

Title: Prevalence and determinants of food insecurity among households headed by mothers who are female sex workers in three African Countries: Validation and application of food insecurity experience scale

Short title: Food insecurity among households headed by mothers who are female sex workers

Swarna D.S. Weerasinghe^{1,5*}, Jennifer A. Jackson², Diane D. Stadler³, Wendy L. Macias-Konstantopoulos^{4,5}, Brian Wills⁵

¹ Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada

² School of Nutrition and Public Health, College of Health, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, United States

³ Graduate Programs in Human Nutrition, School of Medicine, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States

⁴ Center for Social Justice and Health Equity, Department of Emergency Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, United States

⁵Global Health Promise, Portland, Oregon, United States

*Corresponding author

Email: swarna.weerasinghe@dal.ca

1 **Abstract**

2 Reduction in prevalence of food insecurity, a key factor in reaching the United Nations
3 Sustainable Development Goal 2.2, was challenged by COVID-19 lockdowns in low- and
4 middle-income countries, which impacted the affordability and accessibility of food. Prevalence
5 and determinants of food insecurity among female sex workers who are mothers (FSWM) and
6 heads of households (FSWM-HH) in the African region have not been previously assessed. This
7 study validated the food insecurity experience scale (FIES) using data collected from 852
8 FSWM-HH living in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Kenya, or Nigeria. Results
9 were calibrated on the global metric to compare with the country-level prevalence of household
10 severe food insecurity (HSFI). Associated individual and household determinants and their
11 intersections were examined to identify vulnerable sub-groups. The FIES reliably assessed (fit
12 index=0.75) household food insecurity among FSWM-HH using a 7-item scale, omitting the
13 item of being worried about not having enough food to eat. The prevalence of HSFI was 59.6%
14 in the DRC, 77.8% in Kenya, and 89.0% in Nigeria and compared to FAO 2016-2018 country
15 levels, 1.5, 3.0, and 4.5 times higher, respectively, than previous estimates. Determinants of
16 HSFI among FSWM-HH were similar to the African region, except FSWM-HH composition of
17 children, but the magnitudes of odds were higher. Multiple logistic regression revealed important
18 ecological relationships. FSWM-HH with 0-3 children living with them (AOR=1.63,95%
19 CI:1.13-2.37, reference ≥ 4 children) and mothers having no schooling or primary education
20 (AOR=1.92,95% CI:1.33-2.78, reference with higher education) significantly determined HSFI.
21 Prevalence of HSFI was highest among two subgroups of FSWM-HH: those ≥ 30 years of age,
22 without partners (93.7%, $p=0.002$) and those with low levels of education with 0-3 children

23 living with them (85%, $p=0.03$). Food programs and welfare policies may be effective strategies
24 to reduce HSFI among this high-risk group of mothers with children.

25

26 **Introduction**

27 Food insecurity, a global crisis, was exacerbated by pandemic-related lockdowns and disruption
28 to human economic activities, which disproportionately affected vulnerable groups of individuals
29 and households in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) [1]. Escalating rates of
30 undernourishment in all regions of Africa rose to 22.7% in 2016, an increase of 2.7% from 2015,
31 leaving more than 200 million people severely food insecure, even before the pandemic [2].
32 Over one-fifth of the global population in the African region experienced hunger in 2020,
33 leaving 346.4 million suffering from severe food insecurity and an additional 452 million
34 suffering from moderate food insecurity, further widening the gap to achieving the Sustainable
35 Development Goal (SDG) 2.2 targets of ending malnutrition and hunger by 2030 [3]. National
36 and international collaboration is identified as a key strategy to identify and address challenges to
37 achieving food security [3]. To meet the SDG 2.2 goal and make concerted efforts toward
38 combating this public health crisis, countries must focus attention on their most vulnerable
39 populations. Research-based evidence is needed to identify the impact, understand the
40 determinants, and estimate the prevalence and severity of food insecurity in these populations.
41 Between 2018 and 2020, the three countries in Africa with the highest level of moderate to
42 severe food insecurity were Kenya (68%), Nigeria (58%), and the Democratic Republic of the
43 Congo (DRC) (70%) [3]. Within each country, female sex workers who are mothers and who are
44 heads of households (FSWM-HH) and members living in the same household, including
45 children, are among those at the highest risk of experiencing severe food insecurity. Our study

46 explored household food insecurity experiences, using data collected from FSWM-HH in these
47 three Sub-Saharan African countries, and examined the validity of the Food and Agriculture
48 Organization (FAO) Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) measurement tool application to
49 this data, to uncover determinants of household severe food insecurity (HSFI) and to identify the
50 demographically determined subgroups of FSWM-HH. This study's goal was to identify
51 demographically characterized subgroups critical to meeting SDG 2.2 specific to the African
52 region [2, 3] to ensure access to food to all by 2030, specifically the extremely vulnerable
53 populations of FSWM-HH living in three African countries with the highest rates of malnutrition
54 and food insecurity.

55
56 The sub-Saharan region of Africa is entangled with poverty, food insecurity, and HIV/AIDS [2,
57 5]. Research carried out in this region has shown that hunger and malnutrition push women to
58 engage in the sex industry [5]. In Nigeria, 35% of a study sample indicated their reason for
59 becoming a sex worker was poverty and lack of money to purchase food [6]. The same
60 researchers observed a significant relationship between poverty, food insecurity, HIV/AIDS, and
61 unwanted pregnancies in this population, a relationship mediated by low rates of pregnancy
62 prevention measures (75.6%) [6]. The researchers also identified the reduction of poverty and
63 food insecurity as a means to control HIV/AIDS [6]. A systematic review of 10 peer-reviewed
64 articles on female sex workers (FSW) and HIV treatment and care in sub-Saharan Africa
65 revealed that sub-optimal treatment outcomes are partly due to poor nutrition and food insecurity
66 [7]. Women-led households are known to have higher rates of severe food insecurity than men-
67 led households due to the poor economic status of these women [8]. Thus, exploring household
68 food insecurity among FSWM-HH in the three Sub-Saharan countries of Kenya, Nigeria, and the

69 DRC provides noteworthy insight into ways to alleviate hunger, malnutrition, and other related
70 public health concerns.

71
72 One in 20 women in Sub-Saharan Africa have reportedly engaged in sex for money, and Kenya
73 and Nigeria were noted to have the highest percentages of adult women engaging in sex work for
74 money [9]. Literature suggests special consideration be given to vulnerable women since food
75 insecurity can drive them to engage in high-risk sexual behaviors,[8] which in turn can
76 exacerbate their vulnerability to food insecurity. Despite government efforts to provide anti-
77 retroviral treatment (ART) to FSW, food insecurity has been linked to sub-optimal outcomes in
78 engaging in HIV treatment and care [7].

79
80 There is ample evidence linking the COVID-19 pandemic to food insecurity in the Sub-Saharan
81 region and the augmented effect on vulnerable women and FSW [10]. A study conducted among
82 poor urban residents in Malawi, including sex workers, indicated they had little or no money to
83 buy healthy food due to their loss of income resulting from the lockdown [11]. A cross-sectional
84 survey conducted in Nigeria in September 2021 revealed 2.47 higher odds of food insecurity
85 among FSW compared to those women who identified as transgender or living with a disability
86 [10]. The estimated prevalence of food insecurity among the study sample was 76.1% [10].

87
88 Our theoretical underpinning of FSWM household severe food insecurity (HSFI) exploration is
89 governed by the United Nations conceptual framework of social determinants of health (SDH)
90 that was later adapted to understand the adverse health outcomes such as food insecurity [12]
91 resulting from economic volatility induced by the pandemic among TB patients in South Africa

92 [12]. Some disadvantaged groups, such as FSWM and their families, living in the same region
93 are equally or more vulnerable to food insecurity. The study sample of FSWM-HH referenced in
94 this article is at an added disadvantage due to multiple social vulnerabilities, [13] including
95 living in an LMIC, headed by a woman, a mother, and a sex worker. Within the SDH framework,
96 we used an intersectionality lens to examine the impact of the individual FSWM and household
97 intersecting demographic characteristics to identify the most vulnerable subgroups for severe
98 food insecurity.

99

100 We used the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) tool developed by the Voices of the
101 Hungry project, launched by the FAO of the United Nations in 2012. The FIES was piloted in
102 four sub-Saharan African countries, Angola, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Nigeria. Linguistic
103 adaptations were made before release in 2014, and the revised tool was later validated in 151
104 countries [14, 15], including the three study countries. Although the FIES was not validated for
105 use among FSWM-HH, it was applied to collect data from a nationally representative sample of
106 individuals living in the three countries represented in this study. Though the psychometric
107 properties of the FIES have been extensively validated among 151 country sample gathered from
108 global study populations, the applicability of this standard metric to the FSWM-HH sample
109 needs to be assessed.

110

111 The population of interest in this study of FSWM-HH is hidden and rarely included in global
112 studies that estimate food insecurity. This study's findings fill a significant gap in the global food
113 security literature and will assist in developing programs to meet and sustain the United Nation's
114 Sustainable Development Goal 2.2 to diminish hunger among all.

115 **Methods**

116 **Study design and sample selection**

117 This study data came from a larger mixed-method, population-based, cross-sectional study of the
118 maternal, mental, and nutritional health of FSW who are mothers. Participants were recruited
119 using a purposive sample from urban areas by local sex workers organizations in Kenya and
120 Nigeria and by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that provide HIV services to FSWs in
121 the DRC. The selection of cities in each country was guided by a study conducted in 2019 by the
122 same research team that established trust among local partners providing services to FSW.

123 Translation of previous study findings into actions implemented by NGOs was the key to gaining
124 trust among FSW. Approximately 100-150 FSWM were recruited in each city. Due to a lack of
125 preliminary data on the main outcome, food insecurity among FSWM-HH, the determination of
126 the sample size was not based on statistical power analysis. Cities included were Nairobi
127 (n=103), Mombasa (n=99), and Kisumu (n=100) in Kenya; Lagos (n=100), Calabar (n=100), and
128 Abuja (n=100) in Nigeria, and Bukavu (n=100) and Kinshasa (n=150) in the DRC. The local
129 NGO partners contacted FSWM in their catchment area and screened those interested in
130 participating for eligibility using the inclusion criteria described below. Case analyses were
131 conducted for those cases deemed incomplete and therefore not included in the analysis.

132 The study data were collected in January and April 2022. The third wave of COVID-19 ended
133 in 2022 in the region. All lockdown and public health infection control measures were lifted by
134 the time data collection began. Although new COVID variants emerged during the time of data
135 collection, the lockdown measures were not reinstated. The food insecurity measures used
136 collected experiences within the last 12 months starting in January 2022. The COVID-related
137 FIES measurement scale was not used for this data collection.

138

139 A representative sample of FSWM-HH was recruited in each city via collaboration with
140 community partners and local sex worker service-providing organizations. A previous study
141 among FSWM by our research team in 2019, used the same framework of study participant
142 recruitment through the same organizations, in the same cities and the sample size we achieved
143 in this study exceeded or was similar (with 72% more recruited in Kenya, 96% in Nigeria and
144 93% in DRC than in the 2019 study; unpublished data) to the sample size in the previous study.
145 The goal of recruitment was also to have a similar sample size for each city to that of the FAO
146 Gallup World Poll, which identified 100-135 households per cluster [16].

147

148 The FSWM participants in the present study met the following inclusion criteria: engaged in full-
149 time sex work for the past three years; age 18 years or older; had at least one biological child age
150 5 years or younger; and know other FSW. The local partners reviewed the data collection
151 instrument and provided translations during the interviews when necessary. Interviewers were
152 trained and supervised by the lead researcher (BW).

153

154 **Ethics approval and informed consent process**

155 The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Oregon Health &
156 Sciences University (IRB ID: STUDY0002296) and the Ethics Review Committees in each of
157 the three countries, Kenyatta University Centre for Research Ethics and Safety in Kenya, Ecole
158 De Sante Public, University de Keshasha, DRC and Nigerian Institute of Medical Research,
159 Institutional Review Board, Nigeria. The layperson report summaries were submitted to the
160 local partners before submission to the journal. All eligible participants were informed about the

161 study protocol and their participation was deemed voluntary and they were able to refuse to
162 answer any questions or withdraw at any time during their interview. Interested participants were
163 verbally consented for study participation and indicated consent with an “x” or check mark on
164 the consent form to include FSW who did not read or who could not sign their names. No
165 personal identifiers were collected.

166

167 **Data collection and management**

168 Data were collected through individual participant interviews, conducted in Kenya during
169 January and February 2022, in Nigeria during March and April 2022, and in the DRC during
170 February and March 2022. Data were entered into an Excel database and cleaned by one of the
171 data analysts. Further data entry errors such as non numerical entries were corrected by the first
172 author.

173

174 **Survey tools**

175 Items from the World Health Organization (WHO) Demographic Health Survey were used to
176 collect participant demographic information, [19] including age, marital status, and education
177 level. As many FSW live together and often care for children of deceased FSW, information
178 about the total number of adults and children in each household was collected.

179

180 The UN Food and Agriculture Organization’s food insecurity experience scale (FIES) was used
181 to collect information about household-level food insecurity experience (Table 1). [14,[16]]. The
182 eight-item FIES measures food insecurity indirectly through a series of latent trait questions,
183 rather than directly through a specific question about food insecurity. Three of the eight items are

184 considered subjective measures that ask about being worried about getting enough food to eat,
185 being unable to eat healthy food, and eating less than they thought they should. The other five
186 items are considered objective measures and ask if someone in the household ate fewer foods,
187 skipped meals, ran out of food, suppressed hunger, or did not eat for a full day. The response
188 options to each item are binary (yes/no) with a score of 1 representing an affirmative response
189 and a summative score ranging from 0 to 8. The Rasch analytical model [16] was then used to
190 synthesize individual household-level food insecurity experiences into community or population-
191 level food insecurity experiences along a continuum anchored by mild (starting point) to severe
192 (ending point) food insecurity. The first item of the FIES, “Worried about running out of food
193 because of lack of money,” anchors the household-level continuum at mild food insecurity at the
194 global reference minimum level. The last item of the FIES, “Went without eating one whole day
195 because of lack of money” anchors the household-level continuum at severe food insecurity
196 global reference maximum level. Responses to the other six items, which assess the quality and
197 quantity of food availability, are used to further characterize household-level food insecurity
198 experiences of the community or population between mild and severe at the global reference
199 level [18].

Table 1: United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization Eight-Item Food Insecurity Experience Scale		
Thematic Item	Question	Description[19, 20]
WORRIED	During the last 12 MONTHS, was there a time when you were worried about you and others in your household would not have enough food to eat because of a lack of money or other resources?	Subjective: Uncertainty and worry
HEALTHY	Still thinking about the last 12 MONTHS, was there a time when you and others in your household were unable to eat healthy and nutritious food because of a lack of money or other resources?	Subjective: Inadequate food quality
FEWFOOD	Was there a time when you or others in your household ate only a few kinds of foods because of a lack of money or other resources?	Objective: Inadequate food quality
SKIPPED	Was there a time when you or others in your household had to skip a meal because there was not enough money or other resources to get food?	Objective: Insufficient food quantity
ATELESS	Still thinking about the last 12 MONTHS, was there a time when you or others in your household ate less than you thought you should because of a lack of money or other resources?	Subjective: Insufficient food quantity
RANOUT	Was there a time when your household ran out of food because of a lack of money or other resources?	Objective: Insufficient food quantity
HUNGRY	Was there a time when you or others in your household were hungry but did not eat because there was not enough money or other resources for food?	Objective: Insufficient food quantity
WHOLEDAY	During the last 12 MONTHS, was there a time when you or others in your household went without eating for a whole day because of a lack of money or other resources?	Objective: Insufficient food quantity

200

201

202 **Statistical analysis**

203 The Rasch model was applied to the food insecurity data analysis [20, 21] such that the latent
204 traits of an individual household, i , item j ($j=1$ for WORRIED,... $j=8$ for WHOLEDAY as
205 described in Table 1) is represented as:

$$\text{logit}(P_{ij}) = (\theta_i - \beta_j)x_{ij},$$

206
207 wherein $X_{ij}=1$ if individual i responded “yes” to item j listed in Table 1, and $X_{ij} = 0$, if the
208 response was “no”. The latent trait θ_i estimates individual household food insecurity related to
209 the i^{th} person where as β_j measures the latent trait corresponding to j^{th} item of the scale.

210
211 Data analysis was carried out in two parts. Firstly, given that the FIES has never been applied to
212 the FSWM-HH context, the tool was validated using data gathered from all three countries as a
213 composite. Secondly, detailed analyses of country-level food insecurity experiences were
214 performed across key participant demographic characteristics including, age, marital status,
215 education level, household size (adults), household size (children), HIV status, and pregnancy
216 status. Demographic characteristics evaluated were chosen based on previous research. [6, 22,
217 23]. The Rasch model R package RM.W was used for FIES analysis and Fisher's exact test
218 (when counts were less than 5) and chi-square test were used to determine statistically significant
219 within-country demographic differences [20].

220
221 FSWM-HH three-country study sample scores were then compared to the FAO global scale. As
222 part of this analysis, the RM.W package skips responses with non-zero values, e.g., a value of 1
223 representing a response of “yes” to a question by all participants. Therefore, because all

224 participants responded “yes” and received a “1” for their response to FIES Item 1 about being
225 worried they or their household would not have enough food to eat, the scale for WORRIED was
226 obtained through the extended ERM package in the R software,[24] using a randomly assigned
227 negligible amount of zeros approach. This latent trait estimate was only used for visual
228 presentation purposes (Figure 1). As a result, the remaining analyses were carried out using an
229 FAO-certified RM.W package in R software using a seven-item scale excluding Item 1,
230 WORRIED. These item responses are displayed in Figure 1.

231
232 Validation of the FIES for use within the FSWM-HH sample was carried out using 1) reliability
233 estimates of fitting the Rasch model, 2) infit and outfit statistics, and 3) further compared with
234 the global scale by computing comparable estimates after adjusting the three country standards to
235 the global standards, a method described by FAO as calibration. The Rasch model assumption of
236 equal discrimination by each item was tested using infit and outfit statistics to examine outlying
237 values related to each item. Defining a scale of 0.7-1.3 as acceptable for infit statistics, high
238 outfits generally greater than 2 were considered to be unreliable with highly improbable
239 values.[14, 19, 25, 26] The food insecurity measurement fit index measures the Rasch model
240 reliability score and this estimate was used to measure the goodness of fit of the model to the
241 FSWM sample. A fit index Rasch reliability score of 0.7 or above is considered to be a good
242 model fit for the sample of data [15].

243
244 To compare country-specific food insecurity scores among FSWM-HH with FAO country-
245 specific estimates, the equating process discussed by the FAO Voices of Hungry project was

246 applied. [4] Specifically, the linear equation below was used to determine the global standard of
247 the three-country metric of item scales (y);

$$248 \quad y = a + bx, \quad \text{where } b = \frac{SD(\text{country})}{SD(\text{global})}, \quad a = \text{country mean} - (\text{global mean} \times b),$$

249 and x is the scaled parameter, item response, for each FIES item. [18]

250
251 After rank ordering the severity measure, non-overlapping 95% confidence intervals (CI) were
252 used to decide points of demarcation to classify food insecurity experiences among FSWM-HH
253 as mild, moderate, or severe. Following the direction of the FAO classification, setting the
254 threshold for the classification ranking of mild, moderate, and severe food insecurity was
255 selected as follows. It should be noted that the definition of the latent trait threshold is stated as
256 somewhat arbitrary in their publication [18]. Therefore, we used a statistically determined
257 threshold. The lowest items cluster, designated as “mild”, was selected with the lowest
258 overlapping CI item cluster and there were very few (less than 1%) belonging to this category.
259 The second highest items cluster, designated as “moderate”, was selected with no overlapping
260 confidence intervals to the first cluster but with overlapping confidence intervals with each other.
261 The highest items cluster, designated as “severe”, was selected with the highest-ranking items
262 with overlapping CIs and separated from the other items classified as mild to moderate. Using
263 the Rasch model assigned predictive probabilities and associated CIs, households with the
264 highest probability of severe food insecurity were assigned as experiencing severe food
265 insecurity (HSFI=yes) and the rest was assigned as experiencing mild to moderate food
266 insecurity (HSFI=no). Determinants of HSFI were obtained by fitting a multiple logistic
267 regression model to the dichotomous variable of HSFI. Intersectionality analysis was carried out
268 by fitting logistic regression models, to subgroups identified by the intersections of significant

269 demographic characteristics, in the logistic regression model fit. Our intent was to identify the
 270 most vulnerable subgroup for HSFI so that food programs can target them first.

271

272 **Results**

273 **Demographic characteristics of FSWM-HH across three study**

274 **countries**

275 Demographic characteristics of the FSWM-HH sample are shown in Table 2. The majority of
 276 participants were in their 20s and were without a partner. The largest percentage of participants
 277 in each country had a secondary or higher level of education. The number of adults and number
 278 of children in each household varied by country, and the majority of households had one to three
 279 children per adult. Noteworthy to mention is that the FSWM participants who indicated having
 280 zero children in the household (8.0 % in the DRC, 0.3% in Kenya and 18% in Nigeria) have
 281 children living elsewhere and therefore met our inclusion criteria to include only FSW who were
 282 mothers.

Table 2. Participant Demographic Characteristics				
Characteristic	Democratic Republic of the Congo (n=250) %	Kenya (n=302) %	Nigeria (n=300) %	All three countries (n=852) %
<u>Age group (years)**</u>				
18-20	20.4	2.0	7.7	9.4
21-30	75.6	54.0	62.7	63.4
31-40	4.0	39.4	27.0	24.6
41-52	0.0	4.6	2.7	2.6
<u>Marital status**</u>				
Single/never married.	98.0	71.9	73.3	80.1
Separated/divorced/widowed.	2.0	25.8	26.0	18.9
Married	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.2

Not reported	0.0	1.7	0.7	0.8
<u>Education**</u>				
No schooling	20.8	0.7	5.7	8.3
Primary	32.0	41.7	32.0	35.5
Secondary and above	47.2	57.3	60.6	55.5
Other/Not reported.	0.0	0.3	1.7	0.7
<u>Household size (adults)**</u>				
1-3	41.6	90.1	69.7	68.7
4-6	37.6	8.9	23.7	22.5
7 or more	20.8	1.0	6.6	8.8
<u>Number of children**</u>				
0	8.0	0.3	18.0	8.8
1-3	44.4	79.5	59.0	62.0
4-6	36.8	19.5	21.3	25.2
7 or more	10.8	0.7	1.7	4.0
** p-value for the chi-square test for the difference between country percentage across demographic characteristics < 0.0001				

283

284 The demographic profiles of FSWM-HH across the three study countries were different (Table
 285 2) and the participants living in the DRC were demographically different from those living in
 286 Nigeria and Kenya. FSWM-HH in the DRC were statistically significantly younger, were single
 287 or never married, had achieved a lower education level, had larger sized households, and had a
 288 higher percentage of households with more than 3 children compared to FSWM-HH in Kenya or
 289 Nigeria ($p < 0.0001$).

290 Participants' clinical and health behavior characteristics frequency distribution differed by
 291 country (Table 3). The majority of participants did not have or had not tested for HIV, and the
 292 majority were not pregnant at the time of survey administration. Across all three countries, 96%
 293 of participants who reported being HIV-positive were on ART. Participants living in Nigeria had
 294 the highest rate of HIV, followed by those living in the DRC and Kenya. Participants living in
 295 Kenya had the lowest percentage of FSWM who were currently pregnant. The majority of
 296 participants reported consuming alcohol during a pregnancy with a large percentage reporting

297 substance use during a pregnancy. Differences in clinical characteristics of participants across
 298 countries were statistically significant ($p < 0.0001$).
 299

Table 3: Participant Clinical and Health Behaviour Characteristics				
Characteristic	DRC (n=250) %	Kenya (n=302) %	Nigeria (n=300) %	All three countries (n=852) %
<u>HIV status**</u>				
Negative	48.0	75.8	79.0	68.7
Positive	5.6	16.9	8.3	10.6
Not reported/not tested	46.4	7.3	12.7	1.5
<u>Pregnant **</u>				
Yes	17.6	3.0	16.3	12.0
No	82.4	95.7	82.7	87.2
Not reported	0.0	1.3	1.0	0.8
<u>Alcohol use during any pregnancy**</u>				
Yes	77.2	52.3	72.0	66.5
No	19.6	44.7	26.6	31.0
Not reported	3.2	3.0	1.4	2.5
<u>Substance use during any pregnancy**</u>				
Yes	62.0	29.1	18.3	35.0
No	34.0	67.5	79.0	61.7
Not reported	4.0	3.4	2.7	3.3
** statistically significant for the chi-square test for the difference between country percentages with p -value < 0.0001				

300
 301 **Validity of the FIES tool for use among samples of FSWM in the**
 302 **three study countries**
 303 Results of the responses to the FSWM-HH FIES analysis in the DRC, Kenya and Nigeria are
 304 shown in Figure 1, in the composite food insecurity reference continuum. All study participants
 305 were worried about not having enough food to eat which was the anchoring measurement for the
 306 “mild” food insecurity side of the continuum with a score of 0.05 (95% CI:0.01-0.4), which was

307 obtained from ERM package in R software [24]. Due to the lack of inter-individual variability,
308 this item was excluded from the item severity and individual severity estimations using the FAO-
309 recommended RM.W package. “WHOLEDAY” (not eating for the whole day) had the highest
310 score of 7.8 (95% CI: (5.9-10.4) and was defined as the anchoring measurement for the “severe”
311 side of the food insecurity continuum for both groups in the comparison. Participants who were
312 referenced as skipping meals with a score of 6.1 (95% CI: 4.5-8.2) (“SKIPPED” in Figure 1)
313 were grouped into the severe food insecurity group, due to overlapping 95% CI with
314 “WHOLEDAY”, as opposed to classification in the global reference scale as moderate food
315 insecurity [17]. The negative small sample correlation ($r=-0.03$, $p=0.36$) between the responses
316 to these two items, “SKIPPED” and “WHOLEDAY”, were statistically independent and
317 indicates that most FSWM-HH in the severe food insecurity group use either skipping a meal or
318 not to eating for the whole day to address food insecurity. Similar to the global scale, our
319 moderate food insecurity categorization was determined by the two items of hungry and running
320 out of food (“HUNGRY”, “RANOUT” in Figure 1). However, the FSWM-HH scale
321 classification of inability to eat healthy foods (“HEALTHY” in Figure 1) also fell into the
322 moderate food insecurity classification compared to being in the mild classification on the global
323 scale. Overall, FIES item classification of FSWM-HH was similar to the global scale with
324 similar item classification of all three categories (mild, moderate, and severe) for 5 of the 8
325 survey items.

326

327 **Figure 1: Composite Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) Scores of participants living**
328 **in the three study countries**

329

330 The fit of the Rasch model was assessed by using the fit index score, infit and outfit statistics. All
 331 infit statistics were within the range of 0.82 (for “RANOUT”) to 1.1 (“HEALTHY”). In the
 332 literature, infit values within the range of 0.7 to 1.3 are considered to justify the Rasch model
 333 assumption of equal discrimination [27]. In addition, the model fit index reliability score of 0.75
 334 was deemed a good model fit given this value exceeded 0.7, the lower bound of the acceptable
 335 range suggesting the estimated item responses are reliable estimates of food insecurity for the
 336 sample of FSWM-HH.

337

338 **Calibration of FSWM-HH Scale using Global Reference Standards**

339 To compare prevalence across subgroups, it is recommended that FIES item severity scores be
 340 calibrated using Global 147 Country Item Scales as the reference [18, 20]. The results of
 341 calibration against the global metric are shown in Table 4. Based on FAO instructions on FIES
 342 tool use, when calibrating and equating, outliers should be excluded.[28] Therefore, the two
 343 items “WHOLEDAY” and “SKIPPED”, the two major outliers of the item score distribution,
 344 were omitted in the calibration equating linear interpolation parameters (intercept and slope)
 345 calculation [28]. Nevertheless, the adjusted scores shown in Table 4, show the linear
 346 interpolation for these two items after calculating the intercept and the slope based on the
 347 included items.

Table 4: Three Country Female Sex Worker-Mother Head of Household and Global 147 Country Thematic Item Severity Scale Values			
Thematic Item	Three-Country 7-Item Severity Score ^{a,b}	Global 147 country reference scale-7-Item Severity-Score ^{**}	Global Standard calibrated on Three-Country Metric

HEALTHY	0.93 (0.53,1.62)	-0.85	1.35
FEWFOOD	0.65 (0.34,1.25)	-1.11	1.21
SKIPPED	6.05 (4.50,8.15)	0.35	4.0 (adjusted threshold) ^c
ATELESS	0.34 (0.14,0.79)	-0.31	1.0
RANOUT	1.14 (0.68,1.91)	0.51	1.5
HUNGRY	1.74 (1.12,2.69)	0.75*	1.8
WHOLEDAY	7.83 (5.89,10.42)	1.88	4.9 (adjusted threshold) ^c
Mean	2.67	0.1740643*	2.247913
SD	2.99	1.023484	1.548293

^a 7-Item Severity Score was calculated after excluding responses for “WORRIED”

^b Mean (95% Confidence Interval)

^c values were calculated using the mean and SD (standard deviation) calculated without the items (extreme values, see below).

*Source:

(https://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/voices_of_the_hungry/docs/Cafiero_Nord_Viviani_IMEKO_2016_rev_2.pdf)

**FAO statistics downloaded from <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/FS>

348

349 When reference scales are made on a common scale, the two objective measures of skipping

350 meals (“SKIPPED”) and not eating for a whole day (“WHOLEDAY”) due to lack of money and

351 resources for the FSWM-HH sample were discriminant and exceeded the Global Reference Scale

352 metric (Figure 2). The other objective measure of “HUNGRY”, interpreted as “did not eat when

353 hungry” was similar to the Global Reference Scale. The subjective measure of “ATELESS”,

354 “eating less and thinking not enough” item received the lowest severity score on the scale. Very

355 few FSWM-HH participants (n=8, 0.9%) were classified as mildly food insecure, 22.1% were

356 classified as moderately food insecure and 77% were classified as severely food insecure.

357 Further analysis was carried out using two classifications of mild to moderate combined (noted
358 as moderate onwards) and severe.

359

360 **Figure 2: Relationship between 3-country FSWM-HH and Global 147-country Food**
361 **Insecurity Severity Scales, after calibration into the same scale.**

362

363 **Comparison of FSWM-MHH food insecurity prevalence with country-level**
364 **estimates**

365 Country-level food insecurity prevalence among FSWM-HH was calculated by the level of
366 household food insecurity severity, classified as moderate and severe, using individual parameter
367 estimates. The percentage was calculated using the total country FSWM-HH sample size as the
368 denominator (Table 5). The FAO country-level estimates (Table 5) came from the FAO statistics
369 estimates derived from a “*nationally representative samples of the adult population (aged 15 and*
370 *older) in each country*”[18]. The demographic characteristics of the FAO sample in the Sub-
371 Saharan African region differ from that of the study sample of this paper [26]. In the DRC,
372 Kenya, and Nigeria, the prevalence of severe food insecurity is significantly higher among
373 FSWM-HH compared to FAO country-level estimates for the same country. Conversely, the
374 prevalence of moderate food insecurity is significantly lower among FSWM-HH compared to
375 country-level estimates for the same. If the country-level FAO food insecurity survey sample did
376 not include FSWM-HH, then we can assume that the prevalence of severe food insecurity among
377 FSWM-HH is 1.5 times higher in DRC, nearly 3 times higher in Kenya, and 4.5 times higher in
378 Nigeria as the prevalence of severe food insecurity within the rest of the country population.

379 These within and cross-country differences in the prevalence of severe food insecurity among
 380 FSWM-HH are statistically significant ($p < 0.0001$).

Table 5: Prevalence of Moderate and Severe Food Insecurity among the Three-country Female Sex Worker Sample and the FAO 147-Country Estimates				
Country	Prevalence of Food Insecurity by Severity among the Three Country FSWM-HH Sample (95% CI)**		Prevalence of Food Insecurity by Severity among the FAO Country Specific Community Sample*	
	Moderate	Severe	Moderate	Severe
DRC	40.4 (34.3-46.8)	59.6 (53.2-65.7)	69.2 (66.9-71.5)	38.5 (36.1-40.9)
Kenya	22.2 (17.6-27.3)	77.8 (72.7-82.4)	69.5 (67.9-71.1)	26.1 (25.0-27.1)
Nigeria	11.0 (7.70-15.1)	89.0 (84.9-92.3)	62.9 (60.1-65.8)	19.8 (17.6-21.9)
All three countries	23.6 (20.7-26.6)	76.4 (73.4-79.2)	--	--
** Exact (95% Confidence Interval)				
*Source: Three-year average 2018-2020 estimates from FAO stat data https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/FS				

381

382

383 **Household severe food insecurity (HSFI) prevalence across individual and**
 384 **household demographic characteristics**

385 The prevalence of severe food insecurity across the head of the household demographic
 386 characteristics, related to a single determinant impacting HSFI when unadjusted for other
 387 determinants, are listed in Table 6. Of the demographic characteristics of the head of the FSWM-
 388 HH considered, older age, living without a partner (unmarried, widowed, or separated), having
 389 no schooling or only primary schooling, and having 1-3 children living in the household
 390 significantly determined having higher HSFI in the three-country FSWM-HH sample.

391

392

Table 6: Single determinant of severe food insecurity in the three study countries				
Characteristic	DRC Severe FI %	Kenya Severe FI %	Nigeria Severe FI %	All three countries Severe FI %
Age group (years)				
18-20	66.7	83.3	95.7	76.3
21-30	56.6	75.5	87.8	73.2
31-40	80.0	79.8	88.9	83.3
41-52	NA	85.7	100.0	90.9
p-value*	0.20	0.80	0.79	0.01
Marital status				
Single/never married.	60.4	76.0	88.0	74.2
Separated/divorced/widowed.	20.0	83.3	92.3	85.7
Married	NA	50.0	NA	50.0
Not reported	NA	80.0	100	85.7
p-value*	0.16	0.30	0.4	0.005
Education				
No schooling	69.2	50.0	100.0	76.1
Primary	62.5	84.1	96.9	82.5
Secondary and above	53.4	73.4	83.5	72.3
Other/Not reported	NA	100.0	100.0	100.0
p-value*	0.12	0.05	0.002	0.006
Household size (adults)				
1-3	51.0	78.3	91.4	78.1
4-6	61.7	74.1	83.1	71.4
7 or more	73.1	66.7	85.0	76.0
p-value*	0.02	0.60	0.10	0.16
Number of children				
0	70.0	0.0	88.9	82.7
1-3	70.3	76.3	88.1	79.0
4-6	46.7	84.7	90.6	70.2
7 or more	51.8	100.0	100.0	61.8
p-value*	0.004	0.13	0.91	0.006
HIV status				
Not Tested	73.0	82.4	80.6	75.5
Negative	50.0	75.1	91.1	76.5
Positive	28.6	86.3	80.0	75.6
Not reported	100.0	100.0	85.7	92.3
p-value*	0.0001	0.25	0.08	0.86
Pregnant				
Yes	52.3	88.9	89.8	73.5
No	61.2	77.8	88.7	76.9
Not reported/Did not know	0.0	50.0	100.0	71.4
p-value*	0.36	0.32	1.0	0.63

Alcohol use**				
Yes	58.6	81.6	86.1	75.4
No	69.4	72.6	96.3	79.2
Not reported	25.0	88.9	100.0	66.7
p-value	0.05	0.13	0.02	0.29
Substance use**				
Yes	62.0	80.7	85.5	71.8
No	58.8	76.5	89.5	79.5
Not reported	30.0	80.0	100.0	67.9
p-value	0.15	0.81	0.53	0.02
*p-value reflects statistically significant differences across age groups for the Fishers exact test to account for small cell size, otherwise, the two-sample proportion test p-values are reported.				
** during pregnancy.				

393

394 There was a significant trend with older FSWM-headed households showing a higher prevalence

395 of HSFI although this socio-ecological relationship did not reach statistical significance when

396 stratified by country (Table 6). In the DRC ($p=0.12$) and Nigeria ($p=0.002$), the heads of

397 households with no schooling and in Kenya those with a primary education level ($p=0.05$) had a

398 higher prevalence of HSFI, than those with secondary or above levels of education. Household

399 size showed a significant difference to food insecurity only in the DRC where households with

400 seven or more members had the highest prevalence of HSFI. In the DRC, having no or 1-3

401 children in a household significantly determined a higher prevalence of HSFI, and those

402 FSWM-HH with heads who had never tested for HIV had the highest prevalence of HSFI.

403 Country-level HSFI prevalence did not change when classified by FSWM-HH heads' pregnancy

404 status, or substance and alcohol use during pregnancy except in Nigeria. In Nigeria, those heads

405 who stated they did not use alcohol during pregnancy had a significantly higher prevalence of

406 HSFI than those households whose head did use alcohol during pregnancy ($p=0.02$). When all

407 three country responses related to substance use were combined those heads who stated they did

408 not use substances during pregnancy had a higher prevalence of HSFI ($p=0.02$).

409 **Determinants of severe food insecurity: Multivariable analysis results**

410 Multiple logistic regression results revealed the adjusted odds ratio (AOR) of household severe
411 food insecurity when multiple factors simultaneously existed in households. In the three-country
412 combined sample, those FSWM-HH having no children living with them (adjusted odds
413 ratio=AOR=2.3, 95% CI: 1.14-4.45) or 1-3 children living with them (AOR=1.63, 95% CI: 1.13-
414 2.37), compared to those having 4 or more children living with them, were more likely to
415 experience HSFI although this trend was only statistically significant for FSWM-HH in the
416 DRC. In the three-country combined sample, those FSWM-HH with heads having a lower
417 education level (primary education) were twice as likely to be severely food insecure compared
418 to those households with heads having a secondary education level (AOR=1.92, 95% CI:1.33-
419 2.78). This trend was statistically significant in Nigeria where FSWM-HH with primary
420 education levels were more likely to be categorized as having HSFI (AOR=6.4, 95% CI: 1.90-
421 21.8). Overall, those households with FSWM heads who did not use substances during
422 pregnancy were more likely to be classified as having HSFI (AOR=1.45, 95% CI: 1.03-2.04)
423 compared to households with substance-using FSWM heads. This trend was marginally
424 significant.

425

426 **The HSFI at the Intersection of Socio-demographic Vulnerability Indicators**

427 In this section, we present the prevalence of severe food insecurity at the intersection of
428 demographic factors that were significant in the single-factor analysis shown in Table 6. This
429 analysis is limited to the combined sample, in most cases, since there were not enough data to
430 carry out individual country-level analyses in some countries. Four intersections, with salient
431 demographic characteristics informed by the aforementioned analysis results, were determined to

432 include the number of children in the household, living with or without a partner, and the level of
433 education of the FSWM-HH.

434

435 Firstly, we examined the impact of age of the FSW head of the household with no partner, since
436 the majority had no partner. Among the no-partner-headed households, younger FSWM (≤ 30
437 years of age) prevalence of HSFI was 83.2% (10.4% lower with 95% CI: 4.2% to 16.7%)
438 compared to households headed by older FSWM (above 30 years of age) with no partners
439 ($p=0.002$). Secondly, we compared the socio-ecological differences of having four or more
440 versus fewer than four children in a household within the group of households with the lowest
441 level of education, identified as no schooling or primary education. In this group of households
442 headed by FSWM with primary or no schooling, those with 0-3 children in the household had a
443 prevalence of HSFI of 85.0% ($p=0.03$), which was 10% higher than (95% CI: 0.3% to 19%) the
444 households headed by FSWM with four or more children. Thirdly, we compared the impact of
445 having fewer or more children in the household (0-3 children compared to 4 or more children)
446 among FSWM heads group with secondary or higher education. In this group of households,
447 those with 0-3 children had an HSFI prevalence of 76.0%, which was 13% higher (95% CI: 3%
448 to 23%, $p=0.008$) than those with four or more children. Fourthly, we compared the prevalence
449 of HSFI between two of the most vulnerable groups of households with two combined
450 demographic identities of FSWM heads, having 0-3 children in the household and with primary
451 or no schooling to households headed by FSWM and compared with the FSWM-HH having four
452 or more children in the household and secondary or higher education. This intersectionality
453 analysis revealed the most vulnerable group for severe food insecurity was FSWM-HH with 0-3
454 children in the household with no schooling or primary education which had a prevalence of a

455 HSF1 of 85%. The prevalence of HSF1 in this subgroup was 22% higher (95% CI: 12%-32%,
456 $p=0.00001$) than the prevalence of HSF1 in the comparison subgroup of FSWM-HH with four or
457 more 4 children in the household and a head with secondary or higher education level.

458

459 **Discussion**

460 Rasch modeling was used to estimate the prevalence of severe food insecurity among FSWM-
461 HH in three LMIC in Sub-Saharan Africa. The FIES tool has not been specifically or exclusively
462 applied to the FSWM-HH population before and the analyses presented here validate the tool for
463 the use in this vulnerable population, through the exclusion of one item related to being worried
464 about not having food and also calibrated against the global scale. Moreover, the model
465 reliability was at the accepted level for a good fit and all assumptions for the model fit were met.
466 Some caveats noted were the degree to which responses were homogeneous reducing the inter-
467 subject variation. For example, the majority of FSWM, 649 out of 852, answered yes to all items
468 in the FIES indicating severe insecurity, and all 852 answered yes to being worried about food.
469 Given that every FSWM was worried about not having enough food to eat, we omitted this item
470 from the model and used a seven-item scale to measure food insecurity among FSWM-HH.
471 Nevertheless, our Rasch model fit reached the required level of model fit statistic overall (Fit
472 Index=0.75), and item infit, which detected outliers, extreme values, and outfit statistics which
473 detected item response discrimination were all within the required limits. The infit statistics
474 (assessment of model fit) were below the values noted in the literature for Nigeria except for
475 “SKIPPED” in which our infit value was 1.1 and the Nigeria community value noted from the
476 WHO assessment was 1.0 [26]. Similarly, our outfit statistics for all items were below the WHO

477 assessment for Nigeria noted as 0.1[26]. This comparison further validates our Rasch model fit
478 to the FSWM-headed household food insecurity assessment.

479

480 The FSWM-HH sample estimated household food insecurity item scores were calibrated using
481 the global scale and then compared with the FAO country-level estimates. The anchoring points
482 of severe food insecurity in the study sample were marked by the two items skipping meals
483 (SKIPPED) and not eating for the whole day (WHOLEDAY). The prevalence of severe food
484 insecurity among FSWM-HH as estimated in the DRC, Kenya, and Nigeria is 1.5, 3, and 4.5
485 times as high, respectively, as the country-level FAO estimates for the general population. In
486 particular, FSWM-HH in Nigeria and Kenya were skipping meals, not eating for the whole day,
487 and suppressing hunger, because they did not have enough money to buy food or lacked
488 resources. Although the situation for FSWM-HH in the DRC was less severe, HSFI prevalence
489 was nonetheless 1.5 times the FAO estimated country-level prevalence. The country-level
490 prevalence was estimated using a lower cut-off of having answered yes to 7 or more items [26]
491 and we used a higher cut-off of 8. The severe food insecurity situation among FSWM-HH would
492 be even worse if the same cut-off of 7 affirmative responses had been used.

493

494 Determinants of HSFI among FSWM-HH were the same as in the literature with one exception
495 of the composition of children. Previous research findings suggest food insecurity is positively
496 associated with sexual risk behavior and poor pregnancy outcomes in women, [8] in addition to
497 living in low-income households [29]. A study conducted in Nigeria with a sample of 91.2%
498 female households indicated a 66% prevalence of food insecurity [30]. Even further, a study
499 conducted in Sub-Saharan Africa confirmed a higher prevalence of food insecurity among

500 female-headed households [31]. All of these common country and gender-level associated risks
501 may contribute to the high prevalence of severe food insecurity estimated in our FSWM-HH
502 study sample.

503
504 Our sample's HSFI experiences differ in magnitude by household characteristics noted in the
505 literature for the general population in LMICs. The estimated HSFI prevalence in our study
506 sample was higher among headed by older FSWM (aged between 31-52 years) than younger
507 FSWM headed (30 years or less) households. This trend is similar in the general population
508 global statistics among developing countries [29]. However, age is noted as an insignificant
509 predictor of food insecurity in developed nations [32]. Consistently across all three study
510 countries, our sample estimated prevalence of FSWM-HH HSFI was higher for those heads
511 living without a partner which is consistent with global research studies among developing
512 countries [32]. The direction of HSFI trend across FSWM-HH heads' level of education was also
513 similar to that reported in South Africa and East Africa, but the magnitude of severity in
514 prevalence among our sample in Nigeria was three times higher odds of household severe food
515 insecurity compared to the odds reported for East Africa [33], though similar to the odds reported
516 for South Africa [31]. This evidence from studies in the same region affirms our findings that
517 those households with lower education level heads, experience higher odds of HSFI.

518 Concerningly, we also found that households with fewer children living in the household, 0-3
519 children, as having higher odds of HSFI than households having four or more children. This
520 trend is counterintuitive and different than reported in other Sub-Saharan countries, in which
521 households with four or more children found to have higher odds of HSFI [26]. Our data suggest
522 that the age range of households with four or more children varies between 18 months to 16

523 years. These older children may be contributing to securing food or getting food elsewhere and
524 also help to take care of younger siblings, allowing adult members to engage in income
525 generating activities.

526
527 Our findings suggest FSWM-HH share some of the structural-demographic determinants of
528 severe household food insecurity as the general population within the country or region, but the
529 magnitude of the prevalence is much higher among our study population. Moreover, our
530 intersectionality analysis identified the highest severe food insecurity group was headed by
531 FSWM-HH with 0-3 children in the household, and those who had no schooling or primary
532 education, a finding which is consistent across all three study country subgroups of FSWM-HH.

533

534 **Limitations and future directions**

535 Many studies have found income as the strongest determinant of severe household food
536 insecurity [8, 26, 29, 34, 35]. However, we did not collect data on household income, which
537 may be highly variant within and between FSWM-HH. Sample characteristics and prevalence of
538 these characteristics were different across study countries and may be attributed to sample
539 recruitment strategies used in the DCR where participants were recruited and data were collected
540 by HIV service-providing NGOs, not local sex workers organizations as in Kenya and Nigeria.
541 Future studies should assess the types of food consumed by these households, which family
542 members skip meals and go without food for an entire day, demographic characteristics of
543 household members, both children and adults, and household income (per diem per adult), and

544 available resources. In addition, future studies of food insecurity among FSWM-HH should
545 recruit and evaluate larger samples to generate greater inter-person/inter-household variability.

546

547 **Conclusion**

548 The FAO FIES scale can be used to measure household food insecurity among the extremely
549 vulnerable population of FSWM-HH living in LMIC in Africa. We found that in each country
550 studied, the prevalence of severe food insecurity among FSWM households was 1.5, 3, and 4.5
551 times higher than the country-level prevalence of severe food insecurity noted by the FAO using
552 the 2018-2021 country average estimates. In the population of FSWM-HH that we studied,
553 skipping meals and not eating for an entire day reflected the level of severe food insecurity
554 experienced. Demographic characteristics of the study sample household heads were different
555 across the three countries evaluated; however collectively, older age, lower level of education,
556 heading a household without a partner, and having fewer (0-3) children living in the household
557 were strong determinants of household severe food insecurity. Our analyses identified the most
558 vulnerable FSWM-HH subgroup of severe food insecurity have 0-3 children living in the
559 household, headed by FSWM without a partner, have no schooling or a primary education, and
560 are older than 30 years. These findings could be immediately used to design food programs and
561 welfare policies that reduce severe food insecurity among these households. Specifically,
562 although FSWM-HH with 0-3 children are at higher risk for severe food insecurity, all children
563 regardless of household size need protection against malnourishment. Sufficient funding is
564 urgently needed to mitigate HFSI among the most vulnerable mothers and children in the world.
565 Global food programs should recognize the unique situation of and needs of FSWM and their

566 children and target food relief to them. Also monitoring food insecurity among this very
567 vulnerable and marginalized population of women and their children should be prioritized.

568

569 **Acknowledgments**

570 We would like to thank all women who participated in this study and our local partners
571 including: Coast Sex Workers Alliance (Mombasa, Kenya); Kisumu Sex Workers
572 Alliance (Kisumu, Kenya); SWOP Ambassadors (Nairobi, Kenya); cPHDP
573 Champions (Nairobi, Kenya); Kiambu Sex Workers Alliance (Thaki, Kenya); Bar
574 Hostess Empowerment and Support Programme (Nairobi, Kenya); Royal Women's
575 Health and Rights Initiative (Lagos, Nigeria); Initiative for Young Women's Health
576 and Development (Calabar, Nigeria); Nigerian Sex Workers Alliance, also known as
577 Precious Diamonds (Abuja, Nigeria); Parlons SIDA aux Communautaires (Kinshasa,
578 DRC); Cadre De Recuperation Et D'encadrement Pour L'epanouissement Integral
579 Des Jeunes (Kinshasa, DRC); Association Pour Le Soutien, L' Education, La
580 Promotion De La Vie Et des Initiatives Communautaire (Kinshasa, DRC) and Action
581 Humanitaire pour la Santé et le Développement Communautaire (Bukavu, DRC).

582 **Author contributions:**

583 Swarna D.S. Weerasinghe contributed to the conceptualization, data management, analysis,
584 interpretation of results and writing the manuscript. Brian Wills, secured funding, designed the
585 study, trained and supervised local staff in the data collection, coordinated data entry and
586 cleaning, and contributed to writing and reviewing the manuscript. Jennifer A. Jackson, Diane

587 D. Stadler and Wendy L. Macias-Konstantopoulos, contributed to reviewing and editing the
588 manuscript.


589 **References:**

- 590 [1] Mueller V, Grépin KA, Rabbani A, et al. Food insecurity and COVID-19 risk in low-and
591 middle-income countries. Epub ahead of print 2021. DOI: 10.1002/aepp.13200.
592
- 593 [2] Food and Agriculture Organization of United States. *REGIONAL OVERVIEW FOOD
594 SECURITY AND NUTRITION REPORT 2017 Africa The food security and nutrition-conflict
595 nexus: building resilience for food security, nutrition and peace*, www.fao.org/Africa (2017,
596 accessed 24 August 2023).
597
- 598 [3] FAO. *REGIONAL OVERVIEW OF FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION AFRICA
599 STATISTICS AND TRENDS*. Epub ahead of print 2021. DOI: 10.4060/cb7496en.
600
- 601 [4] FAO. *2.1 Food security indicators – latest updates and progress towards ending hunger
602 and ensuring food security*, [https://www.fao.org/3/CC3017EN/online/state-food-security-and-
603 nutrition-2023/food-security-nutrition-indicators.html](https://www.fao.org/3/CC3017EN/online/state-food-security-and-nutrition-2023/food-security-nutrition-indicators.html) (2014, accessed 24 August 2023).
604
- 605 [5] Chop E, Duggaraju A, Malley A, et al. Food insecurity, sexual risk behavior, and
606 adherence to antiretroviral therapy among women living with HIV: A systematic review.
607 *Health Care Women Int* 2017; 38: 927–944.
608
- 609 [6] Oyefara JL. Food insecurity, HIV/AIDS pandemic and sexual behaviour of female
610 commercial sex workers in Lagos metropolis, Nigeria. *SAHARA J* 2007; 4: 626–635.
611
- 612 [7] Lancaster KE, Cernigliaro D, Zulliger R, et al. HIV care and treatment experiences
613 among female sex workers living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review. *Afr J
614 AIDS Res* 2016; 15: 377–386.
615
- 616 [8] Ivers LC, Cullen KA. Food insecurity: Special considerations for women. *American
617 Journal of Clinical Nutrition*; 94. Epub ahead of print 1 December 2011. DOI:
618 10.3945/ajcn.111.012617.
619
- 620 [9] Vandepitte J, Lyerla R, Dallabetta G, et al. Estimates of the number of female sex
621 workers in different regions of the world. *Sex Transm Infect* 2006; 82 Suppl 3: iii18-25.
622 [10] Lamontagne E, Folayan O, Arije O, et al. The effects of COVID-19 on food insecurity,
623 financial vulnerability and housing insecurity among women and girls living with
624 or at risk of HIV in Nigeria. Epub ahead of print 2022. DOI:
625 10.2989/16085906.2022.2113107.
626

- 627 [11] Dzimbiri MN, Mwanjawala P, Chilanga E, et al. Perceived implications of COVID-19
628 policy measures on food insecurity among urban residents in Blantyre Malawi. *BMC Public*
629 *Health*. Epub ahead of print 2021. DOI: 10.1186/s12889-022-12922-6.
630
- 631 [12] Vanleeuw LI, Zembe-Mkabile WI, Atkins SI. Falling through the cracks: Increased
632 vulnerability and limited social assistance for TB patients and their households during
633 COVID-19 in Cape Town, South Africa. Epub ahead of print 2022. DOI:
634 10.1371/journal.pgph.0000708.
635
- 636 [13] Lehnert EA. A Social Vulnerability Framework to Identify and Assist With
637 Environmental Injustice. *American journal of public health* 2022; 112: 1089–1091.
638
- 639 [14] Ballard TJ, Kepple AW CC. Development of a global standard for monitoring hunger
640 worldwide: Voices of the Hungry Project summary. *Report* 2013; 10.
641
- 642 [15] Food and Agriculture Association of the United States, The Food Insecurity Experience
643 Scale. <https://www.fao.org/in-action/voices-of-the-hungry/fies/en/> FAO 2024.
644
- 645 [16] Sen AS. *Psychometric Properties of Food Insecurity Experience Scale as Applied in*
646 *Eastern Africa: Evidence from National and Rural Surveys*,
647 <https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/concern/theses/ws859h90t> (2018).
648
- 649 [17] US Agency for International Development. The DHS-8 Questionnaires: revision Process
650 and New Development. *Report* 2019; 3.
651
- 652 [18] Cafiero C, Viviani S, Nord M. Food security measurement in a global context: The food
653 insecurity experience scale. *Measurement* 2018; 116: 146–152.
654
- 655 [19] Sheikomar OB, Dean W, Ghattas H, et al. Validity of the Food Insecurity Experience
656 Scale (FIES) for Use in League of Arab States (LAS) and Characteristics of Food Insecure
657 Individuals by the Human Development Index (HDI). *Curr Dev Nutr*; 5. Epub ahead of print
658 1 April 2021. DOI: 10.1093/CDN/NZAB017.
659
- 660 [20] Cafiero C, Viviani S, Maintainer MN. Weighted Rasch Modeling and Extensions using
661 Conditional Maximum Likelihood. *Report* 2022; 20.
662
- 663 [21] Nord M, FAO. INTRODUCTION TO ITEM RESPONSE THEORY Basic Concepts ,
664 Parameters and Statistics. *FAO Report* 2016; 2016: 1–20.
665
- 666 [22] Neves Freiria C, Arikawa A, Van Horn LT, et al. Food Insecurity Among Older Adults
667 Living in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Scoping Review. *Gerontologist*; 64. Epub
668 ahead of print January 2024. DOI: 10.1093/geront/gnac161.
669
- 670 [23] Bartfeld, J; Dunifon, R.; Nord, M; Carlson S. *What Factors Account for State-to-State*
671 *Difference in Food Insecurity?*,
672 https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/44132/29216_eib20_002.pdf?v=0 (2006).


- 673
674 [24] R Core Team, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna A. R: A language and
675 environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing,
676 <https://www.r-project.org/>. (2021).
677
- 678 [25] Voices of the Hungry Technical Report Number 1 / August 2016 (Revised version)
679 <http://www.fao.org/in-action/voices-of-the-hungry> voices-of-the-hungry@fao.org
680
- 681 [26] Wambogo EA, Ghattas H, Leonard KL, et al. Validity of the Food Insecurity Experience
682 Scale for Use in Sub-Saharan Africa and Characteristics of Food-Insecure Individuals. *Curr*
683 *Dev Nutr*; 2. Epub ahead of print 1 September 2018. DOI: 10.1093/CDN/NZY062.
684
- 685 [27] Bond, T. G.; Fox CM. *Applying the Rasch model: Fundamental measurement in*
686 *the human sciences*. 3rd ed. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2015.
687
- 688 [28] Food and Agriculture Organization of United States. SDG Indicator 2.1.2 - Using the
689 Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES). *Report*,
690 <https://elearning.fao.org/course/view.php?id=360> (2018, accessed 25 January 2024).
691
- 692 [29] Smith MD, Rabbitt MP, Coleman- Jensen A. Who are the World's Food Insecure? New
693 Evidence from the Food and Agriculture Organization's Food Insecurity Experience Scale.
694 *World Dev* 2017; 93: 402–412.
695
- 696 [30] Ene-Obong HN, Onuoha NO, Eme PE. Gender roles, family relationships, and household
697 food and nutrition security in Ohafia matrilineal society in Nigeria. *Matern Child Nutr*; 13
698 Suppl 3. Epub ahead of print 1 November 2017. DOI: 10.1111/MCN.12506.
699
- 700 [31] Mkhizeid S, Libhaber E, Sewpaul R, et al. Child and adolescent food insecurity in South
701 Africa: A household-level analysis of hunger. Epub ahead of print 2022. DOI:
702 10.1371/journal.pone.0278191.
703
- 704 [32] Grimaccia E, Naccarato A. Food Insecurity Individual Experience: A Comparison of
705 Economic and Social Characteristics of the Most Vulnerable Groups in the World. *Soc Indic*
706 *Res* 2018; 143: 1–20.
707
- 708 [33] Gebremichael B, Beletew B, Bimerew M, et al. Magnitude of urban household food
709 insecurity in East Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. DOI:
710 10.1017/S1368980021003529.
711
- 712 [34] Roberts AA, Osadare JO, Inem VA. Hunger in the midst of plenty: A survey of
713 household food security among urban families in Lagos State, Nigeria. *J Public Health Afr*
714 2019; 10: 35–39.
715
- 716 [35] Labadarios D, Mchiza ZJR, Steyn NP, et al. Food security in south africa: A review of
717 national surveys. *Bull World Health Organ* 2011; 89: 891–899.

Figure 1: Composite food insecurity experience scale scores of FSWM-HH in the three study countries



*Item response for "WORRIED" was obtained by fitting a different Rasch model ERM package in the R software. [24]

Figure 2: Relationship between 3-country FSWM-HH and Global 147-country Food Insecurity Severity Scales, after calibration into the same scale



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.21.24309302>; this version posted June 21, 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](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).