grains	4 or more times per week	20.7	30.7	39.1	46.0	53.4	54.8	52.8	31.4	59.8
	2-3 times per week	49.1	42.0	29.8	41.3	38.9	36.2	28.3	21.9	21.9
	<=1 per week	30.3	27.3	31.1	12.8	7.8	9.0	18.9	46.7	18.3
SSBs	4 or more times per week	2.8	2.0	21.5	2.4	16.9	22.4	18.2	5.2	12.6
	2-3 times per week	42.0	20.3	13.8	22.2	46.1	36.2	29.6	12.7	21.9
	<=1 per week	55.3	77.7	64.7	75.5	37.0	41.4	52.1	82.1	65.5
Sweets and ice cream	4 or more times per week	8.6	5.0	3.5	3.4	12.1	12.4	3.3	14.1	6.3
	2-3 times per week	38.6	16.3	6.2	11.4	41.8	32.1	35.8	23.1	11.6
	<=1 per week	52.8	78.7	90.3	85.2	46.1	55.5	60.9	62.8	82.1
Potatoes, roots and tubers	4 or more times per week	1.9	0.3	10.7	18.8	23.9	29.0	37.1	14.4	66.5
	2-3 times per week	29.6	14.0	35.6	14.4	60.3	46.2	34.9	43.8	17.3
	<=1 per week	68.5	85.7	53.6	66.8	15.8	24.8	28.0	41.8	16.3

375 \*SSBs - Sugar Sweetened Beverages; Ouga - Ouagadougou; Burkina - Burkina Faso; Addis – Addis Ababa.

376

377 *Changes in consumption and diet quality*

378 **Fig 2** shows changes in the frequency of consumption of PDQS food groups comparing  
 379 the time before the COVID-19 pandemic to the first (July to November 2020) and second (July to  
 380 December 2021) round surveys. The frequency of consumption of both healthy and unhealthy  
 381 PDQS food groups was lower in Round 1 and Round 2 surveys (during the COVID-19 pandemic),  
 382 compared to the period before the pandemic (except for SSB). In general, consumption declined

383 most during the Round 1 survey compared with the period before COVID-19 and started to  
384 improve in Round 2. Data were captured around the same months for both surveys, which may  
385 decrease the influence of seasonality. However, there were exceptions. The frequency of  
386 consumption of dark green vegetables declined by 1 day and liquid vegetable oil consumption by  
387 0.5 days on average in Round 2 compared to Round 1. Other food groups for which consumption  
388 was lower in Round 2 include poultry, nuts, and seeds.

389

390 **Fig 2. Changes in frequency of consumption of PDQS food groups comparing the time**  
391 **before the time of COVID-19 to the first and second round surveys**

392

393 *Overall diet quality*

394 The median PDQS (IQR) was 19 (17,22), and PDQS was highest in Nigerian sites and  
395 lowest in Ouagadougou, Addis Ababa, Kersa and Dodoma. **Fig 3** shows mean PDQS before  
396 COVID-19, early during the time of COVID-19 in 2020 (Round 1), and later during the COVID-  
397 19 pandemic in 2021 (Round 2). Overall, PDQS had returned to pre-COVID-19 levels across sites  
398 by Round 2 of the survey but remained low. There are, however, site-specific differences. In Nouna  
399 and Addis Ababa, PDQS was slightly higher in Round 2 of the survey compared to previous times.  
400 In all other sites, PDQS was lower in Round 2, compared to before the pandemic. Tanzania and  
401 Ghana did not participate in round 1 data collection.

402

403 **Fig 3. Mean Prime Diet Quality Scores (PDQS) before, early and later in the COVID-19**  
404 **pandemic across five countries**

405           **Table 5** shows the factors associated with diet quality across the five countries in Round 2  
406 of the ARISE study. In a multivariate analysis, respondents residing in Nigeria (estimate: 2.84,  
407 95% CI: 2.26,3.41) and Ghana (estimate: 0.93, 95% CI: 0.37,1.49) had higher PDQS compared to  
408 those residing in Burkina Faso. Respondents aged 30-39 years (estimate: 0.77, 95% CI: 0.35,1.19)  
409 and those 40 years or older (estimate: 0.72, 95% CI: 0.30,1.13) had higher PDQS compared to  
410 those aged 29 years or younger. Male respondents (estimate: -0.54, 95% CI: -0.88, -0.20) and those  
411 with no education had poorer diet quality (estimate: -0.40, 95% CI: -0.76, -0.03), and secondary  
412 school or higher education was associated with a higher PDQS (estimate: 0.73, 95% CI: 0.32,1.15)  
413 compared to having primary school education. Respondents who identified as Catholic (estimate:  
414 0.66, 95% CI: 0.12,1.19) or Muslim (estimate: 0.51, 95% CI: 0.10,0.93) reported higher PDQS  
415 compared to Orthodox Christian respondents. Farmers and those engaged in casual labor reported  
416 lower PDQS (estimate: -0.60, 95% CI: -1.11, -0.09) compared to those that were formally  
417 employed.

418           Unemployed respondents had on average lower diet quality (estimate: -0.38, 95% CI: -  
419 0.69, -0.06) compared to those whose employment status was unchanged during the COVID-19  
420 pandemic. Those reporting going for an entire day without eating had lower PDQS than those who  
421 did not (estimate: -1.10, 95% CI: -1.53, -0.67). Lower crop production (estimate: -0.87, 95% CI: -  
422 1.28, -0.46) or not engaging in farming (estimate: -1.38, 95% CI: -1.74, -1.02) were associated  
423 with lower PDQS compared to having unchanged levels of crop production. Being in the middle  
424 tertile of the wealth index (estimate: 0.48, 95% CI: 0.14,0.81) was associated with higher PDQS  
425 compared to being in the highest tertile.

426

427

428

429 **Table 5. Factors associated with PDQS in Round 2 of the ARISE study across five countries**

	Univariate	Multivariate model <sup>a</sup>	Multivariate secondary analysis <sup>b</sup>
	Estimate (95% CI)	Estimate (95% CI)	Estimate (95% CI)
PDQS before COVID-19	0.16(0.11,0.22)***	-	0.09(0.03,0.14)*
Country			
Burkina Faso	ref	Ref	ref
Ethiopia	-0.78(-1.17,-0.39)***	-0.37(-0.86,0.11)	-0.85(-1.54,-0.15)*
Nigeria	3.11(2.72,3.49)***	2.84(2.26,3.41)***	1.93(0.82,3.04)**
Tanzania	0.53 (0.14,0.91)*	-0.13(-0.74,0.49)	-
Ghana	0.82(0.34,1.30)**	0.93(0.37,1.49)**	-
Location			
Rural area	-0.11(-0.39,0.11)	-0.13(-0.51,0.24)	0.11(-0.66,0.88)
Urban	ref	ref	ref
Staple prices			
No change or decreased	ref	ref	ref
Increased	0.32(-0.01,0.65)	-0.01(-0.63,0.62)	0.05(-1.28,1.37)
Pulse prices			
No change or decreased	ref	ref	ref
Increased	0.32(-0.01,0.66)	0.21(-0.37,0.79)	0.78(-0.37,1.94)
Fruits prices			
No change or decreased	ref	ref	ref
Increased	0.27(-0.04,0.58)	-0.45(-0.98,0.08)	-1.43(-2.33,-0.52) **
Vegetables prices			
No change or decreased	ref	ref	ref
Increased	0.27(-0.03,0.60)	-0.15(-0.71,0.41)	0.38(-0.64,1.39)
Animal source foods prices			
No change or decreased	ref	ref	ref
Increased	0.49(0.13,0.84)*	0.41(-0.10,0.92)	-0.31(-1.42,0.81)
Age (years)			
20-29	ref	ref	ref
30-39	0.56(0.11,1.01)*	0.77(0.35,1.19)***	0.35(-0.53,1.22)
≥ 40	0.43(0.02,0.82)*	0.72(0.30,1.13)**	-0.04(-0.91,0.84)
Sex			
Female	ref	ref	ref
Male	-0.36(-0.64,-0.08)*	-0.54(-0.88,-0.20)**	0.30(-0.36,0.96)
Education			
None or incomplete primary	-0.65(-0.99,-0.33)***	-0.40(-0.76,-0.03)*	-0.17(-0.77,0.43)
Primary school or incomplete secondary	ref	ref	ref
Secondary school or higher	1.72(1.37,2.06)***	0.73(0.32,1.15)**	1.25(0.47,2.03)*
Household head	-0.64(-0.93,-0.35)***	0.12(-0.24,0.47)	0.08(-0.58,0.74)
Household size	-0.06(-0.10,-0.02)**	0.02(-0.01,0.07)	0.01(-0.04,0.07)
Religion			
None	0.01(-1.18,1.21)	-0.48(-0.64,1.61)	-2.52(-5.23,0.20)



Catholic	-0.56(-1.05,-0.08)*	0.66(0.12,1.19)*	-0.79(-1.80,0.21)
Muslim	-0.89(-1.25,-0.54)***	0.51(0.10,0.93)*	-0.49(-1.30,0.33)
Orthodox Christian	ref	ref	ref
Protestant or other	-0.84(-1.26,-0.42)***	0.27(-0.25,0.78)	-0.59(-1.67,0.48)
<b>Occupation</b>			
Unemployed	-2.20(-2.69,-1.70)***	-0.39(-0.93,0.16)	0.21(-0.69,1.12)
Farmer or casual labor	-2.06(-2.43,-1.70)***	-0.60(-1.11,-0.09)*	0.52(-0.35,1.39)
Employed	ref	ref	ref
Student, self-employed or other	-0.65(-1.03,-0.27)**	0.01(-0.37,0.40)	0.98(0.27,1.70)*
<b>Effects of COVID-19</b>			
None, unemployed	-0.94(-1.25,-0.62)***	-0.38(-0.69,-0.06)*	-0.33(-0.90,0.23)
None, no change in employment status	ref	ref	ref
Lost employment	-0.01(-0.55,0.57)	0.44(-0.09,0.98)	-0.31(-0.48,1.11)
Changed occupation	0.18(-0.64,1.00)	0.12(-0.64,0.88)	0.20(-1.35,1.76)
Other (specify)	0.82(0.23,1.42)*	0.42(-0.15,1.00)	-0.58(-1.94,0.79)
<b>COVID-19 Impact on income</b>			
Income is unchanged	ref	ref	ref
Lost or reduced salary from employer	0.86(0.40,1.32)**	-0.19(-0.67,0.30)	-0.85(-1.62,-0.08)*
Lost or reduced income farming business	0.37(0.06,0.68)	-0.13(-0.45,0.19)	-0.51(-1.07,0.05)
Increased salary from employer or farming business	0.03(-1.11,1.17)	-0.36(-1.40,0.69)	-0.39(-2.16,1.37)
<b>Food security</b>			
Went without eating for a whole day (past month)			
No	ref	ref	ref
Yes	-0.71(-1.17,-0.24)**	-1.10(-1.53,-0.67)***	-1.28(-2.03,-0.52)**
<b>Own crop production affected</b>			
Unchanged	ref	ref	ref
Production has decreased	-1.06(-1.46,-0.67)***	-0.87(-1.28,-0.46)***	-1.04(-1.68,-0.41)**
Production has increased	1.16(0.10,2.22)*	0.18(-0.81,1.17)	0.58(-1.13,2.29)
Does not farm	-0.22(-0.53,0.09)	-1.38(-1.74,-1.02)***	-1.23(-1.84,-0.62)***
<b>Wealth index</b>			
Wealth tertile 1	0.02(-0.31,0.35)	-0.21(-0.51,0.10)	0.14(-0.39,2.26)
Wealth tertile 2	1.07(0.71,1.42)***	0.48(0.14,0.81)*	0.43(-0.16,1.02)
Wealth tertile 3	ref	ref	ref

430 Acronyms: PDQS: Prime Diet Quality Score, \* <0.05, \*\*<0.01, \*\*\*<0.001

431 a/Based on Round 2 data only

432 b/ Model restricted to individuals with round 1 and 2 data (N= 929) and adjusted for PDQS score prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (measured at

433 Round 1).

434 In sensitivity analysis controlling for PDQS before the COVID-19 pandemic and restricted

435 to the three countries with Round 1 data, PDQS before the COVID-19 pandemic was positively

436 associated with PDQS later in the Round 2 survey (estimate 0.09, 95% CI: 0.03,0.14) after

437 adjusting for other factors. We found country-level differences in PDQS, with respondents in  
438 Nigeria having higher PDQS (estimate 1.93, 95% CI: 0.82,3.04) and those in Ethiopia having  
439 lower PDQS (estimate: -0.85, 95% CI: -1.54, -0.15) compared to those residing in Burkina Faso.  
440 Higher fruit prices were associated with lower PDQS (estimate: -1.43, 95% CI: -2.33, -0.52).  
441 Secondary school education or higher was associated with higher diet quality (estimate: 1.25, 95%  
442 CI: 0.47,2.03) compared to primary school education, as was being self-employed or a student  
443 (estimates: 0.98, 95% CI:0.27,1.70) compared to being employed. Lower or reduced salary  
444 (estimate -0.85, 95% CI: -1.62, -0.08), lower crop production (estimate: -1.04, 95% CI: -1.68, -  
445 0.41) and not farming (estimate -1.23, 95% CI: -1.84, -0.62) were associated with lower diet  
446 quality after adjusting for other factors.

447

449

## Discussion

450 We evaluated the impact of COVID-19 on food prices, food security, crop production, and  
451 diet quality, and the factors associated with diet quality two years into the COVID-19 pandemic  
452 in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria and Tanzania. We found that food prices remained  
453 higher than expected during the pandemic, that consumption of healthy food groups remained low,  
454 and that diet quality showed signs of slight recovery since 2020 but remained poor. Food  
455 insecurity, low agriculture production, and occupation were negatively associated with PDQS,  
456 while higher socioeconomic status was positively associated with diet quality.

457 In this study, we found evidence of the continued impact of COVID-19 on food prices,  
458 with the majority of respondents indicating that food prices were higher than before the pandemic.  
459 In a study conducted across several countries early in the COVID-19 emergency in June 2020,  
460 there was evidence that the prices of maize, sorghum, imported rice and rice in SSA were higher  
461 than expected (25). Price increases were attributed to movement restrictions and lockdowns, with  
462 economic factors such as exchange rate, and inflation also contributing (25). Other studies  
463 indicated that a global slowdown due to COVID-19 and its related impact on Gross Domestic  
464 Product (GDP) could lead to impacts on food security and consumption, through increased  
465 unemployment, reduced trade and decreased production (26).

466 In this study, we found that lower agricultural production, not participating in crop  
467 production, as well as food insecurity, were associated with the consumption of lower-quality  
468 diets. The impacts of COVID-19 on agricultural production and food security have also been  
469 documented in previous studies. In one study, the COVID-19 pandemic was shown to impact bean  
470 production by small-scale farmers in SSA, with disruptions in access to seeds, inputs, and labor,  
471 among other things (27). Lower agricultural production can impact the consumption of quality

472 diets by decreasing the availability of foods and increasing prices for nutritious foods. In Nigeria,  
473 disruptions due to COVID-19 restrictions early in the pandemic included lockdowns, curfews and  
474 travel restrictions in urban areas and these affected the ability of local authorities to support  
475 agricultural production, disrupted trade and decreased access to healthy diets (28). Although  
476 restrictions across countries have been lifted, the lasting impact may be due to impacts on regional  
477 and international food trade that have affected food prices (28).

478         The impacts of COVID-19 on the African continent, particularly on food security and diets,  
479 are expected to be dire, given that purchasing power and social safety nets are already limited (29).  
480 However, we found that diet quality and diversity scores showed small increases later during the  
481 COVID-19 crisis and were closer to pre-COVID states. However, despite these increments, it was  
482 still clear that consumption of key food groups such as dark green vegetables, other vegetables,  
483 poultry, nuts and seeds, and liquid vegetable oils were declining. The consumption of red meat  
484 also showed signs of declining. For the DDS food groups, the majority of respondents reported  
485 decreased consumption, with notable declines for dark green vegetables, other vegetables, staples,  
486 meats and fruits. Further, the noted recovery of diet quality scores is small and both diet quality  
487 and diversity remain low across all the countries assessed. Moreover, there were country-specific  
488 differences with greater recovery in diet quality experienced in sites in Nigeria and Addis Ababa.  
489 In contrast, other sites continued to experience declining diet quality and diversity. These  
490 differences could reflect the differences in the states' capacity to mitigate against the COVID-19  
491 impacts and the availability of social protection. In this study, however, the availability of social  
492 protection to address the impacts of COVID-19 was very limited.

493         In several countries, the impacts of COVID-19 on food prices and quality have been due  
494 to decreased economic activity, lower income and declines in employment and income. We found

495 that loss of employment was infrequently reported. However, nearly 50% of the respondents  
496 indicated that they had lost income from employment, farming or business activities. The impacts  
497 of the loss of income from employment and income-generating activities on diets can be through  
498 loss of purchasing power (30). The effects of COVID-19 related income shocks on food security  
499 and diets have been reported in Uganda and Kenya, with poor households most affected (31, 32).  
500 For example, loss of income during COVID-19 was reported by farmers in Burundi (36%), Uganda  
501 (20%), and Kenya (3%). In our study, loss of income from farming and business was greatest in  
502 Kintampo, Dar es Salaam and Ibadan, with rural areas more likely to experience a loss due to  
503 impacts on agriculture. Previous studies have, however, indicated that rural areas and farming  
504 communities might be more resilient to the impacts of COVID-19 due to shorter value chains and  
505 reliance by smallholder farmers on their production (30). In our study, the impacts on rural and  
506 urban locations depend on the country context; for example, the largest declines in DDS were  
507 observed in urban sites such as Ouagadougou and rural sites of Kersa and Nouna.

508 Studies have also indicated that the greatest impact of COVID-19 in the African context  
509 has been felt by those with low socioeconomic status, informal workers, and those reliant on daily  
510 income (30). We found that the older or more educated respondents with higher socioeconomic  
511 status had higher diet quality in the study. We also found that those engaged in farming or casual  
512 labor in our study tended to have lower diet quality, reinforcing this observation. These individuals  
513 are less likely to have enough savings to cope with shocks such as the COVID-19 pandemic and  
514 may have been highly vulnerable even before the shock. Economic stimulus packages and  
515 investment in sectors such as agriculture have been proposed as possible solutions to address the  
516 challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic in Africa and to promote recovery (27). However,  
517 these were not readily available to communities and respondents in our study settings.

518           Our study has several strengths. First, we conducted a repeated cross-sectional study in 3  
519 countries, allowing us to track changes in food security and diet intake at different times during  
520 the COVID-19 pandemic. Further, we collected data on the same individuals in some contexts. A  
521 limitation of the study is that we had a loss to follow-up in round 2 of the survey, limiting our  
522 ability to look at changes over time prospectively. Loss to follow-up is, however, expected in  
523 telephone surveys, especially in our study contexts. Also, possible measurement errors as a result  
524 of self-reported dietary intake and food pricing.

525

## 526 **Conclusion**

527           We found continuing effects of COVID-19 on food prices, and low dietary intake and  
528 quality across the study sites. While there were improvements in diet quality later during the  
529 pandemic, consumption of healthy diets remained low, and improvements lagged across various  
530 sites. High food prices and poor diet quality experienced in the study have health implications.  
531 Efforts should continue to improve diet quality through mitigation measures, including social  
532 protection for people for sustained nutrition recovery.

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

## 541 **Acknowledgments**

542 We thank all study participants and data collectors for contributing to this study. The survey  
543 team in Ghana is grateful for support from the Kintampo Health Research Centre of Ghana Health  
544 Service, and the community leadership of Kintampo North Municipality and Kintampo South  
545 District. We acknowledge institutional support from Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health,  
546 Boston, MA; Harvard University Center for African Studies, Boston, MA; Heidelberg Institute of  
547 Global Health, Germany and the George Washington University Milken Institute of Public Health,  
548 Washington, DC.

549

## 550 **Authors' contributions**

551 AI and IM conceived and designed the study, analyzed the data, and drafted the manuscript.

552 WWF was the principal investigator for the parent study, conceived the study, designed the

553 study, interpreted the data, and guided revisions of the manuscript. YB designed the study,

554 interpreted the data, and guided revisions of the manuscript. EAP, AT, DD, PZ, Mo, NA, AC,

555 FW, FM, BL, EH, DW, SWA, KPA, TB, JK, AO, AS, AS, SV, and ES designed the study,

556 interpreted the data, and guided revisions of the draft manuscript. All authors read and approved

557 the final manuscript.

558

559 **Data sharing:** Data described in the manuscript, code book, and analytic code will be made

560 available upon request pending approval.

561

## References

- 562 1. Bamba C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. *J*  
563 *Epidemiol Community Health*. 2020;74(11):964-8.
- 564 2. WHO. COVID-19 responsible for at least 3 million excess deaths in 2020 2021 [cited 2021].  
565 Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/spotlight/the-impact-of-covid-19-on-global-health-](https://www.who.int/news-room/spotlight/the-impact-of-covid-19-on-global-health-goals)  
566 [goals](https://www.who.int/news-room/spotlight/the-impact-of-covid-19-on-global-health-goals).
- 567 3. McNeely CL, Schintler LA, Stabile B. Social Determinants and COVID-19 Disparities: Differential  
568 Pandemic Effects and Dynamics. *World Medical & Health Policy*. 2020;12(3):206-17.
- 569 4. WHO. COVID-19 situation reports. [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports)  
570 [coronavirus-2019/situation-reports](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports). 2022.
- 571 5. Fakhruddin BS, Blanchard K, Ragupathy D. Are we there yet? The transition from response to  
572 recovery for the COVID-19 pandemic. *Progress in Disaster Science*. 2020;7:100102.
- 573 6. Fairlie R. The impact of COVID-19 on small business owners: Evidence from the first three  
574 months after widespread social-distancing restrictions. *Journal of economics & management strategy*.  
575 2020;29(4):727-40.
- 576 7. Ozili P. COVID-19 in Africa: socio-economic impact, policy response and opportunities.  
577 *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. 2020.
- 578 8. FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2021.  
579 Transforming food systems for food security, improved nutrition and affordable healthy diets for all.  
580 Rome, FAO.; 2021.
- 581 9. FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2020.  
582 Transforming food systems for affordable healthy diets. Rome, FAO.; 2020.
- 583 10. Gilbert M, Pullano G, Pinotti F, Valdano E, Poletto C, Boëlle P-Y, et al. Preparedness and  
584 vulnerability of African countries against importations of COVID-19: a modelling study. *The Lancet*.  
585 2020;395(10227):871-7.
- 586 11. The Sustainable Development Goals Center for Africa and Sustainable Development Solutions  
587 Network (2020): Africa SDG Index and Dashboards Report. Kigali and New York: SDG Center for Africa  
588 and Sustainable Development Solutions Network.; 2020.
- 589 12. Picchioni F, Goulao LF, Roberfroid D. The impact of COVID-19 on diet quality, food security and  
590 nutrition in low and middle income countries: A systematic review of the evidence. *Clinical Nutrition*.  
591 2021.
- 592 13. Madzorera I, Ismail A, Hemler EC, Korte ML, Olufemi AA, Wang D, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on  
593 Nutrition, Food Security, and Dietary Diversity and Quality in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Nigeria. *The*  
594 *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2021;105(2):295-309.
- 595 14. Turner C, Aggarwal A, Walls H, Herforth A, Drewnowski A, Coates J, et al. Concepts and critical  
596 perspectives for food environment research: A global framework with implications for action in low-and  
597 middle-income countries. *Global food security*. 2018;18:93-101.
- 598 15. Darling AM, Assefa N, Bärnighausen T, Berhane Y, Canavan CR, Guwatudde D, et al. Design and  
599 field methods of the ARISE Network Adolescent Health Study. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*.  
600 2020;25(1):5-14.
- 601 16. Hemler EC, Korte ML, Lankoande B, Millogo O, Assefa N, Chukwu A, et al. Design and field  
602 methods of the ARISE Network COVID-19 rapid monitoring survey. *The American Journal of Tropical*  
603 *Medicine and Hygiene*. 2021;105(2):310.
- 604 17. Fung T, Isanaka S, Hu FB, Willett WC. International food group-based diet quality and risk of  
605 coronary heart disease in men and women. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2018;107(1):120-  
606 9.




- 607 18. Fung T, Bromage S, Li Y, Bhupathiraju S, Batis C, Fawzi W, et al. A Global Diet Quality Index and  
608 Risk of Type 2 Diabetes in U.S. Women. *Curr Dev Nutr.* 2020;4:1401-.
- 609 19. Gicevic S, Gaskins AJ, Fung TT, Rosner B, Tobias DK, Isanaka S, et al. Evaluating pre-pregnancy  
610 dietary diversity vs. dietary quality scores as predictors of gestational diabetes and hypertensive  
611 disorders of pregnancy. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(4):e0195103.
- 612 20. Madzorera I, Isanaka S, Wang M, Msamanga GI, Urassa W, Hertzmark E, et al. Maternal dietary  
613 diversity and dietary quality scores in relation to adverse birth outcomes in Tanzanian women. *The  
614 American Journal of Clinical Nutrition.* 2020;112(3):695-706.
- 615 21. Fung TT, Isanaka S, Hu FB, Willett WC. International food group-based diet quality and risk of  
616 coronary heart disease in men and women. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2018;107(1):120-9.
- 617 22. Gicevic S, Gaskins AJ, Fung TT, Rosner B, Tobias DK, Isanaka S, et al. Evaluating pre-pregnancy  
618 dietary diversity vs. dietary quality scores as predictors of gestational diabetes and hypertensive  
619 disorders of pregnancy. *PloS one.* 2018;13(4):e0195103-e.
- 620 23. FAO. Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women: A guide to measurement Rome: Food and  
621 Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and USAID; 2016.
- 622 24. Martin-Prével Y, Allemand, P., Wiesmann, D., Arimond, M., Ballard, T., Deitchler, M., Dop, M.C.,  
623 Kennedy, G., Lee, W.T. & Mousi, M. Moving forward on choosing a standard operational indicator of  
624 women's dietary diversity. Rome: FAO; 2015.
- 625 25. Agyei SK, Isshaq Z, Frimpong S, Adam AM, Bossman A, Asiamah O. COVID-19 and food prices in  
626 sub-Saharan Africa. *Afr Dev Rev.* 2021;33(Suppl 1):S102-S13.
- 627 26. Beckman J, Baquedano F, Countryman A. The impacts of COVID-19 on GDP, food prices, and  
628 food security. *Q Open.* 2021;1(1).
- 629 27. Nchanji EB, Lutomia CK. Regional impact of COVID-19 on the production and food security of  
630 common bean smallholder farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa: Implication for SDG's. *Global Food Security.*  
631 2021;29:100524.
- 632 28. Ali Z, Green R, Zougmore RB, Mkuhlani S, Palazzo A, Prentice AM, et al. Long-term impact of  
633 West African food system responses to COVID-19. *Nature Food.* 2020;1(12):768-70.
- 634 29. Ali Mohamed EM, Alhaj Abdallah SM, Ahmadi A, Lucero-Prisno DE. Food Security and COVID-19  
635 in Africa: Implications and Recommendations. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene.*  
636 2021;104(5):1613-5.
- 637 30. Picchioni F, Goulao LF, Roberfroid D. The impact of COVID-19 on diet quality, food security and  
638 nutrition in low and middle income countries: A systematic review of the evidence. *Clinical Nutrition.*
- 639 31. Agamile P. COVID-19 Lockdown and Exposure of Households to Food Insecurity in Uganda:  
640 Insights from a National High Frequency Phone Survey. *The European Journal of Development Research.*  
641 2022.
- 642 32. Kansiime MK, Tambo JA, Mugambi I, Bundi M, Kara A, Owuor C. COVID-19 implications on  
643 household income and food security in Kenya and Uganda: Findings from a rapid assessment. *World  
644 Development.* 2021;137:105199.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.12.22283393>; this version posted December 13, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.


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

**Figure 1: Map of ARISE sites for Round 2 of the COVID-19 studies**



**Fig 2. Changes in frequency of consumption of PDQS food groups comparing the time before the time COVID-19 to the first and second round surveys**





**Fig 3. Mean Prime Diet Quality Scores (PDQS) prior to, early and later in the COVID-19 pandemic across five countries**




Fig 4. Proportion of people reporting changes in prices of key food groups during the COVID-19 pandemic, as compared to this time of the year in previous years