

International Journal of **Environmental Research** and Public Health



Article 1

Household Hardships during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Examining Household 2

Vulnerability and Responses to Pandemic Related Shocks in Eastern Ethiopia 3

Jonathan A. Muir11*, Merga Dheresa2t, Zachary J. Madewell3, Tamirat Getachew2, Gezahegn Mengesha2, Cynthia 4 G. Whitney1, Nega Assefa2[‡], and Solveig A. Cunningham1[‡] 5

6	1. Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States
6 7	 Haramaya University, Harar, Ethiopia
8	 Center for Global Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, United States
9	†Co-first authors
10	‡Co-senior authors
11	* Correspondence: Jonathan A. Muir, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States, jamuir@emory.edu
12	Abstract: COVID-19 is associated with one of the largest disturbances to life in the 21st century. To
13	quell disease spread, governments implemented lockdowns that likely created hardships for
14	households. To improve knowledge of consequences, we examine how the pandemic period was
15	associated with household hardships and assess factors associated with these hardships. We con-
16	ducted a cross-sectional study using quasi-Poisson regression to examine factors associated with
17	household hardships. Data were collected between August and September of 2021 from a random
18	sample of 880 households living in a Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) located
19	in the Harari Region and the District of Kersa, both in Ethiopia. Having a head of household with no
20	education, residing in a rural area, larger household size, lower income and/or wealth, and com-
21	munity responses to COVID-19 including lockdowns and travel restrictions were independently
22	associated with experiencing household hardships. Our results identify characteristics of groups
23	at-risk for food insecurity during the pan-demic; households that were already struggling prior to
24	the onset of the pandemic were at greatest risk of adverse consequences during the pandemic pe-
25	riod. These findings may inform future efforts to mitigate the consequences of COVID-19 and future
26	disease out-breaks.
27	Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; Africa; Resilience; Vulnerability

28

29 Citation: To be added by editorial staff during production. 30 31 Academic Editor: Firstname 32 Lastname 33 Received: date 34 Revised: date 35 Accepted: date 36 Published: date 37 (\mathbf{i}) (cc)

1. Introduction

39 Copyright: © 2023 by the authors 40 Submitted for possible open acces publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons 42Attribution (CC BY) license⁴³ (https://creativecommons.org/license 44 c/bw/4.0.0

38

The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in one of the largest disturbances to life in the 21st century. Beyond direct health effects,[1] the pandemic had social and economic consequences as government-enforced lockdowns were implemented to stem the pace and severity of the disease.[2] To adhere to these lockdowns, many businesses closed their in-person offices temporarily; for some, business closure was permanent. Mitigation efforts also affected healthcare providers who had to restrict in-person access to patients and/or limit services. These efforts may have affected the health of young children, pregnant women, and mothers by limiting access to healthcare and sufficient food – especially in isolated regions of resource-limited countries.[3-15] These indirect effects, in return, would exacerbate direct effects of the SARS-CoV-2 virus by increasing risk for undernutrition and other conditions that heighten the danger of serious illness. [14,15] Knowledge on the extent to which households living in resource-limited countries have experienced resource restrictions and other hardships remains limited due to incomplete or nonexistent population surveillance.[16]

In sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), national governments undertook considerable efforts to

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56 57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69 70

71

72

73

74

75

76 77

78 79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

89

90 91

92

quell the spread of COVID-19.[2,17] Mitigation efforts in Ethiopia included social distancing, lockdowns, and emphasizing hygiene protocols; these efforts were started on March 16th of 2020, intensified on March 20th, and ultimately a state of emergency was declared on April 10th.[18] Economic and social disparities across different sociodemographic groups and geospatial inequalities may have resulted in uneven implementation of these efforts.[11] These disparities may also have resulted in differential household and community vulnerability to unintended consequences of these efforts.

Vulnerability is the collective effect of cultural, economic, institutional, political, and social processes that modify the experience of and recovery from a given hazard [19] In the context of disasters, it is often not the hazard itself that creates the disaster; rather, the disaster is the impact on individual and community coping patterns and the inputs and outputs of social systems.[20-22] Social vulnerability is partially the result of social disparities that shape or influence the susceptibility of different groups to hazards while also controlling their capacity to respond. [23,24] Individual and household level factors often associated with vulnerability include demographic characteristics such as age, ethnicity, race, and sex; socioeconomic status (e.g., income, wealth, employment, and/or education); household composition (e.g., presence of children or elderly); and housing and transportation.[25] However, social vulnerability also involves place disparities stemming from characteristics of communities and the built environment. For example, differential availability of scarce resources between urban and rural areas may exacerbate individual and household level vulnerabilities to hazards. [26-28] To understand the broader consequences of the pandemic, it is important to consider economic, political, and social markers of vulnerability at the individual, household, and community level. [20-24]

In Ethiopia, those already burdened by social and economic disparities and limited in their ability to access resources are at greater risk for experiencing additional hardships during the pandemic.[7,11,17] Specific demographic groups disproportionately vulnerable include: older adults, people with disabilities or pre-existing medical conditions, the poor, people living in congested residences and/or slums, pregnant women, and the unemployed. Rural populations in Ethiopia are at elevated risk for food insecurity and agricultural hardships as climate change, severe drought, conflict, and environmental degradation have culminated in societal shocks affecting livelihoods, particularly for farmers.[29,30] Populations lacking access to safe drinking water and/or sanitary environments, reliant upon emergency food aid, or with limited access to media or other communication technologies are also at greater risk of adverse consequences of the pandemic.[17] Differential vulnerability requires context specific interventions to address indirect costs of the pandemic.[31]

We used data from an existing Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) in Eastern Ethiopia to analyze the prevalence of household level hardships experienced during the pandemic and examine factors associated with vulnerability to these hardships. We further explore household responses to these hardships and analyze factors associated with households using these coping strategies.

87 **2. Materials and Methods**

88 2.1. Study setting

The setting for this study is a predominantly rural area in the district of Kersa and an urban area in the Harari People's National Regional State in Eastern Ethiopia.[32,33] The rural area consists of 24 kebeles (a neighborhood or ward), and covers 353 km2 with a population of 135,754 in 25,653 households. The urban area consists of 12 kebeles, a

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

population of 55,773 in 14,768 households, across 25.4 km2. The population has been followed through a Health and Demographic Surveillance System since 2012, with demographic and health-related information regularly collected (see Figure 1).




Figure 1. The Harar and Kersa Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) in Eastern Ethiopia. The smaller map panels on the right identify the location of the HDSS catchment areas within Eastern Ethiopia.

This study is part of a larger examination within the Child Health and Mortality Prevention Surveillance (CHAMPS) network to understand the consequences of COVID-19 lockdowns for child health and mortality.[33] We administered a short data collection questionnaire designed to understand how the pandemic and related lockdowns may have affected the livelihood, food availability, and healthcare of households. Households were selected using simple random sampling to achieve a sample size of 440 from the rural (Kersa) and from the urban (Harar) catchment areas (total sample size of 880). The sample size was specified to detect prevalence of changes in accessing healthcare. A priori specifications were 50% of the population experiencing changes, 95% CI, precision of 0.05 and non-response adjustment of 10%.

The survey questionnaire was structured into five sections: knowledge regarding the spread of COVID-19; food availability; COVID-19 related shocks/coping; under-five child healthcare services; and healthcare services for pregnant women. Questions in the survey instrument related to hardships associated with the pandemic period asked respondents to consider whether a given hardship had occurred since March of 2020. Data collectors were drawn from the fieldwork teams of HDSS enumerators already trained and working in the HDSS. Data collection occurred between August and September of 2021 and was carried out through tablet-based in-person interviews with adult household members. Survey data from the questionnaire were linked with data from the most recent HDSS round to incorporate additional demographic data about the respective household: specifically, age, sex, occupation, and education of the head of household; the number of children under 5 years of age and the number of adults over age 60 in the household; and household assets and residence construction materials. Data quality assurance and


^{2.2.} Study design

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

cleaning followed standard procedures for the HDSS.[32,34] Inconsistent or missing data were flagged for data collectors to correct. Field supervisors and the field coordinator selected a random sample of questionnaires for re-visits to validate the recorded information. Implementation of the module was approved by an Institutional Health Research Ethics Review Committee (IHRERC); approval reference number Ref.No.IHRERC/127/2021.

2.3. Measures 130

> The variable of interest Household Hardships was generated as an additive index of the number of hardships a household reported experiencing during the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., since March of 2020); it was coded as a count variable ranging from 0 to 9. Information on household hardships were gathered from the following survey question: "Has your household been affected by any of these events since mid-March?" Responses included: job loss; nonfarm business closure; disruption of farming; disruption of livestock activities; disruption of fishing activities; increased price of farming or business inputs; decreased price of farming or business outputs, increased price of major food items consumed; and illness, injury, or death of any household member. The percentage of households that reported a given hardship is presented in Figure 2. The additive index had a Cronbach's alpha score of 0.77 signifying high internal consistency.[35]





124

125

126 127

128

129

131

132

133

134

135 136

137

138

139

140141

- 144145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

Figure 2. Percentage of Households that Reported a Given Hardship. Represents the distribution of hardships used in the additive index *Household Hardships* (n = 880).

To create an alternative representation of hardships, we used principal components analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation to extract orthogonal factors from the variables in Household Hardships. The eigenvalues of the correlation matrix from PCA demonstrated that the first factor explained 40% of the variability in the data and the second explained 20%. Subsequent factors explained little variability. We opted to retain the first factor, which included job loss, nonfarm business closure, farm disruption, livestock disruption, fishing disruption, and output inflation, as an index we termed Household Disruptions. Variables highly correlated with the factor were weighted against their eigenvector coefficients. Details related to the PCA results for the *Household Disruptions* are presented in Appendix A.

Right-hand side variables in our analyses included information on the head of house-155 hold, characteristics of the household and its homestead, and COVID-19 response varia-156

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

bles. Head of household variables were age (coded as 1 = less than 40 years, 2 = 41 to 44 years, 3 = 45 to 60 years, and 4 = sixty years and above); sex (coded as male = 0 and female = 1); ethnicity (coded as Amhara = 1 (reference) and other = 2, which included Oromo, Somali, Gurage, Harari and Tigray); education (coded as no formal education = 0 (reference), any level of education = 1); occupation (coded as 1 = farmer/domestic (reference), 2 = student, 3 = professional, 4 = sales, 5 = daily laborer, 6 = other employment, 7 = unemployed/retired). Household variables were *urbanicity* (coded as urban (Harar) = 1 and rural (Kersa) = 0); household size (coded as 1 = 1-2 individuals (reference), 2 = 3-4 individuals, 3 = 5-6 individuals, 4 = 7-8 individuals, 5 = 9+ individuals); *children under age* 5 (coded as $0 = n_0$, $1 = y_{es}$; adults over age 60 (coded as $0 = n_0$, $1 = y_{es}$); monthly income (coded as 1 = 10-1,200 Birr Ethiopia Birr (reference), 2 = 1,201-2,000 Birr, 3 = 2,001-3,000 Birr, 4 = 3,001-4,600 Birr, and 5 = 4,600+); and a *wealth index* based on a list of household assets (coded as an 1 = poorest (reference), 2 = poorer, 3 = middle, 4 = richer, 5 = richest). For information on the principal components analysis used to compute the wealth index see Appendix B. Covid response variables were used to analyze associations between household hardships and community/government interventions that were implemented to stem the severity of COVID-19. Responses were gathered from the following survey question: "What steps has your community/government taken to curb the spread of the coronavirus in your area?" Intervention variables analyzed include: lockdowns, travel restrictions, business closures, and intervention centers. Each of these variables were coded Yes = 1 and No = 0.

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198 199

200

201

202

203 204

205

206 207

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164 165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

2.4. Analytic Strategy

Data cleaning and analysis was performed using R version 4.2.0.[36] Education and occupation related data from the HDSS were missing for nine household heads; these households were removed from analyses that included these variables. A series of unadjusted quasi-Poisson regression models were used to analyze associations with the additive index Household Hardships and also with the PCA based index Household Disruptions (results from the unadjusted analyses are available upon request). Adjusted quasi-Poisson regression models were then used to control for additional variables. Variables were included in the final adjusted model if their inclusion had theoretical justification. We assessed model fit with comparison of AIC and BIC scores – both scores were the smallest for the fully adjusted model, indicating that this model had superior fit compared to simpler or pathway specific models. Results are reported as Adjusted Incidence Rate Ratios (AIRR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) and visualized with forest plots.[37,38] Given anticipated differences in demographic, economic, and social characteristics between populations living in urban vs. rural areas, effect modification was evaluated using interaction terms and visualized as predicted probabilities. A secondary analysis was conducted for those households that reported experiencing at least one hardship during the pandemic. This analysis used adjusted logistic regression to examine factors associated with household responses to pandemic hardships. We present results for the response strategies that were used by at least 10% of households.

3. Results

Only 13% of households reported not experiencing any of the measured hardships; the remaining 87% experienced at least one hardship (see Figure 3). The average number of hardships experienced during the pandemic was 2.86 with a standard deviation of 2.31; the interquartile range spanned 1 to 4 hardships. A majority of households (59.5%) observed an increase in local food prices (see Figure 2). Other common hardships included a household member losing their job (55.5%), observing increases in the cost of inputs for businesses or farms (49.8%), nonfarm business closures (30.2%), and reductions in the value of business or farming outputs (27.8%).

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023




Figure 3. Number of Hardships Experienced during the COVID-19 Pandemic (n = 880). Figure 3a. presents a heat map of the number of hardships reported by the 880 sampled households. Figure 3b. presents the distribution of the additive index *Household Hardships*.

A majority of households (66%) were headed by a male household member (Table 1). Average age of the household head was 43 years with a standard deviation of 15. Roughly a quarter of household heads were from the Amhara ethnic group. A majority (58%) of household heads had obtained some level of education; their most common occupations were farmer (46%) and professional (27%). The median number of household members was 5 with a standard deviation of 2.4. Roughly a third of households reported having at least one child under the age of 5 and 27% of households had at least one adult family member over the age of 60. The most commonly reported government/community responses to the pandemic were business closures (48%) followed by travel restrictions (46%) and the establishment of isolation centers (44%).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (n = 880)

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

7 of 25

	_				Urbanicity			x ²	p-valu
		Total	%	Urban	%	Rural	%		
Head of Household Character	ristics								
Age	<40	218	25%	105	24%	113	26%		
	41-50	265	30%	136	31%	129	29%	0.8	0.853
	51-60	179	20%	87	20%	92	21%	0.0	0.000
	60+	218	25%	112	25%	106	24%		
Sex	Female	303	34%	192	44%	111	25%	22.0	-0.001
	Male	577	66%	248	56%	329	75%	33.0	<0.001
Ethnicity	Amhara	222	25%	192	44%	30	7%		
Linderty	Other	658	75%	248	56%	410	93%	158.1	< 0.001
Education	Some Eduation	510	58%	78	18%	283	65%		
Education	No Education	361	50 %	360	82%	150	35%	201.0	< 0.001
~ .									
Occupation	Farmer/Domestic	401	46%	89	20%	312	72%		
	Student	59	7%	34 186	8% 42%	25 50	6%		
	Professional/Sales	236	27% 8%	53	42 % 12%	50 14	12% 3%	255.2	< 0.001
	Daily Laborer Other work	67 21	0 /0 2%	8	2%	13	3%		
	Unemployed/Retire	87	10%	68	16%	19	4%		
Household Characteristics	onemployed/terre	07	10 /0	00	1070		170		
						5.0			
Household Size	1-2	146	17%	94	21%	52	12%		
	3-4	257	29%	168	38%	89	20%	00.0	
	5-6	247	28%	122	28%	125	28%	99.0	<0.001
	7-8	171	19%	37 19	$\frac{8\%}{4\%}$	134 40	30% 9%		
	9+	59	7%						
Children Under Age 5	No	578	66%	322	73%	256	58%	22.0	<0.001
	Yes	302	34%	118	27%	184	42%		
Adults Over Age 60	No	644	73%	306	70%	338	77%	6.0	0.015
	Yes	236	27%	134	30%	102	23%	0.0	0.015
Income (Birr)	4,600+	172	20%	125	28%	49	11%		
(,	3,001 - 4,600	132	15%	71	16%	63	14%		
	2,001 - 3,000	165	19%	75	17%	93	21%	55.1	< 0.001
	1,201 -2,000	209	24%	73	17%	137	31%		
	0 - 1,200	192	22%	96	22%	97	22%		
Wealth Index	Richest	180	20%	95	22%	85	19%		
	Richer	174	20%	87	20%	87	20%		
	Middle	174	20%	72	16%	102	23%	13.4	0.009
	Poorer	176	20%	81	18%	95	22%		
	Poorest	176	20%	105	24%	71	16%		
Covid Response									
Business Closures	No	461	52%	228	52%	233	53%	0.1	0.736
	Yes	419	48%	212	48%	207	47%	0.1	0.750
Isolation Centers	No	497	56%	253	58%	244	55%	<u>.</u>	0 = + -
	Yes	383	44%	187	43%	196	45%	0.4	0.541
Lockdowns	No	502	57%	264	60%	238	54%		
LUCKUUWIIS	Yes	302 378	57% 43%	176	40%	202	46%	3.1	0.077
Travel Restrictions	No	474	54%	227	52%	247	56%	1.8	0.176

n= 880.

Data source: CHAMPS Ethiopia Lockdown Module data and CHAMPS Ethiopia Health and Demographic Surveillance data.

Notes: Nine observations were missing for head of household's education and occupation. One observation was missing for whether a household had experienced food insecurity prior to the onset of COVID-19. The "other" category for ethnicity included: Oromo, Somali, Gurage, Harari, Tigray, and "other". One observation was missing for whether a household had experienced food insecurity prior to the onset of COVID-19.

3.1. Factors Associated with Household Hardships

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

8 of 25

235	After adjusting for other variables (see Figure 4), households were more likely to report
236	hardships during the pandemic if the household resided in a rural compared to an urban
237	area (AIRR = 1.34, 95% CI [1.20, 1.49]). Compared to households with 1 to 2 household
238	members, larger households were also more likely to report hardships during the pan-
239	demic; for example, for households with 7-8 members, the AIRR for experiencing hard-
240	ships during the pandemic was 1.42 (95% CI [1.24, 4.65]). In contrast, households were
241	less likely to report experiencing hardships during the pandemic if the household head
242	had at least some education compared to none (AIRR = 0.87, 95% CI [0.79, 0.96]); was
243	employed in a professional occupation (AIRR = 0.75, 95% CI [0.66, 0.84]) or as a day la-
244	borer (AIRR = 0.74, 95% CI [0.62, 0.88]) compared to employment in agriculture; had a
245	monthly household income greater than 1,200 Birr (for example, the AIRR for experi-
246	encing hardships during the pandemic for households with a monthly income greater
247	than 4,600 Birr was 0.57 (95% CI [0.49, 0.66])); or were wealthier compared to the poorest
248	households. Households were also more likely to report experiencing hardships during
249	the pandemic if they also reported local community/government implementation of
250	lockdowns (AIRR = 1.29, 95% CI [1.14, 1.46]), travel restrictions (AIRR = 1.38, 95% CI
251	[1.23, 1.56]), and the establishment of isolations centers (AIRR = 1.17, 95% CI [1.03, 1.33]).
252	The age, sex, and ethnicity of the household head as well as the presence of children
253	under the age of 5 or adults older than age 60 in the household were not associated with
254	household hardships after adjusting for other variables. Results from the analysis of the
255	Household Disruptions index (Figure 5) were generally consistent with the results from
256	analyzing the Household Hardships index.
250	
230	
257	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the
257	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the
257 258	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a
257 258 259	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing
257 258 259 260 261	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban
257 258 259 260	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were
257 258 259 260 261 262	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining
257 258 259 260 261 262 263	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with <i>Household Hardships</i> while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with <i>Household Hardships</i> while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted probabilities indicate that households with a household head that identified as an ethnic
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with <i>Household Hardships</i> while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted probabilities indicate that households with a household head that identified as an ethnic group other than the Amhara or had no education were primarily at greater risk of ex-
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with <i>Household Hardships</i> while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted probabilities indicate that households with a household head that identified as an ethnic group other than the Amhara or had no education were primarily at greater risk of experience hardships if they were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area.
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with <i>Household Hardships</i> while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted probabilities indicate that households with a household head that identified as an ethnic group other than the Amhara or had no education were primarily at greater risk of experience hardships if they were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area. Dramatic dose responses of higher probability for experiencing hardships are seen for
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 270	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with <i>Household Hardships</i> while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted probabilities indicate that households with a household head that identified as an ethnic group other than the Amhara or had no education were primarily at greater risk of experience hardships if they were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area. Dramatic dose responses of higher probability for experiencing hardships are seen for larger households, households with lower income, and households with lower wealth
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 271	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with <i>Household Hardships</i> while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted probabilities indicate that households with a household head that identified as an ethnic group other than the Amhara or had no education were primarily at greater risk of experience hardships if they were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area. Dramatic dose responses of higher probability for experiencing hardships are seen for larger households, households with lower income, and households with lower wealth that were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area.
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with <i>Household Hardships</i> while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted probabilities indicate that households with a household head that identified as an ethnic group other than the Amhara or had no education were primarily at greater risk of experience hardships if they were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area. Dramatic dose responses of higher probability for experiencing hardships are seen for larger households, households with lower income, and households with lower wealth that were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area,
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 270 271 272 273	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with <i>Household Hardships</i> while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted probabilities indicate that households with a household head that identified as an ethnic group other than the Amhara or had no education were primarily at greater risk of experience hardships if they were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area. Dramatic dose responses of higher probability for experiencing hardships are seen for larger households, households with lower income, and households with lower wealth that were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area, local implementation of lockdowns and business closures as a response to the pandemic
257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272	Baseline predicted probabilities of household experiences with hardships during the pandemic based on <i>urbanicity</i> (urban vs. rural residence) as well as probabilities estimated from models including interaction terms with other variables are presented as a facet grid in Figure 6. The top facet presents the elevated probability of experiencing hardships during the pandemic for households living in a rural compared to an urban area while holding all other variables at their mean. These baseline probabilities were estimated using results from the analytic model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included statistically significant interaction terms between <i>urbanicity</i> and other variables associated with <i>Household Hardships</i> while holding all adjusting variables at their mean. The predicted probabilities indicate that households with a household head that identified as an ethnic group other than the Amhara or had no education were primarily at greater risk of experience hardships if they were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area. Dramatic dose responses of higher probability for experiencing hardships are seen for larger households, households with lower income, and households with lower wealth that were residing in a rural area compared to an urban area,

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

		n	AI	R	
Age (Household Head)				
ige (neuconoia noua	<40	209			Reference
	41–50	263			
					1.02 (0.92, 1.13
	51–60	179	•		1.10 (0.98, 1.23
	60+	218	-		1.09 (0.92, 1.29
Sex (Household Head))				
	, Female	299			Reference
	Male	571			1.07 (0.98, 1.17
Ethnicity (Household)		571		•	1.07 (0.30, 1.17
Ethnicity (Household		004			D.(
	Amhara	221	•		Reference
	Other	649	•		1.10 (0.97, 1.25
Education (Household	l Head)				
· ·	No Education	361	•		Reference
	Some Education	509			0.87 (0.79, 0.96
Occupation (Househo		505	•		0.07 (0.70, 0.00
		404			Defenses
	Farmer/Domestic	401	•		Reference
	Student	59		-	0.91 (0.76, 1.08
	Professional	235			0.75 (0.66, 0.84
	Daily Laborer	67	—		0.74 (0.62, 0.88
	Other Work	21		-	0.81 (0.62, 1.03
	Unemployed/Retired	87			0.86 (0.74, 0.99
		07			0.00 (0.74, 0.98
Urbanicity (Household		12.2			L (
	Urban (Harar)	438			Reference
	Rural (Kersa)	432		—	1.34 (1.20, 1.49
Household Size	. ,				
	1–2	144			Reference
	3–4	254		<u> </u>	1.21 (1.06, 1.38
		-			
	5-6	242			1.36 (1.19, 1.56
	7–8	171		—	1.42 (1.24, 1.65
	9+	59			1.67 (1.41, 1.98
Children Under Age 5	(Household)				
	Ňo	575			Reference
	Yes	295			0.94 (0.86, 1.0
Adults Over Age 60 (H		235	•		0.34 (0.00, 1.0
Addits Over Age 60 (F		004			
	No	634			Reference
	Yes	236		-	0.90 (0.77, 1.05
Income (Household)					
	0-1,200	192	•		Reference
	1,201-2,000	209	—		0.84 (0.75, 0.94
	2,001–3,000	165			0.74 (0.65, 0.84
	3,001-4,600	132			0.74 (0.64, 0.84
	4,600+	172	—		0.57 (0.49, 0.66
Wealth Index (Househ	old)				
•	Poorest	176	•		Reference
	Poorer	172	_	-	0.98 (0.89, 1.08
	Middle	170			0.86 (0.76, 0.97
	Richer	173			0.78 (0.69, 0.89
	Richest	179	—		0.65 (0.56, 0.74
Lockdown (Covid Res	ponse)				
•	No	498	•		Reference
	Yes	372		—	1.29 (1.14, 1.40
Business Closures (C					
Buaineaa Giusuiea (C		456			Reference
	No				
	Yes	414	•	—	1.11 (0.97, 1.28
Travel Restrictions (Co	ovid Response)				
•	No	472	•		Reference
	Yes	398		—	1.38 (1.23, 1.56
		000			
solation Centers (Co					
Isolation Centers (Cov		101			Deference
	No Yes	494 376			Reference 1.17 (1.03, 1.33

Figure 4. Adjusted Association with *Household Hardships* presented as Adjusted Incidence Rate Ratios (AIRR). The forest plot presents AIRRs with 95% confidence intervals from a multivariate quasi-Poisson regression model. The AIRRs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=870)

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

Variable		n	All	KK	
Age (Household Hea	d)				
	<40	209			Reference
	41–50	264	-	-	0.93 (0.79, 1.10
	51-60	179	-	←	1.08 (0.90, 1.30
	60+	218		· 	1.01 (0.77, 1.32
Say (Hausshald Has		210			1.01 (0.77, 1.32
Sex (Household Hea		000			Defenses
	Female	299			Reference
	Male	571		-	1.10 (0.96, 1.26
Ethnicity (Household	l Head)				
	Amhara	221	•		Reference
	Other	649	_	-	1.05 (0.81, 1.30
Education (Househo	ld Head)				
	No Education	361			Reference
	Some Education	509	-+		0.88 (0.75, 1.04
Occupation (Househ		000	•		0.00 (0.70, 1.0
becupation (nousen	Farmer/Domestic	401			Deference
					Reference
	Student	59		_	1.00 (0.74, 1.3
	Professional	235			0.60 (0.46, 0.78
	Daily Laborer	67			0.77 (0.54, 1.06
	Other Work	21	+	-	0.86 (0.57, 1.23
	Unemployed/Retired	87	—		0.65 (0.48, 0.8
Jrbanicity (Househo	ld)				,
	Urban (Harar)	438			Reference
	Rural (Kersa)	432			4.09 (3.27, 5.14
lousehold Size	(Noia)	452			7.03 (0.27, 0.14
Tousenoid Size	4.0	4.4.4			Deferences
	1–2	144			Reference
	3–4	254		—	1.60 (1.26, 2.06
	5–6	242		—	1.90 (1.48, 2.4
	7–8	171		—	2.03 (1.58, 2.6)
	9+	59		—	2.49 (1.86, 3.34
Children Under Age	5 (Household)				,,
ennaren enaer /ige	No	575			Reference
	Yes	295			0.94 (0.82, 1.00
Adults Over Age 60		235			0.34 (0.02, 1.00
Adults Over Age ou		004			Deference
	No	634			Reference
	Yes	236	-	-	0.93 (0.73, 1.1
ncome (Household)					
	0–1,200	192			Reference
	1,201-2,000	209	-		0.67 (0.57, 0.79
	2,001-3,000	165	—		0.51 (0.41, 0.63
	3,001-4,600	132	—		0.50 (0.40, 0.63
	4.600+	172	·		0.26 (0.19, 0.3
Nealth Index (House		112	•		0.20 (0.18, 0.30
realth muex (nouse		170			Deference
	Poorest	176			Reference
	Poorer	172			0.92 (0.79, 1.08
	Middle	170	-+		0.85 (0.70, 1.04
	Richer	173	-+-		0.81 (0.66, 1.00
	Richest	179	—		0.35 (0.27, 0.4
_ockdown (Covid Re		-			, ,
	No	498			Reference
	Yes	372			1.39 (1.05, 1.84
Business Closures (012		•	1.00 (1.00, 1.0
Juaniesa Ciosules (450			Deference
	No	456			Reference
	Yes	414	-+	-	0.88 (0.65, 1.19
Fravel Restrictions (Covid Response)				
	No	472			Reference
	Yes	398		—	1.46 (1.17, 1.83
solation Centers (Co					,,
	No	494			Reference
	Yes	376			1.27 (0.97, 1.65
				V	∎ 1.∠/ (U.∀/. 1.00

283
284
285
286
287
288
289

Figure 5. Adjusted Associations with *Household Disruptions* presented as Adjusted Incidence Rate Ratios (AIRR). The forest plot presents AIRRs with 95% confidence intervals from a multivariate quasi-Poisson regression model. The AIRRs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=870)

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW





Figure 6. Evaluating Effect Modification between Urbanicity and other Factors Associated with Household Hardships. The figure presents a facet grid of predicted probabilities from multiple analytic models. The top facet presents the predicted probabilities for household residence in an urban (represented in green) vs. rural (represented in yellow) area, holding all other variables at their mean, to establish the baseline probabilities for households living in either of the two communities. The probabilities for this baseline were estimated using the results from the model presented in Figure 5. The remaining facets present predicted probabilities estimated from models that included interaction terms between urbanicity and other variables associated with *Household Hardships* while holding all adjusting variables at their mean.



Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

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

3.2. Factors Associated with Household Responses to Hardships

The most common household response to experiencing at least once hardship during the pandemic was reducing food consumption, which was reported by 24.4% of affected households (see Figure 7). Other common responses included selling household assets (21.4%), seeking means to generate additional income (20.5%), seeking help from family or friends (14.0%), and borrowing from family or friends (10.6%).




Figure 7. Percentage of Households that Experienced a Given Hardship during the COVID-19 Pandemic (n = 766).

Comprehensive results for the analyses examining factors associated with household responses to pandemic related hardships are presented in Figures A1 – A5 (see Appendix C). After adjusting for other variables, including other potential hardships, households that had a member lose their job were more likely to report reducing food consumption (AOR = 1.75, 95% CI [1.06, 2.92]); selling assets (AOR = 3.19, 95% CI [1.30, 8.41]); seeking to generate additional income (AOR = 2.82, 95% CI [1.55, 5.25]); seeking help from family and friends (AOR = 2.20, 95% CI [1.28, 3.83]); and borrowing from family or friends (AOR = 5.80, 95% CI [2.61, 13.82]). Households that observed increases in the costs of business or farming inputs were more likely to report reducing food consumption (AOR = 2.77, 95% CI [1.51, 5.20]); selling assets (AOR = 9.24, 95% CI [3.82, 23.96]); seeking help from family and friends (AOR = 3.45, 95% CI [1.80, 6.82]); and borrowing from family or friends (AOR = 5.54, 95% CI [2.30, 14.06]). Observing increased food prices was associated with households selling assets (AOR = 2.36, 95% CI [1.12, 4.96]). Households that had a member close their business during the pandemic were less likely to report selling assets (AOR = 0.08, 95% CI [0.02, 0.29]). Households that experienced farming disruptions were more likely to report seeking to generate additional income (AOR = 24.79, 95% CI [7.26, 97.71]). Households residing in a rural vs. an urban area were more likely to use all of the measured strategies to mitigate experiencing hardships associated with the pandemic-these associations were robust to adjusting for other variables.

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

329

330

331 332

333

334

335 336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359 360

361

362

363

364 365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

4. Discussion

In this study, we examined the prevalence of household hardships during the COVID-19 pandemic in a rural and an urban community in Eastern Ethiopia. We further examined demographic, economic, and social characteristic associated with these hardships as well as strategies households used to mitigate the severity of these hardships. Almost 90% of households reported experiencing at least one hardship since the onset of the pandemic; 75% of households reported experiencing at least 4 distinct hardships. Risk factors for experiencing these hardships included inequalities across demographic, economic, and social characteristics, but also place inequalities. Households that were already struggling prior to the onset of the pandemic were at greatest risk for experiencing additional hardships—residing in a rural area magnified the strength of the associations for several household level risk factors.

Households were more likely to report hardships if the head of household had no education or worked as a farmer or in a domestic/subsistence occupation. Households were also more likely to report experiencing hardships if they resided in a rural vs. an urban area, had a larger number of household members, had less monthly income, and were poorer compared to other households in the community. The pattern of association for both monthly income and household wealth is suggestive of a dose response; households with less wealth and less monthly income were at significantly higher risk for experiencing hardships. These associations are consistent with risk factors reported in studies from other resource limited countries and early stage research from Ethiopia.[6,10-13,17] Community responses to the pandemic associated with hardships included lockdowns and travel restrictions; business closures were only associated with experiencing hardships for households residing in an urban area. Future interventions that seek to mitigate negative consequences associated with pandemics mitigation efforts should anticipate these characteristics as important risk factors and target interventions to aid vulnerable groups.

Loss of employment for a household member and observation of increasing costs of business or farming inputs were both associated with the broadest combination of household responses to pandemic hardships. Patterns of association between demographic, economic, and social characteristics and household response strategies were inconsistent; however, compared to urban households, rural households were more likely to implement each of the measured response strategies, even after adjusting for demographic, economic, and social characteristics as well as the various pandemic related hardships.

The empirical findings from this study are not generalizable outside of the communities under study; while we acknowledge this limitation, we note that it is common to studies using HDSS data.[16] As an observational study, other potential limitations include unmeasured variable bias (for example, having data on household participation in Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) may have helped contextualize our results) or recall bias due to the extended length of time considered in the study (i.e., some respondents may have forgotten hardships that occurred closer to onset of the pandemic). As a cross-sectional study, we cannot draw causal inferences. Results from other studies suggest hardships associated with the COVID-19 pandemic are temporary.[7] Looking forward, scholars should collect and analyze longitudinal data to evaluate hardship events over time. In the context of demographic surveillance systems, follow-up data collection using the same survey instrument is easy to attach to subsequent rounds of data collection already being fielded. A further limitation, common to studies involving humanitarian crises, is that we are unable to differentiate between the effects of the pandemic and that of the political tension in the northern region of Ethiopia.[26] How-

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

379	ever, it is noteworthy that the northern region is more than 400 km away from the study
380	communities.
381	5. Conclusions
382	Households living in the rural area of Kersa were at greater risk of experiencing a variety
383	of hardships during the COVID-19 pandemic, even after adjusting for demographic,
384	economic, and social risk factors. Moreover, the strength of the associations between
385	household hardships and demographic, economic, and social risk factors was greater for
386	households residing in the rural area of Kersa compared to the urban area of Harar.
387	These results suggest an enduring urban vs. rural divide that amplifies the effects of
388	household level socioeconomic inequalities. Interventions seeking to ameliorate conse-
389	quences of lockdowns and other efforts implemented to stem disease spread should seek
390	to address place inequalities associated with rural areas as distinct from, but also inter-
391	acting with, household level risk factors. These finding may inform future policies and
392	practices aiming to mitigate negative consequences of COVID-19 and future disease
393	outbreaks.



International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health



394 395	Supplementary Materials : The following supporting information can be downloaded at: www.mdpi.com/xxx/s1, Figure S1: title; Table S1: title; Video S1: title.
396	Author Contributions: For research articles with several authors, a short paragraph specifying
397	their individual contributions must be provided. The following statements should be used "Con-
398	ceptualization, J.M., S.C., N.A., and M.D.; methodology, J.M., S.C., N.A., and M.D.; software, J.M.;
399	validation, J.M., N.A., and M.D.; formal analysis, J.M. and Z.M.; investigation, J.M., Z.M., S.C.,
400	N.A., T.G., G.M., and M.D.; resources, J.M., Z.M., C.M., S.C., N.A., T.G., G.M., and M.D.; data
401	curation, N.A., T.G., G.M., and M.D.; writing-original draft preparation, J.M.; writing-review
402	and editing, J.M., Z.M., C.M., S.C., N.A., and M.D.; visualization, J.M. and Z.M.; supervision, C.M.,
403	S.C., and N.A.; project administration, J.M. and M.D.; funding acquisition, C.M. All authors have
404	read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript."
405	Funding: This work was supported, in whole or in part, by grant OPP1126780 from the Bill &
406	Melinda Gates Foundation to Dr Cynthia Whitney. Under the grant conditions of the Foundation, a
407	Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Generic License has already been assigned to the Author Ac-
408	cepted Manuscript version that might arise from this submission.
409	Institutional Review Board Statement: This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid
410	down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving research study participants were
411	approved by the human subjects ethical committee of Haramaya University.
412	Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the
413	study.
414	Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the
415	corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to restrictions.
416	Acknowledgments: In this section, you can acknowledge any support given which is not covered
417	by the author contribution or funding sections. This may include administrative and technical
418	support, or donations in kind (e.g., materials used for experiments).
419	Conflicts of Interest: None.
420	Disclaimers: The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not nec-
421	essarily represent the views of the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.



International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health



Appendix A

Table S1. Principal components factor analysis of hardship variables				
Variable	Factor Pattern			
Job loss	0.60			
Nonfarm business closure	0.87			
Farm disruption	0.79			
Livestock disruption	0.92			
Fishing disruption	0.80			
Output deflation	0.87			
Eigenvalue	4.00			
Explained variance	40%			



423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434 435

436

437

438 439

440

441

442

443

444

International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health



Appendix B

Wealth Index Generation

A wealth index was generated based on a collection of assets and construction materials for the main dwelling of a given household. To generate the index, we followed recommendations from the DHS and the World Food Programme (WFP) that summarize steps for calculating an asset based wealth index,[42-44] including coding instructions for Stata,[45] and an adaptation of this coding process implemented in R.[29,46] Using these documents to guide us, we generated our wealth index by identifying a list of household assets for inclusion in our index computation, recoded all household assets into dichotomous variables; recoded dwelling materials into improved vs. non-improved dichotomous variables; divided our sample into rural and urban subsamples and assessed level of representation of a given variable within the rural and urban subsamples (per WFP recommendations, a given variable was included in further calculations if percent ownership ranged between 5 and 95 percent); employed principal components analysis with varimax rotation to calculate component scores for those households living in either rural or urban areas, which explained 45% of the variation in both subsamples; extracted and combined the PCA scores of the first component from the urban and rural subsamples; and finally organized the scores into wealth quintiles to generate a composite asset index. The resulting wealth quintiles are presented in Figure (4). The distribution of assets owned by households as well as the materials used for constructing a household's residence are presented as percentages in Figure (5).




Figure 7. Household Wealth Index Distribution




446

- 447
- 448
- 449

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x. https://doi.org/10.3390/xxxxx

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW





450

451

Figure 8. Households Asset Ownership and Dwelling Construction Materials included in Wealth Index



454

International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health



Appendix C

Variable		n	Adjusted Odds Ratios	
Age (Household Head)	10			
	<40	177	. †	Reference
	41-50	234		0.80 (0.45, 1.44)
	51–60	159		1.20 (0.63, 2.27)
	60+	186	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.12 (0.43, 3.03)
Sex (Household Head)				
	Female	261	•	Reference
	Male	495	→	0.85 (0.53, 1.37)
Ethnicity (Household Head)				
	Amhara	170		Reference
	Other	586		1.35 (0.69, 2.77)
Education (Household Head)				(<i>'</i> , <i>'</i> ,
· · · · ·	No Education	329	•	Reference
	Some Education	427		1.00 (0.58, 1.73)
Occupation (Household Head)	Como Education			
eccupation (neuconora noau)	Farmer/Domestic	360		Reference
	Student	48		0.23 (0.05, 0.76)
	Professional	195	·	0.82 (0.44, 1.55)
	Daily Laborer	59		
				0.63 (0.24, 1.52)
	Other Work	16		2.37 (0.68, 7.96)
I khonioiky (Housekala)	Unemployed/Retired	78		0.54 (0.24, 1.17)
Urbanicity (Household)	Listen (Lister)	050		Deferre
	Urban (Harar)	356		Reference
	Rural (Kersa)	400		2.36 (1.18, 4.78)
Household Siz e				
	1-2	121	I ↑	Reference
	3–4	214		0.64 (0.31, 1.30)
	5–6	207		1.03 (0.50, 2.14)
	7–8	158		1.16 (0.54, 2.51)
	9+	56		1.32 (0.52, 3.37)
Adults Over Ag e 60 (Household	d)			
	No	556	•	Reference
	Yes	200		1.07 (0.43, 2.47)
Children Under Ag e 5 (Househ	old)			,
5	No	501	•	Reference
	Yes	255		0.98 (0.62, 1.53)
Income (Household)				
	0-1,200	174	•	Reference
	1,201-2,000	181		1.38 (0.72, 2.71)
	2,001-3,000	141		2.11 (1.06, 4.28)
	3,001-4,600	121		1.34 (0.64, 2.82)
	4,600+	139		0.63 (0.26, 1.49)
Wealth Index (Household)	4,0001	100	•	0.00 (0.20, 1.40)
wealth index (nousehold)	Poorest	159		Reference
	Poorer	159		0.72 (0.41, 1.26)
	Middle	149		0.50 (0.25, 0.99)
	Richer	145		
				0.37 (0.17, 0.78)
	Richest	144		0.46 (0.21, 0.96)
Job Loss (Household)	No	274		Poforonco
		271		Reference
Nonform Business Classes (1)	Yes	485		1.75 (1.06, 2.92)
Nonfarm Business Closure (Ho		405		Deference
	No	495		Reference
F	Yes	261		1.82 (0.84, 3.89)
Farm Disruption (Household)	NI.	0.15		D. (
	No	640	1 1 .	Reference
	Yes	116		2.95 (0.97, 9.01)
Livestock Disruption (Househo		_		
	No	526	· · •	Reference
	Yes	230	·	0.16 (0.05, 0.51)
Fishing Disruption (Household)				
-	No	647	•	Reference
	Yes	109		1.42 (0.54, 3.53)
Input Inflation (Household)				
. ,	No	323	•	Reference
	Yes	433		2.77 (1.51, 5.20)
Output Deflation (Household)				, , , /
	No	514	•	Reference
	Yes	242		1.16 (0.52, 2.51)
Food Price Increase (Household			·	. (, =
	No	241	↓	Reference
	Yes	515		1.26 (0.68, 2.33)
Illness/Death (Household)		010	•	0 (0.00, 2.00)
inicos Death (nousenolu)	No	664		Reference
			• •	
	Yes	92	└╴╴╴╴╸╸╸	1.03 (0.55, 1.89)

- 459
- 460

Figure A1. Adjusted Associations with *Reduced Food Consumption* presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios (AOR). The forest plot presents AORs with 95% confidence intervals from an adjusted logistic regression model. The AORs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=756)

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

Variable		n	Adiusted Od ds Ratios	
Age (Household Head)				
	<40	177	.	Reference
	41–50	234		1.32 (0.59, 2.98)
	51-60	159		1.50 (0.59, 3.84)
	60+	186		2.15 (0.53, 9.40)
Sex (Household Head)	001	100	•	2.10 (0.00, 0.10)
bex (nousenoid nead)	Female	261		Deference
			I	Reference
	Male	495		0.83 (0.42, 1.64)
Ethnicity (Household Head)				
	Amhara	170	•	Reference
	Other	586		3.86 (0.85, 27.99)
Education (Household Head)				
	No Education	329		Reference
			_ L _	
	Some Education	427		1.17 (0.54, 2.55)
Occupation (Household Head)				
	Farmer/Domestic	360	•	Reference
	Student	48		0.10 (0.00, 0.61)
	Professional	195		0.15 (0.04, 0.54)
		59		
	Daily Laborer			0.46 (0.04, 2.76)
	Other Work	16		0.81 (0.15, 4.09)
	Unemployed/Retired	78		0.77 (0.24, 2.44)
Jrbanicity (Household)				1
, ,	Urban (Harar)	356	•	Reference
	Rural (Kersa)	400		136.48 (36.55, 631.8
lousehold Siz e		-+00		100.40 (00.00, 001.0
	4.0	404	1	Deferrer
	1–2	121	Ť	Reference
	3–4	214		3.79 (1.03, 15.79)
	5-6	207	 →→→	4.21 (1.12, 17.74)
	7–8	158		6.83 (1.85, 28.54)
	9+	56		7.42 (1.62, 37.38)
Adults Over Ag e 60 (Househol				
	No	556	•	Reference
	Yes	200		0.66 (0.17, 2.29)
Children Under Ag e 5 (Househ				
official official Age o (fieldset	No	501		Reference
	Yes	255		0.54 (0.29, 0.98)
Income (Household)				
	0–1,200	174	•	Reference
	1,201-2,000	181		1.73 (0.76, 4.06)
	2,001-3,000	141		3.57 (1.34, 9.71)
	3,001-4,600	121		4.90 (1.71, 14.59)
	4,600+	139		0.98 (0.20, 4.21)
Wealth Index (Household)				
	Poorest	159	•	Reference
	Poorer	159		1.08 (0.46, 2.54)
	Middle	149		2.14 (0.73, 6.49)
	Richer	145	-	1.59 (0.53, 4.84)
	Richest	144		3.03 (0.94, 10.05)
Job Loss (Household)				
	No	271	•	Reference
	Yes	485		
		400		3.19 (1.30, 8.41)
Nonfarm Business Closure (Ho				
	No	495		Reference
	Yes	261	→ I	0.08 (0.02, 0.29)
Farm Disruption (Household)				
	No	640	4	Reference
	Yes	116		1.15 (0.28, 4.51)
Livestock Disruption (Househo				
	No	526	+	Reference
	Yes	230		6.94 (1.72, 30.62)
Fishing Disruption (Household		200	Ť	
ising Distuption (nousehold		047		Deferenci
	No	647	J	Reference
	Yes	109		0.79 (0.24, 2.36)
nput Inflation (Household)				1
,	No	323	•	Reference
	Yes	433		
	100	400		9.24 (3.82, 23.96)
Output Deflation (Household)				
	No	514	†	Reference
	Yes	242	—	0.80 (0.28, 2.30)
Food Price Increase (Househol	No	241	L	Poforonco
Food Price Increase (Househol	IN()			Reference
Food Price Increase (Househol				2.36 (1.12, 4.96)
Food Price Increase (Househol	Yes	515		
•		515		
Food Price Increase (Househol Ilness/Death (Household)	Yes		1	
•		515 664 92	<u> </u>	Reference 0.87 (0.35, 2.12)

Figure A2. Adjusted Associations with *Sold Assets* presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios (AOR). The forest plot presents AORs with 95% confidence intervals from an adjusted logistic regression model. The AORs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=756)

465

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

Variable		n	Adjusted Odds Ratios	
Age (Household Head)				
	<40	177		Reference
	41–50	234		0.81 (0.43, 1.50)
	51-60	159		1.37 (0.69, 2.72)
	60+	186	_ _	0.90 (0.28, 3.10)
Sex (Household Head)				
. ,	Female	261	•	Reference
	Male	495		1.48 (0.87, 2.54)
Ethnicity (Household Head)				. , ,
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Amhara	170	•	Reference
	Other	586		0.58 (0.28, 1.21)
Education (Household Head)		000		0.00 (0.20, 1.21)
	No Education	329		Reference
	Some Education	427		0.80 (0.43, 1.50)
Occupation (Household Head)		721		0.00 (0.40, 1.00)
occupation (nouscribia ricad)	Farmer/Domestic	360	1	Reference
	Student	48		
				0.25 (0.04, 1.00)
	Professional	195		0.97 (0.47, 2.00)
	Daily Laborer	59		1.02 (0.36, 2.70)
	Other Work	16		1.36 (0.32, 5.46)
	Unemployed/Retired	78		1.00 (0.39, 2.41)
Urbanicity (Household)		0.5.0		
	Urban (Harar)	356	† .	Reference
	Rural (Kersa)	400	→	5.10 (2.43, 10.93)
Household Siz e				
	1–2	121	+	Reference
	3-4	214	++-	1.93 (0.83, 4.75)
	5-6	207		2.83 (1.18, 7.19)
	7–8	158		5.22 (2.12, 13.64)
	9+	56		3.47 (1.10, 11.24)
Adults Over Ag e 60 (Household				0(
	., No	556		Reference
	Yes	200		0.82 (0.26, 2.34)
Children Under Ag e 5 (Househ		200		0.02 (0.20, 2.04)
ciliaren onder Ages (nousen)	No	501		Reference
	Yes	255		0.59 (0.36, 0.97)
Income (Household)	103	200		0.03 (0.00, 0.07)
income (nousenoid)	0 4 000	474		Deference
	0-1,200	174		Reference
	1,201-2,000	181		0.85 (0.40, 1.84)
	2,001-3,000	141		1.29 (0.60, 2.83)
	3,001-4,600	121		1.89 (0.86, 4.23)
	4,600+	139		0.94 (0.38, 2.29)
Wealth Index (Household)				
	Poorest	159	†	Reference
	Poorer	159		0.89 (0.44, 1.78)
	Middle	149		1.79 (0.78, 4.21)
	Richer	145		1.48 (0.60, 3.65)
	Richest	144		2.20 (0.93, 5.33)
Job Loss (Household)				
· /	No	271	•	Reference
	Yes	485	→	2.82 (1.55, 5.25)
Nonfarm Business Closure (Ho				(,)
	No	495	•	Reference
	Yes	261		0.54 (0.20, 1.37)
Farm Disruption (Household)				
	No	640	4	Reference
	Yes	116		24.79 (7.26, 97.71)
Livestock Disruption (Househo		110		24.13 (1.20, 31.11)
Livestock Distuption (nouseno		526	1	Reference
	No		<u> </u>	Reference
Fishing Discuption (Louge - Li)	Yes	230		0.05 (0.01, 0.19)
Fishing Disruption (Household)		04-		Deferre
	No	647	T .	Reference
and half and the second	Yes	109		2.49 (0.93, 6.63)
nput Inflation (Household)				
	No	323	†	Reference
	Yes	433		1.05 (0.56, 1.99)
Output Deflation (Household)				
. ,	No	514	+	Reference
	Yes	242	-+	1.33 (0.57, 3.07)
Food Price Increase (Household	d)			,
,, ,	No	241	•	Reference
	Yes	515	_ _	1.07 (0.58, 1.98)
Ilness/Death (Household)				
	No	664	•	Reference
	Yes	92		0.66 (0.32, 1.30)

Figure A3. Adjusted Associations with *Sought to Generate Additional Income* presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios (AOR). The forest plot presents AORs with 95% confidence intervals from an adjusted logistic regression model. The AORs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=756)

471

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

Variable		n	Adjusted Odds Ratios	
Age (Household Head)				
	<40	177	+	Reference
	41-50	234		1.60 (0.86, 3.02)
	51-60	159		1.48 (0.73, 3.03)
	60+	186		0.87 (0.28, 2.77)
Sex (Household Head)	001	100	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.07 (0.20, 2.17)
Xex (nousenoid nead)	Female	261		Reference
	Male	495		0.75 (0.45, 1.24)
Sthnight (Household Hood)	IVIDIE	495		0.75 (0.45, 1.24)
Ethnicity (Household Head)	Amhara	170		Beference
				Reference
	Other	586		0.98 (0.51, 1.90)
Education (Household Head)		000		D (
	No Education	329	t	Reference
	Some Education	427		1.07 (0.58, 1.96)
Occupation (Household Head)				
	Farmer/Domestic	360	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Reference
	Student	48		0.45 (0.10, 1.48)
	Professional	195		1.33 (0.67, 2.65)
	Daily Laborer	59	_	1.52 (0.63, 3.60)
	Other Work	16		0.51 (0.03, 2.99)
	Unemployed/Retired	78	<u> </u>	1.02 (0.44, 2.29)
Jrbanicity (Household)	Chempioyeantealea	.0		1.02 (0.17, 2.20)
isamony (nouseholu)	Urban (Harar)	356	1	Reference
		400	I	
lousehold Siz e	Rural (Kersa)	400		• 3.10 (1.50, 6.45)
iousenoia siz e	4.0	101	l	Deferen
	1-2	121	Ť.	Reference
	3–4	214	_ 	1.18 (0.59, 2.38)
	5–6	207	+ <u> </u>	0.75 (0.35, 1.63)
	7–8	158		0.73 (0.32, 1.69)
	9+	56	_	0.38 (0.10, 1.22)
Adults Over Ag e 60 (Househol	d)			
U (Ňo	556	•	Reference
	Yes	200	_	1.13 (0.40, 2.99)
Children Under Ag e 5 (Houseł				
	No	501		Reference
	Yes	255		1.45 (0.88, 2.38)
ncome (Household)	105	200		1.40 (0.00, 2.00)
licome (nousenoid)	0-1,200	174		Reference
	1,201-2,000	181		0.63 (0.31, 1.26)
	2,001-3,000	141		0.65 (0.31, 1.35)
	3,001-4,600	121		0.64 (0.29, 1.37)
	4,600+	139	I	0.34 (0.14, 0.79)
Wealth Index (Household)				
	Poorest	159	+	Reference
	Poorer	159	+	1.19 (0.62, 2.29)
	Middle	149		0.93 (0.42, 2.02)
	Richer	145	_	0.66 (0.28, 1.51)
	Richest	144		1.10 (0.50, 2.43)
Job Loss (Household)				(1.50, 2.10)
	No	271	1	Reference
	Yes	485		2.20 (1.28, 3.83)
Nonfarm Business Closure (Ho		100		2.20 (1.20, 0.00)
tomarin Dusiness Closure (HC	No	495		Poforonco
				Reference
Term Discustion (House b. 1.)	Yes	261		0.57 (0.21, 1.40)
Farm Disruption (Household)	No	0.40		Deferrer
	No	640	1	Reference
	Yes	116		1.93 (0.52, 7.18)
Livestock Disruption (Househo				
	No	526	+	Reference
	Yes	230	-	0.41 (0.10, 1.51)
Fishing Disruption (Household)			
	No	647	+	Reference
	Yes	109	_	0.53 (0.17, 1.74)
nput Inflation (Household)				
,	No	323	▲	Reference
	Yes	433		3 .45 (1.80, 6.82)
Output Deflation (Household)	100	400		3.40 (1.00, 0.02)
Juiput Denation (Household)	No	514	l	Deference
	No	514	T	Reference
	Yes	242		0.99 (0.40, 2.40)
Food Price Increase (Househo				
	No	241	†	Reference
	Yes	515		1.02 (0.54, 1.98)
liness/Death (Household)				
. ,	No	664	+	Reference
	Yes	92		1.48 (0.76. 2.76)

Figure A4. Adjusted Associations with *Sought Help from Family or Friends* presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios (AOR). The forest plot presents AORs with 95% confidence intervals from an adjusted logistic regression model. The AORs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=756)

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

Variable		n	Adjusted Od ds Ratios	
Age (Household Head)				
	<40	177	+	Reference
	41-50	234		3.81 (1.49, 10.53)
	51-60	159		6.10 (2.21, 18.05)
	60+	186		2.31 (0.41, 13.87)
Sex (Household Head)	00+	100		2.01 (0.41, 10.07)
bex (nousenoid nead)	Female	261	1	Reference
	Male	495	I	
The side (Llaus also also also also	IVIAIE	495		0.54 (0.26, 1.14)
Ethnicity (Household Head)	A	470		Deferrer
	Amhara	170	T .	Reference
	Other	586		1.79 (0.56, 6.35)
Education (Household Head)				
	No Education	329	↑ .	Reference
	Some Education	427	_ 	1.43 (0.64, 3.19)
Occupation (Household Head)				
	Farmer/Domestic	360	• •	Reference
	Student	48	_	0.66 (0.13, 2.63)
	Professional	195		0.65 (0.22, 1.79)
	Daily Laborer	59		0.09 (0.00, 0.70)
	Other Work	16	· ·	3.77 (0.71, 17.57)
lab and alter (I laws a b a lat)	Unemployed/Retired	78		1.25 (0.39, 3.80)
Urbanicity (Household)				5 (
	Urban (Harar)	356	† .	Reference
	Rural (Kersa)	400		• 44.54 (14.55, 152.5 <i>°</i>
Household Siz e				
	1–2	121	+	Reference
	3–4	214	_	0.77 (0.22, 2.99)
	5-6	207		1.23 (0.35, 4.92)
	7–8	158		1.56 (0.42, 6.47)
	9+	56		1.37 (0.27, 6.99)
Adults Over Ag e 60 (Househol				
	No	556	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Reference
	Yes	200		1.26 (0.26, 5.37)
Children Under Ag e 5 (Househ	old)			,
.. <i>.</i> ..	No	501	↓	Reference
	Yes	255		2.48 (1.29, 4.84)
ncome (Household)	100	200		2.10 (1.20, 1.01)
licome (nousenoid)	0 1 200	174		Deference
	0-1,200			Reference
	1,201-2,000	181		3.16 (1.15, 9.61)
	2,001-3,000	141		1.92 (0.62, 6.35)
	3,001–4,600	121		3.55 (1.08, 12.53)
	4,600+	139		1.04 (0.25, 4.25)
Wealth Index (Household)				
	Poorest	159	+	Reference
	Poorer	159		1.55 (0.51, 5.07)
	Middle	149		2.59 (0.78, 9.37)
	Richer	145		1.70 (0.49, 6.33)
		144		
	Richest	144		2.14 (0.63, 7.78)
Job Loss (Household)		074		D (
	No	271	T	Reference
	Yes	485		5.80 (2.61, 13.82)
Nonfarm Business Closure (Ho	ousehold)			
	No	495	+ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Reference
	Yes	261		0.29 (0.07, 1.08)
Farm Disruption (Household)				
	No	640	1	Reference
	Yes	116		
iventeek Digrumtien (Herrerk		110	T	0.28 (0.04, 1.62)
Livestock Disruption (Househo		500		Deferrer
	No	526	. 1	Reference
	Yes	230		0.24 (0.05, 1.07)
Fishing Disruption (Household)			
•	No	647	+	Reference
	Yes	109	_	0.75 (0.15, 3.72)
nput Inflation (Household)				I
	No	323	L	Reference
			Ι	
	Yes	433		5.54 (2.30, 14.06)
Output Deflation (Household)				
	No	514	+	Reference
	Yes	242	—	0.83 (0.28, 2.46)
Food Price Increase (Househo				
	No	241	4	Reference
	Yes	515		1.45 (0.68, 3.14)
	100	515	- T	1.40 (0.00, 0.14)
Ilnees/Deeth (Heuseheld)				
Illness/Death (Household)	Na	004		Deferenci
Iness/Death (Household)	No Yes	664 92	• .	Reference 2.00 (0.79, 4.79)

Figure A5. Adjusted Associations with *Borrowed from Family or Friends* presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios (AOR). The forest plot presents AORs with 95% confidence intervals from an adjusted logistic regression model. The AORs were adjusted for the other variables included in the model. Education and Occupation had 9 missing values; Income had one outlier set to missing. (n=756)



International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health



485 References

- Wang, H.; Paulson, K.R.; Pease, S.A.; Watson, S.; Comfort, H.; Zheng, P.; Aravkin, A.Y.; Bisignano, C.; Barber, R.M.; Alam,
 T. Estimating excess mortality due to the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic analysis of COVID-19-related mortality,
 2020–21. *The Lancet* 2022.
- 489 2. Baldwin, R.E.; Weder, B. Mitigating the COVID Economic Crisis: Act Fast and Do Whatever It Takes; CEPR press: 2020.
- 490 3. Picchioni, F.; Goulao, L.F.; Roberfroid, D. The Impact of COVID-19 on Diet Quality, Food Security and Nutrition in Low
 491 and Middle Income Countries: A Systematic Review of the Evidence. *Clinical Nutrition* 2021.
- 4. Osendarp, S.; Akuoku, J.K.; Black, R.E.; Headey, D.; Ruel, M.; Scott, N.; Shekar, M.; Walker, N.; Flory, A.; Haddad, L. The
 493 COVID-19 Crisis Will Exacerbate Maternal and Child Undernutrition and Child Mortality in Low-and Middle-Income
 494 Countries. *Nature Food* 2021, 2, 476-484.
- 495 5. Akseer, N.; Kandru, G.; Keats, E.C.; Bhutta, Z.A. COVID-19 Pandemic and Mitigation Strategies: Implications for Maternal 496 and Child Health and Nutrition. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* **2020**, *112*, 251-256, doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqaa171.
- 6. Onyango, E.O.; Crush, J.; Owuor, S. Preparing for COVID-19: Household Food Insecurity and Vulnerability to Shocks in
 Nairobi, Kenya. *PLoS ONE* 2021, *16*, e0259139.
- 499 7. Hirvonen, K.; de Brauw, A.; Abate, G.T. Food Consumption and Food Security During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Addis
 500 Ababa. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 2021, 103, 772-789.
- 5018.Ayanlade, A.; Radeny, M. COVID-19 and Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa: implications of Lockdown during502Agricultural Planting Seasons. npj Science of Food 2020, 4, 1-6.
- 9. Hirvonen, K.; Abate, G.T.; de Brauw, A. Survey Suggests Rising Risk of Food and Nutrition Insecurity in Addis Ababa,
 504 Ethiopia, as COVID-19 Restrictions Continue. *IFPRI book chapters* 2020, 46-49.
- Chitiga, M.; Henseler, M.; Mabugu, R.E.; Maisonnave, H. How COVID-19 pandemic worsens the economic situation of
 women in South Africa. *The European Journal of Development Research* 2021, 1-18.
- Fikire, A.H.; Zegeye, M.B. Determinants of Rural Household Food Security Status in North Shewa Zone, Amhara Region,
 Ethiopia. *The Scientific World Journal* 2022, 2022.
- Manfrinato, C.V.; Marino, A.; Condé, V.F.; Maria do Carmo, P.F.; Stedefeldt, E.; Tomita, L.Y. High prevalence of food
 insecurity, the adverse impact of COVID-19 in Brazilian favela. *Public health nutrition* 2021, 24, 1210-1215.
- Banna, M.; Al, H.; Sayeed, A.; Kundu, S.; Kagstrom, A.; Sultana, M.; Begum, M.R.; Khan, M.S.I. Factors associated with
 household food insecurity and dietary diversity among day laborers amid the COVID-19 pandemic in Bangladesh. *BMC nutrition* 2022, *8*, 1-11.
- Roberton, T.; Carter, E.D.; Chou, V.B.; Stegmuller, A.R.; Jackson, B.D.; Tam, Y.; Sawadogo-Lewis, T.; Walker, N. Early
 Estimates of the Indirect Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Maternal and Child Mortality in Low-Income and
 Middle-Income Countries: A Modeling Study. *The Lancet Global Health* 2020, *8*, e901-e908.
- Chen, J.; Vullikanti, A.; Santos, J.; Venkatramanan, S.; Hoops, S.; Mortveit, H.; Lewis, B.; You, W.; Eubank, S.; Marathe, M.
 Epidemiological and Economic Impact of COVID-19 in the US. *Scientific reports* 2021, *11*, 1-12.
- Clark, S.; Wakefield, J.; McCormick, T.; Ross, M. Hyak Mortality Monitoring System: Innovative Sampling and Estimation Methods–Proof of Concept by Simulation. *Global Health, Epidemiology and Genomics* 2018, 3.
- 17. Goshu, D.; Ferede, T.; Diriba, G.; Ketema, M. Economic and Welfare Effects of COVID-19 and Responses in Ethiopia: Initial
 Insights; Ethiopian Economic Policy Research Institute: 2020.
- 523 18. Shigute, Z.; Mebratie, A.D.; Alemu, G.; Bedi, A. Containing the Spread of COVID-19 in Ethiopia. *Journal of Global Health*524 2020, 10.
- Spielman, S.E.; Tuccillo, J.; Folch, D.C.; Schweikert, A.; Davies, R.; Wood, N.; Tate, E. Evaluating Social Vulnerability
 Indicators: Criteria and Their Application to the Social Vulnerability Index. *Natural Hazards* 2020, 100, 417-436.

Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, x FOR PEER REVIEW

527	20.	Muir, J.A.; Cope, M.R.; Angeningsih, L.R.; Jackson, J.E.; Brown, R.B. Migration and Mental Health in the Aftermath of			
528		Disaster: Evidence From MT. Merapi, Indonesia. International journal of environmental research and public health 2019, 16,			
529		2726.			
530	21.	Muir, J.A.; Cope, M.R.; Angeningsih, L.R.; Jackson, J.E. To Move Home or Move On? Investigating the Impact of Recovery			
531		Aid on Migration Status as a Potential Tool for Disaster Risk Reduction in the Aftermath of Volcanic Eruptions in Merapi,			
532		Indonesia. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction 2020, 46, 101478.			
533	22.	Perry, R.W. What is a Disaster? In Handbook of Disaster Research; Springer: 2007; pp. 1-15.			
534	23.	Cutter, S.L.; Barnes, L.; Berry, M.; Burton, C.; Evans, E.; Tate, E.; Webb, J. A place-based model for understanding			
535		community resilience to natural disasters. Global environmental change 2008, 18, 598-606.			
536	24.	Cutter, S.L.; Boruff, B.J.; Shirley, W.L. Social vulnerability to environmental hazards. In Hazards vulnerability and			
537		environmental justice; Routledge: 2012; pp. 143-160.			
538	25.	Flanagan, B.E.; Gregory, E.W.; Hallisey, E.J.; Heitgerd, J.L.; Lewis, B. A Social Vulnerability Index for Disaster			
539		Management. Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management 2011, 8.			
540	26.	Muir, J.A. Societal Shocks as Social Determinants of Health; The Ohio State University: 2021.			
541	27.	Muir, J.A. Indicators of Fertility Change in a Developing Nation: Examining the Impact of Motorcycles as a Distance Demolishing			
542		Technology on Fertility Change in Rural Indonesia; Brigham Young University: 2012.			
543	28.	Sanders, S.R.; Muir, J.A.; Brown, R.B. Overcoming Geographic Penalties of Inequality: The Effects of			
544		Distance-Demolishing Technologies on Household Well-Being in Vietnam. Asian Journal of Social Science 2018, 46, 260-280.			
545	29.	Gebru, M.; Remans, R.; Brouwer, I.D.; Baye, K.; Melesse, M.B.; Covic, N.; Habtamu, F.; Abay, A.H.; Hailu, T.; Hirvonen, K.			
546		Food systems for healthier diets in Ethiopia: Toward a research agenda. IFPRI Discussion Paper 2018.			
547	30.	Haile, D.; Seyoum, A.; Azmeraw, A. Food and nutrition security impacts of resilience capacity: Evidence from rural			
548		Ethiopia. Journal of Agriculture and Food Research 2022, 8, 100305.			
549	31.	Juntunen, L. Addressing Social Vulnerability to Hazards. University of Oregon Eugene, 2004.			
550	32.	Assefa, N.; Oljira, L.; Baraki, N.; Demena, M.; Zelalem, D.; Ashenafi, W.; Dedefo, M. HDSS profile: the Kersa Health and			
551		Demographic Surveillance System. International Journal of Epidemiology 2016, 45, 94-101.			
552	33.	Cunningham, S.A.; Shaikh, N.I.; Nhacolo, A.; Raghunathan, P.L.; Kotloff, K.; Naser, A.M.; Mengesha, M.M.; Adedini, S.A.;			
553		Misore, T.; Onuwchekwa, U.U. Health and Demographic Surveillance Systems within the Child Health and Mortality			
554		Prevention Surveillance Network. Clinical Infectious Diseases 2019, 69, S274-S279.			
555	34.	Cunningham, S.A.; Muir, J.A. Data Cleaning. In The Cambridge Handbook of Research Methods and Statistics for the Social and			
556		Behavioral Sciences: Volume 1: Building a Program of Research; Cambridge University Press: In Press; Volume 1.			
557	35.	Cho, E. A comprehensive review of so-called Cronbach's alpha. Journal of Product Researcg 2020, 38, 9-20.			
558	36.	R Core Team R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, R Foundation for Statistical Computing: Vienna,			
559		Austria, 2022.			
560	37.	Yeh, J.; D'Amico, F. Forest plots: data summaries at a glance. <i>Journal of Family Practice</i> 2004, 53, 1007-1008.			
561	38.	Lewis, S.C.; Keerie, C.; Assi, V. Forest Plot. In Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online; pp. 1-6.			
562	Diecla	imer/Publisher's Note: The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent			
562 563		the views of the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Likewise, the statements, opinions and data contained in all pub-			

564 lications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the edi-

tor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.