

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^{1,2}

5 Amber Hromi-Fiedler²

6 Suneth B. Agampodi¹

7 Gayani S. Amarasinghe¹

8 Nuwan D. wickramasinghe¹

9 Imasha U. Jayasinghe¹

10 Ayesh U. Hettiarachchi¹

11 Rafael Perez-Escamilla²

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^a

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

