

1 **Self-applied ELCSA is valid for rapid tracking of household food insecurity among**  
2 **pregnant women during the COVID-19 pandemic**

3 **Authors**

4 Thilini C. Agampodi<sup>1,2</sup>

5 Amber Hromi-Fiedler<sup>2</sup>

6 Suneth B. Agampodi<sup>1</sup>

7 Gayani S. Amarasinghe<sup>1</sup>

8 Nuwan D. wickramasinghe<sup>1</sup>

9 Imasha U. Jayasinghe<sup>1</sup>

10 Ayesh U. Hettiarachchi<sup>1</sup>

11 Rafael Perez-Escamilla<sup>2</sup>

12 **Affiliations**

13 1 Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Allied Sciences, Rajarata  
14 University of Sri Lanka.

15 2 Department of Social and behavioral sciences, Yale School of Public Health.

16

17 **Abstract**

18 **Background**

19 Rapid household food insecurity (HFI) tracking has been identified as a priority in the context of  
20 the COVID-19 pandemic and its aftermath. We report the validation of the Latin American and  
21 Caribbean Food Security Scale (*Escala Latinoamericana y Caribena de Seguridad Alimentaria* -  
22 ELCSA) among pregnant women in Sri Lanka.

23

## 24 **Methods**

25 The adult eight-items of the English version of ELCSA was translated into Sinhala and Tamil.  
26 Cognitive testing (on ten pregnant women and five local experts) and psychometric validation of  
27 the self-administered HFI tool was conducted among pregnant women (n=269) attending the  
28 Rajarata Pregnancy Cohort (RaPCo) special clinics in Anuradhapura in February 2020. We  
29 assessed psychometric properties and fit using a one parameter logistic model (Rasch analysis)  
30 using STATA version 14 and WINSTEP software version 4.3.4. Concurrent validity was tested  
31 using psychological distress.

## 32 **Results**

33 The scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = 0.79), had a good model fit (Rasch infit  
34 statistic range: 0.85 to 1.07). Item 8 ('did not eat for the whole day') was removed from the  
35 model fit analysis as it was not affirmed by anyone. Item severity scores ranged from -2.15 for  
36 'not eating a diverse diet' to 4.43 for 'not eating during the whole day'. Concurrent validity  
37 between HFI and psychological distress was confirmed ( $r=0.15$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).

## 38 **Conclusions**

39 The self-applied version of ELCSA- pregnancy in Sri Lanka (ELCSA-P-SL) is a valid and  
40 feasible tool to track HFI among pregnant women in similar contexts during the COVID-19  
41 pandemic, where social distancing is a major concern and its aftermath.

42

## 43 **Key words**

44 House hold food insecurity, pregnancy, Sri Lanka, measurement, validity

45

## 46 **1.0 Introduction**

47 In high income countries (HICs) as well as low and middle income countries (LMICs) household  
48 food insecurity (HFI) has been associated with non-communicable diseases in pregnancy such as  
49 gestational diabetes mellites, pregnancy induced hypertension and obesity (1,2). A recent  
50 systematic review in South Asia indicate that HFI is a determinant of intra household food  
51 allocation with women acting as a buffer and being more sensitive to deprivation of food (3). In  
52 LMIC's HFI has been associated with child malnutrition and infectious diseases (4). HFI has  
53 been associated with discrimination of women in the household suggesting that women are the  
54 most vulnerable in this regard (5). FI has also been consistently associated with maternal anemia,  
55 domestic violence and depression in women, and poor early childhood development (4)

56 With the global health focus on the aftermath of the pandemic, food insecurity has been  
57 predicted to become the “sting in the tail of COVID-19” (6), hence carefully and efficiently  
58 monitoring household food insecurity, in the context of social distancing, has become a global  
59 public health priority. The pandemic has become a strong challenge for achieving the Sustainable  
60 Developmental Goals (SDG), especially in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMIC) where  
61 maternal and under-five malnutrition, morbidity, and mortality are expected to rise due to the  
62 major poverty increases and disruption of primary health and related services (7). Hence, global  
63 health authorities have advised countries to be alert and prepared for a COVID-19-undernutrition  
64 syndemic strongly rooted in social determinants of health inequities (8). In 2005, the World  
65 Health Organization (WHO) Commission for Social Determinants of Health (CSDH) was  
66 established to understand and act on inequities in health (9). One of the three recommendations  
67 of the commission to close the gap in a generation was “to measure and understand the problem  
68 and assess the impact of action” on inequities in social determinants of health (10). Given that  
69 “closing the gap in a generation” would be a challenge with the current COVID-19 pandemic,

70 counties across the globe need to track household food insecurity (HFI) frequently as it is a  
71 crucial social determinant of health. This information is necessary for proper targeting and  
72 resource allocations through effective food and nutrition security actions.

73

74 HFI has been measured indirectly through indicators such as anthropometry, dietary intake  
75 surveys, and household food expenditure. The only direct measure is derived from experience-  
76 based HFI scales that capture the experience of a household respondent, cognizant of the food  
77 situation in the family, about the lack of access to a healthy and nutritious diet as a result of  
78 poverty, social deprivation or situations such as natural or man-made disasters (11). The  
79 evolution and validation of experience-based HFI assessment tools has been well documented  
80 across world regions. The US Household Food Security Survey Module (US-HFSSM, 1995)(12),  
81 Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS, 2007)(13) and FAO's *Escala*  
82 *Latinoamericana y Caribeña de Seguridad Alimentaria* (ELCSA) and derived Food Insecurity  
83 Experience Scale (FIES) have been validated across a number of different settings and are now  
84 being used extensively to track HFI globally (14). However, these scales have not been  
85 validated in self-administered form in LMICs which is a major gap in the context of pandemics  
86 or other public health emergencies requiring social distancing measures, such as COVID-19.

87 The objective of this study was to test the validity of a self-applied culturally adapted 8-item  
88 version of ELCSA in a large population-based cohort study of pregnant women in Sri Lanka (15)  
89 in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

90

91 **2.0 Methods**

92 We conducted cognitive and psychometric validation of the self-administered ELCSA for  
93 pregnant women in Sri Lanka (ELCSA-P-SL). The study population included pregnant women  
94 in their third trimester (32-36 weeks of gestation) of pregnancy enrolled in the Rajarata  
95 Pregnancy cohort in Anuradhapura district, Sri Lanka. The study was carried out in February  
96 2020, just before Sri Lanka was affected by the COVID-19 lockdown.

## 97 **2.1 The context**

98 Sri Lanka became an upper middle income country in 2019 with a Gross National Income (GNI)  
99 per capita of USD 4060 (16). The average life expectancy at birth for Sri Lankans is 75.5 years  
100 (17). The literacy rate of males and females are 93.6% and 91.7% respectively (18). More than  
101 90% of the population has access to safe drinking water and sanitation (18). The prevalence of  
102 poverty (i.e., the percentage of the population below the national poverty line) is reported as 4.1%  
103 (19). The food security status of the country is reported in a global survey in 2016 indicating that  
104 7.1% and 17.7% of the population is affected by severe and moderate to severe HFI respectively  
105 (20). An ongoing prospective cohort study in Sri Lanka provided a unique opportunity to  
106 validate a self-reported measure of HFI due to its relatively high maternal literacy rates,  
107 universal maternal and child health service coverage and focus in equity for women.

## 108 **2.2 Cognitive validation**

109 The adult 8-items of English version of ELCSA was culturally adapted to Sri Lanka's context  
110 and translated into Sinhala and Tamil following a modified version of Sumathipala and Murray's  
111 method (21). Cognitive validation was performed through expert opinion with five local experts  
112 with different experiences in the fields of nutrition, scale development methodology, maternal  
113 health, social determinants of health, and public health. Target group interviews were held with

114 ten pregnant women using the methods suggested by Bowden et al for cognitive validation (22).  
115 The intended meanings of the eight items of the original questionnaire was compared with the  
116 understanding of the translated versions of each of the items. We especially focused on ensuring  
117 that the original meaning was preserved; and that the wording was clear, simple and self-  
118 explanatory to facilitate its' self-administration.

119

## 120 **2.3 Psychometric validation**

121

122 The cognitively validated ELCSA-P-SL was self-administered by a consecutive sample of 269  
123 pregnant women attending the Rajarata Pregnancy Cohort (RaPCo) special clinics in  
124 Anuradhapura district, Sri Lanka, in February 2020 (15). Data were collected from 21 out of 22  
125 public health administrative areas (Medical Officer of Health areas) in the district. Pregnant  
126 women filled the questionnaire themselves. Participants psychological distress was  
127 simultaneously assessed using the validated Sinhala and Tamil versions of the General Health  
128 Questionnaire 12 (GHQ 12)(23) in order to assess the concurrent validity of the new HFI scale.  
129 We assessed internal consistency, psychometric properties and fit using a one parameter logistic  
130 model (Rasch analysis) using STATA version 14. Item severity scores and infit statistics were  
131 calculated using WINSTEP software version 4.3.4.

132

## 133 **3.0 Results**

134

### 135 **3.1 Changes made in Cognitive validation**

136

137 Expert and mothers agreed that the questions were clear to them and that the intended meaning  
138 of each item was preserved. Based on consensus from the experts, the introduction of the  
139 questionnaire was adjusted to include lay language which can be easily understood by rural  
140 women. It was clearly mentioned that lack of access to food was being asked in the context of  
141 lack of socio-economic resources; and that it did not refer to food restrictions due to dieting, loss  
142 of appetite, or pregnancy related symptoms such as nausea, vomiting or heart burn. To maintain  
143 the respondents, focus on the time period the phrases “during the past three months” was added  
144 at the beginning of each question. To ensure that the exact intended reasons of food insecurity  
145 were taken into account, the phrases such as “due to the above mentioned reasons” or “due to  
146 less availability of food in your house” were used in each and every item. Using these phrases  
147 repeatedly was designed to enable participants to remain focused on accurately answering the  
148 ELCSA-P-SL self-administered questions.

## 149 **3.2 Psychometric assessment**

### 150 **3.2.1 Characteristics of the study sample**

151 Of the 328 pregnant women attended the RaPCo special clinics during this period 269 (82%)  
152 responded to the questionnaire. The response rate was 82%. The ethnic breakdown and the level  
153 of education represented the study population (Table 1).

154

### 155 **3.2.2 Frequency distribution of responses**

156

157 Inability to have a diversity of food due to lack of money or other resources was the item more  
158 frequently affirmed. There were no pregnant women in this sample who affirmed item 8; i.e., not

159 eating throughout the day (Table 2). The percentage of missing data ranged from 0.4% to 3.3%  
160 in each item. The missing data were replaced by the answer “no” as it did not change the order of  
161 severity by doing so and it was predictable based on the pattern of responses in rest of items. As  
162 an example a mother who responded “no” to item 7 (experience of hunger for one meal) would  
163 invariably not left with hunger during the whole day which indicates a “no” answer for item 8.  
164 Further assessment of model fit without replacing the missing data indicated no significant  
165 change in severity scores and infit values.

166

### 167 **3.2.3 Psychometric properties**

168 The tool was internally consistent (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.79). The one parameter logistic model  
169 indicated that food diversity was the first factor to be compromised and that experience of  
170 hunger represented the most severe stage of HFI (figure 1). The item infit statistics indicated  
171 good model fit (range: 0.85 to 1.07). Item 8 (did not eat for the whole day) was removed from  
172 the model fit analysis as no woman affirmed this item. Overall, the item severity scores ranged  
173 from -2.15 for diversity food to 4.43 for hunger during the whole day. Concurrent validity  
174 between HFI and psychological distress was confirmed ( $r=0.15$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).

## 175 **4.0 Discussion**

176 This study reports the validation of the 8-item self-administered ELCSA-P-SL (Appendix 1).  
177 The scale had strong cognitive, psychometric, and concurrent validity , hence it can be valuable  
178 for fast tracking of HFI in pregnancy in Sri Lanka an similar settings, in the context of social  
179 distancing. Although the ELCSA tool had been previously among pregnant adolescents in Brazil



180 (24), as far as we know this is the first time that ELCSA was validated as a self-administered  
181 questionnaire among pregnant women in a LMIC country.

182 The severity scores of ELCSA-P-SL behaved as expected indicating that dietary diversity is  
183 sacrificed first and that food intake reduction or hunger is the most severe manifestation of HFI.  
184 Poor diet diversity has indeed been identified as being prevalent in Sri Lanka) (25,26). By  
185 contrast in other contexts being worried or having fear about running is the item that has been  
186 more frequently affirmed (27). Figuring out the reason behind this between-country difference in  
187 items' order require further research.

188 This study is likely to have minimized social desirability bias as the HFI questionnaire was self-  
189 administered (20). Likewise, pregnant women who may have felt shy or uncomfortable reporting  
190 food problems in a face-to-face interview might be more open to report them in the self-  
191 administered modality.

192 In Sri Lankan as in many other cultures, mothers are the persons most informed about the food  
193 situation in the household. Hence the validity of our findings should not be extrapolated to other  
194 possible respondents including fathers or other relatives.

195 One important advantage of ELCSA is that it not only captures the access to food, but also  
196 reflects the underlying pain and anxiety experienced by the participants due to food insecurity  
197 and hunger. Indeed, HFI derived from ELCSA-P-SL was significantly correlated with  
198 psychological distress which is in agreement with recent findings from HFI phone surveys in  
199 Mexico (supplementary file).

200 Ideally the psychometric validation of ELCSA-P-SL should have been done separately for the  
201 Sinhala and Tamil language versions. However, because the sample of Tamil pregnant women  
202 was very small (n=20) we were not able to do so. However, we did confirm that removing Tamil  
203 participants from the validation analyses led to very similar findings (available upon request  
204 from authors) and did not affect any of the conclusions.

205 The items included in the ELCSA-P-SL scale are not pregnancy specific; thus, in principle this  
206 scale could also be used for rapid assessment of HFI in the lactation period or in the general  
207 population. Hence further research is needed to assess the external validity of self-administered  
208 ELCSA-P-SL to other stages of the woman's life course or other populations in the context of  
209 emergencies that require social distancing measures. This research can help the public health and  
210 social protection sectors response to COVID-19 and its aftermath in Sri Lanka and beyond.

#### 211 **4.0 Conclusion**

212 The self-administered ELCSA-P-SL is valid and feasible to rapidly track HFI among pregnant  
213 women in Sri Lanka.

#### 214 **Author contributions**

215 RPE, TCA, SBA, GSA, IUJ designed the study. GSA, IUJ, NDW and AUH conducted the  
216 research. TCA, SBA and AHF conducted statistical analysis. TCA, NDW and AHF wrote the  
217 paper. RPE and SBA edited the manuscript. All authors had the primary responsibility for final  
218 content of the data. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

#### 219 **References**

- 220 1. Laraia BA, Siega-Riz AM, Gundersen C. Household Food Insecurity Is Associated with  
221 Self-Reported Pregravid Weight Status, Gestational Weight Gain, and Pregnancy  
222 Complications. *J Am Diet Assoc* [Internet]. 2010;110(5):692–701. Available from:  
223 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jada.2010.02.014>
- 224 2. Hojaji E, Zavoshy R, Noroozi M, Jahanihashemi H, Ezzedin N, Growth C, et al.  
225 Assessment of Household Food Security and its Relationship with Some Pregnancy  
226 Complications. *J Maz Univ Med Sci*. 2015;25(123):87–98.
- 227 3. Harris-Fry H, Shrestha N, Costello A, Saville NM. Determinants of intra-household food  
228 allocation between adults in South Asia - A systematic review. *Int J Equity Health*.  
229 2017;16(1):1–21.
- 230 4. Pérez-Escamilla R. Food security and the 2015-2030 sustainable development goals: From  
231 human to planetary health. *Curr Dev Nutr*. 2017;1(7):1–8.
- 232 5. Panter-Brick C, Eggerman M. Panter-Brick C, Eggerman M. Household responses to food  
233 shortages in western Nepal. *Hum Organ*. 1997;56:190–8. *Hum Organ*. 1997;56:190–8.
- 234 6. Editors. Editorial Food insecurity will be the sting in the tail of COVID-19. *Lancet Glob*  
235 *Heal* [Internet]. 2018;8(6):e737. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2214-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30228-X)  
236 [109X\(20\)30228-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30228-X)
- 237 7. Robertson T, Carter ED, Chou VB, Stegmuller AR, Jackson BD, Tam Y, et al. Articles  
238 Early estimates of the indirect effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on maternal and child  
239 mortality in low-income and middle-income countries: a modelling study. *Lancet Glob*  
240 *Heal* [Internet]. 2020;(20):1–8. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2214-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30229-1)  
241 [109X\(20\)30229-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30229-1)

- 242 8. Cornia GA, Jolly R, Stewart F. COVID-19 and children, in the North and in the South  
243 [Internet]. Innocenti Discussion Papers UNICEF. 2020. Available from:  
244 [https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1087-covid-19-and-children-in-the-north-and-the-](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1087-covid-19-and-children-in-the-north-and-the-south.html)  
245 [south.html](https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1087-covid-19-and-children-in-the-north-and-the-south.html)
- 246 9. Marmot M. Social determinants of health inequalities. *Lancet* [Internet].  
247 2005;365(9464):1099–104. Available from:  
248 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15781105>
- 249 10. Report of Commission on Social Determinants of Health, Organization WH. Closing the  
250 gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health.  
251 Final Report of the Commission on Social Determinants of Health. Geneva: World Health  
252 Organization; 2008.
- 253 11. Ballard TJ, Kepple AW, Cafiero C. The food insecurity experience scale: development of  
254 a global standard for monitoring hunger worldwide. Technical Paper. [Internet]. Rome;  
255 2013. Available from: <http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/voices/en/>).
- 256 12. Food and Agricultural Organization. Declaration of the World Summit on Food Security,  
257 World Summit on Food Security. Rome; 2009.
- 258 13. Coates J, Swindale, Bilinsky P. Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) for  
259 measurement of household food access: indicator guide (v. 3). Washington DC; 2011.
- 260 14. Pérez-Escamilla R, Gubert MB RB, Hromi-Fiedler A. Food security measurement and  
261 governance: Assessment of the usefulness of diverse food insecurity indicators for policy  
262 makers. *Glob Food Sec.* 2017;14:96–104.
- 263 15. Agampodi TC, Wickramasinghe ND, Indika R, Prasanna R, Mudiyansele P, Jayathilake

- 264 B, et al. The Rajarata Pregnancy Cohort ( RaPCo ): study protocol. BMC Pregnancy  
265 Childbirth. 2020;20(374):1–13.
- 266 16. World Bank. New country classification according to income 2019-2020. 2020.
- 267 17. United Nations Population Division. United Nations Population Division. World  
268 Population Prospects: 2019 [Internet]. World bank. 2019 [cited 2020 Jan 5]. Available  
269 from: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/sp.dyn.le00.in>
- 270 18. Department of Census and Statistics Ministry of National Policies and Economic Affairs.  
271 Sri Lanka Demographic and Health Survey 2016. Colombo; 2017.
- 272 19. Central Bank Sri Lanka. Economic and Social Statistics of Sri Lanka 2019 [Internet].  
273 Available from:  
274 [https://www.cbsl.gov.lk/sites/default/files/cbslweb\\_documents/statistics/otherpub/ess\\_201](https://www.cbsl.gov.lk/sites/default/files/cbslweb_documents/statistics/otherpub/ess_2019_e.pdf)  
275 [9\\_e.pdf](https://www.cbsl.gov.lk/sites/default/files/cbslweb_documents/statistics/otherpub/ess_2019_e.pdf)
- 276 20. Food and Agricultural Organization U. Methods for estimating comparable rates of food  
277 insecurity experienced by adults throughout the world. Rome; 2016.
- 278 21. Sumathipala A, Murray J. New approach to translating instruments for cross-cultural  
279 research: a combined qualitative and quantitative approach for translation and consensus  
280 generation. Int J Methods Psychiatr Res. 2000;9(2):87–95.
- 281 22. Bowden A et al. Methods for pre-testing and piloting survey questions: illustrations from  
282 the KENQOL survey of health - related quality of life. Health Policy Plan.  
283 2002;17(3):322–30.
- 284 23. Abeysena H, Jayawardana P, Peiris U, Rodrigo A. Validation of the Sinhala version of the  
285 12-item General Health Questionnaire. J Postgrad Inst Med. 2014;1(1):1–7.

- 286 24. Muñoz-Astudillo M, Martínez J, Quintero A, 2010;12(2):173-183. V de la EL y C de SA  
287 en gestantes adolescentes [Validating L-A and CL-A food security scale on pregnant  
288 adolescents]. RSP (Bogota). Muñoz-Astudillo MN, Martínez JW, Quintero AR.  
289 Validación de la Escala Latinoamericana y Caribeña de Seguridad Alimentaria en  
290 gestantes adolescentes [Validating Latin-American and Caribbean Latin-American food  
291 security scale on pregnant adolescents]. Rev Salud Publica. 2010;12(2):173–83.
- 292 25. Aguayo VM. Complementary feeding practices for infants and young children in South  
293 Asia . A review of evidence for action post - 2015. 2017;13(December 2016):1–13.
- 294 26. Sirasa F, Mitchell L, Harris N. Dietary diversity and food intake of urban preschool  
295 children in North-Western Sri Lanka. 2020;(March):1–17.
- 296 27. Perez Escamilla R, Dessalines M, Finnigan M, Pacho H. Household Food Insecurity Is  
297 Associated with Childhood Malaria in Rural Haiti 1 , 2. 2009;(7).

298 **Figure legends:**

299 Figure1: Item characteristic and information curves of ELCSA-P-SL<sup>a</sup>

300

301 Figure 2: Item severity and fit statistics of ELCSA-P-SL

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321 **Tables:**

322 Table 1: Characteristics of the study population

Characteristic		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age	18 or less	6	2.3
	19-35	247	93.6
	above 35	11	4.2
Ethnicity	Sinhala	243	92
	Tamil	1	0.4
	Moor	19	7.2
	Other	1	0.4
Level of education	Primary only	2	0.8
	post	154	59

	primary					
	secondary	47		18		
	Tertiary	58		22.2		
Item		Answered "yes"	Percentage "yes"	Answered "no"	Percentage "no"	Missing data

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344 Table 2: Frequency distribution of responses to the scale



Fear of run out of food	21	7.8%	245	91.1%	3 1.1%
Run out of food	16	5.9%	253	93.7%	1 0.4%
Run out of nutritious food	18	6.7%	242	90.0%	9 3.3%
Run out of food diversity	31	11.5%	234	87.0%	4 1.5%
Have skipped one meal	7	2.6%	260	96.7%	2 0.7%
Have reduced amount	9	3.5%	260	96.5%	5 1.9%
experienced hunger for one meal	3	1.1%	263	97.8%	3 1.1%
experienced hunger whole day	0	0%	267	100%	2 0.7%

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360



361

362



363

364

Item Characteristic Curves




Item Information Functions



- A-** Fear of runout of food
- B-** Run out of food
- C-** Run out of nutritious food
- D-** Run out of food diversity
- E-** Skip one meal
- F-** Reduce amount of meal
- G-** Experience hunger for one meal

Item severity level



Infit values

