

1 **Assessing Sociodemographic Factors Associated with Household Hardships**  
2 **during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Manhiça, Mozambique using Data Collected**  
3 **between April 2021 and February 2022**

4 Ariel Q. Nhacolo<sup>1†</sup>, Jonathan A. Muir<sup>2†</sup>, Zachary J. Madewell<sup>3</sup>, Fatima Keiri<sup>2</sup>, Charfudin N. Saco<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Edgar L. Jamisse<sup>1</sup>, Elisio G. Xerinda<sup>1</sup>, Teodimiro Matsena<sup>1</sup>, Aura M. Hunguana<sup>1</sup>, Quique  
6 Bassat<sup>1,4,5,6,7</sup>, Cynthia G. Whitney<sup>2</sup>, Inácio M. Mandomando<sup>1,8‡</sup>, and Solveig A. Cunningham<sup>2‡</sup>

7  
8 †Co-first authors

9 ‡Co-senior authors

- 10  
11 1. Centro de Investigação em Saúde de Manhiça, Maputo, Mozambique  
12 2. Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States  
13 3. Global Health Center, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, United States  
14 4. ISGlobal - Hospital Clínic, Unversitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain  
15 5. Institutó Catalana de Recerca I Estudis Avançats, Barcelona, Spain  
16 6. Pediatrics Department, Hospital Sant Joan de Déu, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain  
17 7. Consorcio de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Epidemiología y Salud Pública, Madrid, Spain  
18 8. Instituto Nacional de Saúde, Maputo, Mozambique

19 **\* Correspondence:**

20 Jonathan A. Muir

21 jamuir@emory.edu

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 **Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, Mozambique, Household Hardships, Resilience, Vulnerability**

## 35 **Abstract**

### 36 **Background**

37 COVID-19 resulted in vast disruption to life in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. To quell the disease spread, national  
38 governments implemented several containment measures like state of emergency, curfews, and  
39 lockdowns that likely created hardships for households. To improve knowledge of the negative  
40 consequences of these lockdowns, we examine the extent to which the pandemic period was  
41 associated with hardships at the household level and assess factors associated with household  
42 vulnerability to these hardships.

### 43 **Methods**

44 We conducted a cross-sectional survey between April 2021 and February 2022 among households  
45 residing in the district of Manhica through a survey questionnaire fielded in the Health and  
46 Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) operating in Manhica, Mozambique. Logistic regression  
47 was used to analyze associations between the head of household and household characteristics with  
48 specific household hardships (business closure, food price increase, household member detained,  
49 input inflation, job loss).

### 50 **Results**

51 Households headed by individuals with lower education and employed in non-agricultural  
52 occupations as well as households that were larger in size or poorer in asset ownership compared to  
53 other households were generally at greater risk of experiencing a larger variety of hardships.  
54 Conversely, households that owned “distance demolishing technologies” such as motorcycles were  
55 less likely to experience these hardships, presumably as they were able to transcend local conditions.

### 56 **Conclusions**

57 These results identify at-risk groups according to a social determinants of vulnerability framework  
58 and will help inform future policies and practices that aim to mitigate the negative consequences of  
59 COVID-19 as well as future disease outbreaks.

60

## 61 **Background**

62 Beyond direct health effects,[1] the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in vast disruption to life. As  
63 government-enforced containment measures such as curfews and lockdowns were implemented to  
64 stem the pace and severity of the disease, a variety of social and economic consequences ensued.[2]  
65 To adhere to these lockdowns, many businesses temporarily closed their in-person workplaces; while  
66 for some, these closures were permanent. Mitigation efforts also affected healthcare providers, who  
67 had to restrict in-person access to patients and/or limit services. These efforts may have affected  
68 already vulnerable populations by limiting access to healthcare and food.[3-15] These indirect  
69 effects, in turn, would have exacerbated the direct effects of SARS-CoV-2 by increasing the risk of  
70 undernutrition and other conditions that heighten the risk of serious illness.[6, 15] Population-based  
71 knowledge of the extent to which households living in resource-limited countries have experienced  
72 resource restrictions and other hardships has remained limited due to limitations in population-based  
73 surveillance.[16]

74 In sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), national governments undertook considerable efforts to quell  
75 the spread of COVID-19.[2, 17] In Mozambique, the first confirmed COVID-19 case was detected  
76 on Mar 22, 2020. On Mar 31, 2020, the Mozambique government declared a state of emergency to  
77 slow the spread of the pandemic, followed by a gradual reopening of the economy.[18, 19] The state  
78 of emergency included the closure of schools, suspension of entertainment and sports events, limited  
79 hours of marketing, reduced public transportation occupancy, and limiting in-person presence at  
80 workplaces to one-third of the workforce.[19] These measures resulted in decreased travel and  
81 movement and limited public services and gatherings.[20] Early implementation of COVID-19  
82 prevention measures in Mozambique kept COVID-19 cases relatively low in the country from March  
83 to September 2020.[18, 21] However, these efforts likely affected vulnerable populations in myriad  
84 ways beyond direct effects on disease transmission.

85 Vulnerability is the communal effect of cultural, economic, political, and social processes that  
86 alter the experience of and recovery from a given hazard.[22] Disasters, particularly in the context of  
87 environmental hazards, are often not the result of a given hazard, but rather of the shock to individual  
88 and community coping patterns and the inputs and outputs of social systems.[23-25] Social  
89 vulnerability is partially the result of social disparities that shape or influence the susceptibility of  
90 different groups to hazards while also controlling their capacity to respond.[26, 27] Individual and  
91 household level factors often associated with vulnerability include demographic characteristics such  
92 as age, ethnicity, race, and sex; socioeconomic status (e.g., lower wealth, employment, and/or  
93 education); household composition (e.g., presence of children); and housing and transportation.[28]  
94 Social vulnerability also involves place disparities stemming from characteristics of the built  
95 environment; e.g., differential availability of resources between urban and rural areas may exacerbate  
96 individual- and household-level vulnerabilities.[29-32] To understand the broader consequences of  
97 the pandemic, it is important to consider economic, political, and social markers of vulnerability.

98 Mozambique is one of the poorest countries in the world.[33] Following decades of wars  
99 (liberation war during 1964-1974, and civil war during 1976-1992) the poverty level in Mozambique  
100 declined from 70% to about 50% between 1996 and 2008.[18] However, this economic recovery  
101 flattened and deteriorated in 2015 and the following years, mainly due to the interruption of funding  
102 from key donors.[33, 34] Other reasons for the economic stagnation included severe weather shocks  
103 (e.g., droughts, cyclones, and flooding), increased violence in the central and northern regions of the  
104 country, and the international economic crisis.[33, 35] These conditions resulted in substantial  
105 population displacement, destruction of infrastructure, and increased risk of infectious disease.[36]  
106 These shocks further exacerbated economic disparities within the country. Southern and urban areas  
107 experienced less economic impact compared to rural areas. Also, despite the decline in the poverty  
108 rates following the war in Mozambique, high population growth led to an increase in the number of  
109 individuals living in poverty.[18] In Mozambique, the pandemic hit an already vulnerable population.

110 Mozambique's economy lost 5.6 percentage points of growth in the second quarter of 2020  
111 due to COVID-19 and the state of emergency.[37] This economic contraction was mainly due to  
112 reduced exports, reflecting the dependence on a limited range of export commodities, rendering it  
113 susceptible to trade-related shocks. Limited marketing for agriculture caused by transport restrictions,  
114 closed borders, and reduced purchasing power forced farmers to lower their prices, contributing to an  
115 agricultural shock.[38] In places where most of the population were self-employed or employees for  
116 wages, particularly in urban areas, the impacts were higher because there was no national social  
117 welfare system to support these people. These factors increased overall vulnerability to economic  
118 hardship and food insecurity during the pandemic.[39] However, the effects of the pandemic varied  
119 according to socioeconomic factors. For example, rural areas experienced a more notable increase in  
120 poverty compared to urban areas, possibly attributed to the generally lower economic resilience of  
121 rural households, rendering them susceptible to even minor economic hardships.[18] However, urban  
122 populations experienced greater employment loss and income reduction due to movement  
123 restrictions, overall, they suffered more economic shock than the rural.[18]

124 Thus, the few studies in Mozambique suggest that there had been an overall negative impact  
125 of the pandemic and associated lockdowns on the population. To further elucidate the prevalence of  
126 hardships experienced during the pandemic and examine potential risk factors for vulnerability to  
127 hardships, we used data collected by the Manhiça Health Research Center (CISM) through a cross-  
128 sectional household survey module added to the existing Health and Demographic Surveillance  
129 System (HDSS) in Manhiça district, Mozambique.

130

## 131 **METHODS**

### 132 **Study design**

133 This study is part of a broader examination within the Child Health and Mortality Prevention  
134 Surveillance (CHAMPS) Network to analyze the consequences of COVID-19 lockdowns for child  
135 health and mortality.[40-43] Leveraging the established platform within the CHAMPS Network of  
136 HDSS [44] in 2021, we administered a questionnaire to households in Manhiça, Mozambique.

### 137 **Study Setting**

138 Manhiça is a district in Maputo Province, located about 85 km north of the country's capital  
139 city, Maputo. An HDSS was established there in 1996 by CISM and currently covers the entire  
140 Manhiça District, which spans 2,380 km<sup>2</sup> (Figure 1). More information about the Manhiça HDSS has  
141 been published elsewhere.[45, 46] With a population of 201,845, Manhiça is the second most  
142 populated district in Maputo Province after the Matola District (the capital of Maputo Province).[45]  
143 The population is mainly peasants and vendors, with a portion also working in two sugar factories in  
144 the district, namely Maragra, and Xinavane, which are the country's primary sugar factories. The  
145 health system in Manhiça comprises one district hospital located in Manhiça village, one rural  
146 hospital located in the Xinavane administrative post, and 19 health centers.

147 Manhiça district is a geographic corridor highly exposed to imported diseases such as HIV,  
148 and currently COVID-19, stemming from population migration. The district is intersected by  
149 Mozambique's main road (National Road Number 1), which connects the Southern, Central, and  
150 Northern regions of the country as well as neighboring countries of South Africa, Eswatini,  
151 Zimbabwe, Malawi, Zambia, and Tanzania. The district is also crossed by a railway line connecting  
152 Zimbabwe to Maputo city and harbor, facilitating population mobility and disease spread. A large  
153 proportion of the Manhiça population migrate to the nearby capital city of Maputo or beyond, to  
154 South Africa and Eswatini, with regular return visits to their households in Manhiça.

155

### 156 **Study Participants**

157 Study participants comprised heads of households or their representatives, defined as any  
158 household member aged 18 years or older who possessed adequate information about the household  
159 and its co-residing members, including visitors who had entered the household since March 2020  
160 until the date of interview. All households within the Manhiça HDSS were eligible to participate in  
161 the study, aligning with the procedures and schedule of the HDSS rounds visits, during which this  
162 questionnaire was administered. This study adopted the definition of household and of household  
163 members used by the HDSS, defining a household as a group of one or more people living together  
164 in the same houses or group of houses within Manhiça District who share domestic expenses, eat  
165 together, and recognize one of them as their leader or representative. A member of the HDSS is a  
166 person who has resided in a household within Manhiça District for three or more months, or entered  
167 the study area with the intention of residence.[45]

168

## 169 **Survey Instrument**

170 A survey instrument was developed to collect information about households' experiences  
171 during the COVID-19 lockdown. It included information on knowledge regarding COVID-19  
172 symptoms, transmission, and prevention; COVID-19 related shocks and household coping strategies;  
173 needs for and access to healthcare services for children under five years of age and for pregnant  
174 women; and food availability. The development of the survey followed state-of-the-art survey design  
175 methods. Steps in the design process included identifying central research concepts and questions;  
176 engaging in a rapid literature review; developing, adopting, and revising survey questions based on  
177 example questionnaires such as the one that the World Bank developed to assess economic and social  
178 consequences of the pandemic (i.e., the “High-Frequency Mobile Phone Surveys of Households to  
179 Assess the Impacts of COVID-19” survey); and pretesting the survey in the field.[47-49] Health  
180 authorities in the Manhiça district contributed to adapting the survey to local contexts and suggested  
181 additional questions to include in the instrument. The survey instrument prompted respondents to

182 consider their household's experiences since March 2020 while answering questions related to  
183 hardships that their household may have experienced during the pandemic. Data were collected  
184 electronically using tablets and a version of the survey that was translated into Portuguese.

185 Data collection was conducted by HDSS fieldworkers during their regular visits to the  
186 households through tablet-based in-person interviews with heads of households or their  
187 representatives if the heads were unavailable. Households were recruited in April 2021 before the  
188 Delta variant wave to the peak of Omicron cases in February 2022. In 2021, the HDSS recorded a  
189 total of 40,636 active households, of which 33,087 (81%) responded to the lockdown survey module.  
190 Data from the lockdown module were linked with data from the HDSS questionnaires, providing  
191 socio-demographic data about the household and their heads. Household variables included, among  
192 others: household size, number of children under 5 years of age, number of adults over 60 years, and  
193 number of pregnant women; household assets; and materials used for constructing the houses  
194 (Supplemental Materials, Figure 5). Variables about the head of household were age, sex, occupation,  
195 education, religion, ethnicity, and marital status.

196 The fieldworkers and their supervisors were trained by the study coordinator, a senior  
197 demographer at CISM, who led the adaptation and implementation of the Network module to  
198 Manhiça HDSS. Data cleaning and quality assurance followed standard procedures for the HDSS  
199 site, which covered every phase of the research process. In this process, 5% of households visited  
200 each week were revisited to confirm the recorded information.[45, 46, 50] Also, a script was used to  
201 filter errors at the time of uploading the data from tablets to the server, with records showing  
202 inconsistencies being returned to the field for reconciliations.

## 203 **Measures**

204 The primary outcome variables of interest included five indicators of hardships a household  
205 reported experiencing since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., during the 1 to 1½ years



206 since March 2020).<sup>1</sup> Information on these household hardships were gathered from the following  
207 survey question: “Has your household been affected by any of these events since mid-March?”  
208 Responses included job loss, non-agricultural business closure, increases in the price of the main  
209 food products consumed, increases in the price of agricultural or commercial inputs, and having a  
210 household member detained.

211 Right-hand side variables. Head of household variables were age (coded as 1 = less than 30  
212 years (reference), 2 = 30 to 39 years, 3 = 40 to 49 years, 4 = 50 to 59 years, 5 = 60 to 69 years, and 6  
213 = 70+ years); sex (coded as male = 0 and female = 1); religion (coded as 1 = Zion (reference), 2 =  
214 Evangelical, 3 = Christian (non-denominational), 4 = Protestant, 5 = Catholic, 6 = other); ethnicity,  
215 defined by mother language,[51] (coded as 1 = Tsonga (reference), 2 = Sena/Ndau, 3 =  
216 Lomwe/Chuwabo 4 = Macua and 5 = European, 6 = other); education (coded as 1 = Primary  
217 (reference), 2 = Secondary, 3 = Technical, 4 = Tertiary, 5 = Literate, 6 = Other); and occupation  
218 (coded as 1 = farmer/fisherman/subsistence (reference), 2 = locksmith/bricklayer, 3 =  
219 guards/security, 4 = miner/factory worker, 5 = carpenter/electrician, 6 = lumberjack, 7 = merchants, 8  
220 = health professional, 9 = military/policy, 10 = teacher, 11 = disabled/unemployed, 12 = volunteer,  
221 and 13= other).

222 Household variables included household size (coded as 1 = 1-2 individuals (reference), 2 = 3-  
223 4 individuals, 3 = 5-6 individuals, 4 = 7+ individuals); children under age 5 (coded as 0, 1+  
224 individuals); adults over age 60 (coded as 0, 1+ individuals); and a wealth index based on a list of

---

<sup>1</sup> In preliminary analyses, these variables were used to generate additive and PCA based indices of household hardships; however, after evaluating these indices (e.g., the Cronbach’s Alpha scores for the additive index was 0.069) we concluded that the combination of these variables resulted in a poor fit for an index and therefore decided to examine each hardship independently.

225 household assets (coded as 1 = poorest (reference), 2 = poorer, 3 = middle, 4 = richer, 5 = richest (see  
226 Appendix A for details of computation of this index). Specific household assets included vehicles  
227 (coded as 0 = none (reference), 1 = car, 2 = motorcycle, 3 = both); media (coded as 0 = none  
228 (reference), 1 = radio, 2 = tv, 3 = both).

229

## 230 **Analytic Strategy**

231 Data cleaning and analysis was performed using R version 4.2.0.[37] Missing values for age,  
232 sex, religion, ethnicity, education, and occupation were less than 5 percent of the total observations.  
233 Descriptive statistics were reported for head of household and household characteristics. A series of  
234 un-adjusted logistic regression models were used to analyze associations between head of household  
235 and household characteristics with specific household hardships (i.e., business closure, food price  
236 increase, household member detained, input inflation, and job loss). Adjusted logistic regression  
237 models were then used to control for additional variables, which were included in the final adjusted  
238 model if their inclusion had theoretical justification. We assessed model fit with a comparison of  
239 Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) scores—the smallest  
240 scores were for the fully adjusted model, indicating that this model had superior fit compared to  
241 simpler models. Results from the final logistic regression model are reported as Adjusted Odds  
242 Ratios (AOR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) and visualized with forest plots.[52, 53]

243 Models were first run using the complete data set that included 33,087 households. A  
244 subsequent analysis was run with only those households who reported having at least one family  
245 member employed or operating a business during the HDSS round prior to the observation period.  
246 These selection criteria were used in order to only evaluate the 28,771 households that were at risk of  
247 having a family member lose a job, have a business close, or have prices increase in the inputs for  
248 their business or agricultural activities. Frequency distributions of the number of hardships  
249 experienced by a given household were comparable for the data with 33,087 households and 28,771

250 households. Likewise, results from the analyses using the complete data set and the analysis using the  
251 sub-sample were generally comparable. Hereafter, we present the results from the analysis of the sub-  
252 sample, results from the analysis using the complete data are available upon request.

253

## 254 **RESULTS**

255 A majority of households (52.0%) were headed by a male household member and the majority  
256 (54.3%) of household heads were married (Table 1). The median and modal age category of the  
257 household head was 40-49 years. Tsonga was the most common ethnic group (92.3%); Sena/Ndau  
258 and Lomwe/Chuwabo combined represented about 3.1% of households. Roughly 91.4% of  
259 household heads identified religiously as either Zion, Evangelical, non-denominational Christian,  
260 Protestant, or Catholic. A majority (54.1%) of household heads had primary education, and 15.6%  
261 had secondary education. The most common occupations were farmer/fisherman/subsistence (53.1%)  
262 and miner/factory worker (13.1%); a little less than 6% were disabled or unemployed. Median  
263 household size was 3-4 household members. Of all households, 43.6% had children under 5 years  
264 and about 29.0% had adult family members over the age of 60. The percentage of households that  
265 reported a given hardship is presented in Figure 2; a Euler diagram presenting the shared distribution  
266 of hardships experienced by households during the pandemic is presented in Figure 3. A majority of  
267 households (59.2%) reported that they experienced 1 hardship during the observation period and  
268 another 18.2% reported experiencing more than 1 hardship. A little less than 25% of households  
269 reported that they did not experience any of the measured hardships during the observation period  
270 (Figure 2).

### 271 **Price Increases for Food**

272 The most common hardship that households reported experiencing during the observation  
273 period was increases in food prices, with 70.3% of households reporting this hardship (Figure 4).

274 After adjusting for other variables (see Figure 5 for a composite summary of results for all 5  
275 hardships; detailed results are provided in supplementary figures in Appendix B), households were  
276 more likely to report increases in food prices if their household head identified as Protestant (AOR =  
277 1.73, 95% CI [1.60, 1.77]) or Catholic (AOR = 1.27, 95% CI [1.15, 1.41]) compared to Zion or if the  
278 head of household was divorced or separated compared to single (AOR = 1.27, 95% CI [1.15, 1.41]).  
279 Compared to households whose heads worked in farming, fishing, or subsistence activities,  
280 households were more likely to report increases in food prices if their household head was employed  
281 as a locksmith or bricklayer (AOR = 1.29, 95% CI [1.05, 1.59]), a carpenter or electrician (AOR =  
282 1.35, 95% CI [1.01, 1.83]), a merchant (AOR = 1.27, 95% CI [1.12, 1.44]), in the military or police  
283 force (AOR = 1.88, 95% CI [1.36, 2.66]), as a teacher (AOR = 1.43, 95% CI [1.09, 1.87]), or if they  
284 were unemployed or disabled (AOR = 1.79, 95% CI [1.57, 2.04]). Households with a larger number  
285 of household members were more likely to report increases in food prices; for example, compared to  
286 households with 1-2 members, the odds that a household reported increases in food prices were  
287 higher if the household had 3-4 members (AOR = 1.20, 95% CI [1.11, 1.29]), 5-6 members (AOR =  
288 1.24, 95% CI [1.13, 1.35]), or 7 or more members (AOR = 1.21, 95% CI [1.10, 1.34]). Households  
289 were also more likely to report increases in food prices if they owned a TV (AOR = 1.79, 95% CI  
290 [1.65, 1.95]) or both TV and radio (AOR = 1.76, 95% CI [1.61, 1.91]).

291 Households were generally less likely to report increases in food prices if their household  
292 head had a higher level of education, were relatively wealthier, or if they had access to means of  
293 transportation. After adjusting for other variables, households were less likely to report increases in  
294 food prices during the pandemic if the head of household had a secondary education (AOR = 0.89,  
295 95% CI [0.82, 0.97]), a technical education (AOR = 0.66, 95% CI [0.50, 0.90]), a technical education  
296 (AOR = 0.66, 95% CI [0.50, 0.90]), a tertiary education (AOR = 0.76, 95% CI [0.56, 1.04]), or  
297 identified as being literate (AOR = 0.78, 95% CI [0.67, 0.90]) compared having only a primary  
298 education, although the association with having a tertiary education was not statistically significant.

299 Compared to the poorest households, households were less likely to report food price increases  
300 during the pandemic, after adjusting for other variables, if the household fell within the poorer (AOR  
301 = 0.82, 95% CI [0.76, 0.90]) to richest (AOR = 0.75, 95% CI [0.67, 0.83]) wealth index quintiles.  
302 Households were less likely to report food prices increases if they owned a motorcycle (AOR = 0.60,  
303 95% CI [0.50, 0.72]) or both a motorcycle and a car (AOR = 0.47, 95% CI [0.34, 0.64]).

#### 304 **Price Increases for Agricultural or Business Inputs**

305 After increases in food prices, the next most common hardship that households reported  
306 experiencing was increases in the prices of agricultural or business inputs (14.1% of households  
307 reported this hardship). After adjusting for other variables (see Figure 5), age of the household head  
308 was positively associated with increases in the price of agricultural or business inputs—compared to  
309 a household head younger than 30 years, households were more likely to have experienced input  
310 increases if they were headed by someone who was age 60-69 (AOR = 1.41, 95% CI [1.14, 1.75]) or  
311 70 years old or more (AOR = 1.36, 95% CI [1.09, 1.71]). Households were also more likely to report  
312 increases in the price of agricultural or business inputs if their household head identified as  
313 Evangelical (AOR = 1.73, 95% CI [1.60, 1.77]), non-denominational Christian (AOR = 1.73, 95% CI  
314 [1.60, 1.77]) or Catholic (AOR = 1.27, 95% CI [1.15, 1.41]) compared to the Zion denomination.  
315 Increases in the price of agricultural or business inputs were likewise associated with household  
316 ownership of a radio (AOR = 1.36, 95% CI [1.21, 1.52]), a TV (AOR = 1.16, 95% CI [1.04, 1.29]) or  
317 both TV and radio (AOR = 1.95, 95% CI [1.75, 2.16]). In contrast, household wealth status was  
318 negatively associated with increases in the price of agricultural or business inputs; compared to the  
319 poorest households, households were less likely to report increases in the price of agricultural or  
320 business inputs, if the household fell within the poorer (AOR = 0.88, 95% CI [0.79, 0.97]) to richest  
321 (AOR = 0.68, 95% CI [0.59, 0.78]) wealth index quintiles.

#### 322 **Household Member Detained**

323 About 7.4 percent of households reported having a household member detained (e.g.,  
324 prevented from returning home due to mobility restraints) during the observational period.  
325 Households were more likely to report experiencing this if they were headed by a female (AOR =  
326 1.52, 95% CI [1.34, 1.73]); had a household head who was married; had households with 7 or more  
327 members (AOR = 1.43, 95% CI [1.20, 1.45]) compared to 1-2 members; were from the poorer  
328 (AOR = 1.37, 95% CI [1.18, 1.60]) or middle (AOR = 1.39, 95% CI [1.20, 1.62]) wealth quintiles  
329 compared to the poorest; owned a radio (AOR = 1.43, 95% CI [1.23, 1.65]) or both TV and radio  
330 (AOR = 1.42, 95% CI [1.23, 1.63]); or if they owned a motorcycle (AOR = 2.94, 95% CI [2.31,  
331 3.71]) or both a motorcycle and a car (AOR = 3.10, 95% CI [2.07, 4.52]). Households were less  
332 likely to have experienced having a family member detained if they were headed by someone who  
333 was 70 years old or more (AOR = 0.64, 95% CI [0.48, 0.87]) compared to a household head younger  
334 than 30 years. Households were less likely to have experienced having a family member detained if  
335 their household head identified as Evangelical (AOR = 0.83, 95% CI [0.71, 0.96]), non-  
336 denominational Christian (AOR = 0.75, 95% CI [0.64, 0.88]) or Catholic (AOR = 0.79, 95% CI  
337 [0.69, 0.90]) compared to the Zion denomination.

### 338 **Household Member Job Loss**

339 A little over five percent of households reported having a household member lose their job  
340 during the pandemic period. Households were at greater risk of having a family member lose their  
341 job if the household head was non-denominational Christian (AOR = 1.55, 95% CI [1.31, 1.83])  
342 compared to Zion; married (AOR = 1.40, 95% CI [1.11, 1.75]), divorced or separated (AOR = 1.56,  
343 95% CI [1.20, 2.04]), or widowed (AOR = 1.37, 95% CI [1.05, 1.79]) compared to single; had larger  
344 households (e.g., 7 or more members (AOR = 1.42, 95% CI [1.13, 1.77])) compared to 1-2  
345 members); or owned a TV (AOR = 1.76, 95% CI [1.50, 2.07]) or both TV and radio (AOR = 1.33,  
346 95% CI [1.12, 1.59]). Conversely, the age of the household head was negatively associated with job

347 loss; e.g., compared to a household head younger than 30 years, households were less likely to have  
348 experienced having a family member lose their job if they were headed by someone who was age 30-  
349 39 (AOR = 0.69, 95% CI [0.57, 0.84]), 40-49 (AOR = 0.66, 95% CI [0.54, 0.81]), 50-59 (AOR =  
350 0.62, 95% CI [0.49, 0.78]), 60-69 (AOR = 0.51, 95% CI [0.36, 0.72]), or 70 years old or more (AOR  
351 = 0.40, 95% CI [0.27, 0.58]). Head of household employment in the military or police force,  
352 compared to farming, fishing, or subsistence, was negatively associated with having a household  
353 member lose their job (AOR = 0.05, 95% CI [0.00, 0.24]). Households were also less likely to report  
354 job loss if the household was in the richer (AOR = 0.77, 95% CI [0.63, 0.94]) or richest (AOR =  
355 0.68, 95% CI [0.54, 0.85]) wealth index quintiles. Likewise, households were less likely to report  
356 having a household member lose their job if they owned a motorcycle (AOR = 0.30, 95% CI [0.13,  
357 0.56]) or both a motorcycle and a car (AOR = 0.44, 95% CI [0.13, 1.05]); however, the association  
358 between ownership of both a motorcycle and a car and job loss was not statistically significant.

### 359 **Business Closure**

360 The least commonly reported hardship by households was having a business closure (3.1%).  
361 Having a household head employed as a carpenter/electrician compared to farming, fishing, or  
362 subsistence was positively associated with business closure (AOR = 2.11, 95% CI [1.12, 3.65]).  
363 Larger households with 7 or more members were also more likely to have had a business closure  
364 (AOR = 1.58, 95% CI [1.20, 2.08]) compared to 1-2 members. Conversely, households were less  
365 likely to experience a business closure if the household head was employed as a security guard (AOR  
366 = 0.53, 95% CI [0.26, 0.96]) or miner/factory worker closure (AOR = 0.65, 95% CI [0.50, 0.84])  
367 compared to farming, fishing, or subsistence. Having an adult household member over the age of 60  
368 was likewise negatively associated with business closure (AOR = 0.67, 95% CI [0.48, 0.92]).

369

### 370 **DISCUSSION**

371 In this study, we examined the prevalence of several household hardships during the COVID-  
372 19 pandemic in the district of Manhica of Mozambique. We further examined the demographic,  
373 economic, and social characteristics of individuals and households associated with these hardships.  
374 Roughly 78.1% of households reported experiencing at least one hardship since the onset of the  
375 pandemic, the most commonly reported hardship was an increase in local food prices. In preliminary  
376 analyses, we considered evaluating additive and PCA based indices of these household hardships;  
377 however, we concluded that the combination of these variables resulted in a poor fit for an index after  
378 evaluating the additive index via Cronbach's Alpha scores and the results of the PCA analysis. The  
379 results from our analyses further suggest that there was utility in evaluating each hardship  
380 independently as associations with individual and household level factors were heterogeneous across  
381 the hardships examined, particularly with regards to the factors associated with having a household  
382 member detained.

383 Individual-level risk factors for experiencing these hardships included head of household  
384 characteristics such as lower levels of education, a variety of occupations (merchants, health  
385 professionals, military/police, teachers, volunteers) as well as being disabled or unemployed.  
386 Household-level risk factors included having a larger household and having lower wealth status as  
387 indicated by ownership of fewer household assets. In general, the pattern of association for household  
388 wealth is suggestive of a dose-response; households with greater wealth (more assets) were at  
389 significantly lower risk for experiencing hardships. These associations are largely consistent with risk  
390 factors reported in studies from other resource-limited countries.[6,10-13,17] Overall, TV and radio  
391 ownership were positively associated with experiencing hardships. This positive association persisted  
392 even after controlling for household wealth, suggesting that this relationship may be attributed to  
393 the functionality of these assets as a means of mass communication and not just as an indicator of  
394 wealth; i.e., households with a TV or radio may be better informed of the events surrounding the  
395 pandemic and fear what is happening in Maputo, South Africa and around the world. Household



396 ownership of a motorcycle or both a motorcycle and a car were inversely related to experiencing  
397 hardships. This may relate to transportations' ability to empower individuals and households to  
398 transcend local conditions and access resources from a larger geographic area, thereby increasing  
399 their resilience to hardships during the pandemic.[30-32] In contrast to prior findings,[18] having a  
400 head of household employed in farming, fishing, or subsistence was protective in some instances  
401 against households experiencing hardships compared to several other occupations. This observation  
402 is consistent with the local economic context of Manhiça, where farming dominates the lower  
403 Inkomati River region, which occupies large extensions of the district from north to the south. The  
404 agriculture in Manhiça generally consists of family-based subsistence farming, supplemented by  
405 some commercial farming, along with employment in sugar-cane plantations that are central to the  
406 region's economy. Farming, fishing, or subsistence activities were not subject to lockdown measures,  
407 potentially contributing to the reduced impact of hardships on households engaged in these activities.  
408 Future interventions that seek to mitigate negative consequences associated with pandemic mitigation  
409 efforts should anticipate these characteristics as important risk factors and target interventions to aid  
410 vulnerable groups.

411 The empirical findings from this study are specific to the community living within the study  
412 site; a limitation common to studies using HDSS data.[16] However, our findings are generally  
413 consistent with findings reported in other studies from sub-Saharan African countries.[40-42] As an  
414 observational study, other potential limitations include unmeasured variable bias (for example, we  
415 did not gather information related to food insecurity beyond increases in local food prices) or recall  
416 bias due to the extended length of time considered in the study (i.e., some respondents may have for-  
417 gotten hardships that occurred closer to the onset of the pandemic). We also cannot draw causal  
418 inferences given the cross-sectional nature of the study. Results from other studies suggest hardships  
419 associated with the COVID-19 pandemic are ephemeral.[7] Looking forward, scholars should collect  
420 and analyze longitudinal data to evaluate hardship events over time and explore potential causal

421 relationships. Demographic surveillance systems present an efficient platform for follow-up data  
422 collection using the same survey instrument attached to subsequent rounds of regular data collection.

423

## 424 **CONCLUSION**

425         Households in Manhiça experienced a variety of hardships during the COVID-19 pandemic,  
426 with the most prevalent hardship being the surge in local food prices. Restrictions of travel and  
427 closure of borders, particularly the border with South Africa, may have been the most important  
428 causes of this increase in food prices. Southern Mozambique relies heavily on imported food supplies  
429 from South Africa and certain provinces in Central and Northern Mozambique. Informal vendors of  
430 different scales play an important (if not the major) role in the amount of imported goods from South  
431 Africa. The price hikes commenced following the South African government’s announcement of  
432 border closures in March 2020, and even during periods of border reopening, travel to South Africa  
433 incurred additional expenses due to mandatory COVID-19 testing at the border. Households headed  
434 by individuals with lower education and employed in specific occupations as well as households that  
435 were larger in size or poorer in asset ownership compared to other households were generally at  
436 greater risk of experiencing a larger variety of hardships. Conversely, households that owned  
437 “distance demolishing technologies” such as motorcycles were less likely to experience several of  
438 these hardships, presumably because they were able to transcend local conditions.[29-32]  
439 Associations between specific hardships and individual and household characteristics varied to some  
440 degree; these variations highlight the importance of considering specific hardships when planning  
441 and implementing interventions to improve the health and well-being of populations living in these  
442 conditions. These findings may inform future policies and practices aiming to mitigate the negative  
443 consequences of COVID-19 and future disease outbreaks.

## 444 **DECLARATIONS**

### 445 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

446 This study was conducted according to the guidelines in the Declaration of Helsinki; all procedures  
447 involving research study participants, including digital data collection using tablets that were  
448 programmed with the corresponding survey instruments, were approved by the Institutional Ethics  
449 Review Board for Health (CIBS) approval reference number No Ref:CIBS-CISM/15/2021. Written  
450 informed consent was obtained for participants who were able to read and write. For participants who  
451 were unable to read or write, the informed consent statement was read, and oral informed consent  
452 from the participant was obtained, documented, and witnessed. These procedures for obtaining  
453 written or oral informed consent were approved by the Institutional Ethics Review Board for Health  
454 (CIBS), a review board affiliated with the National Bioethics Committee for Health (CNBS).

### 455 **Consent for publication**

456 All authors provide consent for publication.

### 457 **Availability of data and materials**

458 The COVID-19 lockdown dataset analyzed for this study can be found in the CHAMPS Population  
459 Surveillance Dataverse [[link](#)].[54] The Manhiça HDSS data that was used in combination with the  
460 COVID-19 lockdown dataset are available from the authors upon reasonable request.

### 461 **Competing Interests**

462 *The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial*  
463 *relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.*

464 Disclaimers: The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not  
465 necessarily represent the views of the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

## 466 **Funding**

467 This work was supported, in whole or in part, by grant OPP1126780 from the Bill & Melinda Gates  
468 Foundation. CISM is supported by the Government of Mozambique and the Spanish Agency for  
469 International Development (AECID). ISGlobal receives support from the Spanish Ministry of  
470 Science and Innovation through the “Centro de Excelencia Severo Ochoa 2019-2023” Program  
471 (CEX2018-000806-S), and support from the Generalitat de Catalunya through the CERCA Program.

## 472 **Author contributions**

473 Conceptualization (AN, CS, TM, QB, IM), data curation (AN, CS, TM, QB, IM), formal analysis  
474 (JM, ZM), investigation (AN, CS, TM, QB, IM), methodology (AN, ZM, JM, CS, TM, QB, IM, SC),  
475 project administration (AN, CS, TM, QB, IM, SC), resources (AN, CS, TM, QB, IM), supervision  
476 (AN, QB, IM, SC), visualization (ZM, JM), writing – original draft preparation (JM, ZM), writing –  
477 review & editing (AN, ZM, JM, CS, TM, QB, IM, SC).

## 478 **Acknowledgements**

479 We are indebted to the households living within the Manhica HDSS that participated in our study  
480 and voluntarily contributed their time and energy in responding to our survey questionnaire in  
481 addition to ongoing participation in the regular data collection activities of the HDSS. We are also  
482 indebted to the HDSS team members who fielded the survey.

483 **REFERENCES**

- 484 1. Wang H, Paulson KR, Pease SA, Watson S, Comfort H, Zheng P, Aravkin AY, Bisignano C,  
485 Barber RM, Alam T: **Estimating excess mortality due to the COVID-19 pandemic: a**  
486 **systematic analysis of COVID-19-related mortality, 2020–21.** *The Lancet* 2022.
- 487 2. Baldwin RE, Weder B: *Mitigating the COVID Economic Crisis: Act Fast and Do Whatever It*  
488 *Takes*. London: CEPR press; 2020.
- 489 3. Akseer N, Kandru G, Keats EC, Bhutta ZA: **COVID-19 Pandemic and Mitigation**  
490 **Strategies: Implications for Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition.** *The American*  
491 *Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2020, **112**:251-256.
- 492 4. Ayanlade A, Radeny M: **COVID-19 and Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa:**  
493 **implications of Lockdown during Agricultural Planting Seasons.** *npj Science of Food*  
494 2020, **4**:1-6.
- 495 5. Banna M, Al H, Sayeed A, Kundu S, Kagstrom A, Sultana M, Begum MR, Khan MSI:  
496 **Factors associated with household food insecurity and dietary diversity among day**  
497 **laborers amid the COVID-19 pandemic in Bangladesh.** *BMC nutrition* 2022, **8**:1-11.
- 498 6. Chen J, Vullikanti A, Santos J, Venkatramanan S, Hoops S, Mortveit H, Lewis B, You W,  
499 Eubank S, Marathe M: **Epidemiological and Economic Impact of COVID-19 in the US.**  
500 *Scientific reports* 2021, **11**:1-12.
- 501 7. Chitiga M, Henseler M, Mabugu RE, Maisonnave H: **How COVID-19 pandemic worsens**  
502 **the economic situation of women in South Africa.** *The European Journal of Development*  
503 *Research* 2021, **34**:1-18.
- 504 8. Fikire AH, Zegeye MB: **Determinants of Rural Household Food Security Status in North**  
505 **Shewa Zone, Amhara Region, Ethiopia.** *The Scientific World Journal* 2022, **2022**:1-8.
- 506 9. Hirvonen K, Abate GT, de Brauw A: **Survey Suggests Rising Risk of Food and Nutrition**  
507 **Insecurity in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, as COVID-19 Restrictions Continue.** In *COVID-19*  
508 *and Global Food Security*. IFPRI Books: International Food Policy Research Institute  
509 (IFPRI); 2020: 46-49
- 510 10. Hirvonen K, de Brauw A, Abate GT: **Food Consumption and Food Security During the**  
511 **COVID-19 Pandemic in Addis Ababa.** *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 2021,  
512 **103**:772-789.
- 513 11. Manfrinato CV, Marino A, Condé VF, Maria do Carmo PF, Stedefeldt E, Tomita LY: **High**  
514 **prevalence of food insecurity, the adverse impact of COVID-19 in Brazilian favela.**  
515 *Public health nutrition* 2021, **24**:1210-1215.
- 516 12. Onyango EO, Crush J, Owuor S: **Preparing for COVID-19: Household Food Insecurity**  
517 **and Vulnerability to Shocks in Nairobi, Kenya.** *PLoS ONE* 2021, **16**:e0259139.
- 518 13. Osendarp S, Akuoku JK, Black RE, Headey D, Ruel M, Scott N, Shekar M, Walker N, Flory  
519 A, Haddad L: **The COVID-19 Crisis Will Exacerbate Maternal and Child**  
520 **Undernutrition and Child Mortality in Low-and Middle-Income Countries.** *Nature Food*  
521 2021, **2**:476-484.
- 522 14. Picchioni F, Goulao LF, Roberfroid D: **The Impact of COVID-19 on Diet Quality, Food**  
523 **Security and Nutrition in Low and Middle Income Countries: A Systematic Review of**  
524 **the Evidence.** *Clinical Nutrition* 2021, **41**:2955-2964.

- 525 15. Robertson T, Carter ED, Chou VB, Stegmuller AR, Jackson BD, Tam Y, Sawadogo-Lewis T,  
526 Walker N: **Early Estimates of the Indirect Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on**  
527 **Maternal and Child Mortality in Low-Income and Middle-Income Countries: A**  
528 **Modeling Study.** *The Lancet Global Health* 2020, **8**:e901-e908.
- 529 16. Clark S, Wakefield J, McCormick T, Ross M: **Hyak Mortality Monitoring System:**  
530 **Innovative Sampling and Estimation Methods–Proof of Concept by Simulation.** *Global*  
531 *Health, Epidemiology and Genomics* 2018, **3**:1-14.
- 532 17. Goshu D, Ferede T, Diriba G, Ketema M: **Economic and Welfare Effects of COVID-19**  
533 **and Responses in Ethiopia: Initial Insights.** Ethiopia: Ethiopian Economic Policy Research  
534 Institute; 2020.
- 535 18. Barletta G, Castigo F, Egger EM, Keller M, Salvucci V, Tarp F: **The impact of COVID-19**  
536 **on consumption poverty in Mozambique.** *Journal of International Development* 2022,  
537 **34**:771-802.
- 538 19. Leight J, Hensly C, Chissano M, Ali L: **Short-term effects of the COVID-19 state of**  
539 **emergency on contraceptive access and utilization in Mozambique.** *PLoS One* 2021,  
540 **16**:e0249195.
- 541 20. das Neves Martins Pires PH, Macaringue C, Abdirazak A, Mucufo JR, Mupueleque MA,  
542 Zakus D, Siemens R, Belo CF: **Covid-19 pandemic impact on maternal and child health**  
543 **services access in Nampula, Mozambique: a mixed methods research.** *BMC health*  
544 *services research* 2021, **21**:1-8.
- 545 21. Squarcina M, Egger E-M: **Effects of the COVID-19 crisis on household food consumption**  
546 **and child nutrition in Mozambique.** World Institute for Development Economic Research  
547 (UNU-WIDER); 2022.
- 548 22. Spielman SE, Tuccillo J, Folch DC, Schweikert A, Davies R, Wood N, Tate E: **Evaluating**  
549 **Social Vulnerability Indicators: Criteria and Their Application to the Social**  
550 **Vulnerability Index.** *Natural Hazards* 2020, **100**:417-436.
- 551 23. Muir JA, Cope MR, Angeningsih LR, Jackson JE, Brown RB: **Migration and Mental**  
552 **Health in the Aftermath of Disaster: Evidence From MT. Merapi, Indonesia.**  
553 *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2019, **16**:2726.
- 554 24. Muir JA, Cope MR, Angeningsih LR, Jackson JE: **To Move Home or Move On?**  
555 **Investigating the Impact of Recovery Aid on Migration Status as a Potential Tool for**  
556 **Disaster Risk Reduction in the Aftermath of Volcanic Eruptions in Merapi, Indonesia.**  
557 *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 2020, **46**:101478.
- 558 25. Perry RW: **What is a Disaster?** In *Handbook of Disaster Research.* New York: Springer;  
559 2007: 1-15
- 560 26. Cutter SL, Barnes L, Berry M, Burton C, Evans E, Tate E, Webb J: **A place-based model for**  
561 **understanding community resilience to natural disasters.** *Global environmental change*  
562 2008, **18**:598-606.
- 563 27. Cutter SL, Boruff BJ, Shirley WL: **Social vulnerability to environmental hazards.** In  
564 *Hazards vulnerability and environmental justice.* New York: Routledge; 2012: 143-160
- 565 28. Flanagan BE, Gregory EW, Hallisey EJ, Heitgerd JL, Lewis B: **A Social Vulnerability**  
566 **Index for Disaster Management.** *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency*  
567 *Management* 2011, **8**:1-22.

- 568 29. Muir JA: *Indicators of Fertility Change in a Developing Nation: Examining the Impact of*  
569 *Motorcycles as a Distance Demolishing Technology on Fertility Change in Rural Indonesia.*  
570 Provo: Brigham Young University; 2012.
- 571 30. Muir JA: *Societal Shocks as Social Determinants of Health.* Columbus: The Ohio State  
572 University; 2021.
- 573 31. Sanders SR, Muir JA, Brown RB: **Overcoming Geographic Penalties of Inequality: The**  
574 **Effects of Distance-Demolishing Technologies on Household Well-Being in Vietnam.**  
575 *Asian Journal of Social Science* 2018, **46**:260-280.
- 576 32. Muir JA: **Another mHealth? Examining Motorcycles as a Distance Demolishing**  
577 **Determinant of Health Care Access in South and Southeast Asia.** *Journal of Transport &*  
578 *Health* 2018, **11**:153-166.
- 579 33. Egger E-M, Salvucci V, Tarp F: **Evolution of multidimensional poverty in crisis-ridden**  
580 **Mozambique.** *Social Indicators Research* 2023:1-35.
- 581 34. Wernau J: **IMF Suspends Lending to Mozambique.** In *The Wall Street Journal*; 2016.
- 582 35. Mugabe VA, Gudo ES, Inlamea OF, Kitron U, Ribeiro GS: **Natural disasters, population**  
583 **displacement and health emergencies: multiple public health threats in Mozambique.**  
584 *BMJ global health* 2021, **6**:e006778.
- 585 36. Gennaro F, Occa E, Ramirez L, Marotta C, Segala F, Santana J, Cotugno S, Papagni R, De  
586 Meneghi G, De Vivo E: **Malaria, HIV and malnutrition among internally displaced**  
587 **people in Mozambique during COVID-19 pandemic: results from a community-based**  
588 **intervention.** *Annals of Global Health* 2022, **88**.
- 589 37. Betho R, Chelengo M, Jones S, Keller M, Mussagy IH, van Seventer D, Tarp F: **The**  
590 **macroeconomic impact of COVID-19 in Mozambique: A social accounting matrix**  
591 **approach.** *Journal of International Development* 2022, **34**:823-860.
- 592 38. Krauss JE, Artur L, Brockington D, Castro Jr E, Fernando Jr J, Fisher J, Kingman A, Moises  
593 HM, Mlambo A, Nuvunga M: **‘To prevent this disease, we have to stay at home, but if we**  
594 **stay at home, we die of hunger’—Livelihoods, vulnerability and coping with Covid-19 in**  
595 **rural Mozambique.** *World Development* 2022, **151**:105757.
- 596 39. Chiwona-Karlton L, Amuakwa-Mensah F, Wamala-Larsson C, Amuakwa-Mensah S, Abu  
597 Hatab A, Made N, Tarenwa NK, Melyoki L, Rutashobya LK, Madonsela T: **COVID-19:**  
598 **From health crises to food security anxiety and policy implications.** *Ambio* 2021, **50**:794-  
599 811.
- 600 40. Muir JA, Dheresa M, Madewell ZJ, Getachew T, Daraje G, Mengesha G, Whitney CG,  
601 Assefa N, Cunningham SA: **Household hardships and responses to COVID-19 pandemic-**  
602 **related shocks in Eastern Ethiopia.** *BMC Public Health* 2023, **23**:2086.
- 603 41. Muir JA, Deresa M, Madewell ZJ, Getachew T, Mengesha G, Whitney CG, Assefa N,  
604 Cunningham SA: **Food Insecurity amid COVID-19 Lockdowns: Assessing**  
605 **Sociodemographic Indicators of Vulnerability in Harar and Kersa, Ethiopia.** *medRxiv*  
606 2023:2023.2001.2031.23284545.
- 607 42. Nhacolo A, Madewell ZJ, Muir JA, Sacoer C, Xerinda E, Matsena T, Jamisse E, Bassat Q,  
608 Whitney CG, Mandomando I: **Knowledge of COVID-19 symptoms, transmission, and**  
609 **prevention: Evidence from health and demographic surveillance in Southern**  
610 **Mozambique.** *PLOS Global Public Health* 2023, **3**:e0002532.

- 611 43. Muir JA, Matsena T, Madewell ZJ, Keiri F, Sacoer C, Jamisse E, Xerinda E, Hunguana AM,  
612 Bassat Q, Mandomando I: **Coronavirus Awareness and Household Hardship Survey Data**  
613 **for the Champs Hdss Network: Data Collected between April 2021 and February 2022**  
614 **in the Manhiça Hdss, Mozambique.**
- 615 44. Cunningham SA, Shaikh NI, Nhacolo A, Raghunathan PL, Kotloff K, Naser AM, Mengesha  
616 MM, Adedini SA, Misore T, Onuwchekwa UU: **Health and Demographic Surveillance**  
617 **Systems within the Child Health and Mortality Prevention Surveillance Network.**  
618 *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2019, **69**:S274-S279.
- 619 45. Nhacolo A, Jamisse E, Augusto O, Matsena T, Hunguana A, Mandomando I, Arnaldo C,  
620 Munguambe K, Macete E, Alonso P, et al: **Cohort Profile Update: Manhiça Health and**  
621 **Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) of the Manhiça Health Research Centre**  
622 **(CISM).** *Int J Epidemiol* 2021, **50**:395.
- 623 46. Sacoer C, Nhacolo A, Nhalungo D, Aponte JJ, Bassat Q, Augusto O, Mandomando I,  
624 Sacarlal J, Lauchande N, Sigauque B: **Profile: Manhiça health research centre (Manhiça**  
625 **HDSS).** *International journal of epidemiology* 2013, **42**:1309-1318.
- 626 47. World Bank Group: **High Frequency Mobile Phone Surveys of Households to Assess the**  
627 **Impacts of COVID-19 (Vol. 4) : Questionnaire Template (English).** vol. 4. Washington,  
628 D.C.; 2020.
- 629 48. Palacios-Lopez A, Noumedem Temgoua C, Kokas D, Talbert EA, Siwatu GO, Ponzini G,  
630 Illukor J, Phadera L, Yoshida N, Wollburg PR: **High Frequency Mobile Phone Surveys of**  
631 **Households to Assess the Impacts of COVID-19 (Vol. 5): Overview of the Questionnaire**  
632 **Template.** Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group; 2020.
- 633 49. Ruel E, Wagner III WE, Gillespie BJ: *The practice of survey research: Theory and*  
634 *applications.* Sage Publications; 2015.
- 635 50. Cunningham SA, Muir JA: **Data Cleaning.** In *The Cambridge Handbook of Research*  
636 *Methods and Statistics for the Social and Behavioral Sciences: Volume 1: Building a*  
637 *Program of Research (Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology, pp 443-467).* Volume 1. Edited  
638 by Nichols AL, Edlund JE. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2023
- 639 51. Arnaldo C: **Ethnicity and marriage patterns in Mozambique.**
- 640 52. Lewis SC, Keerie C, Assi V: **Forest Plot.** In *Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online.* 1-6
- 641 53. Yeh J, D'Amico F: **Forest plots: data summaries at a glance.** *Journal of Family Practice*  
642 2004, **53**:1007-1008.
- 643 54. Nhacolo A, Sacoer C, Xerinda E, Matsena T, Muir JA, Madewell ZJ, Whitney CG,  
644 Cunningham SA, Bassat Q, Mandomando I: **COVID-19 Impact Data for the CHAMPS**  
645 **HDSS Network: Data from Manhiça, Mozambique.** V1 edition: UNC Dataverse; 2023.
- 646 55. Rutstein SO, Johnson K, Measure O: **The DHS Wealth Index: ORC Macro.** *MEASURE*  
647 *DHS* 2004, **6**:1-77.
- 648 56. Rutstein SO: **Steps to Constructing the New DHS Wealth Index.** *Rockville, MD: ICF*  
649 *International* 2015.
- 650 57. Hjelm L, Mathiassen A, Miller D, Wadhwa A: **Creation of a wealth index.** *United Nations*  
651 *World Food Programme* 2017.



652 58. Fry K, Firestone R, Chakraborty NM: **Measuring Equity With Nationally Representative**  
653 **Wealth Quintiles.** *Washington DC* 2014.

654


655

656

657

658






664

665

**Figure 2. Percentage of Households that Reported a Given Number of Hardships (n = 28,711)**



666

667

668

**Figure 3. Pattern of Multiple Hardships Reported by Households (n = 28,711). Euler diagram representing the overlap of hardships that households reported experiencing during the pandemic.**

669



670

671 **Figure 4. Percentage (and 95% confidence interval) of Households that Reported a Given Hardship (n = 28,711).**

672


673

674

675

676

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



677

678

679

680

681

**Figure 5. Adjusted Associations between Individual and Household Characteristics with Hardships Reported by Households Living in Manhiça, Mozambique (n=27,404).** Presented as Adjusted Incidence Risk Ratios with 95% confidence intervals. Missing values for age, sex, religion, ethnicity, education, and occupation were less than 5 percent of the total observations.

682 TABLES

683 **Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Head of Household Characteristics (n=28,771)**

|  |                                | n     | %      |
|--|--------------------------------|-------|--------|
| <b>Head of Household Characteristics</b> |                                |       |        |
| Age                                      | <30                            | 2513  | 8.70%  |
|  | 30-39                          | 6561  | 22.71% |
|  | 40-49                          | 7103  | 24.59% |
|  | 50-59                          | 4843  | 16.76% |
|  | 60-69                          | 3797  | 13.14% |
|  | 70+                            | 3643  | 12.61% |
| Sex                                      | Female                         | 15013 | 51.96% |
|  | Male                           | 13608 | 47.10% |
| Marital Status                           | Single                         | 2684  | 9.29%  |
|  | Married                        | 15694 | 54.32% |
|  | Divorced/Separated             | 3506  | 12.14% |
|  | Widowed                        | 6202  | 21.47% |
| Religion                                 | Zion                           | 9613  | 33.27% |
|  | Evangelical                    | 3868  | 13.39% |
|  | Christian (Non-denominational) | 3276  | 11.34% |
|  | Protestant                     | 6147  | 21.28% |
|  | Catholic                       | 2629  | 9.10%  |
|  | Other                          | 2477  | 8.57%  |
| Ethnicity                                | Tsonga                         | 26658 | 92.27% |
|  | Sena/Ndau                      | 441   | 1.53%  |
|  | Lomwe/Chuwabo                  | 440   | 1.52%  |
|  | Macua                          | 129   | 0.45%  |
|  | European                       | 95    | 0.33%  |
|  | Other                          | 284   | 0.98%  |
| Education                                | Primary                        | 15620 | 54.07% |
|  | Secondary                      | 4511  | 15.61% |
|  | Technical                      | 239   | 0.83%  |
|  | Tertiary                       | 299   | 1.03%  |
|  | Literate                       | 954   | 3.30%  |
|  | Other                          | 2810  | 9.73%  |
|  | No Education                   | 3325  | 11.51% |
| Occupation                               | Farmer/Fisherman/Subsistence   | 15330 | 53.06% |
|  | Locksmith/Bricklayer           | 994   | 3.44%  |
|  | Guards/Security                | 530   | 1.83%  |
|  | Miner/Factory Worker           | 3787  | 13.11% |
|  | Carpenter/Electrician          | 128   | 0.44%  |
|  | Lumberjack                     | 222   | 0.77%  |
|  | Merchants                      | 1770  | 6.13%  |
|  | Health Professional            | 198   | 0.69%  |
|  | Military/Policy                | 261   | 0.90%  |
|  | Teacher                        | 425   | 1.47%  |
|  | Disabled/Unemployed            | 1673  | 5.79%  |
|  | Volunteer                      | 420   | 1.45%  |
| Other                                    | 2322                           | 8.04% |        |

684 Notes: Data source: CHAMPS Mozambique Lockdown Module data and CHAMPS Mozambique Health and  
 685 Demographic Surveillance data. Less than 5 percent of observations were missing for any of the variables for head of  
 686 household characteristics. The original data set, representing 33,087 households, was restricted to only those households  
 687 that had reported at least one family member employed or engaged in business or agricultural activities in the HDSS  
 688 round prior to the observation period; this resulted in a subset of data that included 28,771 households.  
 689

690

691 **Table 1.1: Descriptive Statistics for Household Characteristics (n=28,771)**

|                                  |            | n     | %      |
|----------------------------------|------------|-------|--------|
| <b>Household Characteristics</b> |            |       |        |
| Household Size                   | 1-2        | 6919  | 23.95% |
|                                  | 3-4        | 8403  | 29.09% |
|                                  | 5-6        | 7802  | 27.00% |
|                                  | 7+         | 5647  | 19.55% |
| Children Under Age 5             | 0          | 16163 | 55.94% |
|                                  | 1+         | 12608 | 43.64% |
| Adults Over Age 60               | 0          | 20385 | 70.56% |
|                                  | 1+         | 8386  | 29.03% |
| Wealth Index                     | Richest    | 5888  | 20.38% |
|                                  | Richer     | 5749  | 19.90% |
|                                  | Middle     | 5897  | 20.41% |
|                                  | Poorer     | 5635  | 19.50% |
|                                  | Poorest    | 5602  | 19.39% |
| Media                            | None       | 12733 | 44.07% |
|                                  | Computer   | 3401  | 11.77% |
|                                  | TV         | 6551  | 22.67% |
|                                  | Both       | 6086  | 21.07% |
| Vehicles                         | None       | 26523 | 91.80% |
|                                  | Car        | 1553  | 5.38%  |
|                                  | Motorcycle | 510   | 1.77%  |
|                                  | Both       | 185   | 0.64%  |

692

693 Notes: Data source: CHAMPS Mozambique Lockdown Module data and CHAMPS Mozambique Health and  
 694 Demographic Surveillance data. No observations were missing for any of the variables for household characteristics. The  
 695 original data set, representing 33,087 households, was restricted to only those households that had reported at least one  
 696 family member employed or engaged in business or agricultural activities in the HDSS round prior to the observation  
 697 period; this resulted in a subset of data that included 28,771 households.

698

699

## 700 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

### 701 **Appendix A. Household Wealth Index Generation**

702 A household wealth index was generated using principal components analysis and a list of household  
703 assets and construction materials for the main dwelling of a given household. To generate this index,  
704 we followed the recommendations from the Demographic and Health Surveys Program (DHS) and  
705 the World Food Programme (WFP) that outline steps for calculating an asset-based wealth index,[55-  
706 57] including coding instructions for implementation in Stata,[58] and an adaptation of this coding  
707 process that we implemented in R in a prior study.[30, 32] Using these documents to guide us, we  
708 generated a wealth index for Manhiça households by identifying a list of household assets (see Figure  
709 A1). Assets were recoded into dichotomous variables representing whether or not a household owned  
710 a given asset; dwelling materials were recoded into improved vs. non-improved. The WFP  
711 recommends that a given variable should be included in subsequent calculations of the index only if  
712 the percent of ownership ranged between 5 and 95 percent. We employed principal components  
713 analysis with varimax rotation to calculate component scores for households, which explained 45%  
714 of the variation; extracted the PCA scores of the first component; and finally organized the scores  
715 into wealth quintiles to generate an asset index. The distribution of assets owned by households as  
716 well as the materials used for constructing a household's residence are presented as percentages in  
717 Figure (A1).

718


719

720

721



722




723

724 **Figure A1.** Household Asset Ownership and Dwelling Construction Materials. A Mitad is a portable,  
 725 electric hotplate used for cooking.

726


727 **Appendix B. Hardship Specific Analyses**



728  
729  
730  
731

**Figure B.1. Adjusted Associations with Food Price Increases among Households Living in Manhiça (n=27,404).** Presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios with 95% confidence intervals. Missing values for age, sex, religion, ethnicity, education, and occupation were less than 5 percent of the total observations.


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



732  
733  
734  
735

**Figure B.2. Adjusted Associations with Agricultural or Business Inputs Inflation among Households Living in Manhiça (n=27,404).** Presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios with 95% confidence intervals. Missing values for age, sex, religion, ethnicity, education, and occupation were less than 5 percent of the total observations.


736



737  
738  
739  
740

**Figure B.1. Adjusted Associations with having a Household Member Detained among Households Living in Manhiça (n=27,404).** Presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios with 95% confidence intervals. Missing values for age, sex, religion, ethnicity, education, and occupation were less than 5 percent of the total observations.

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



741


742

743

744

**Figure B.4. Adjusted Associations with Job Loss among Households Living in Manhica (n=27,404).** Presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios with 95% confidence intervals. Missing values for age, sex, religion, ethnicity, education, and occupation were less than 5 percent of the total observations.

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



745  
746  
747  
748

**Figure B.5. Adjusted Associations with Business Closures among Households Living in Manhica (n=27,404).** Presented as Adjusted Odds Ratios with 95% confidence intervals. Missing values for age, sex, religion, ethnicity, education, and occupation were less than 5 percent of the total observations.