

1 **Adherence to and enforcement of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) for COVID-19**  
2 **prevention in Nigeria, Rwanda, and Zambia: A mixed-methods analysis**

3 Hiwote Solomon<sup>1</sup>, Donald M. Thea<sup>2</sup>, Sandro Galea<sup>3</sup>, Lora L. Sabin<sup>2</sup>, Daniel R. Lucey<sup>4</sup>, Davidson  
4 H. Hamer<sup>2,5</sup>

5  
6 <sup>1</sup> Doctor of Public Health Program, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston,  
7 Massachusetts, USA

8 <sup>2</sup> Department of Global Health, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston,  
9 Massachusetts, USA

10 <sup>3</sup> Department of Epidemiology, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston,  
11 Massachusetts, USA

12 <sup>4</sup> Department of Medicine, Georgetown University Medical Center, Washington, D.C., USA

13 <sup>5</sup> Department of Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

14

15 **Corresponding author**

16 Hiwote Solomon

17 Boston University School of Public Health

18 801 Massachusetts Avenue

19 Boston, MA 02119

20 [solomohi@bu.edu](mailto:solomohi@bu.edu)

21 **Abstract**

22 **Introduction:** In the early parts of the COVID-19 pandemic, non-pharmaceutical interventions  
23 (NPIs) were implemented worldwide, including in sub-Saharan Africa, to prevent and control  
24 SARS-CoV-2 transmission. This mixed-methods study examines adherence to and enforcement  
25 of NPIs implemented to curb COVID-19 in Nigeria, Rwanda, and Zambia, leading up to the  
26 10,000<sup>th</sup> case of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 in each country. Additionally, we aim to  
27 evaluate the relationship between levels and changes of NPIs over time and changes in COVID-  
28 19 cases and deaths.

29 **Methods:** This mixed-methods analysis utilized semi-structured interviews and a quantitative  
30 dataset constructed using multiple open data sources, including the Oxford COVID-19  
31 Government Response Tracker. To understand potential barriers and facilitators in implementing  
32 and enforcing NPIs qualitative data were collected from those involved in the COVID-19 response  
33 and analyzed using NVivo. Quantitative results were analyzed using descriptive statistics, plots,  
34 ANOVA, and post hoc Tukey.

35 **Results:** Individual indicator scores varied with the COVID-19 response in all three countries.  
36 Nigeria had sustained levels of strict measures for containment and closure NPIs, while in  
37 Rwanda there was substantial variation in NPI score as it transitioned through the different case  
38 windows for the same measures. Zambia implemented moderate stringency throughout the  
39 pandemic using gathering restrictions and business/school closure measures but maintained low  
40 levels of strictness for other containment and closure measures. Rwanda had far more consistent  
41 and stringent measures compared to Nigeria and Zambia. Rwanda's success in implementing  
42 COVID-related measures was partly due to strong enforcement and having a population that  
43 generally obeys its government.

44 **Conclusion:** Various forces either facilitated or hindered adherence and compliance to COVID-  
45 19 control measures. This research highlights important lessons, including the need to engage  
46 communities early and create buy-in, as well as the need for preparation to ensure that response  
47 efforts are proactive rather than reactive when faced with an emergency.

## 48 **Introduction**

49  
50 In a pandemic, non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) are crucial in curbing disease  
51 spread, especially in the absence of vaccines and other pharmaceutical interventions (1). It is  
52 widely accepted in public health that early interventions are an important step to halting the  
53 progression of a new communicable disease threat (2). Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the  
54 impact of NPIs has been largely studied in controlling influenza outbreaks, including the  
55 1918/1919 influenza pandemic (1,3). NPIs include actions that can be taken by individuals and the  
56 larger community. These include frequent hand washing, covering coughs and sneezes, isolating  
57 sick persons, contact tracing, quarantining exposed persons, and physical/social distancing  
58 measures for the general population (1,4,5). The latter includes containment strategies such as the  
59 closing of schools and workplaces, restricting public gatherings, curfews, quarantine, and  
60 maximizing telework (when applicable) (5–8).

61 The success of NPIs is dependent on enforcement, political governments, and citizens'  
62 willingness to comply with the measures. Until recently, the effectiveness of NPIs has not been  
63 tested systematically. Early measures of efficacy were explored mainly through the use of  
64 mathematical models, while few published studies have reviewed the historical evidence on NPI  
65 adoption during past pandemics (1,3,9). A small number of studies have explored the impact of  
66 public health interventions and NPIs during the 1918-1919 influenza pandemic, in which NPIs  
67 played a critical role in delaying the temporal effects of the pandemic, in addition to reducing the  
68 overall and peak attack rate and the number of cumulative deaths (3,9). How successful NPIs were  
69 in limiting disease spread in Africa, especially in the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic has  
70 been underexplored in the literature. The degree of implementation and the impact of these NPIs  
71 during the COVID-19 pandemic has largely been studied in high-income countries, and there has

72 been limited data in the literature focused on low- and middle-income countries, especially in  
73 Africa (10–15).

74 In the absence of treatment beyond supportive care and vaccination for the early parts of  
75 the COVID-19 pandemic, NPIs were implemented across the world to prevent and control the  
76 transmission and spread of SARS-CoV-2. By early March 2020, several countries in Africa  
77 (affected and unaffected by COVID-19) began mobilizing in response to the pandemic. This  
78 included prompt case identification, information campaigns to sensitize citizens, and building  
79 laboratory capacity (16,17). Some countries relied on innovative strategies such as using locally  
80 produced cloth masks, soaps, and hand sanitizers, developing inexpensive diagnostic tests, testing  
81 pooled COVID-19 samples, and using drones to transport test kits and samples to and from hard-  
82 to-reach areas (18–20). By the end of March 2020, many African Union Member States had  
83 imposed travel bans on flights arriving from certain Asian and European countries (20). In the  
84 following two months, almost two-thirds of African Union Member States had closed their borders  
85 to all international travelers, except for cargo, freight, and expatriation of foreign nationals (19,20).  
86 Fifteen countries, including Nigeria and Rwanda, implemented border closures before any  
87 COVID-19 cases were confirmed (21). Other NPIs, such as restrictions of movement and public  
88 gathering, and closure of schools and workplaces were also implemented across the region.

89 The present study focuses on three countries in Africa: Nigeria in West Africa, Rwanda in  
90 East Africa, and Zambia in southern Africa. These countries were selected to provide variety in  
91 geopolitical structures, population size, region, and World Bank income classification. This mixed-  
92 methods study aims to examine adherence and enforcement of NPIs implemented to curb COVID-  
93 19 in Nigeria, Rwanda, and Zambia, leading up to the 10,000<sup>th</sup> recorded case of COVID-19 in each

94 country. Additionally, we aim to broadly evaluate the relationship among the levels/changes in  
95 NPIs implemented and changes in COVID-19 cases and deaths.

## 96 **Methods and Materials**

### 97 **Study design**

98 This mixed-methods study utilized a mix of semi-structured interviews and a quantitative  
99 dataset constructed using multiple open data sources.

### 100 **Qualitative method**

101 To understand the potential barriers and facilitators in implementing and enforcing NPIs  
102 and how other epidemics within the countries may have affected compliance in NPIs, qualitative  
103 data were collected from decision-makers and experts involved in the COVID-19 response using  
104 key informant interviews (KIIs). KIIs were conducted with officials of Ministries of Health, Africa  
105 CDC Regional Collaborating Centers, and WHO African Regional Office (AFRO). Recruitment  
106 utilized purposive and convenience sampling, including a snowball sampling approach. All KIIs  
107 provided verbal consent before the start of the interview. Each KII took on average 30 minutes to  
108 complete using Zoom. The audio recordings were downloaded from Zoom and then immediately  
109 uploaded to a secure database and deleted from the computer. Transcription took place upon  
110 completion of the interviews. Data were collected and analyzed using a grounded theory approach  
111 (22). Thematic analysis using inductive coding was used to systematically extract key themes in  
112 an iterative process as they emerged through the analysis process. An iterative process was used  
113 to develop a comprehensive codebook. During the initial coding phase, first-order codes were  
114 developed, while secondary coding allowed for the grouping of first-order codes into themes.  
115 Quotes attributed to specific themes were extracted. Both coding and analysis were conducted  
116 using NVivo Release 1.6 Mac Edition (23).

## 117 **Quantitative Methods**

118           A time-series dataset was constructed using multiple open data sources. Observations for  
119 each variable were recorded daily beginning on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, for each of the three countries  
120 (Nigeria, Rwanda, and Zambia) and ending on the date when each country surpassed its 10,000<sup>th</sup>  
121 case. While most studies exploring the effect of NPIs have focused on 100 cases as the outbreak  
122 threshold, this study uses four case windows to gain a broader picture: no cases ( $W_0$ ), 1-100 cases  
123 ( $W_1$ ), >101-1,000 cases ( $W_2$ ), and >1,001-10,000+ cases ( $W_3$ ). New and cumulative cases during  
124 this period were obtained from the COVID-19 data repository by the Center for Systems Science  
125 and Engineering at Johns Hopkins University (24). In addition to COVID-19 case and death  
126 aggregates, the dataset also includes variables from the University of Oxford COVID-19  
127 Government Response Tracker (OxCGRT), which collects publicly available information on 20  
128 indicators in different areas, such as containment policies, economic policies, and health policies  
129 in more than 150 countries since January 2020 (25). Data are collected in real-time and from  
130 publicly available sources in each country. The OxCGRT dataset utilized in this paper was  
131 downloaded in March 2021.

132           This paper focuses on two policy indices calculated by the OxCGRT, the stringency index  
133 (SI) and the containment and health index (CHI). Table 1 shows which variables were included in  
134 each index. The SI records the strictness of closure and containment policies using 9 indicators,  
135 which include lockdown policies, primarily aimed at restricting certain behaviors, while the CHI  
136 includes all the variables from the stringency index and additional variables focused on mitigating  
137 the health consequences of COVID-19 (e.g., testing, use of facial coverings outside the home, and  
138 contact tracing) (25). The methods and calculation of indices are described elsewhere by Hale et  
139 al (25). Broadly, both indices aggregate the data of individual policy measures into a single

140 number, between 0 to 100, that reflects the level of a government's response along certain  
141 dimensions to measure the indicators upon which a government has acted, and to what degree.

**Table 1. Non-pharmaceutical policy variables used in OxCGRT index calculation**

Variable	Description	SI	CHI
C1	Record closings of schools and universities	X	X
C2	Record closings of workplaces	X	X
C3	Record canceling public events	X	X
C4	Record limits on gatherings	X	X
C5	Record closing of public transport	X	X
C6	Record orders to "shelter-in-place" and otherwise confine to the home	X	X
C7	Record restrictions on internal movement between cities/regions	X	X
C8	Record restrictions on international travel (this records policy for foreign travelers, not citizens)	X	X
H1	Record presence of public info campaigns	X	X
H2	Record government policy on who has access to testing Note: this records policies about testing for current infection (PCR tests) not testing for immunity (antibody test)		X
H3	Record government policy on contact tracing after a positive diagnosis Note: Policies include only those that would identify all people potentially exposed to COVID-19		x
H6	Record policies on the use of facial coverings outside the home		x
H7	Record policies for protecting elderly people (as defined locally) in Long Term Care Facilities and/or the community and home setting		x

142  
143 To examine the degree of implementation of NPIs relative to the four case windows, we  
144 used plots and descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) stratified by the case  
145 windows. Indices were compared across case windows using analysis of variance (ANOVA)  
146 models with post-hoc comparisons (p-values adjusted using Tukey's method). All analyses were  
147 performed using SAS statistical software version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) (26).

### 148 **Ethical Considerations**

149 IRB exemption was granted on May 5, 2021, by the Boston University Medical Center  
150 Institutional Review Board (IRB number: H-41329). All key informant interviewees were  
151 informed that participation was voluntary. All participants provided verbal consent to being  
152 recorded before the start of the interview.



## 153 **Results**

### 154 **Quantitative findings**

155 It took Rwanda less time to surpass the first 100 cases (21 days) compared to Nigeria (30  
156 days) and Zambia (43 days); however, it took Rwanda substantially longer to surpass 10,000  
157 cases (379 days) than Nigeria and Zambia (152 and 232 days, respectively). All three countries  
158 experienced an exponential rise in cases after surpassing 1,000 cases of COVID-19.

159 An examination of SI scores from January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021, until each country surpassed 10,000  
160 cases, reveals several important differences across countries (Tables 2a-2c). In Rwanda, the  
161 average score of the SI from January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, until it surpassed 10,000 cases was 61.1 out of 100  
162 (SD = 26.6, median=73.2) indicating sustained moderate stringency on measures. In contrast,  
163 Nigeria and Zambia had average scores of 42.1 (SD = 37.1, median=11.1) and 34.3 (SD = 22.3,  
164 median=43.5), respectively. In Nigeria, a Tukey post hoc test shows the mean SI scores in case  
165 windows  $W_2$  (SI=83.0) and  $W_3$  (SI=84.6) were statistically significantly different ( $p<0.0001$ ) when  
166 compared to  $W_0$  (SI=6.2). However, there was no difference between the mean SI scores between  
167  $W_2$  and  $W_3$  ( $p=0.85$ ), indicating stringency scores stayed relatively around the same level after the  
168 100<sup>th</sup> case. In contrast, in Zambia, the mean SI scores in case windows  $W_1$  (SI= 49.5),  $W_2$   
169 (SI=51.2), and  $W_3$  (SI=47.4) were significantly different ( $p<0.0001$ ) than  $W_0$  (SI=5.6), indicating  
170 that Zambia's stringency levels varied post-identification of the index case compared to pre-  
171 identification. However, there was no difference between the mean SI scores across case windows  
172  $W_1$ ,  $W_2$ , and  $W_3$ , suggesting that the stringency levels in how the measures were implemented  
173 stayed relatively stable despite cases increasing. In Rwanda, mean SI scores in  $W_1$  (SI=73.2) and  
174  $W_3$  (SI=70.3) were statistically significantly different ( $p<0.05$ ) when compared to  $W_2$  (SI=79.5).  
175 However, there was no difference between the mean SI scores between  $W_1$  and  $W_3$  ( $p=0.53$ )

176 suggesting that the stringency levels were similar in terms of which measures were implemented  
 177 during  $W_1$  and  $W_3$ .

178 **Table 2a. One-Way Analysis of Variance of the Stringency Index Score by Case**  
 179 **Window, Nigeria**

Case Window	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Tukey's Post-hoc Comparisons			
				$W_0$	$W_1$	$W_2$	$W_3$
<b>Pooled</b>	152	42.1	37.1	-	-	-	-
<b><math>W_0</math></b>	58	6.2	5.1		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
<b><math>W_1</math></b>	30	22.3	16.3	<0.0001		<0.0001	<0.0001
<b><math>W_2</math></b>	26	83.0	0.6	<0.0001	<0.0001		0.85
<b><math>W_3</math></b>	38	84.6	0.6	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.85	

Note:  $W_0$ : 0 cases,  $W_1$ : 1-100+ cases,  $W_2$ : >101-1,000+ cases,  $W_3$ : >1,001-10,000+ cases  
*n*: number of days, *SD*: standard deviation

185

186 **Table 2b. One-Way Analysis of Variance of the Stringency Index by Case**  
 187 **Window, Rwanda**

Case Window	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Tukey's HSD Comparisons			
				$W_0$	$W_1$	$W_2$	$W_3$
<b>Pooled</b>	379	61.1	26.6	-	-	-	-
<b><math>W_0</math></b>	73	10.9	7.6		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
<b><math>W_1</math></b>	21	73.2	25.6	<0.0001		0.04	0.54
<b><math>W_2</math></b>	86	79.5	8.6	<0.0001	0.04		<0.0001
<b><math>W_3</math></b>	199	70.3	7.5	<0.0001	0.54	<0.0001	

Note:  $W_0$ : 0 cases,  $W_1$ : 1-100+ cases,  $W_2$ : >101-1,000+ cases,  $W_3$ : >1,001-10,000+ cases  
*n*: number of days, *SD*: standard deviation

188

189

**Table 2c. One-Way Analysis of Variance of the Stringency Index by Case Window, Zambia**

Case Window	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Tukey's HSD Comparisons			
				<b>W<sub>0</sub></b>	<b>W<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>W<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>W<sub>3</sub></b>
<b>Pooled</b>	232	34.3	22.3	-	-	-	-
<b>W<sub>0</sub></b>	77	5.6	7.9		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
<b>W<sub>1</sub></b>	43	49.5	14.7	<0.0001		0.87	0.63
<b>W<sub>2</sub></b>	27	51.2	12.1	<0.0001	0.87		0.25
<b>W<sub>3</sub></b>	85	47.4	5.1	<0.0001	0.63	0.25	

Note: W<sub>0</sub>: 0 cases, W<sub>1</sub>: 1-100+ cases, W<sub>2</sub>: >101-1,000+ cases, W<sub>3</sub>: >1,001-10,000+ cases  
*n*: number of days, *SD*: standard deviation

190

191 There were also major differences between countries when examining the degree of

192 implementation of the CHI which measured all eight containment and closure NPIs and eight

193 health system NPIs. In Rwanda, the overall average score for the CHI was 58.5 (SD = 25.3,

194 median=71.4) (Table 3a). In contrast, the average scores in Nigeria and Zambia were 38.3 (SD =

195 32.2, median=16.7) and 31.1 (SD = 20.8, median=40.5), indicating lower stringency and levels of

196 implementation compared to Rwanda. When looking at differences in implementation between

197 case windows, there were significant differences between the CHI scores across case windows in

198 Nigeria indicating varying levels of implementation between the case windows. By comparison,

199 in Rwanda, the mean containment and health index scores in case windows W<sub>1</sub> (CHI=65.3) and

200 W<sub>3</sub> (CHI=68.7) were significantly different (p<0.001) compared to W<sub>2</sub> (CHI=74.7). However,

201 there was no difference between the mean CHI scores in W<sub>1</sub> and W<sub>3</sub>, indicating that the

202 implementation of measures calculated in the CHI were similar during W<sub>1</sub> and W<sub>3</sub>. Lastly, in

203 Zambia, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean containment and health

204 index scores in case windows W<sub>1</sub> (CHI=41.7), W<sub>2</sub> (CHI=47.8), and W<sub>3</sub> (CHI=45.3). However,

205 there was no difference in the mean containment and health index scores between W<sub>1</sub> and W<sub>2</sub>

206 compared to  $W_3$  ( $p>0.05$ ), which again indicates similar implementation of the measures calculated  
 207 in the containment and health index during  $W_1$ ,  $W_2$ , and  $W_3$ .

**Table 3a. One-Way Analysis of Variance of the Containment and Health Index by Case Window, Nigeria**

Case Window	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Tukey's Post-hoc Comparisons			
				$W_0$	$W_1$	$W_2$	$W_3$
<b>Pooled</b>	152	38.3	32.2	-	-	-	-
<b><math>W_0</math></b>	58	5.1	4.4		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
<b><math>W_1</math></b>	30	26.5	13.8	<0.0001		<0.0001	<0.0001
<b><math>W_2</math></b>	26	70.5	1.0	<0.0001	<0.0001		0.0065
<b><math>W_3</math></b>	38	76.1	0.4	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.0065	

Note:  $W_0$ : 0 cases,  $W_1$ : 1-100+ cases,  $W_2$ : >101-1,000+ cases,  $W_3$ : >1,001-10,000+ cases  
*n*: number of days, *SD*: standard deviation

208

**Table 3b. One-Way Analysis of Variance of the Containment and Health Index by Case Window, Rwanda**

Case Window	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Tukey's HSD Comparisons			
				$W_0$	$W_1$	$W_2$	$W_3$
<b>Pooled</b>	379	58.5	25.3	-	-	-	-
<b><math>W_0</math></b>	73	9.7	8.0		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
<b><math>W_1</math></b>	21	65.3	21.0	<0.0001		<0.0001	0.24
<b><math>W_2</math></b>	86	74.7	4.6	<0.0001	<0.0001		<0.0001
<b><math>W_3</math></b>	199	68.7	6.2	<0.0001	0.24	<0.0001	

Note:  $W_0$ : 0 cases,  $W_1$ : 1-100+ cases,  $W_2$ : >101-1,000+ cases,  $W_3$ : >1,001-10,000+ cases  
*n*: number of days, *SD*: standard deviation

209

**Table 3c. One-Way Analysis of Variance of the Containment and Health Index by Case Window, Zambia**

Case Window	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Tukey's HSD Comparisons			
				$W_0$	$W_1$	$W_2$	$W_3$
<b>Pooled</b>	232	31.1	20.8	-	-	-	-
<b><math>W_0</math></b>	77	3.6	5.1		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
<b><math>W_1</math></b>	43	41.7	13.7	<0.0001		0.005	0.05
<b><math>W_2</math></b>	27	47.8	7.8	<0.0001	0.005		0.43
<b><math>W_3</math></b>	85	45.3	3.3	<0.0001	0.05	0.43	

Note:  $W_0$ : 0 cases,  $W_1$ : 1-100+ cases,  $W_2$ : >101-1,000+ cases,  $W_3$ : >1,001-10,000+ cases  
*n*: number of days, *SD*: standard deviation

210

## 211 **Qualitative Findings**

212 A total of ten (n=10) KIIs were conducted. Interviewees represented different agencies  
213 involved in the response including Ministries of Health, WHO AFRO, academic institutions, and  
214 non-governmental organizations. Several themes emerged regarding challenges in implementing  
215 NPIs from participants. The socioeconomic impact of the NPIs was a major theme. Other  
216 challenges included lack of adherence and compliance to measures and perceived severity of  
217 COVID-19 by the community. Several notable sub-themes were also identified. These are  
218 discussed below in more detail, along with illustrative statements

219 Nearly all participants commented on the economic hardships that certain NPIs such as  
220 lockdowns and business closures have created.

221 *“... overall, the economy was affected, when businesses were closed, everywhere was*  
222 *closed, the economy was affected. Like we said earlier, there was also impact in accessing*  
223 *the services by the general population because of the movement restrictions. So, there are*  
224 *some of the things that were negatively impacted and has put the countries in a tight corner*  
225 *and made them start re-opening the economy and lifting some of those measures.” –*  
226 *Participant 1, WHO AFRO*

227  
228 *“Businesses really suffered. All nightclubs are completely shut down now, they’re*  
229 *completely out of the picture. Many restaurants shut down. And right after the lockdown*  
230 *was lifted, restaurants became very expensive. They had to compensate for the last one full*  
231 *year. That has been a challenge.” – Participant 3, Rwanda*

232  
233 Social determinants of health such as poverty, lack of access to water, overcrowding, and food  
234 insecurity were major sub-themes that emerged. Poverty was mentioned by nearly all participants  
235 as a major challenge in both implementation and adherence to NPIs.

236 *“...the challenges have been number one poverty. There are several people in Africa,*  
237 *Rwanda included, that depend on day-to-day wages. Take the earnings of motorcycle*  
238 *drivers, taxi drivers, day-laborers, farmers. Quarantine for them has been a huge, huge*  
239 *blow, a huge blow. Vis-a-vi other African countries did not implement quarantine. I think*  
240 *it was only Uganda and Kenya that did so. So that has been a big challenge.” – Participant*  
241 *3, Rwanda*

242

243 *“And then you also want to look at the fact that when you tell me wash your hands, and*  
244 *there’s no running water in your area, how are you going to wash your hands? Or when*  
245 *you say keep a safe distance and then you have a family of 6 living in a room, how are they*  
246 *going to keep a safe distance? And you have the whole block of single room apartments*  
247 *which is packed with so many people. Or in the marketplace, how do you keep distance in*  
248 *the market? So, some of the non-pharmaceutical interventions were not implementable*  
249 *because of the environment we are in.” – Participant 1, WHO AFRO*  
250

251 An additional theme was perceived severity of disease. Several noted that media outlets, especially  
252 in the West, had emphasized that when COVID-19 reached Africa, it would create complete  
253 catastrophe. When this was not the case in the first and second wave, KII participants noted that  
254 citizens did not perceive COVID-19 to be a major threat and did not find the strict measures to be  
255 justified. KII participants mentioned that this view was further intensified by misinformation, and,  
256 in the case of Nigeria, major distrust in the government.

257 *“First of all, I’m sad to say that the major challenge was the people didn’t trust the*  
258 *government. Two, they didn’t believe there was COVID because people were not dying*  
259 *because the wrong impression was created that when COVID came to Africa it was going*  
260 *to kill everybody, and so when they didn’t see any dead bodies then they just assumed that*  
261 *there was no COVID. And there was a lot of fake information and things about COVID,*  
262 *which people took as truth.” – Participant 1, Nigeria*  
263

264 *“...the number one challenge is the people’s perception of the disease itself because despite*  
265 *all the government did to make people understand how the disease is caught, you will hear*  
266 *people say it is a scam, that it is an attempt for government to just make money out of*  
267 *donors, that there’s no such disease as COVID... there was buy-in initially but because of*  
268 *these fear...the fear that the government cannot be trusted, because people think they had*  
269 *what they call “hidden agenda.” – Participant 2, Nigeria*  
270

271 Lack of compliance and adherence to NPIs was also a major theme that emerged. In Zambia, the  
272 pandemic also coincided with a particularly tense election year, which brought its own challenges  
273 in terms of adherence to measures.

274 *“... it’s been an election year for Zambia. This is unique to us so we had political*  
275 *gatherings that I think needed time...they didn’t really adhere to us under our*  
276 *recommendations, or they said in principle they would accept that, and then just went*  
277 *ahead and did whatever they wanted to do. So, it was rather a challenging time. And we*  
278 *had large gatherings, political gatherings, that was a big challenge for us to manage*

279 *adherence to COVID-19 regulations, as well as ensure that there is a democratic electoral*  
280 *process running side by side.” – Participant 1, Zambia*

281  
282 Enforcement was a common theme among participants. In Rwanda, enforcement was mentioned  
283 as a success several times, and it was attributed to both the malleability of the Rwandese people  
284 as a population that respects its government and strict enforcement by the government.

285 *“Rwandans obey the rule of law. Obey their government. If there’s a policy, it’s respected,*  
286 *generally. Even without an enforcer, without the involvement of the police, of law*  
287 *enforcement, it is generally accepted. That’s the main thing. The second thing is they’re*  
288 *very strict. Walking without a mask is I think \$30. I’ve seen several people getting penalized*  
289 *right in front of my eyes in Kigali. So, they don’t joke around. If you are caught past the*  
290 *curfew, you will be taken to the national stadium, you’ll be kept there throughout the*  
291 *night—that’s punishment in addition to \$100 payment.” – Participant 3, Rwanda*

292  
293 *“Like everyone had to be home at 7pm. Right now, the time is 7:45pm and if you go on the*  
294 *road, you won’t find anybody. Just that move of respecting the guidelines and the level of*  
295 *cooperation is why I think we’re successful.” – Participant 1, Rwanda*  
296

297 *“...the enforcement piece I could say that there were radio talks about any of the measures*  
298 *that were put in place by the government and local entities were in charge of making sure*  
299 *these measures are respected by the general population.” – Participant 2, Rwanda*

300  
301 Whereas enforcement was a success in Rwanda, enforcement was a major challenge in Nigeria  
302 and Zambia. KII participants noted that the length and protracted nature of the response have had  
303 major consequences in terms of compliance and adherence to several public health and social  
304 measures that were being implemented at various points throughout the pandemic, not only by the  
305 community but some KIIs mentioned government figures themselves were not adhering to  
306 precisely the measures they were responsible for enforcing.

307 *“...there were not really [consequences for lack of adherence] ...well they put it there...but*  
308 *complying with the law and enforcing is one thing...on a few cases here and there they did.*  
309 *But it didn’t last. In about a week or two everybody had forgot, and they went back...even*  
310 *the guy who is supposed to be enforcing it is not wearing a mask \*laughs\*” – Participant*  
311 *1, Nigeria*

312  
313 *“For places of worship, they are now back to their old, crowded form despite the*  
314 *regulations. Because the latest law was no gathering of 50 or more people, but I was in*



315 *church on Sunday, and I think we were more than 2,000 in that gathering so that's how it*  
316 *is. So, there is no consistency or uniformity in the enforcement. Like every state or local*  
317 *government can do whatever they felt like implementing.” – Participant 2, Nigeria*

318  
319 *“...in some of the large density populations in the peri urban areas, if you went there, they*  
320 *would just see blatant disregard of the regulations despite posters being around or motor*  
321 *vehicles with the speakerphone going around announcing what to do. You would*  
322 *essentially see nobody wearing for instance a mask, and that just shows you the defiance*  
323 *levels people had, and because we didn't really have people going around arresting you*  
324 *for not putting on a mask for instance, so that was some of the challenges we saw.” –*  
325 *Participant 1, Zambia*

326  
327 In the opinion of KII participants, political structures and dynamics also played a factor as a barrier  
328 in the implementation of NPIs. In countries like Nigeria and Zambia, where there is a decentralized  
329 government, enforcement was much more difficult than in a country like Rwanda, which has a  
330 very centralized government.

331 *“Over time, there was no consistency in the enforcement and no uniformity between States.*  
332 *Some States tended to take it more seriously than other States. But on the part of the*  
333 *Federal Government of Nigeria, the government had been the one really wielding the big*  
334 *stick. The States were left to do what they felt like doing because at first when the [federal]*  
335 *government tried to send down regulations right from the country's capital, some State*  
336 *governments saw it as [an] affront to their own rights because the body governance and*  
337 *the president were elected so they didn't like the idea of a [federal] government official*  
338 *trying to decide what happens at the State level. So, the States were left to do what they*  
339 *wanted to do.” – Participant 2, Nigeria*

340  
341 *“It also depends on the political structure of the country. Nigeria is a very complex country*  
342 *where it has federal [territories] and states. The states have very much power in terms of*  
343 *dealing with the local issues, so the application and implementation of these measures at*  
344 *the local level was a little bit not much uniform in the country. Whereby in countries like*  
345 *Rwanda, it's most centralized, of course with good leadership, the implementation of these*  
346 *measures was very much uniform across the country.” – Participant 2, WHO AFRO*

## 347 348 **Discussion**

349 To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to focus on understanding the degree  
350 of implementation and facilitators and barriers to enforcement in sub-Saharan Africa. In the early  
351 stages of the pandemic, many countries in sub-Saharan Africa including Nigeria, Rwanda, and  
352 Zambia replicated NPIs, such as travel restrictions and shelter-in-place orders, as implemented by



353 Western countries in Europe and the United States. However, approaches that were effective in  
354 countries outside of Africa were not necessarily appropriate for the African region. Given the  
355 heterogeneity in populations, health systems, and governments in the region, blanket NPI measures  
356 such as restrictions on movement proved challenging to implement. Almost three-fourths (71%)  
357 of Africans work in the informal sector and thus encountered severe economic hardship with the  
358 enforcements of lockdowns and border closures (18,27,28). With the implementation of certain  
359 measures, some countries had food shortages, social unrest, and economic instability (18,19).  
360 Economic instability was felt across the African continent; however, Zambia became the first  
361 African country to default on its Eurobond national debt during the pandemic (29). The pandemic  
362 caused the Zambian economy to enter its deepest recession in history with the economy shrinking  
363 by 4.2% in 2020 (30–32). An assessment of the Zambian economy a year into the pandemic  
364 claimed that the “recession goes beyond the containment measures (which were moderate) and  
365 reflects vulnerabilities to external shocks and unfavorable internal macroeconomic decisions, with  
366 potential long-term implications” (33).

367         Additionally, as key informants noted, enforcement of NPIs was met with resistance and  
368 noncompliance in countries where governmental authority was weak or contested, or  
369 misinformation was high (34–37). Similarly, physical or social distancing measures were also  
370 difficult to enforce and implement. Aside from the high population density in many communities  
371 in Africa, social interaction is a key aspect of life. In urban areas in Africa, public transportation  
372 systems are often overcrowded, dense shanty towns and informal settlements are part of the  
373 physical infrastructure, and many people do not have the luxury to self-isolate even if they are  
374 positive, as many homes face overcrowding. For example, Makoko in Lagos, Nigeria has 300,000  
375 people whose homes are built on stilts in a lagoon (35). In rural areas, many households share

376 sanitation facilities and have only access to water from a communal tap. Ekumah et al. (2020) used  
377 demographic and health survey data from 25 countries in sub-Saharan Africa to explore how  
378 vulnerability to COVID-19 was affected by access to basic necessities (sanitation, water, and food)  
379 within a household (38). They found that 46% of sampled households (except South Africa) lacked  
380 access to any of these three basic necessities, and only 8% had access to all three (38). Thus,  
381 physical distancing measures, including shelter-in-place measures, were unrealistic in  
382 overcrowded areas with inadequate sanitation as pointed out by KIIs.

383 In addition to several long-term effects of implementing NPIs, timing plays a crucial role  
384 in the implementation of NPIs. Several KIIs including those at WHO AFRO pointed out early  
385 measures undertaken by countries. However, experts may find it challenging to determine the  
386 optimal time to implement different interventions. If governments wait too long, this may lead to  
387 the proliferation of disease at a rapid rate and overwhelm health systems quickly. Consequently,  
388 the roll-out of NPIs that are too premature or uniform across an entire country may also increase  
389 the risk of a “second wave” of infections once the initial measures are halted or pandemic fatigue  
390 sets in (39,40). The implementation of NPIs, especially over a prolonged time period, can have  
391 significant detrimental consequences in terms of social and economic costs as was the case in  
392 Nigeria, Rwanda, and Zambia. While NPIs are generally effective in reducing the burden of  
393 disease and alleviating pressure on health infrastructures, studies have found that a longer duration  
394 of NPI implementation may have consequences such as increased unemployment, economic  
395 hardship, and social disruption (11). Resource-poor settings are at an especially increased risk,  
396 with some data showing income reduction as great as 70% and reduction in consumption  
397 expenditure by 30% (11,41,42). The Africa Research, Implementation Science, and Education  
398 (ARISE) Network conducted a telephone survey in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, and Nigeria between

399 July and November 2020 to understand COVID-19 knowledge, attitudes, practices, and their  
400 impacts on health, nutrition, and education (43,44). The education sector was profoundly affected  
401 by school closures. Food shortages and insecurity were rampant across the three sites in the study.  
402 Consumption of a range of staple foods in all three countries declined, while the prices of staples,  
403 legumes, vegetables, fruit, and animal-source foods rose (43,45). Additionally, with increased  
404 unemployment and decreased crop production, respondents described reductions in general food  
405 intake and dietary diversity (43,45).

406 Compliance is also a major factor in NPI implementation. NPIs are dependent on  
407 enforcement and citizens' willingness to comply with the measure. Compliance generally wanes  
408 the longer measures are in effect (10). Poverty and economic dislocation also reduce compliance  
409 especially with NPIs focused on containment (i.e., shelter-in-place) which again was supported by  
410 KIIs in our study (46). In Rwanda, compliance with public health measures, including mask-  
411 wearing, was governed strictly by police and an anti-corona task force. Anecdotal reports detailed  
412 police pulling over cars with unmasked drivers and/or passengers, hand-washing stations and  
413 sanitizer dispensers were monitored for use before entering businesses, and arrests were made of  
414 those violating the country-wide curfew (47). The strictness with which measures were  
415 implemented in Rwanda was supported by claims made by KIIs. This was also supported by the  
416 quantitative data where the pooled average SI and CHI scores for Rwanda were much higher than  
417 that of Nigeria and Zambia. Additionally, despite a robust public information campaign to dispel  
418 misinformation, many residents in Nigeria did not initially adhere to the recommendations aimed  
419 at reducing the spread of COVID-19. This caused high tension between the civilians and armed  
420 forces who became violent when trying to enforce certain protocols (48,49). To enforce lockdown  
421 and curfew measures, policy, paramilitary, and military personnel were deployed to various areas

422 in the country. Among the challenges in this implementation were persistent corruption and  
423 political distrust (48,49). There were also multiple reports of unlawful use of force and misconduct  
424 of the Nigerian police while enforcing COVID-19 measures (50,51). Implementation and  
425 enforcement were marred by a lack of compliance from the public, which limited the outcomes of  
426 the government response to COVID-19. An article in The Guardian described Nigerians defying  
427 the stay-at-home orders which some attributed to distrust in the government and rising reports of  
428 hunger (34). There were also reports of security operatives being susceptible to bribes from those  
429 choosing to defy lockdown measures (48). This weakened the impact of travel restrictions and  
430 lockdown measures on the slowing down of COVID-19 in the country which was also supported  
431 by KIIs.

432         The study has several limitations. First, given the fluidity of the COVID-19 pandemic and  
433 the time it took each of the three countries to get there, external factors such as variants, holiday  
434 season, etc., could have affected the degree of implementation. For example, Nigeria reached  
435 10,000 cases in May 2020 while Rwanda reached that point in January 2021. The state of the  
436 pandemic and global guidance had changed significantly in between that time. There are also  
437 specific limitations in the OxCGRT dataset itself. The dataset does not measure implementation  
438 or compliance, nor does it provide subnational measures for almost all countries apart from adding  
439 a flag denoting whether the restriction was national or subnational (25). Thus, our nation-focused  
440 analysis may miss some variation of policies implemented at the sub-national level. Additionally,  
441 our sample size of KIIs is relatively small, therefore there may be other diverse opinions about  
442 what worked and what did not during NPI implementation, that were not captured here.

443         During pandemics, apart from effective vaccine strategies, NPIs are one of the most  
444 important tools that individuals and communities can utilize to limit disease spread and reduce

445 deaths. In addition, the timing of NPI implementation is crucial. Delayed implementation of NPIs  
446 will lead to unchecked proliferation of disease in the community and overwhelm health systems  
447 (4,8,39). However, in addition to timing, the success of NPIs depends critically on the fidelity of  
448 implementation and the willingness of individuals to comply with the NPIs (52–55). Careful  
449 consideration of tailored NPI measures for the specific community context may lead to less  
450 resistance and improved compliance.

## 451 References

- 452 1. Aledort JE, Lurie N, Wasserman J, Bozzette SA. Non-pharmaceutical public health  
453 interventions for pandemic influenza: an evaluation of the evidence base. *BMC Public*  
454 *Health* [Internet]. 2007 Aug 15 [cited 2021 Jul 27];7(1):208. Available from:  
455 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-7-208>
- 456 2. Institute of Medicine (US) Forum on Microbial Threats. Strategies for Disease Containment  
457 [Internet]. Ethical and Legal Considerations in Mitigating Pandemic Disease: Workshop  
458 Summary. National Academies Press (US); 2007 [cited 2020 Apr 16]. Available from:  
459 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK54163/>
- 460 3. Markel H, Lipman HB, Navarro JA, Sloan A, Michalsen JR, Stern AM, et al.  
461 Nonpharmaceutical Interventions Implemented by US Cities During the 1918-1919  
462 Influenza Pandemic. *JAMA*. 2007 Aug 8;298(6):644–54.
- 463 4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Nonpharmaceutical Interventions (NPIs)  
464 [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2020 Apr 16]. Available from:  
465 <https://www.cdc.gov/nonpharmaceutical-interventions/index.html>
- 466 5. Bo Y, Guo C, Lin C, Zeng Y, Li HB, Zhang Y, et al. Effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical  
467 interventions on COVID-19 transmission in 190 countries from 23 January to 13 April  
468 2020. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2021 Jan 1;102:247–53.
- 469 6. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin H, Coupland H, Mellan T, et al. Report 13:  
470 Estimating the number of infections and the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on  
471 COVID-19 in 11 European countries [Internet]. 35. 2020 Mar [cited 2021 Jul 27]. Available  
472 from: <http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77731>
- 473 7. Lai S, Ruktanonchai NW, Zhou L, Prosper O, Luo W, Floyd JR, et al. Effect of non-  
474 pharmaceutical interventions for containing the COVID-19 outbreak in China [Internet].  
475 *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Mar [cited 2020 Apr 16]. Available from:  
476 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.03.20029843>
- 477 8. Banholzer N, Weenen E van, Lison A, Cenedese A, Seeliger A, Kratzwald B, et al.  
478 Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on the number of new infections  
479 with COVID-19 during the first epidemic wave. *PLOS ONE*. 2021 Jun 2;16(6):e0252827.
- 480 9. Hatchett RJ, Mecher CE, Lipsitch M. Public health interventions and epidemic intensity  
481 during the 1918 influenza pandemic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.  
482 2007;104(18):7582–7.
- 483 10. Briscese G, Lacetera N, Macis M, Tonin M. Compliance with COVID-19 social-distancing  
484 measures in Italy: the role of expectations and duration. 2020;
- 485 11. Chowdhury R, Heng K, Shawon MSR, Goh G, Okonofua D, Ochoa-Rosales C, et al.  
486 Dynamic interventions to control COVID-19 pandemic: a multivariate prediction modelling  
487 study comparing 16 worldwide countries. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2020 May 1;35(5):389–99.

- 488 12. Hallas L, Hatibie A, Majumdar S, Pyarali M, Hale T. Variation in US States' Responses to  
489 COVID-19. University of Oxford. 2021;
- 490 13. Akter S. The impact of COVID-19 related 'stay-at-home' restrictions on food prices in  
491 Europe: findings from a preliminary analysis. *Food Security*. 2020;12(4):719–25.
- 492 14. Cameron-Blake E, Tatlow H, Wood A, Hale T, Kira B, Petherick A, et al. Variation in the  
493 response to COVID-19 across the four nations of the United Kingdom. Blavatnik School of  
494 Government, University of Oxford. 2020;
- 495 15. Koh WC, Naing L, Wong J. Estimating the impact of physical distancing measures in  
496 containing COVID-19: an empirical analysis. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*.  
497 2020;100:42–9.
- 498 16. Africa Centres for Disease Control and Prevention. Recommendations for Stepwise  
499 response to COVID-19 [Internet]. 2020 Mar [cited 2020 Apr 18]. Available from:  
500 <https://africacdc.org/download/recommendations-for-stepwise-response-to-covid-19/>
- 501 17. Ohia C, Bakarey AS, Ahmad T. COVID-19 and Nigeria: putting the realities in context.  
502 *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020 Jun 1;95:279–81.
- 503 18. Lancet T. COVID-19 in Africa: no room for complacency. *Lancet* (London, England).  
504 2020;395(10238):1669.
- 505 19. Ihekweazu C, Agogo E. Africa's response to COVID-19. *BMC Med*. 2020 Dec;18(1):151.
- 506 20. Massinga Loembé M, Tshangela A, Salyer SJ, Varma JK, Ouma AEO, Nkengasong JN.  
507 COVID-19 in Africa: the spread and response. *Nat Med*. 2020 Jul;26(7):999–1003.
- 508 21. Frank Hartwich, Massoud Hedeshi. COVID-19 effects in sub-Saharan Africa and what  
509 local industry and governments can do | UNIDO [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Sep 10].  
510 Available from: <https://www.unido.org/news/covid-19-effects-sub-saharan-africa-and-what-local-industry-and-governments-can-do>  
511
- 512 22. Glaser BG, Strauss AL. *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*.  
513 Routledge; 2017.
- 514 23. QSR International. NVivo qualitative data analysis software. NVivo Release 1: QSR  
515 international Pty ltd. 2021.
- 516 24. Miller M. 2019 Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 (2019-nCoV) Data Repository: Johns  
517 Hopkins University Center for Systems Science and Engineering. *Bulletin-Association of*  
518 *Canadian Map Libraries and Archives* (ACMLA). 2020;(164):47–51.
- 519 25. Hale T, Angrist N, Goldszmidt R, Kira B, Petherick A, Phillips T, et al. A global panel  
520 database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). *Nat*  
521 *Hum Behav*. 2021 Apr;5(4):529–38.



- 522 26. SAS Institute. SAS University Edition [Internet]. Cary, NC; 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 9].  
523 Available from: <https://support.sas.com/en/software/university-edition-support.html>
- 524 27. Abdalla S, Galea S. Africa and Coronavirus—Will Lockdowns Work? | Think Global  
525 Health [Internet]. Council on Foreign Relations. 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 16]. Available from:  
526 <https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/africa-and-coronavirus-will-lockdowns-work>
- 527 28. Nina Sun, Livio Zilli. COVID-19 Symposium: The Use of Criminal Sanctions in COVID-  
528 19 Responses – Enforcement of Public Health Measures, Part II [Internet]. Opinio Juris.  
529 2020 [cited 2021 Sep 7]. Available from: [http://opiniojuris.org/2020/04/03/covid-19-](http://opiniojuris.org/2020/04/03/covid-19-symposium-the-use-of-criminal-sanctions-in-covid-19-responses-enforcement-of-public-health-measures-part-ii/)  
530 [symposium-the-use-of-criminal-sanctions-in-covid-19-responses-enforcement-of-public-](http://opiniojuris.org/2020/04/03/covid-19-symposium-the-use-of-criminal-sanctions-in-covid-19-responses-enforcement-of-public-health-measures-part-ii/)  
531 [health-measures-part-ii/](http://opiniojuris.org/2020/04/03/covid-19-symposium-the-use-of-criminal-sanctions-in-covid-19-responses-enforcement-of-public-health-measures-part-ii/)
- 532 29. Smith E. Zambia becomes Africa’s first coronavirus-era default: What happens now?  
533 [Internet]. CNBC. 2020 [cited 2021 Oct 7]. Available from:  
534 [https://www.cnbc.com/2020/11/23/zambia-becomes-africas-first-coronavirus-era-default-](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/11/23/zambia-becomes-africas-first-coronavirus-era-default-what-happens-now.html)  
535 [what-happens-now.html](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/11/23/zambia-becomes-africas-first-coronavirus-era-default-what-happens-now.html)
- 536 30. KPMG. Zambia - KPMG Global [Internet]. KPMG. 2020 [cited 2021 Sep 28]. Available  
537 from: [https://home.kpmg/xx/en/home/insights/2020/04/zambia-government-and-institution-](https://home.kpmg/xx/en/home/insights/2020/04/zambia-government-and-institution-measures-in-response-to-covid.html)  
538 [measures-in-response-to-covid.html](https://home.kpmg/xx/en/home/insights/2020/04/zambia-government-and-institution-measures-in-response-to-covid.html)
- 539 31. Ernst & Young. Zambia issues additional fiscal measures to mitigate the impact of COVID-  
540 19 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Sep 28]. Available from:  
541 [https://taxnews.ey.com/news/2020-11-13-zambia-issues-additional-fiscal-measures-to-](https://taxnews.ey.com/news/2020-11-13-zambia-issues-additional-fiscal-measures-to-mitigate-the-impact-of-covid-19?uAlertID=Sd%2FG8rua1oj6%2F158EZ2AiA%3D%3D)  
542 [mitigate-the-impact-of-covid-19?uAlertID=Sd%2FG8rua1oj6%2F158EZ2AiA%3D%3D](https://taxnews.ey.com/news/2020-11-13-zambia-issues-additional-fiscal-measures-to-mitigate-the-impact-of-covid-19?uAlertID=Sd%2FG8rua1oj6%2F158EZ2AiA%3D%3D)
- 543 32. Zeidy IA. Fiscal Policy Responses Limit COVID 19’s Economic Damage. 2020;18.
- 544 33. Twivwe Siwale. One year on: Zambian economy during COVID-19 [Internet]. International  
545 Growth Centre. 2021 [cited 2021 Sep 28]. Available from:  
546 <https://www.theigc.org/blog/one-year-on-zambian-economy-during-covid-19/>
- 547 34. Maria Diamond, Adetayo Adeowo, Onyinye Ezeilo. Hunger obeys no order, say Nigerians  
548 defying stay-at-home directive. The Guardian Nigeria News - Nigeria and World News  
549 [Internet]. 2020 Apr 25 [cited 2021 Aug 24]; Available from: [https://guardian.ng/saturday-](https://guardian.ng/saturday-magazine/covid-19-lockdown-hunger-obeys-no-order-say-nigerians-defying-stay-at-home-directive/)  
550 [magazine/covid-19-lockdown-hunger-obeys-no-order-say-nigerians-defying-stay-at-home-](https://guardian.ng/saturday-magazine/covid-19-lockdown-hunger-obeys-no-order-say-nigerians-defying-stay-at-home-directive/)  
551 [directive/](https://guardian.ng/saturday-magazine/covid-19-lockdown-hunger-obeys-no-order-say-nigerians-defying-stay-at-home-directive/)
- 552 35. Noko K. In Africa, social distancing is a privilege few can afford [Internet]. [cited 2021 Sep  
553 10]. Available from: [https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2020/3/22/in-africa-social-](https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2020/3/22/in-africa-social-distancing-is-a-privilege-few-can-afford)  
554 [distancing-is-a-privilege-few-can-afford](https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2020/3/22/in-africa-social-distancing-is-a-privilege-few-can-afford)
- 555 36. Verani A, Clodfelter C, Menon AN, Chevinsky J, Victory K, Hakim A. Social distancing  
556 policies in 22 African countries during the COVID-19 pandemic: a desk review. Pan Afr  
557 Med J. 2020 Dec 14;37(Suppl 1):46.



- 558 37. Isabel Gunther. Why social distancing is a big challenge in many African countries  
559 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Sep 10]. Available from: [https://phys.org/news/2020-04-social-](https://phys.org/news/2020-04-social-distancing-big-african-countries.html)  
560 [distancing-big-african-countries.html](https://phys.org/news/2020-04-social-distancing-big-african-countries.html)
- 561 38. Ekumah B, Armah FA, Yawson DO, Quansah R, Nyieku FE, Owusu SA, et al. Disparate  
562 on-site access to water, sanitation, and food storage heighten the risk of COVID-19 spread  
563 in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Environ Res*. 2020 Oct;189:109936.
- 564 39. Sebhatu A, Wennberg K, Arora-Jonsson S, Lindberg SI. Explaining the homogeneous  
565 diffusion of COVID-19 nonpharmaceutical interventions across heterogeneous countries.  
566 *PNAS* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 1 [cited 2021 Jul 27];117(35):21201–8. Available from:  
567 <https://www.pnas.org/content/117/35/21201>
- 568 40. Davies NG, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Gimma A, Edmunds WJ, Jombart T, et al. Effects of  
569 non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths, and demand for hospital  
570 services in the UK: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5(7):e375–85.
- 571 41. Lora Jones, Daniele Palumbo, David Brown. Coronavirus: How the pandemic has changed  
572 the world economy - BBC News [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Sep 7]. Available from:  
573 <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-51706225>
- 574 42. Lora Jones, David Brown, Daniele Palumbo. Coronavirus: A visual guide to the economic  
575 impact - BBC News [Internet]. Diplomatic Academy. 2020 [cited 2021 Sep 7]. Available  
576 from: [https://www.unic.ac.cy/da/2020/05/08/coronavirus-a-visual-guide-to-the-economic-](https://www.unic.ac.cy/da/2020/05/08/coronavirus-a-visual-guide-to-the-economic-impact-bbc-news/)  
577 [impact-bbc-news/](https://www.unic.ac.cy/da/2020/05/08/coronavirus-a-visual-guide-to-the-economic-impact-bbc-news/)
- 578 43. Hamer DH. Short-term and Potentially Long-term Negative Impacts of COVID-19 in Sub-  
579 Saharan Africa: Evidence from the Africa Research, Implementation Science, and  
580 Education Network Rapid Monitoring Survey. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine*  
581 *and Hygiene*. 2021 Aug 11;105(2):269–70.
- 582 44. Hemler EC, Korte ML, Lankoande B, Millogo O, Assefa N, Chukwu A, et al. Design and  
583 Field Methods of the ARISE Network COVID-19 Rapid Monitoring Survey. *The American*  
584 *Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2021 Aug 11;105(2):310–22.
- 585 45. Madzorera I, Ismail A, Hemler EC, Korte ML, Olufemi AA, Wang D, et al. Impact of  
586 COVID-19 on Nutrition, Food Security, and Dietary Diversity and Quality in Burkina Faso,  
587 Ethiopia and Nigeria. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2021 Jun 23;tpmd201617.
- 588 46. Wright AL, Sonin K, Driscoll J, Wilson J. Poverty and economic dislocation reduce  
589 compliance with COVID-19 shelter-in-place protocols. *Journal of Economic Behavior &*  
590 *Organization*. 2020;180:544–54.
- 591 47. Bethany Murphy. Safer in Rwanda: Other Countries Are Taking COVID-19 Seriously, and  
592 It Shows - Ms. Magazine [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Sep 22]. Available from:  
593 [https://msmagazine.com/2020/10/29/safer-in-rwanda-other-countries-are-taking-covid-19-](https://msmagazine.com/2020/10/29/safer-in-rwanda-other-countries-are-taking-covid-19-seriously-and-it-shows/)  
594 [seriously-and-it-shows/](https://msmagazine.com/2020/10/29/safer-in-rwanda-other-countries-are-taking-covid-19-seriously-and-it-shows/)

- 595 48. Okolie-Osemene J. Nigeria's Security Governance Dilemmas During the Covid-19 Crisis.  
596 *Politikon*. 2021 Apr 3;48(2):260–77.
- 597 49. Ezeibe CC, Ilo C, Ezeibe EN, Oguonu CN, Nwankwo NA, Ajaero CK, et al. Political  
598 distrust and the spread of COVID-19 in Nigeria. *Global Public Health*. 2020 Dec  
599 1;15(12):1753–66.
- 600 50. Philip Obaji Jr. Women 'abused' by police enforcing COVID-19 rules in Nigeria [Internet].  
601 2020 [cited 2021 Oct 13]. Available from:  
602 [https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2020/9/9/women-abused-by-police-enforcing-covid-19-](https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2020/9/9/women-abused-by-police-enforcing-covid-19-rules-in-nigeria)  
603 [rules-in-nigeria](https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2020/9/9/women-abused-by-police-enforcing-covid-19-rules-in-nigeria)
- 604 51. Aborisade RA. Accounts of Unlawful Use of Force and Misconduct of the Nigerian Police  
605 in the Enforcement of COVID-19 Measures. *J Police Crim Psych*. 2021 Sep 1;36(3):450–  
606 62.
- 607 52. Yapi RB, Hounbedji CA, N'Guessan DKG, Dindé AO, Sanhoun AR, Amin A, et al.  
608 Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) Regarding the COVID-19 Outbreak in Côte  
609 d'Ivoire: Understanding the Non-Compliance of Populations with Non-Pharmaceutical  
610 Interventions. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2021  
611 Jan;18(9):4757.
- 612 53. Fellows IE, Slayton RB, Hakim AJ. The COVID-19 Pandemic, Community Mobility and  
613 the Effectiveness of Non-pharmaceutical Interventions: The United States of America,  
614 February to May 2020. arXiv:200712644 [q-bio, stat] [Internet]. 2020 Jul 9 [cited 2021 Jul  
615 27]; Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2007.12644>
- 616 54. Harling G, Gómez-Olivé FX, Tlouyamma J, Mutevedzi T, Kabudula CW, Mahlako R, et al.  
617 Protective behaviours and secondary harms from non-pharmaceutical interventions during  
618 the COVID-19 epidemic in South Africa: a multisite prospective longitudinal study.  
619 medRxiv [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jul 27]; Available from:  
620 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7668759/>
- 621 55. Kantor BN, Kantor J. Non-pharmaceutical Interventions for Pandemic COVID-19: A  
622 Cross-Sectional Investigation of US General Public Beliefs, Attitudes, and Actions.  
623 *Frontiers in Medicine*. 2020;7:384.
- 624