

# Assessing the impact of Covid-19 on Nurturing Care in Nairobi Slums: Findings from 5 rounds of cross-sectional telephone surveys

Robert C Hughes<sup>1\*</sup>, Silas Onyango<sup>2</sup>, Nelson Langat<sup>2</sup>, Ruth Muendo<sup>2</sup>, Rachel Juel<sup>1</sup>, Elizabeth Kimani-Murage<sup>2</sup>, Zelee Hill<sup>3</sup>, Betty Kirkwood<sup>1†</sup>, Sunil S Bhopal<sup>1,4†</sup>, Patricia Kitsao-Wekulo<sup>2†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Population Health, Faculty of Epidemiology & Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London WC1E 7HT

<sup>2</sup>Maternal and Child Wellbeing Unit, African Population and Health Research Center, Nairobi, Kenya

<sup>3</sup>University College London, Epidemiology and Public Health, Institute of Global Health, London, UK

<sup>4</sup>Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle upon Tyne, Tyne and Wear, UK UCL

† These authors share last authorship

## \* Correspondence:

Corresponding Author

[Robert.Hughes@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:Robert.Hughes@lshtm.ac.uk)

**Keywords:** Early Childhood Development, Urban health, Child health, Childcare, Nurturing Care, Covid-19

**Words:** 5579

22

## 23 **Abstract**

24 **Introduction:** This study investigates the multifaceted impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on early  
25 childhood in three of Nairobi's informal settlements or slums. Focusing on the first five years of life, a  
26 critical period for human capital development, we analyse how Nurturing Care across five domains  
27 (Health, Nutrition, Responsive Caring, Early Learning, Security and Safety) was influenced by the  
28 pandemic and the mitigation measures that were implemented.

29 **Methods:** Using a longitudinal design, we conducted five rounds of cross-sectional surveys (with between  
30 578 and 774 respondents in each) over 13 months, correlating with different phases of the pandemic and  
31 varying levels of Covid-19 restrictions.

32 **Results:** Our findings reveal significant disruptions in healthcare services, particularly pronounced in early  
33 rounds with missed vaccinations (reported by 1 in 5 parents of infants) and therapeutic healthcare  
34 seeking (missed by up to 21% of families). The study also highlights persistent food and nutrition  
35 insecurity, with a large majority of families struggling to feed their children (up to 72% in Round 1) due to  
36 financial constraints. Economic shocks were near-universal, with widespread losses in income and  
37 employment reported; 99.7% of respondents reporting earning less since the start of the pandemic. The  
38 use of paid childcare initially plummeted but showed a resurgence over time (up to 21% usage by Round  
39 5) as the pandemic and control measures evolved. Young children were commonly left alone in all  
40 rounds, but especially earlier in the pandemic; 24% in Round 1, and at least 13% in all rounds,  
41 underscoring the enduring challenges in providing consistent nurturing care in these settings. Very few  
42 (less than 2%) of study participants reported direct experience of Covid-19 in their family in any round.

43 **Conclusion:** Despite adaptations over time and the decrease in reported disruptions, the prolonged  
44 economic shock was associated with multiple adverse effects Nurturing Care. The study's longitudinal  
45 scope provides insights into the dynamic nature of ensuring young children in slums thrive during crises,  
46 highlighting the need for tailored interventions and policies that address the compounded vulnerabilities  
47 of young children in these communities.

48 [342 words]

49

50

## 51 **1. Introduction**

52 Early childhood development (ECD), by which we refer to the first five years of a child's life, is central to  
53 setting a child's developmental trajectory. In recognition that this period is a critical one for accumulation  
54 or loss of human capital the early years have received increasing attention from policy makers (1),  
55 funders (2,3) and academics(4) in recent years. This culminated in the launch of the Nurturing Care  
56 Framework by the WHO/UNICEF and World Bank in 2018(1).

57 However, there is limited published literature on ECD in urban areas, particularly in slums or informal  
58 settlements<sup>1</sup>, despite the rapid growth of these settings. In particular, little is known about either the  
59 provider of care, or what care is provided to young children(5). In addition, the SARS-Cov-2 pandemic  
60 from 2020 led to radical disruption of early childhood in almost every country around the world due to  
61 both the direct and the indirect effects of the virus and efforts to control it(6). While there has been  
62 considerable emphasis and research into the effects of the pandemic on health systems and services (7),  
63 there has been little work on early childhood specifically, especially in low- and middle-income countries  
64 where resilience to shocks may be most limited(8).

65 We therefore aimed to track over time how the care of young children in three slums in Nairobi was  
66 affected by the pandemic and efforts to control it. We aimed to estimate impacts across all five  
67 components of Nurturing Care (Health, Nutrition, Responsive Caring, Early Learning and Security and  
68 Safety) alongside cross-cutting impacts(for example household economic impacts) during a year of the

---

<sup>1</sup> In this paper we have largely adopted the approach and terminology as used in the *Lancet* series on 'The health of people who live in slums', which defines the term 'slums' as distinct from 'informal urban areas' based on neighbourhood effects, many of which seem relevant to the discussion around childcare(4). Nevertheless, our experience is that the terms 'slum' and 'informal urban areas' are often used somewhat interchangeably, and at times we have used both terms.

69 pandemic. This study is nested within the broader Nairobi Early Childhood Care in Slums (NECS) study, a  
70 detailed mixed-methods exploration of the care of children in Nairobi slums(9).

71 Our key pre-study hypotheses were: firstly, that the evolving Covid-19 pandemic would be likely to  
72 impact on Nurturing Care in slums, and that these impacts would be felt across multiple domains.  
73 Secondly, we hypothesised that these impacts may evolve over time, in relation to both Covid-19 case  
74 incidence and the stringency of epidemic control measures in force.

## 75 **2. Methods**

### 76 **2.1. Setting**

77 The setting for the study was three slums in Nairobi, Kenya: Kibera; Mukuru-Viwandani; and  
78 Kawangware. These slums are characterized by high levels of poverty, poor sanitation, inadequate  
79 shelter, poor infrastructure, high levels of insecurity, and low rates of formal employment(10,11). These  
80 slums were selected for several reasons: firstly, these characteristics meant that they represented a  
81 particularly vulnerable group; secondly, because of access to a pre-existing database of residents who  
82 had consented to being contacted for surveys (described further in section 2.6); and thirdly, to overlap  
83 with the wider Nairobi Early Childcare in Slums Study (NECS)(9).

### 84 **2.2 Study design**

85 Five rounds of cross-sectional surveys were undertaken through computer-assisted telephone interviews  
86 (CATI). Participants were parents of children aged under five years selected from a pre-existing database  
87 of around 48,000 low-income household contacts living in three Nairobi slums (Kibera (c. 25,000  
88 contacts), Kawangware (c. 13,000 contacts) and Mukuru-Viwandani (c. 10,000 contacts). These were  
89 people who had previously participated in surveys/field experiments conducted by the non-profit  
90 research firm BUSARA(12) and who had consented to being invited to participate in future studies. These  
91 potential participants were initially recruited door-to-door by field assistants.

92 The first round of data collection was from 10 to 29 November 2020, which corresponded with the peak  
93 of Kenya's second wave of recorded Covid-19 infections. Rounds 2-5 were all in 2021 (Round 2: data 9-29  
94 March; Round 3: 6-25 June; Round 4: 6 September -1 October; Round 5: 29 November-13 December).  
95 Table 1 summarises the prevailing Covid-19 epidemiology and controls in place at the time of each round  
96 of data collection.

97 **Table 1 – The context for each survey round**

Round	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Data collection dates:</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> -29 <sup>th</sup> November 2020	9 <sup>th</sup> -29 <sup>th</sup> March 2021	6 <sup>th</sup> -25 <sup>th</sup> June 2021	6 <sup>th</sup> September-1 <sup>st</sup> October 2021	29 <sup>th</sup> November-13 <sup>th</sup> December 2021
<b>Season</b>	<i>Short rains</i>	<i>Start of long rains</i>	<i>Dry – start of cold season</i>	<i>Start of short rains</i>	<i>End of short rains</i>
<b>Summary of covid epidemiology at the time</b> – narrative; overall trend in epidemiology	<i>This period coincided with the peak of Kenya's second wave of recorded Covid-19 infections, which peaked in mid-November <sup>2</sup>. Towards the end of the data collection period cases had begun to fall.</i>	<i>A period of high growth in recorded Covid-19 case; during this period the Kenya's third wave of infections was emerging. The wave peaked towards the end of this round of data collection.</i>	<i>A period of relatively low Covid-19 cases compared to previous rounds, albeit with some growth in recorded cases after the data collection period.</i>	<i>A period of falling Covid-19 cases, after the peak, in mid-August, of the country's fourth wave.</i>	<i>Very low levels of cases of Covid-19 recorded, the lowest since the start of the pandemic. Towards the end of the data collection period some rise in cases which turned out to be the start of the fifth wave in Kenya.</i>
<b>Mean daily covid cases (across data collection period). <sup>3</sup></b>	1021	1074	518	388	97
<b>Range in daily cases</b>	413-1459	431-2008	161 - 796	54 - 704	28 - 202
<b>Covid control measures in place:</b>					
<b>Curfew</b>	Yes – 10pm-4am	Yes – 8pm-4am	Yes – 8pm-4am	Yes – 10pm-4am	No
<b>Ban on gatherings</b>	Yes – all types	Yes – all types	Yes – all types	Limited – no more than 15, except weddings and funerals (up to 100)	Unrestricted
<b>Public messaging</b>	<i>“No Mask, No service”</i>	<i>“Work from home if you can”</i>	<i>“Work from home if you can”</i>	<i>“Mask mandatory in public places”</i>	<i>“Return to normal”</i>
<b>Closure of hospitality</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	No
<b>Schools</b>	<i>Mostly closed – staggered re-opening for some grades</i>	<i>Partially closed – exam grades in school for delayed exams</i>	<i>Open for all grades</i>	<i>Open for all grades</i>	<i>Open for all grades</i>
<b>Covid vaccination rollout</b>	<i>No vaccine available</i>	<i>Vaccine rollout being planned, but not yet rolling out.</i>	<i>Mass vaccination programme rolled out, around about one million vaccinated.</i>	<i>Mass vaccination campaign ongoing; 3.8 m people have received at least one dose.</i>	<i>5 million people have received at least one dose, 3.3m have received two doses; Proportion of adults fully vaccinated was 12.0%.</i>
<b>Covid stringency Index <sup>4</sup> – mean (range)</b>	51.9 (51.85-51.85)	52.7 (50.93-64.35)	66.2 (65.74-74.07)	56.0 (56.02-56.02)	41.4 (41.33-41.39)

98  
99

<sup>2</sup><https://www.health.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/NERC-MOH-CS-COVID-RELEASE-15.11.2020e-2.pdf>

<sup>3</sup>Data obtained from the Ministry of Health official website <https://www.health.go.ke/press-releases/>

<sup>4</sup> See [COVID-19 Government Response Tracker | Blavatnik School of Government \(ox.ac.uk\)](https://www.bls.gov/charts/2020/04/2020-04-01-covid-19-government-response-tracker)

100        **2.3 Sampling and recruitment**

101        Survey respondents were selected randomly from the BUSARA database. The recruitment procedure was  
102        as follows:

- 103            1. A randomly ordered list of potentially eligible respondents was identified based on their being  
104            resident in the three slum areas (52% of these were from Kibera, 27% Kawangware, and 21%  
105            from Mukuru-Viwandani);
- 106            2. An SMS message was sent briefly introducing the research and informing them that they would  
107            be called.
- 108            3. An eligibility check telephone call was completed, during which, if eligible and interested, the  
109            background and rationale for the study were explained, followed by a clear and explicit consent  
110            process. This was followed by either immediate completion of survey, or a further scheduled  
111            callback at convenient time

112        Up to five call attempts were made to reach each potential participant each round, at a variety of times  
113        during the day. When surveys were interrupted by a dropped call or other interruption, up to five  
114        attempts were made to complete the survey over the following days.

115        Steps 2-3 were repeated in each subsequent round of data collection. If a round was missed, respondents  
116        remained in the study, and the same procedures applied in each subsequent round.

117 **Figure 1: Graph illustrating timing of data collection in relation to 7-day rolling average numbers of**  
118 **confirmed Covid-19 cases in Kenya**

119

## 120 **2.4 Respondent eligibility criteria**

121 Respondents were eligible to participate in the study if they: (i) were 18 years or older; (ii) had a child aged  
122 under 5 years old living in their households (or who lived there at some point in the year 2020; in order to  
123 avoid excluding children who had moved out of the city due to the pandemic); (iii) were resident in the study  
124 setting. In addition, individuals needed to have provided consent to BUSARA within the last 5 years to be  
125 contacted with invitations for future research studies.

126

## 127 **2.5 Data collection**

128 Data were collected by enumerators working for the non-profit research firm BUSARA(12) who had expertise  
129 in public health and epidemiology research. The SurveyCTO(13) platform was used for digital data collection  
130 which was used to guide call-center operators, (who were experienced in survey work), through the survey  
131 questions in Kiswahili. Enumerators had been trained for a total of 12 hours before the start of data  
132 collection. They worked from home (due to Covid-19 control measures) with daily check-in video call  
133 meetings with supervisors. Data quality was managed through enumerator training and pre-testing,  
134 automated range and consistency checks, manual checks on a sample of the data, debriefings, and refresher  
135 training. Survey interviews were digitally audio recorded for quality checks (conducted by supervisors on 10%  
136 of total surveys in each round).

## 137 **2.6 Survey content**



138 The survey consisted of a set of mostly closed questions. The survey questions were derived from a  
139 previously developed conceptual framework and draft household survey tool for the Nairobi Early Childcare  
140 in Slums Study(9), supplemented with additional questions aiming to identify the direct and indirect impacts  
141 of the Covid-19 pandemic on young children and their families.

142 Questions covered the following domains:

- 143     ▪ Respondent characteristics and survey eligibility
- 144     ▪ Child characteristics, including age, and reported sensory or mobility difficulties
- 145     ▪ Who was looking after their youngest child, for even a few minutes and for >1 hour in the previous  
146         three days.
- 147     ▪ Additional questions about the usage frequency and costs of paid childcare amongst those reporting  
148         using it
- 149     ▪ The Family Care Indicators (FCI) questions about daily activities(14)
- 150     ▪ Disruptions to healthcare services or care seeking
- 151     ▪ Food and nutrition security, including impacts on breastfeeding
- 152     ▪ Perceptions of community safety and security and reports of violence against children
- 153     ▪ Levels of concern about the pandemic
- 154     ▪ Economic impacts of the pandemic, including loss of work or income
- 155     ▪ Help received
- 156     ▪ Household assets (only the first time respondents took part)

157 Where there was more than one child in the house, respondents were asked to focus on the youngest child  
158 in the household.

159 **Error! Reference source not found.** includes the full survey instruments for Round 1 and Rounds 2-5, noting  
160 the minor changes that were added following review of Round 1 data quality and free text 'other' answers.

161 **2.7 Sample size:**

162 In Round 1 we planned to recruit an initial 600 participants, allowing for a 20% loss to follow up, with the aim  
163 of achieving 480 participants who were followed throughout the study. This was calculated in order to yield  
164 estimates of the type of childcare used with precisions of at most +/- 5% including a 25% adjustment for  
165 clustering. In practice, we oversampled (by 174, to a total of 774 responses) in Round 1, to allow for higher  
166 levels of loss to follow up. In Rounds 2-5, new respondents were recruited following the same procedures as  
167 in Round 1.

168

169 **2.8 Data Analysis:**

170

171 Data were analysed using STATA 18(15) and Microsoft Excel365(16). Descriptive summary statistics were  
172 calculated to describe the samples for each round and changes between rounds. The frequency of reported  
173 impacts across all domains of Nurturing Care and cross-cutting impacts was reported with some indicators  
174 (breastfeeding problems, the use of childcare, FCI indicators and children left alone) disaggregated by age of  
175 child. Only fully completed surveys were included in the final dataset. A principal component analysis (PCA)  
176 was conducted based on a list of 21 reported household assets to generate socio-economic status (SES)  
177 quintiles for each unique respondent. Only surveys that were completed fully were shared by BUSARA; i.e.  
178 there were no missing data in the dataset we received.

179

180 Additional information on Covid-19 epidemiology (drawn from WHO Data Dashboards(17)) and Covid-19  
181 control measures (taken from both the Kenyan Ministry of Health Website(18) and the Oxford Covid Policy  
182 Tracker(19)) was collated for use in analyses and interpretation of the survey data.

183 **2.9 Public involvement:**

184 During the design and inception phase for the wider NECS Study (in February 2020), public engagement  
185 meetings were held with community-based organisations in Mukuru-Viwandani. These meetings provided an  
186 opportunity to discuss the research methods and questions with the local community, including the planned  
187 household survey that informed these telephone surveys. Pre-study visits to the study site allowed for initial  
188 discussions about the research questions with parents, childcare providers, and other community members.  
189 During preparation of this manuscript emerging draft findings were shared in a community meeting in  
190 Nairobi in March 2022, where these findings were discussed with community members, with a focus on  
191 implications of the research for local planning and policy making.

#### 192 **2.10 Ethics:**

193 Informed verbal consent was obtained from all respondents and was recorded for audit purposes. The  
194 consent process included provision of information about the purpose of the study, confidentiality, how data  
195 would be used and shared, and the right to withdraw consent at any time. Participants who completed a  
196 survey round received KES150 (equivalent to US\$1.5) for each round of survey completed to compensate  
197 them for their costs of participation). The LSHTM Research Ethics Committee (LSHTM Ref: 22692) and Amref  
198 Health Africa’s Ethics and Scientific Review Committees (ESRC) in Kenya (Ref: P777/2020) reviewed and  
199 approved the study protocol. The National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI)  
200 provided research clearance. The consent script and anticipated ‘frequently asked questions’ are included in  
201 **Error! Reference source not found.**

#### 202 **2.11 Role of the funders:**

203 The NECS Study was funded by The British Academy (Grant ECE190134) and Echidna Giving who supported a  
204 linked Clinical Research Fellowship for RCH. Echidna Giving also provided a ‘Covid Response’ grant for  
205 additional costs associated with the Covid-impacts tracker study that is reported on in this manuscript. The  
206 funders had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the

207 paper. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for  
208 the decision to submit for publication.

209

## 210 **3 Results**

### 211 **3.1 Survey and respondent characteristics by round**

212 A total of 1077 participants completed at least one round (774 respondents in R1, 664 in R2, 594 in R3, 528 in  
213 R4 and 642 in R5). The flow between rounds is illustrated in **Error! Reference source not found.**, which  
214 shows that 774 entered the study at R1; 122 at R2, 58 at R3, 62 at R4, 61 at R5, and that most loss to follow  
215 up occurred between R1 and R2. 279 respondents completed all 5 rounds (197 completed 4 rounds; 131  
216 three rounds; 134 two rounds; 336 one round) (Supplementary Table 2).

217 The median duration of interviews in R1 was 27 minutes, which increased to 34 minutes in R2 (when  
218 additional questions were added), and then reduced to 23, 20 and then 17 mins in subsequent rounds (as the  
219 number of new recruits fell and familiarity with the questions increased<sup>5</sup>). Most respondents were  
220 interviewed on the first call attempt (86-95% in R2-5; data on the number of call attempts was not retained  
221 by BUSARA in R1) (Supplementary Table 1).

222 Table 2 summarises the respondent characteristics by round. Respondents were mostly mothers (52%),  
223 fathers (35%) or grandmothers (8%) (see Supplementary Table 3). The mean age of survey respondents was  
224 similar across rounds (Range across rounds: 32.0 to 33.8 years old), as was the percent educated to 18 years  
225 old or more (Range: 28.3% to 33.4%). Similarly, the proportion of respondents in the lowest socio-economic  
226 quintile was consistent across rounds (Range: 20.5% to 17.4%).

---

<sup>5</sup> Questions about household assets were only asked in the first round that a respondent took part in.

227 In each round 8.7 to 10.1% of respondents reported that the youngest child had a problem with at least one  
 228 of seeing, hearing, moving or communicating. Problems seeing were most common, followed by  
 229 communicating and moving (see Supplementary Table 4).

230

231 **Table 2 – Survey Respondent Characteristics by Round**

232 **Table 2 – Survey Respondent Characteristics by Round**

233

Round	1	2	3	4	5
n=	774	664	594	528	642
Of whom newly recruited	774	122	58	62	61
<b>Age of survey respondent (yrs):</b> Mean	32.0	32.9	33.2	33.0	33.8
Median	31	31	32	32	32
Range	19-67	19-67	20-56	19-67	18-88
<b>% educated to age 18yrs+</b>	_* <sup>6</sup>	33.4%	32.9%	32.3%	28.3%
n	*	222	196	171	182
<b>Mean age of participant's youngest child (months):</b>	21.0 <sup>7</sup>				
Inter-quartile range of ages of youngest child: (SD)	30 (18.3)	31.3	28.5	31.3	31.5
<b>SES Status –</b>					
% in lowest quintile	20.5	18.1	18.5	17.4	18.2
<b>Reported disabilities:</b> % parents report their youngest child having a problem with any of: seeing; hearing; moving; communicating	8.9%	9.3%	10.1%	9.6%	8.7%
n	69	62	60	51	56

234

235

236 **3.2 Impacts by Nurturing Care Framework Domain**

---

<sup>6</sup> This question was asked differently after Round 1, as there appeared to be some confusion in how to responded (Participants were asked how many years of schooling they had completed, but frequently reported the age that they left education)

<sup>7</sup> In Round 1, insufficient range checks and age verification questions were in place in the survey instrument; something that was corrected in subsequent rounds. This number is therefore reported, but may need to be interpreted with caution.

237 Table 3A summarises the reported impacts in each round across the domains of Nurturing Care.

### 238 **3.2.1 Health**

239 Significant disruptions were reported to a broad set of health services in early survey rounds, and although  
240 disruptions continued, there was a reduction in the reported incidence over time. In R1, when asked about  
241 disruptions to health services since the start of the pandemic in Kenya, the most frequently reported missed  
242 or delayed services was child growth monitoring (reported to have been missed/delayed by 28.8% of  
243 respondents) followed by missed vaccination appointments (which was reported for 19.7% of children aged  
244 under 12 months old) and seeking care for an unwell child (21.2% reported missing this, across all ages of  
245 child). In R1 8.7% of parents/carers reported a missed or delayed antenatal appointment since the start of  
246 the pandemic in R1.

247 In subsequent rounds, respondents were asked about disruptions in the previous 30 days. Across these  
248 rounds, there is a largely consistent pattern of declining levels of reported disruption round to round. By R5,  
249 7.0% reported having missed/delayed a growth monitoring appointment, 6.1% delaying/avoiding seeking  
250 care for an unwell child, and 5.1% having missed a family planning appointment, and 1.6% an antenatal  
251 appointment. Only 2.3% of respondents with a youngest child aged under 12 months reported having missed  
252 a vaccination appointment in the last 30 days by R5.

### 253 **3.2.2 Nutrition**

254 A high proportion of respondents reported problems feeding their child/children in all rounds (R1: 72.1%, R2-  
255 5 46.1-52.1%). A large majority of these reported that this was because of having insufficient money (68.9%  
256 of respondents reported this in R1), with a much smaller proportion citing being afraid to go out (2.8%) as  
257 the reason for their difficulties. Few if any respondents reported food being unavailable locally in any round  
258 (0%-0.8%). Amongst respondents with children aged under 24 months, breastfeeding problems were cited by  
259 11.3% in R1, and between 1.6% and 9.6% in subsequent rounds, with no clear trend in over time.

260 In R2-5 questions from the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)(20) were included in the survey. In R2,  
261 83% of respondents reported having skipped a meal and 44% reported having not eaten for a whole day due  
262 to a lack of money/resources. Reported indicators of food insecurity remained high but dropped slightly in  
263 subsequent rounds. By R5, 77% reported having skipped a meal and 38% reported having not eaten for a  
264 whole day.

		ROUND	1	2	3	4	5
CATEGORY	Question	n	774	664	595	529	642
<b>A – NURTURING CARE DOMAINS</b>							
<b>HEALTH</b>	<b>Missed/delayed...</b>						
	...vaccination appointment... ...since start of pandemic^.	% parents/carers of <12m	19.7				
	...in past 30 days	% parents/carers of <12m	-	13.3	7.9	6.3	2.2
	...growth monitoring... ...since start of pandemic.	%	28.8	-	-	-	-
	...in past 30 days.	%	-	17.0	13.6	7.6	7.0
	...seeking healthcare for an unwell child... ...since start of pandemic.	%	21.2	-	-	-	-
	...in past 30 days.	%	-	10.7	6.9	7.6	6.1
	...antenatal appointment... ...since start of pandemic.	%	8.7	-	-	-	-
	...in past 30 days.	%	-	2.6	1.2	0.9	1.6
	...family planning appointment... ...in past 30 days.	%	-	5.9	5.4	4.5	5.1
<b>NUTRITION</b>	Are you facing any problems with <b>feeding your child/children at the moment</b> (either having enough to provide, or with physical feeding)?	% Yes	72.1	46.5	52.1	46.7	46.1
	% (of whole round sample) who report that this is because...						
	...we don't have enough money.	%	68.9	38.8	46.4	42.5	43.5
	...I am scared to go out.	%	2.8	1.1	0.7	1.5	0.6
	...I breastfeed, and I am having problems with breastfeeding.	% of those w child <24m	11.3	5.3	1.6	9.6	9.5
	...I am scared to go out.	%	0.3	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.0
	<b>Household food security:</b>						
	Reported skipping a meal because of a lack of money/resources in the last 30 days	% Yes	-	83.4	84.2	77.8	77.1
	Reported not eating for a whole day because of lack of money/resources in the last 30 days	% Yes	-	44.0	38.7	38.3	38.2
<b>RESPONSIVE CAREGIVING</b>							
<b>PROVIDER</b>	Used paid childcare in last 3 days	% Yes	1.6	17.6	19.4	18.2	21.2
	Used grandparent provided care		14.2	23.9	24.0	19.8	24.5
	Used sibling provided care		31.2	20.5	21.8	18.2	19.7
<b>AFFECTION</b>	Have you found it more difficult to be affectionate to [name] over the past 30 days?	% Yes	28.3	15.	13.0%	14.5	12.5
<b>EARLY LEARNING/ EDUCATION: FAMILY CARE INDICATORS</b>							
	In the past 3 days, did you or anyone else age 15 or over engage in any of the following activities with [name]?						
	Read books	% Yes	32.1	43.6	48.7	47.1	52.5
	Tell stories	% Yes	32.0	37.0	40.4	37.8	44.2
	Sing songs	% Yes	72.4	73.3	72.7	70.3	76.4
	Take outside	% Yes	50.6	67.0	68.0	71.3	68.0
	Name, count, draw	% Yes	39.9	54.3	53.0	55.0	60.4
	Play	% Yes	72.1	76.6	74.6	76.6	81.3
	How many children's books or picture books do you have for [name]?	% with zero	54.6	38.9	47.5	44	42.2
		% with 0-5	96.5	94.5	97.8	95.6	96.7
		% with >5	3.5	5.5	2.3	4.4	3.3
<b>SECURITY AND SAFETY</b>							
<b>NEGLECT</b>	left alone for >1hr for on one or more days in last 7	%	23.5	19.3	12.7	14.9	13.7
	0-5m	%	15.8	17.2	2.6	13.6	2.9
	6-11m	%	15.5	15.9	11.5	13.5	15.8
	12-35m	%	25.0	21.4	13.3	13.7	12.4
	36-59m	%	28.7	18.5	12.5	13.0	11.2
	60m+	%	35.0	21.2	15.6	16.0	16.6
<b>COMMUNITY SAFETY</b>	Has there been any change to how safe, in terms of the risk of violence, your neighbourhood feels since [the start of the pandemic? (R1)   in past 30 days? (R2)]						
		WORSENING	29.9	29.5	31.3	31.2	33.3
		NO CHANGE /unsure	24.1	37.0	43.7	44.2	44.2
		IMPROVEMENT	45.9	33.5	25.0	24.6	22.4
	"Do you think there has been any change in the amount of violence within households (domestic violence) in your community in the past month?" (R2+)						
		% Yes – violence increasing	-	25.6	26.4	24.4	22.4
		% No/don't know	-	50.7	55.5	56.5	53.1
		% Yes –violence decreasing	-	23.8	18.2	19.1	24.5
		% Yes - increasing (female respondents)	-	25.8	24.6	22.7	22.2
<b>B - CROSS-CUTTING IMPACTS</b>							
	Has how [name of youngest child] spends their time changed... ...since Covid started to affect Kenya?	% 'Yes'	63.4				
	...in the last 30 days?	% 'Yes'		35.6	20.0	19.0	15.3
<b>ECONOMIC EFFECTS</b>	Has the type of work you do changed since Covid started to affect Kenya?	% reporting loss of job/work	80.3%				
	Have you lost your job, or changed your work in the past YEAR?	% Yes	-	60.6%	58.8%	45.4%	45.2%
	Have you lost your job, or changed your work in the past MONTH?	% Yes	-	24.7	22.0	16.5	16.8
	How has the amount of money you get changed since start of pandemic?	% reporting earning less	99.7	-	-	-	-
		% reporting earning more	0.1	-	-	-	-
	How has the amount of money you get changed in the past 30days?	% reporting earning less	-	85.4	86.3	80.4	83.8
		% reporting earning more	-	3.5	1.4	2.5	1.7
<b>C - MORE DIRECT EFFECTS OF COVID:</b>							
	"In the last 30 days, I or a family member have been unwell with COVID symptoms"		1.3	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.3
	Which of the following best describes how you feel about COVID-19?	% My biggest concern	50.1	36.4	39.7	44.2	38.0
		% Very concerned	36.9	40.3	42.2	32.5	29.9
		% Somewhat concerned	10.7	16.7	15.8	19.3	24.5
		% Not at all concerned	2.3	6.6	2.4	4.0	7.6
<b>D - HELP RECEIVED</b>							
	Proportion of sample reporting having received any help in the month before the survey round:	%	70.1	7.5	4.5	4.5	2.6

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.08.24307078>; this version posted May 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.



267 **3.2.3 Responsive Care**

268 In R1, only 1.6% of respondents reported having used paid childcare in the previous 3 days. In subsequent  
269 rounds the levels of use of paid childcare increased considerably, for example to 17.6% in R2 and to 21.2% in  
270 R5. Box 1 summarizes the frequency of use by age, hours and fees paid for childcare reported. Grandparent  
271 provided care was common across all rounds, but was lowest in R1 (14.2%), and highest in R5 (24.5%). Sibling  
272 provided care was common in R1 (28.3% reported using it) but declined to 12.5% use by R5.

273 When asked “Have you found it more difficult to be affectionate to [name] over the past 30 days?” 28.3%  
274 said yes in R1, 15.6% in R2 and 12.5% by R5.

**Box 1: Use of Paid Childcare**

Figure 2 illustrates the probability of children of different ages using paid childcare in each round. Older children may have more commonly used childcare in early rounds. However, by R4-R5, other than uncommon childcare use amongst children >60m, the probability of children using childcare was similar across all other age groups.

Those who reported using paid childcare were additionally asked about how much it cost, which days it was used, and what hours it was reported to be used for. Most (67-87%) of childcare users in all rounds reported attending for 5 or more days each week (Supplementary table 5). The most common times for using paid childcare were mornings (77-88% of users each round) and afternoons (72-88%), with evening childcare also being frequently used (18-42% of users), but no respondents reporting using paid childcare overnight (Supplementary table 6). The average spend on childcare was similar across rounds, with the median being KES 50-70 (around 0.5 – 0.7 USD) in all rounds (the mean ranged from 67 KES in R4 to 82 KES in R1)(Supplementary table 7).

276 **Figure 2: The probability of using paid childcare for each age group in each round**

277

278

279

280

### 281 **3.2.4 Early learning (and education)**

282 The most commonly reported activities from the Family Care Indicators were playing, singing songs and  
283 (especially in subsequent rounds after R1) taking children outside: 72-81% of children were reported to have  
284 had a parent or someone over 15 years old playing with them in the previous 3 days; 70-76% reported to  
285 have sung songs; and although in R1 only 51% reported having taken their youngest outside in the previous 3  
286 days, in R2-R5 67-71% reported having done so.

287 Figure 3 is a heatmap illustrating the percentages reporting each Family Care Indicator for each age group  
288 for each round. Some activities were reported more frequently with older children (reading,  
289 counting/naming/drawing, and telling stories) and singing was more common with younger children. It also  
290 appears that there was a modest increase over time in several activities that was not obviously age  
291 confounded.

292

293 **Figure 3: Heatmap illustrating % of respondents reporting 'yes' to family care indicators by age**

294

295

296 There were few books reported to be in the home; a high proportion of respondents in all rounds reported  
297 having no children’s books or picture books (38.9%-54.6%); only 2.3-5.5% reported owning more than 5  
298 books.

### 299 **3.2.5 Security and Safety**

300 In R1, 23.5% of respondents reported having left their child alone for more than an hour on at least 1 day in  
301 the past week. This reduced to 19.3% in R2, and 12.7%-14.9% in R3-5. Although the practice of leaving  
302 children alone seemed to be more common with older ages of children, the % of very young children (those  
303 aged under 6 months old) reported to be left alone was still high; up to 17% in R2 (Figure 4).

304

305 **Figure 4: Heatmap of % of children reported to be left alone by age group and round.**

306

307 Being left under the care of children was also common, with 44.9% reporting in R1 having left their youngest  
308 child under the care of someone aged under 15 years old for more than 1 hour in the past week. In R2, 47.1  
309 reported leaving a child with an under 15-year-old, and 33.5% leaving them with an under 10-year-old. The  
310 frequency of being left under the care of a child declined from R1 to R3, and then remained relatively  
311 consistent, with 37.1% and 26.9% being left alone with an under 15-year-old and an under 10-year-old  
312 respectively by R5.

313 When asked about community safety “Has there been any change to how safe, in terms of the risk of  
314 violence, your neighbourhood feels [since the start of the pandemic – R1 / in the past 30 days – R2-5]?” a  
315 mixed picture emerged, and this evolved over time. Across all rounds, up to one third of respondents  
316 reported a worsening of community safety (range: 29.5%[R2] to 33.3%[R5]). However in earlier rounds a

317 large proportion (45.9% in R1, 33.5% in R2) of respondents suggested safety had improved. By R5, the largest  
318 proportion (44.2%) reported that safety had stayed the same or 'Don't know'.

319 Reported violence towards young children was similar across rounds, ranging between 6.3% in R1 to 4.8% in  
320 R4 responding 'Yes' to the question "In the past month, has anyone been angry or violent towards your  
321 youngest child?". Amongst children under 2 years-old, the rate varied between 1.3% (R2) and 5.4% (R3)  
322 across all 5 rounds.

323 In rounds 2-5, an additional question asked about perceptions of any change in household/domestic  
324 violence; in all but R5, a slightly higher proportion of respondents suggested that domestic violence was  
325 increasing (25.6%-24.4% R2-4), than suggested it was falling ((23.8% - 19.1% R2-R4). In all rounds around half  
326 of respondents replied that it was not changing or 'Don't know'. Amongst female respondents (those  
327 reporting their relationship to the child was one of being a mother, grandmother or aunt) the rates of  
328 increased perceptions of domestic violence were similar to those in the whole sample (25.8%[R2] to  
329 22.2%[R5]).

#### 330 **4 Cross-cutting impacts**

331 Table 3B summarises reported cross-cutting impacts, including effects on how young children spent their  
332 time and on household income and work. In R1, nearly two thirds (63.4%) reported that the pandemic had  
333 led to a change in how their young child spent their time, with the top reported reasons for this being: the  
334 closure of childcare; lack of money making childcare unaffordable; the impact of partial reopening of schools;  
335 and reductions in contacts with peers/relatives. Over the course of survey rounds, there was a tendency  
336 towards lower levels of reported disruption, with only 15.3% reporting a change in the past 30 days by R5,  
337 compared to 35.6% reporting this in R2.

338 Economic impacts of the pandemic were reported to be widespread; in R1 80.3% reported a loss of  
339 job/source of income since the start of the pandemic, and 99.7% of respondents reported earning less than

340 in the pre-pandemic period. When asked in subsequent rounds about change in the past 30 days between  
341 80.4% and 86.3% continued to report a reduction in income each round. Very few respondents (0.1-3.5%)  
342 reported an increase in earnings in any round.

### 343 **3.3 Reported incidence and concern about Covid-19**

344

345 When asked about any other impacts of the pandemic, a small proportion of respondents, between 1.3% in  
346 R1 and 0.3% in R3, reported that they or a family member had been unwell with Covid-19 symptoms (Table  
347 3C). Levels of concern about Covid-19 were very high initially (with 87% of respondents saying that Covid-19  
348 was their “biggest concern” (50%) or that they were “very concerned” about it (37%)), and although this  
349 declined over the course of the data collection period, even by R5, 38% were still saying that Covid-19 was  
350 their biggest concern.

351

### 352 **3.4 Help received**

353 The proportion of people reporting having received any help was significantly higher in R1(70.1%) compared  
354 to R2 (7.5%) and later rounds, falling to 2.6% in R5. Most help was reported to have been received in the  
355 earlier time periods surveyed, and was in the form of being given information (reported to as received by  
356 41.5% in R1), being given support for their mental wellbeing (for example someone sitting with you, talking  
357 with you), (28.8% in R1), and donations of masks (28.6% in R1).

358

## 359 **4 Discussion**

360 **Principal findings:** There are several notable features of the reported impacts of the pandemic on Nurturing  
361 Care in slums. Firstly, the impacts were broad in their extent, affecting all components of Nurturing Care. We  
362 show that healthcare was radically disrupted, especially earlier in the pandemic, for example with 1 in 5

363 families with a child aged under 12 months reporting having missed a childhood vaccination appointment in  
364 R1, and a similar proportion (21%) of families of children aged up to five years reporting having missed or  
365 delayed seeking healthcare for an unwell child since the start of the pandemic. We also identified high levels  
366 of reported food and nutrition insecurity, including 4 in 10 respondents having not eaten for a whole day in  
367 all the rounds where this question was asked. High levels of disruption to responsive caregiving were  
368 reported, including the use of paid childcare which was reported by less than 2% of respondents in R1. It was  
369 common for children, including very young children, to be left alone. This was especially the case earlier in  
370 the pandemic (24% of children under 5 years and 16% of those aged under 6 months old were left alone for a  
371 least one hour on at least one day in the past week in R1).

372 Secondly, there was considerable change in reported Nurturing Care over time as the pandemic and control  
373 measures evolved from an initial strict 'lockdown' with closed schools and workplaces to a near-return to  
374 normal by the final round of data collection. The most notable changes over this period were the return to  
375 widespread use of paid childcare (which increased to more than 1 in 5 reporting using it by R5).  
376 Parents/carers of even very young children used paid childcare regularly (usually for five or more days a  
377 week), paying very low fees (commonly around KES50 or 0.5USD/day) to do so. We also found reductions in  
378 the frequency of reported disruptions to healthcare over time (by R5 only 2.3% of parents of infants reported  
379 having missed a vaccination appointment in the last 30 days) and a decline in the incidence of lost  
380 jobs/incomes. However, other impacts were reported to be persistent. For example, even by R5, 14% of  
381 children aged under 5 were still being left alone on at least one of the last seven days, and high levels of  
382 food insecurity continued to be reported.

383 Underlying all of these was an almost universal experience of a significant economic shock, with almost all  
384 respondents reporting a loss of work or income, especially earlier in the pandemic; 99.7% of respondents  
385 reporting having experienced a reduction in work or income in R1. Strikingly, despite high levels of concern

386 about Covid-19, especially in early rounds, very few (less than 2%) of study participants reported direct  
387 experience of Covid-19 in their family in any round.

388 **Strengths** of this study include its longitudinal design; five survey rounds spread over a year provide insights  
389 into temporal changes and trends in the nurturing care of young children in these slums. In addition, the  
390 explicit focus on people living in slums provides valuable insights into an often-underrepresented  
391 demographic in ECD research(21). Finally, the multi-domain approach, encompassing all components of  
392 nurturing care, offers a broad assessment of the impacts of the pandemic and attempts to control it on  
393 young children in these settings.

394 **Limitations** include a reliance on self-reporting, which may introduce biases or inaccuracies in the data,  
395 including both recall bias and the potential for response bias including strategic misrepresentation (if  
396 respondents thought that replying in certain ways might lead to allocation of resources to their  
397 predicament)(22). The reliance on a pre-existing database of potential respondents, all of whom had access  
398 to a mobile phone, may also have introduced selection bias including an over sampling of better off  
399 participants. In addition, the changes in the respondent pool over the study period could affect the  
400 consistency of the findings (although efforts were made to account for the risk of age confounding in the  
401 analysis of results). Finally, the focus on three slums in Nairobi limits the extrapolation of findings to other  
402 settings.

403 **Situating these findings within the broader literature:** These findings are broadly consistent with other  
404 research that has been published on the impacts of the pandemic on the care of young children, albeit with  
405 few comparators from informal settings and studies which have tracked impacts over time. For example,  
406 health service disruption has been documented through time-series analyses in Kenya which showed that  
407 the biggest declines in activity were in outpatient visits and childhood immunisations, with some rebound as  
408 the pandemic evolved(23). Several studies have documented the radical economic shocks precipitated by the  
409 pandemic, including globally/regionally(24) and within Kenyan slums particularly, where the pandemic and

410 resulting government policies were reported to have had devastating consequences on the livelihood of slum  
411 dwellers who were “left to choose between life and livelihood”(25), “violating” their human right to  
412 food(26). Such findings were replicated in Bangladesh, where the impacts on household economics (27,28)  
413 and the mental health of caregivers (27) were stark. In addition, the quantitative findings presented in this  
414 paper are consistent with our qualitative research with parents living in Nairobi slums during the pandemic,  
415 which described socio-economic impacts which were deep, protracted, and widely felt (29,30).

416 One review that looked at the impacts of the pandemic on Nurturing Care found a bias within the published  
417 literature towards quantitative studies in high-income countries and those focused on caregiver mental  
418 health(8) However, a wide range of UNICEF reviews has documented a broad set of global impacts on  
419 children arising from the pandemic, including early learning losses(31), nutrition impacts(32), disruption to  
420 child protection(33) and health services(34,35). Few studies have looked at trends over time as the pandemic  
421 evolved, but some have sought to estimate how disruptions to health(36) and broader early childhood  
422 adversities precipitated by the pandemic may translate into short- and long-term impacts(37).

423 By the final round of our data collection, around 1 in 5 children were attending paid childcare regularly. This  
424 is lower than another estimate in a different Nairobi slum (Korogocho), in which 46% of employed and 23%  
425 of unemployed mothers reported using paid childcare for daytime care for their children aged 1-3 years (38).  
426 This variance could be related to differences in sampling, the ongoing impacts/legacy of the pandemic,  
427 differences between the settings or differences in how the question was framed and asked. The fees charged  
428 that we found are similar to another recent Kenyan study, and highlight the limited resources in the childcare  
429 system(39).

430 **Unanswered questions and future research:** to build on this research it would be valuable to examine how  
431 the disruptions noted in this study translate into impacts on child outcomes. In the short-term, this could  
432 include child health and development outcomes and then school readiness, but longer term it will be  
433 important to understand how the early childhood adversities experienced by this cohort of children, and



434 parents, translates into later life learning, earning and wellbeing. That said, in many ways it is more  
435 important and urgent that further implementation research is conducted to develop and test intervention  
436 strategies, potentially building on the potential of the childcare platform, to mitigate from some of these  
437 disruptions. In addition, these findings underscore the need for better research to characterise the childcare  
438 system, including the economics, policies and perspectives of key stakeholders involved, in and beyond  
439 Kenya(40,41).

440 **Policy implications:** This research suggests a number of ways in which policy and practice can better serve  
441 young children growing up in slums or informal settlements. Firstly, as noted by others(26) people, and  
442 especially children, growing up in slums deserve a much greater consideration in public including pandemic  
443 policy making. The application of blanket policies to very different settings ought to be avoided(25), and in  
444 particular the practicalities and impacts of attempting to ‘lockdown’ a slum – where most residents shop  
445 daily for necessities, and many rely on daily wages – in particular ought to be better recognised(42).  
446 Secondly, the data presented here and in related studies yimplies an urgent need for implementation of  
447 ambitious and well-resourced interventions to address both the underlying vulnerabilities experienced by  
448 young children growing up in slums, and the ways that there were amplified by the pandemic and attempts  
449 to control it. Paid childcare – a platform that seems to be widely used yet significantly under-resourced -  
450 may provide an intervention opportunity to address some of the risks identified in this research(43). Finally,  
451 noting that many of the risks to the wellbeing of children we predicted early in the pandemic with  
452 accompanying calls for mitigation of harms to young children(37), given that these calls seem to have rarely  
453 been heeded, it may be that more research and innovation is needed into the structural changes needed to  
454 better bring the next generation’s voices and rights into decision making(44).

455

## 456 **5 Conclusion**

457 The early years are a period of both opportunity and vulnerability. This study explored how the care of young  
458 children growing up in slums was affected by the Covid-19 pandemic and the control measures brought in to  
459 control it. A deep and broad set of impacts across all domains of Nurturing Care were evident. While some of  
460 the disruptions appeared to resolve over the five rounds of data collection, others – most notably those  
461 related to the economic shocks related to the pandemic – persisted. Provision of paid childcare was  
462 effectively suspended in the early part of the pandemic, but usage recovered over time. Collectively, these  
463 findings imply an urgent need for greater policy attention being paid to the care of young children growing  
464 up in slums, especially at times of crisis.

465

466 **6 Conflict of Interest**

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

469 **7 Author Contributions**

470 RH, SB, BK, PK-W, and ZH were responsible for conceptualizing the study. RH played a key role in planning  
471 the paper, leading the analysis, and writing the first draft of the paper. RM, with PK-W, SO, ZH and SB  
472 supervised and supported the data collection. RH and RJ completed data cleaning and initial quality checks.  
473 RH and SB and then all authors reviewed draft manuscripts. All authors edited the draft and contributed  
474 important intellectual content. The final manuscript was approved by all authors.

475 **8 Funding**

476 The funding for this work was provided by the British Academy (Grant number ECE190134) and Echidna  
477 Giving, which supports RH through a linked Clinical Research Fellowship and which provided a Covid  
478 Response Grant to support of this study.

479 **9 Acknowledgments**

480 We would like to firstly thank the study participants who completed the telephone surveys reported here at  
481 a time of considerable disruption. We would also like to acknowledge and thank the data collection team at  
482 BUSARA, in particular Jennifer Adhiambo, and the critical administration teams at both APHRC and LSHTM  
483 (Antonio Aparicio). We would also like to thank both Echidna Giving and The British Academy for their vital  
484 support for this and wider work on childcare in slums. Finally, we would like to thank Dr APS Munro for  
485 assistance in extracting Oxford covid stringency index data.

486 **3 Data Availability Statement**

487 The datasets analysed for this study can be found in the LSHTM Data Compass site for the NECS Study(45).

488 **10 References**

489

- 490 1. WHO [Internet]. [cited 2019 May 17]. WHO | Nurturing care for early childhood development:  
491 Linking survive and thrive to transform health and human potential. Available from:  
492 [http://www.who.int/maternal\\_child\\_adolescent/child/nurturing-care-framework/en/](http://www.who.int/maternal_child_adolescent/child/nurturing-care-framework/en/)
- 493 2. Arregoces L, Hughes R, Milner KM, Ponce Hardy V, Tann C, Upadhyay A, et al. Accountability for  
494 funds for Nurturing Care: what can we measure? *Arch Dis Child*. 2019 Apr 1;104(Suppl 1):S34.
- 495 3. World Bank [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 12]. Early Years: The Foundation for Human Capital.  
496 Available from: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/earlyyears>
- 497 4. Black MM, Walker SP, Fernald LCH, Andersen CT, DiGirolamo AM, Lu C, et al. Early childhood  
498 development coming of age: science through the life course. *The Lancet*. 2017 Jan  
499 7;389(10064):77–90.
- 500 5. Who actually cares for children in slums? Why we need to think, and do, more about paid  
501 childcare in urbanizing sub-Saharan Africa | *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:  
502 Biological Sciences* [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 12]. Available from:  
503 <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/full/10.1098/rstb.2020.0430>
- 504 6. Clark H, Coll-Seck AM, Banerjee A, Peterson S, Dalglish SL, Ameratunga S, et al. After COVID-19,  
505 a future for the world’s children? *The Lancet*. 2020 Aug 1;396(10247):298–300.
- 506 7. Arsenault C, Gage A, Kim MK, Kapoor NR, Akweongo P, Amponsah F, et al. COVID-19 and  
507 resilience of healthcare systems in ten countries. *Nat Med*. 2022 Jun;28(6):1314–24.
- 508 8. Proulx K, Lenzi-Weisbecker R, Hatch R, Hackett K, Omoeva C, Cavallera V, et al. Nurturing care  
509 during COVID-19: a rapid review of early evidence. *BMJ Open*. 2022 Jun 1;12(6):e050417.
- 510 9. Hughes RC, Kitsao-Wekulo P, Bhopal S, Kimani-Murage EW, Hill Z, Kirkwood BR. Nairobi Early  
511 Childcare in Slums (NECS) Study Protocol: a mixed-methods exploration of paid early childcare  
512 in Mukuru slum, Nairobi. *BMJ Paediatr Open*. 2020 Dec 1;4(1):e000822.
- 513 10. Chesire EJ, Orago AS, Oteba LP, Echoka E. Determinants Of Under Nutrition Among School Age  
514 Children In A Nairobi Peri-Urban Slum. *East Afr Med J*. 2008;85(10):471–9.
- 515 11. Kibera. In: Wikipedia [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 14]. Available from:  
516 <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Kibera&oldid=976073134>
- 517 12. The Busara Center for Behavioral Economics [Internet]. [cited 2020 Sep 6]. The Busara Center  
518 for Behavioral Economics. Available from: <https://www.busaracenter.org>

- 519 13. Product | SurveyCTO [Internet]. [cited 2019 Nov 27]. Available from:  
520 <https://www.surveycto.com/product/>
- 521 14. Kariger P, Frongillo EA, Engle P, Britto PMR, Sywulka SM, Menon P. Indicators of Family Care for  
522 Development for Use in Multicountry Surveys. *J Health Popul Nutr.* 2012 Dec;30(4):472–86.
- 523 15. Stata | Explore our products [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 24]. Available from:  
524 <https://www.stata.com/products/>
- 525 16. Excel | Microsoft 365 [Internet]. [cited 2023 Mar 26]. Available from:  
526 <https://www.office.com/launch/excel?auth=2>
- 527 17. datadot [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 24]. COVID-19 cases | WHO COVID-19 dashboard. Available  
528 from: <https://data.who.int/dashboards/covid19/cases>
- 529 18. <https://www.health.go.ke/covid-19> [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 24]. Available from:  
530 <https://www.health.go.ke/covid-19>
- 531 19. Coronavirus Government Response Tracker [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jul 10]. Available from:  
532 [https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-response-](https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-response-tracker)  
533 [tracker](https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/coronavirus-government-response-tracker)
- 534 20. Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) | Policy Support and Governance | Food and Agriculture  
535 Organization of the United Nations [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 24]. Available from:  
536 <https://www.fao.org/policy-support/tools-and-publications/resources-details/en/c/1236494/>
- 537 21. Ezeh A, Oyebode O, Satterthwaite D, Chen YF, Ndugwa R, Sartori J, et al. The history, geography,  
538 and sociology of slums and the health problems of people who live in slums. *The Lancet.* 2017  
539 Feb 4;389(10068):547–58.
- 540 22. Santesso N, Barbara AM, Kamran R, Akkinapally S, Cairney J, Akl EA, et al. Conclusions from  
541 surveys may not consider important biases: a systematic survey of surveys. *J Clin Epidemiol.*  
542 2020 Jun 1;122:108–14.
- 543 23. Kiarie H, Temmerman M, Nyamai M, Liku N, Thuo W, Oramisi V, et al. The COVID-19 pandemic  
544 and disruptions to essential health services in Kenya: a retrospective time-series analysis. *Lancet*  
545 *Glob Health.* 2022 Sep;10(9):e1257–67.
- 546 24. Laborde D, Martin W, Swinnen J, Vos R. COVID-19 risks to global food security. *Science.* 2020 Jul  
547 31;369(6503):500–2.
- 548 25. Nyadera IN, Onditi F. COVID-19 experience among slum dwellers in Nairobi: A double tragedy or  
549 useful lesson for public health reforms? *Int Soc Work.* 2020 Nov 1;63(6):838–41.

- 550 26. Kimani-Murage EW, Osogo D, Nyamasege CK, Igonya EK, Ngira DO, Harrington J. COVID- 19 and  
551 human right to food: lived experiences of the urban poor in Kenya with the impacts of  
552 government’s response measures, a participatory qualitative study. BMC Public Health. 2022 Jul  
553 21;22(1):1399.
- 554 27. Pitchik HO, Tofail F, Akter F, Sultana J, Shoab A, Huda TMN, et al. Effects of the COVID-19  
555 pandemic on caregiver mental health and the child caregiving environment in a low-resource,  
556 rural context. Child Dev. 2021;92(5):e764–80.
- 557 28. Hamadani JD, Hasan MI, Baldi AJ, Hossain SJ, Shiraji S, Bhuiyan MSA, et al. Immediate impact of  
558 stay-at-home orders to control COVID-19 transmission on socioeconomic conditions, food  
559 insecurity, mental health, and intimate partner violence in Bangladeshi women and their  
560 families: an interrupted time series. Lancet Glob Health. 2020 Nov 1;8(11):e1380–9.
- 561 29. Hughes RC, Muendo R, Bhopal SS, Onyango S, Kimani-Murage E, Kirkwood BR, et al. Parental  
562 experiences of the impacts of COVID-19 on the care of young children; qualitative interview  
563 findings from the Nairobi Early Childcare in Slums (NECS) Project [Internet]. medRxiv; 2022  
564 [cited 2022 Sep 27]. p. 2022.09.09.22279760. Available from:  
565 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.09.09.22279760v1>
- 566 30. Hughes RC, Muendo R, Bhopal SS, Onyango S, Kimani-Murage EW, Kirkwood BR, et al. Parental  
567 experiences of childcare in an informal urban settlement: qualitative interview findings from the  
568 Nairobi Early Childcare in Slums (NECS) project. BMJ Open. 2023 Apr 27;13(4):e071627.
- 569 31. Innocenti UO of R. UNICEF-IRC. [cited 2024 Mar 26]. It’s Not Too Late to Act on Early Learning:  
570 Understanding and recovering from the impact of pre-primary education closures during  
571 COVID-19. Available from: [https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1213-its-not-too-late-to-act-](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1213-its-not-too-late-to-act-on-early-learning.html)  
572 [on-early-learning.html](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1213-its-not-too-late-to-act-on-early-learning.html)
- 573 32. Innocenti UO of R. UNICEF-IRC. [cited 2024 Mar 26]. COVID-19: Missing More Than a Classroom.  
574 The impact of school closures on children’s nutrition. Available from: [https://www.unicef-](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1176-covid-19-missing-more-than-a-classroom-the-impact-of-school-closures-on-childrens-nutrition.html)  
575 [irc.org/publications/1176-covid-19-missing-more-than-a-classroom-the-impact-of-school-](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1176-covid-19-missing-more-than-a-classroom-the-impact-of-school-closures-on-childrens-nutrition.html)  
576 [closures-on-childrens-nutrition.html](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1176-covid-19-missing-more-than-a-classroom-the-impact-of-school-closures-on-childrens-nutrition.html)
- 577 33. Innocenti UO of R. UNICEF-IRC. [cited 2024 Mar 26]. Impacts of Pandemics and Epidemics on  
578 Child Protection: Lessons learned from a rapid review in the context of COVID-19. Available  
579 from: [https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1104-working-paper-impacts-of-pandemics-and-](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1104-working-paper-impacts-of-pandemics-and-epidemics-on-child-protection-lessons-learned.html)  
580 [epidemics-on-child-protection-lessons-learned.html](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1104-working-paper-impacts-of-pandemics-and-epidemics-on-child-protection-lessons-learned.html)
- 581 34. Innocenti UO of R. UNICEF-IRC. [cited 2022 Mar 14]. What were the immediate effects of life in  
582 lockdown on children? Available from: [https://www.unicef-irc.org/article/2163-what-were-the-](https://www.unicef-irc.org/article/2163-what-were-the-immediate-effects-of-life-in-lockdown-on-children.html)  
583 [immediate-effects-of-life-in-lockdown-on-children.html](https://www.unicef-irc.org/article/2163-what-were-the-immediate-effects-of-life-in-lockdown-on-children.html)


- 584 35. COVID-19 & Children : Rapid Research Response [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 26]. Available from:  
585 <https://www.unicef-irc.org/covid19>
- 586 36. Robertson T, Carter ED, Chou VB, Stegmuller AR, Jackson BD, Tam Y, et al. Early estimates of the  
587 indirect effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on maternal and child mortality in low-income and  
588 middle-income countries: a modelling study. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2020 Jul 1;8(7):e901–8.
- 589 37. Yoshikawa H, Wuermli AJ, Britto PR, Dreyer B, Leckman JF, Lye SJ, et al. Effects of the Global  
590 Coronavirus Disease-2019 Pandemic on Early Childhood Development: Short- and Long-Term  
591 Risks and Mitigating Program and Policy Actions. *J Pediatr*. 2020 Aug 1;223:188–93.
- 592 38. Clark S, De Almada M, Kabiru CW, Muthuri S, Wanjohi M. Balancing paid work and child care in  
593 a slum of Nairobi, Kenya: the case for centre-based child care. *J Fam Stud*. 2018 Aug 23;1–19.
- 594 39. Nampijja M, Langat N, Oloo L, Amboka P, Okelo K, Muendo R, et al. The feasibility, acceptability,  
595 cost and benefits of a “communities of practice” model for improving the quality of childcare  
596 centres: a mixed-methods study in the informal settlements in Nairobi. *Front Public Health*  
597 [Internet]. 2023 Aug 1 [cited 2024 Mar 26];11. Available from:  
598 <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1194978/full>
- 599 40. Abboah-Offei M, Amboka P, Nampijja M, Owino GE, Okelo K, Kitsao-Wekulo P, et al. Improving  
600 early childhood development in the context of the nurturing care framework in Kenya: A policy  
601 review and qualitative exploration of emerging issues with policy makers. *Front Public Health*.  
602 2022;10:1016156.
- 603 41. Better Jobs and Brighter Futures : Investing in Childcare to Build Human Capital [Internet]. [cited  
604 2022 Mar 12]. Available from: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/35062>
- 605 42. Broadbent A, Streicher P. Can you lock down in a slum? And who would benefit if you tried?  
606 Difficult questions about epidemiology’s commitment to global health inequalities during Covid-  
607 19. *Glob Epidemiol*. 2022 Dec 1;4:100074.
- 608 43. Nampijja M, Kitsao-Wekulo P, Hughes RC, Griffiths P, Elsey H. Editorial: Day-care for healthy  
609 child development and wider social and economic gain in urban areas in low- and middle  
610 income countries. *Front Public Health* [Internet]. 2024 Mar 25 [cited 2024 Mar 26];12. Available  
611 from: [https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-](https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1386958/full)  
612 [health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1386958/full](https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1386958/full)
- 613 44. Hughes RC, Hunt X, Tomlinson M. Building minds for an uncertain future? Nurturing care in  
614 early childhood is more important than ever. *Arch Dis Child* [Internet]. 2023 Sep 27 [cited 2024  
615 Mar 26]; Available from: [https://adc.bmj.com/content/early/2023/09/27/archdischild-2023-](https://adc.bmj.com/content/early/2023/09/27/archdischild-2023-325606)  
616 [325606](https://adc.bmj.com/content/early/2023/09/27/archdischild-2023-325606)

617 45. Hughes R, Kitsao-Wekulo P, Bhopal S, Kimani-Murage E, Hill Z, Kirkwood B. The Nairobi Early  
618 Childcare in Slums (NECS) Study [Internet]. London, United Kingdom: London School of Hygiene  
619 & Tropical Medicine; 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 30]. Available from:  
620 <https://datacompass.lshtm.ac.uk/1780/>

621



**Figure 1: Graph illustrating timing of data collection in relation to 7-day rolling average numbers of confirmed Covid-19 cases in Kenya**



Notes: Data source: WHO Covid-19 Dashboard (<https://covid19.who.int/>), graphic adapted with permission CC-BY (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) from OurWorldInData (<https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus/country/kenya>). Red bars illustrate approximate data collection periods for Rounds 1 (R1) to 5 (R5) of data collection.

Figure 1

Figure 2:  
The probability of using childcare for each age group in each round




Figure 2

*"In the past 3 days, did you, or anyone else age 15 or over, engage in any of the following activities with [name]?"*




Figure 3

**% LEFT ALONE for >1hr one or more days in the last seven**



Figure 4