

1 **Household food insecurity, living conditions, and individual sense of security among**
2 **Burkina Faso refugees in Ghana: a cross-sectional survey using in-person data collection**

3 Abdul-Wahab Inusah¹, Ken Brackstone², Michael Head^{2,3,4*}, Tahiru Issahaku Ahmed⁵, David
4 Tetteh Nartey¹, Shamsu-Deen Ziblim⁶

5

6 ¹JSI Research & Training Institute, INC. Takoradi, Ghana

7 ²Clinical Informatics Research Unit, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

8 ³School of Medicine, University for Development Studies, Northern Region, Ghana

9 ⁴F.N. Binka School of Public Health, University of Health and Allied Sciences, Hohoe, Volta
10 Region, Ghana

11 ⁵Bawku West District Assembly, Upper-East region, Bolgatanga, Ghana

12 ⁶Directorate of Academic Planning & Quality Assurance (DAPQA) University for Development
13 Studies, Tamale, Ghana

14

15 *Correspondence author – Michael Head, m.head@soton.ac.uk

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Abstract

24 Food insecurity and adequate nutrition is a major global challenge, especially in vulnerable groups
25 such as refugee communities. In West Africa, due to conflict and instability in their home country,
26 thousands of Burkina Faso refugees have crossed the border into northern Ghana. We conducted
27 a cross-sectional study aimed at assessing household food insecurity, living conditions, and sense
28 of security among Burkina Faso refugees currently residing in the upper east region of Ghana.
29 Study data was collected from 19-29 October 2022 from 498 refugee households. Results revealed
30 that almost 100% of households experienced food insecurity, with 80.3% experiencing severe food
31 insecurity. Refugees from rural areas were more food secure compared to urban refugees. Refugees
32 residing in host communities experienced lesser food insecurity than those in designated refugee
33 camps. Further, refugees who were dissatisfied with the size of their accommodation were more
34 likely to experience food insecurity. More than half of the refugees felt safe and welcomed by the
35 host communities. The study underscores the critical need for targeted intervention to avert hunger
36 and malnutrition among vulnerable groups such as children, pregnant women, and the aged in the
37 refugee population. The study also emphasizes the importance of community support systems and
38 social amenities for refugees' well-being. Long-term measures should include improving logistics
39 for food distribution, providing suitable accommodation, and strengthening healthcare services.
40 Follow-up research, such as repeated community surveys, can track this evolving situation to
41 continuously inform decision-making for refugee support.

42

43 **Key Words:** Household food insecurity, Burkina Faso refugees, Food security, Living

44 conditions.

45

46

47

48 **Introduction**

49 Food insecurity leads to malnutrition, which negatively impacts upon all individuals, but
50 can have a devastating effect on more vulnerable groups such as young children and pregnant
51 women (1,2). The UN estimates that 735 million people, around 9% of the world's population,
52 are experiencing hunger and food insecurity, with increases in the prevalence of
53 undernourishment observed in sub-Saharan Africa(3). The Global Nutrition Report highlights
54 that no African country is on track to meet any diet-related non-communicable disease targets.
55 This makes it challenging, if not impossible, to achieving the SDG target to eradicate hunger by
56 2023(4).

57

58 Globally, approximately 26 million people are currently refugees with close to 80% of this
59 population experiencing food insecurity regardless of location (1). Refugees often flee from
60 armed conflict. Violence can directly lead to food insecurity and malnutrition by obliterating
61 food systems, reducing farming labour, and destroying transport systems, thus leading to a
62 reduction in community resilience (5–7).

63 Burkina Faso is in West Africa, with an estimated population of 22.1m. It is a landlocked
64 nation bordering several other countries, including Ghana to the south. Since 2015, Burkina Faso
65 has witnessed several waves of armed conflicts emanating from non-state armed groups whose
66 aims are to instrumentalize communal tensions and exploit the vulnerability of an already fragile
67 population. This has resulted in a displacement surge among its citizens [1]. Reports from
68 UNICEF indicate that Burkina Faso recorded 488 armed attacks with 144 people killed in the
69 first quarter of 2022 (8). As a result of this conflict, the number of internally displaced persons

70 (IDP) has risen to over 1.8 million, with 61% of the group being children (9). The ongoing
71 instability and violence means that there are declining crop yields, with a continued rise in prices
72 of goods and services (8). As a result, around 13 million people are faced with food insecurity,
73 and one-third are malnourished children aged under 5 years old (10).

74 The insecurity situation in the country has resulted in 179 healthcare centres being closed
75 in the hardest hit regions, with 353 healthcare centres operating at suboptimal levels. These
76 closures have denied over 2 million citizens access to health care (8). A significant proportion of
77 population now have little access to basic social amenities such as water, food, shelter,
78 education, and healthcare, with many people considering that their best option is to flee to
79 neighboring countries. As of February 2023, Ghana hosted 13,500 refugees, of which 4000 of
80 these were Burkina Faso citizens seeking asylum (11). These numbers continued to increase
81 across 2022 and 2023, particularly within the Upper East region of Ghana, which directly
82 borders Burkina Faso (8). The care of these refugees is the sole responsibility of the Ghanaian
83 local and national authorities and is supported by international humanitarian agencies such as
84 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Their arrival has not only resulted
85 in increased pressure on Ghanaian and international agencies to provide humanitarian needs for
86 these refugees, but also places excess pressure on social amenities in their host communities.

87 This study was conducted to assess the health, social, and economic needs of these
88 refugees in the Upper East region of Ghana, with a specific focus on food insecurity and the
89 living conditions among this population. We aimed to explore and understand predictors of food
90 insecurity, and to describe some of the key characteristics of this vulnerable group.

91

92 **Methods**

93 **Study design and settings.** A community-based cross-sectional study was implemented in
94 Ghana using in-person data collection from household heads of identified refugees (supplementary
95 S1). Data was collected in the rural districts of Binduri District, Bawku Municipal, and Bawku
96 West, situated within the Upper East region of Ghana (Figure 1), where the majority of displaced
97 people are located. The region contains 15 administrative districts with a population of 1,301,226
98 (12), and a total landmass of 8,842sq/km constituting 2.7% of the country's land size (13). The
99 regional capital is Bolgatanga, approximately 60-100km west of the study sites. Upper East region
100 shares international borders in the north with Burkina Faso, and in the east with Togo (13). The
101 location of the region exposes it to a lot of cross-border activities with neighbouring migrants and
102 traders from Burkina Faso and Mali, Togo and Niger using it as transmit point into Ghana.

103

104 ***Fig 1.** Map showing the regions of Ghana, Upper-East region, and the municipals with refugee*
105 *communities. Image created in QGis Version 3.28.1 by author Abdul-Wahab Inusah.*

106

107 **Study population and sample size determination**

108 All consenting adult heads of refugee households in the host communities were eligible
109 participants. Start and end dates of data collection was 11-21 October 2022. Sample size was
110 calculated using a single population proportion formula with an assumption of 50% population
111 proportion ($p = 0.5$) due to the unknown population size. With a 95% confidence level, a 5%
112 margin of error, and a normal population distribution $Z = 1.96$, we adjusted for a 5% non-
113 response rate. This provided an estimated sample size of 400.

114

115 **Sampling technique and sampling procedures**

116 Using the list provided by the National Disaster Management Organization department of
117 all three administrative districts, the number of participants studied in each district was
118 proportional to the total number of registered refugees in the district. The number of registered
119 refugees for each district was 1072 in Binduri District (64%), 495 in Bawku Municipal (29%)
120 and 112 in Bawku West district (7%), which totalled 1679 individuals. Since the calculated
121 sample size for the study was 400, the number of participants for each district was 256 for
122 Binduri district, 116 for Bawku Municipal, and 28 for Bawku West district. A purposive
123 sampling technique was used to select only communities hosting Burkina Faso refugees. With
124 the help of the community refugee focal persons (persons appointed by the respective local
125 assemblies) who documented all refugees in the communities, we identified and contacted all
126 registered refugee households using the refugee register for each community. In each household,
127 the household head was our respondent. A household was revisited in the absence of the
128 household head. If that individual was still not available upon the second visit, the survey was
129 carried out with an individual nominated from the rest of the household members.

130

131 **Study variables**

132 **Household food insecurity assessment**

133 We used the USAID household food insecurity assessment score (HFIAS) module (14),
134 which was used to assess household food insecurity over the previous 30 days. HFIAS consist of
135 9 questions grouped into 3 domains, including: (1) anxiety and uncertainty, (2) insufficient
136 quality, and (3) insufficient food intake and physical consequences. Participants responded “yes”
137 or “no” to each of the nine questions. Those who answered “yes” were further asked about the
138 frequency of the occurrence of the condition and the responses were “rarely”, “sometimes”, or

139 “often”. We summed the responses to the nine questions to get the HFIAS index. The minimum
140 score was 0 if the participant responded “no” to all the nine conditions and the maximum of 27 if
141 all the nine conditions were selected “yes”. A higher HFIAS score indicates greater food
142 household insecurity and a lower score indicates greater food security (14). Households were
143 finally categorized into secure, mildly food insecure, moderately food insecure, and severely
144 food insecure consistent with the HFIAS score (14).

145 **Living condition variables.** Participants were asked about their current accommodation,
146 and living conditions including whether they knew locals prior to arriving in the community, the
147 size of their accommodation facility, and presence of any social support for their household and
148 sources of these social support systems.

149 **Sense of security.** To measure the safety and sense of security among the study
150 participants, 4 questions were asked using the 5-point Likert scale (e.g., “Generally, I feel
151 satisfied with my current living conditions”; 1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). We
152 averaged the items to form a single index ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.99$, $\alpha = 0.68$).

153 **Sociodemographic variables.** These included: sex (male, female), age (continuous),
154 marital status (not married, married, separated/divorced, widowed), religious affiliation of the
155 household head (Christian, Muslim, Traditional, other), household size (number of people
156 sharing a common shelter), number of children under five in the household, and number of
157 household members pregnant.

158 **Data collection procedure and quality control.** Some of the questions were adapted
159 from an existing questionnaire used in 2022 with Ukrainian refugees and internally-displaced
160 persons by the same research team (15,16). The survey questions were uploaded to an Android
161 smartphone App (ODK). The tool was pretested in Nabdam, a neighbouring district among 20

162 refugees. These test responses were not included in the final analysis. All the necessary
163 adjustments, including skip logic, and age groupings were made before the main data collection
164 begins. Ten community health workers participated in a two-day data collection training
165 workshop, covering issues such as data collection, good research practice and the need for
166 explaining the study and obtaining informed consent. As we anticipated low literacy rates,
167 survey questions were verbally read out and the data collectors recorded their responses directly
168 onto the ODK app. The survey was written in English. A local dialect, Moshie, was used for
169 verbal translations and context.

170

171 **Data analysis techniques**

172 Stata version 15 was utilized in carrying out descriptive and inferential statistics for the
173 data. Descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation. A
174 reliability test was conducted for the 9 HFIAS and the 4 sense of security variables and a
175 Cronbach alpha value of 0.84 and 0.68 respectively were obtained. To assess determinants of
176 household food insecurity, a logistic regression analysis was conducted, and p-values of $< .05$
177 were considered statistically significant.

178

179 **Ethical consideration**

180 Ethical approval (UDS/RB/112/22) was obtained from the University for Development
181 Sciences Research and Ethics Review (Supplementary, S2). Separately, approval and community
182 entry was sought from the 3 district assemblies to carry out the study within their populations.
183 Informed written consent was obtained from all individuals before they participated in the study.

184

185 **Results**

186 In total, 498 participants completed the survey (Table 1), with a majority being female
187 (65.3%). The average age was 37.2 years ($SD = 16.2$, *Range* 18-98). Nearly 86.0% had no formal
188 education, 93.0% were affiliated to Islamic religion, and 90.0% indicated that their home
189 community was a rural area (Table 1). The mean household size was 5.97 people, with a mean of
190 1.42 children aged under 5 years per household. Finally, 5.5% of the female group indicated that
191 they were pregnant.

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202 **Table 1.** Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Burkina Faso Refugees in Ghana ($n = 498$)

Characteristics	Frequency(n)	Percentage (%)
Sex		
Female	325	65.3
Male	173	34.7
Age (Years)		

18-30yrs	227	45.6
31-40yrs	115	23.1
41-50yrs	45	9.0
50-60yrs	57	11.4
61yrs+	54	10.8
Marital status		
Never married	35	7.0
Divorced/widowed	70	14.1
Married	393	78.9
Religious affiliation		
Christian	29	5.8
Traditional	7	1.4
Islam	462	92.8
Educational level		
No formal education	426	85.5
Basic secondary school	63	12.7
Complete secondary school	9	1.8
Description of participants home community		
Countryside/rural	448	90.0
Urban/city	50	10.0
When did you arrive at your current location?		
1-7 days ago	9	1.8
2 weeks-1month ago	60	12.1

More than 1 month ago	429	86.1
-----------------------	-----	------

203

204 **Prevalence of household food insecurity among the study households**

205 Of the 498 households served, only 4 (0.8%) of households were defined as food secure,
 206 with 494 (99.2%) of households defined as experiencing mild to severe food insecurity (Table 2,
 207 Figure 2). Across the previous 4 weeks, 35% of households were often worried that their
 208 household did not have enough food, and approximately 38% of households were not able to eat
 209 the kind of food the household preferred. Results also show that 27.5% of households have a
 210 member/s who had to go through a whole day and night without eating anything because there
 211 was not enough food available.

212

213

214 **Table 2.** Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) components among households in the
 215 past 4 weeks

HHFS Items	Never Experienced	Rarely Experienced	Sometimes Experienced	Often Experienced
Q1 In the past four weeks, did you worry that your household would not have enough food?	36(7.2)	66(13.3)	224(45.0)	172(34.5)
Q2 In the past four weeks, were you or any household member not able to eat the kinds of foods you preferred because of a lack of resources?	36(7.2)	53(10.6)	221(44.4)	188(37.8)

Q3 In the past four weeks, did you or any household member have to eat a limited variety of foods due to a lack of resources?	19(3.8)	63(12.7)	259(52)	157(31.5)
Q4 In the past four weeks, did you or any household member have to eat some foods that you did not want to eat because of a lack of resources	18(3.6)	76(15.3)	232(46.6)	172(34.5)
Q5 In the past four weeks, did you or any household member have to eat a smaller meal than you felt you needed because there was not enough food?	15(3.0)	49(9.8)	265(53.2)	169(33.9)
Q6 In the past four weeks, did you or any other household member have to eat fewer meals in a day because there was not enough food?	56(11.2)	47(9.4)	226(45.4)	169(33.9)
Q7 In the past four weeks, was there ever no food to eat of any kind in your household because of a lack of resources to get food?	55(11.0)	62(12.4)	206(41.4)	175(35.1)
Q8 In the past four weeks, did you or any household member go to sleep at night hungry because there was not enough food?	42(8.4)	129(25.9)	165(33.1)	162(32.5)
Q9 In the past four weeks, did you or any household member go a whole day and night without eating anything because there was not enough food?	92(18.5)	99(19.9)	170(34.1)	137(27.5)

216

217

218

219 **Fig 2.** Overall prevalence of household food insecurity among the study population

220

221 **Determinants of household food insecurity**

222 From a simple linear logistic regression model, the sociodemographic variables were not
223 significant (Table 3). We therefore adjusted for only three significant variables, such as refugee
224 residents before migrating to their current location, refugees' current location in Ghana, and the
225 size of the accommodation facilities in the final multivariate logistic regression model. From the
226 model, rural refugee were negatively associated with food insecurity. That is, refugees from rural
227 areas were more food secure than those from cities or urban areas, $B = -4.25$ (CI: $-5.79 - -2.71$),
228 $p < .001$. Refugees currently staying with someone they knew, such as a relative or a friend in
229 the host community, reported lower food insecurity compared to those living in housing
230 specifically set up to house refugees, $B = -1.56$ (CI: $-2.74 - -0.39$), $p = .009$. Finally, lower
231 satisfaction with accommodation space was marginally associated with increased food insecurity
232 compared to those happy with the size of their accommodation space, $B = 2.96$ (CI: $-0.06 -$
233 2.47), $p = .060$. Results are displaced in Table 3.

234

235 **Table 3.** Multivariate logistic regression model of predictors of food insecurity among Burkina
236 Faso refugees in Ghana (n = 489)

Variable	B	t	P-value	[95% CI]
Resident before migrating to Ghana				

City/Town	Ref			
Countryside/rural	-4.25	-5.4	0.001*	-5.79 – -2.71
Current residence (Ghana)				
In housing specifically set up to house refugees or internally displaced people	Ref			
With a local person or people who have offered me accommodation	2.34	1.5	0.10	-0.35 – 2.43
With somebody I knew before, such as relatives or friends	-1.56	-2.6	0.009*	-2.74 – -0.39
With somebody with whom I was put in touch, for example, friends of friends	-0.53	-0.4	0.66	-2.92 – 1.86
How would you describe the size of your accommodation?				
Happy with the space I have currently	Ref			
Least happy with the space I have	1.2	1.8	0.06	-0.062 – 2.47

237

238 **Living conditions of the refugees.**

239 By accommodation status, 54.0% were living in housing specifically set up to house
 240 refugees, with 22.7% living with somebody they knew before migrating to Ghana, such as
 241 relatives or friends (Table 4). A further 19.5% were living in accommodation provided by a

242 member of the host community who was not previously known to the refugee participant. Most
243 females (69.1%) were living in housing specifically set up to house refugees (**Error! Reference**
244 **source not found.**). By living conditions, 84.1% of participants were least happy about their
245 current living conditions, with only 2.4% reporting being happy. In terms of support system, only
246 120 (24.1%) participants had received any welfare or housing payment to support their living
247 standards (Table 4). Of the 120 participants who received financial support, most had received
248 support from more than one source, with 94.2% receiving welfare payments from the Ghanaian
249 Government, and 85.0% from international agencies such as UNICEF and UNHCR as their
250 source of welfare payments (Figure 3). Overall, 76.0% of respondents indicated they did not
251 have enough financial and other resources to meet their household basic needs.

252

253 **Table 4.** Living Conditions of the Burkina Faso refugees in Ghana (n = 498)

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Where are you currently staying?		
In housing specifically set up to house refugees or internally displaced people	269	54.0
With a local person or people who have offered me accommodation	97	19.5
With somebody I knew before, such as relatives or friends	113	22.7
With somebody with whom I was put in touch, for example, friends of friends	19	3.8
How would you describe the size of your accommodation?		
Very happy	79	15.9
Least happy	419	84.1

Have you received any welfare or housing payments to support yourself in your new accommodation since leaving Burkina Faso?

No	378	75.9
Yes	120	24.1

254

255

256 **Fig 3.** Main Sources of Welfare or payment support among Burkina Faso Asylum refugees in
257 Ghana ($n = 120$)

258

259 **Self-reported sense of security in the current living conditions among Burkina Faso**
260 **Refugees**

261 Regarding participants' sense of security, 71.9% of respondents agreed to some extent
262 that they feel satisfied with their current living conditions. However, 28.5% of participants
263 disagreed to some extent that they feel satisfied with their current living conditions. With regards
264 to community safety, 72.5% agreed to some extent that they felt safe in their new location, with
265 16.0% expressing some form of disagreement. By community response, 73.5% agreed to some
266 extent that they felt welcome by the local community, whereas around 17.0% disagreed to some
267 extent. Finally, participants 23.3% indicated that they had perceived some level of hostility or
268 anger from others in their local community (Table 5).

269

270

271

272

Table 5. Sense of security in the current living conditions of the study participants.

Variables	Responses (%)					Mean
	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Uncertain	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	
Q13 Generally, I feel satisfied with my current living conditions	72 (24.5)	20 (4.0)	48 (9.6)	129 (25.9)	229 (46.0)	3.8
Q14 I feel safe in the place where I am currently	54 (10.8)	26 (5.2)	57 (11.4)	95 (19.1)	266 (53.4)	4.0
Q15 I have been made to feel welcome by the local community	49 (9.8)	20 (4.0)	63 (12.7)	76 (15.3)	290 (58.2)	4.1
Q16 My family and I have experienced hostility or anger from other people in the local community	338 (67.9)	22 (4.4)	22 (4.4)	63 (12.7)	53 (10.6)	1.9

Discussion

Displaced persons are often disadvantaged with access to adequate food and suitable living conditions. Among Burkina Faso refugees currently living in the Northern part of Ghana, our study found that close to 100% experienced household food insecurity, with 80.3% of households experiencing severe insecurity. Self-reported satisfaction of living conditions was variable across the study population, with most participants reporting how they felt safe and welcomed by their new local community.

The level of food insecurity was higher than the national prevalence of food insecurity in both Burkina Faso (41%) and the host country Ghana (11.7%) (17,18). Although, a recent study found some level of food insecurity reported by Ghanaian participants from a rural community in the Northern Region of Ghana(19). Among other refugee populations, food insecurity is typically very high. For example, several studies have reported greater than 80% insecurity for refugees in the USA, with 42% of children experiencing hunger (20). Similar results were found among Syrian refugees in Canada (21), and Afghan refugees in Iran (22). Lower insecurity was reported among Iraqi refugees in Lebanon (44.4%) and Scotland (56%) (23). Our findings add to the evidence base around risks of hunger and malnutrition among these vulnerable populations. There may be a need for targeted interventions to reduce the negative impact on the lives of under-5s, pregnant women, and older people, as these populations are disproportionately affected by food insecurity and conflict (21,24,25) For those who remained in Burkina Faso, there is a longer-term trend of difficulties with food security as a result of climate change, the impact of COVID-19, increases in food prices, and the continued rise in armed conflicts (24,26,27).

Around half of the participants in this study resided in refugee camps set up by UNHCR and the local authorities, and these people reported less satisfaction and greater insecurity with

the quality of their accommodation compared to participants who were staying with community members who they knew. This may highlight the increased vulnerability of forced migrants who have little knowledge of their new community, with issues such as familiarity and language being factors that may make it more difficult to access food, water, and healthcare.

Most participants (80%) reported some level of unhappiness around the size of their accommodation. A qualitative study conducted in Southern Australia among refugees and asylum seekers exploring the relationship between housing and health revealed that a significant number of participants were worried about the size of the accommodation which was reported to have a negative impact on their mental health (28). There are many factors that affect wellbeing of refugee groups, and this provides an opportunity for stakeholders to conduct site-specific needs assessments to determine optimum and realistic living conditions alongside the level of satisfaction among refugees.

Refugees are entitled to receive welfare support from local authorities, although this is often difficult due to individuals' lack of familiarity with bureaucratic and regulatory barriers. From our study, only 24.1% of refugees received welfare support with the major source of accessible support coming from Government of Ghana and the United Nations agency, such as UNICEF and UNHCR. This finding indicates the key role played by host-country in supporting the mandated UN systems to take care of displaced persons during emergencies.

Around half of the participants indicated that they felt safe and welcomed by the host communities. Refugees' sense of safety and security in the host community is a complex issue that varies across different contexts. Studies have shown that host communities' attitudes toward refugees can have a significant impact on their sense of safety and security (29). Acceptance and assistance from the host community are crucial in ensuring support for refugee populations

(30). However, the perception of safety among refugees is subjective and individual, with many refugees not considering themselves to have found complete safety and protection in their host countries (31).

Our analyses indicate that refugees who migrated from rural areas had higher levels of food security compared with those from urban areas. The majority of participants indicated they were originally from rural areas. Thus, it is possible that rural-dwellers can more easily assimilate themselves with community members for support compared to those from cities who may have a problem adjusting to rural life. This is consistent with an earlier study conducted in Australia, which revealed that refugees from rural communities found it easy assimilating with rural host communities compared to urban refugees (32). There can also be a negative impact upon food security within the host communities themselves, as an influx of refugees can lead to uneven distribution of limited food supplies (29). In this study, refugees who are presently residing with an acquaintance within the host community, such as a relative or a friend, encountered fewer complexities concerning food insecurity in comparison to individuals residing in housing exclusively designated for refugees or internally displaced persons. These findings are in line with an earlier study reporting the importance of social support and community networking in improving the well-being of refugees (33,34). The result equally confirms the trade and inter-personal relationships that exists between the Northern part of Ghana and southern Burkina Faso (35). These relationships are established by historical, cultural, and economic elements, with migration and familial connections present between the populations of both nations (36).

The number of the displacement of Burkina Faso populations are on a much smaller scale than the situation with Ukraine, and perhaps this is one of the reasons for the lower profile of this

crisis in West Africa. However, the needs and conditions of the populations described here appear to be worse than those experienced by Ukraine refugees who are typically wealthier and moving to higher-income settings. When comparing Burkina Faso refugees in Ghana with the population remaining within Afghanistan, the prevalence of food insecurity is similarly high. Malnutrition is one of the key concerns in Afghanistan, and this has to be a real concern for those addressing the refugee crisis in northern Ghana.

Strengths and limitations

The strength of this study lies in the fact that this was a community-based cross-sectional study, with high-level refugees' participation. This study fills a knowledge gap around assessment of food insecurity, safety, and wellbeing among refugees within the sub-region. However, the study contains limitations. The tool that was used to measure household food insecurity provides a direct measure of household ability to afford food within the last 30 days and does not take into account other factors, including seasonality of food production and availability, discrimination in food allocation, and food preference. These aspects must be explored further to understand how they influence household food insecurity. There is little data available around the demographics of this refugee population, and thus we cannot be sure how representative our study populations are. This is also a one-off survey at one point in time – the refugee situation evolves quickly, and repeated similar measurements would provide an up to date assessment of health and social needs.

Conclusion

The current study found a high prevalence of household food insecurity among the Burkina Faso refugee population residing in Ghana. Refugees staying with populations known to themselves reported higher food security. Participants who were unhappy with their

accommodation size were associated with a higher risk of household food insecurity. A majority of the participants felt safe and welcomed by the host communities. The short-term measures should include improved logistics for regular food distribution by governments, UNHCR, and UNICEF. Measures should be taken to improve the living conditions through the provision of acceptable accommodation facilities. Health services should be strengthened, with proactive review of potential emerging cases of malnutrition. Further research can include repeating this survey to ensure up-to-date findings are available for decision-makers.

Acknowledgements

The study team would like to acknowledge and thank the participants and data collectors for their help and support with this research.

References

1. Nisbet C, Lestrat KE, Vatanparast H. Food Security Interventions among Refugees around the Globe: A Scoping Review. *Nutrients*. 2022;14(3):1–44.
2. UNHCR. UNHCR Global Trends 2019 | UNHCR [Internet]. 2019. Available from: <https://www.unhcr.org/media/unhcr-global-trends-2019>
3. FAO. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2023. 2023; Available from: <http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc3017en>
4. GNR. 2021 Global Nutrition Report | Executive summary - Global Nutrition Report [Internet]. 2021. Available from: <https://globalnutritionreport.org/reports/2021-global-nutrition-report/executive-summary/>
5. Weldegiargis AW, Abebe HT, Abraha HE, Abrha MM, Tesfay TB, Belay RE, et al. Armed conflict and household food insecurity: evidence from war-torn Tigray, Ethiopia. *Confl Health*. 2023;17(1):1–9.
6. Boll H. War: Conflicts feed hunger, hunger feeds conflict | Heinrich Böll Stiftung [Internet]. 2021. Available from: <https://www.boell.de/en/war-conflicts-feed-hunger>
7. Darrow M. Food Security and Arm Conflict. *World Dev* [Internet]. 2011;14. Available from: <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/622491468331234468/pdf/620340WP0Food00BOX0361475B00PUBLIC0.pdf>
8. UNICEF. Burkina Faso Burkina Faso. 2022;(1):19–24. Available from: <http://www.coraf.org/burkina-faso/?lang=fr>
9. Annon. Burkina Faso Health Care Development Support Project (Centre-East and North

- Regions). 2005;(March).
10. Ouedraogo P, Pietra V, Schumacher RF. Impact of COVID-19 on Outpatient Malnutrition Centers in Urban and Rural Burkina Faso. 2023;1–6.
 11. Ghana IM. High level dialogue on Burkinabe Refugees in Ghana held in Accra - Ministry of the Interior | Republic of Ghana [Internet]. 2023. Available from: <https://www.mint.gov.gh/high-level-dialogue-on-burkinabe-refugees-in-ghana-held-in-accra/>
 12. Ministry of Gender Children and Social Protection. Upper East Regional Profile. 2014;8.
 13. Ghana Statistical Service. 2010 Population and Housing Census: Regional Analytical Report Upper East Region. Ghana Stat Serv [Internet]. 2013;205. Available from: www.statsghana.gov.gh
 14. Coates J, Bilinsky P, Coates J. Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) for Measurement of Food Access : Indicator Guide VERSION 3 Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) for Measurement of Food Access : Indicator Guide VERSION 3. 2007;(August).
 15. Head MG, Brackstone K, Crane K. UNDERSTANDING HEALTH NEEDS OF UKRAINIAN POPULATIONS. 2022;(July):1–18.
 16. Perelli-harris B, Torrisi O, Brackstone K. Demographic and household composition of refugee and internally displaced Ukraine populations : Findings from an online survey. 2023;22. Available from: <https://publications.iom.int/books/mrs-no-74-demographic-and-household-composition-refugee-and-internally-displaced-ukraine>
 17. Peter Takyi Pephrah CF. 2020 Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA) Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability. 2020;

18. Kimberly Woods USAID. AGRICULTURE & FOOD SECURITY. 2021.
19. Boxall J, Abugri B, Amoores B, Fothergill-misbah N, Head M, Kunc M, et al. The Impact of Climate Change on the Health of Vulnerable Populations : A Pilot Study in a Last Mile District of Rural Ghana. 2023;3.
20. Hadley C, Sellen D. Food security and child hunger among recently resettled liberian refugees and asylum seekers: A pilot study. *J Immigr Minor Heal*. 2006;8(4):369–75.
21. Al-Kharabsheh L, Al-Bazz S, Koc M, Garcia J, Lane G, Engler-Stringer R, et al. Household food insecurity and associated socio-economic factors among recent Syrian refugees in two Canadian cities. *Bord Crossing*. 2020;10(2):203–14.
22. Pakravan-Charvadeh MR, Vatanparast H, khakpour M, Flora C. Food Insecurity Status of Afghan Refugees is Linked to Socioeconomic and Resettlement Status, Gender Disparities and Children’s Health Outcomes in Iran. *Child Indic Res [Internet]*. 2021;14(5):1979–2000. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-021-09827-y>
23. Zerizghy MG, Vieux BBE, Tilahun A, Taye M, Zewdu F, Ayalew D, et al. The relationship between food insecurity and practical food issues amongst a sample of refugees in Edinburgh. *Am J Res Commun [Internet]*. 2009;5(August):12–42. Available from: [http://downloads.esri.com/archydro/archydro/Doc/Overview of Arc Hydro terrain preprocessing workflows.pdf](http://downloads.esri.com/archydro/archydro/Doc/Overview%20of%20Arc%20Hydro%20terrain%20preprocessing%20workflows.pdf)^{0A}<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.11.003>^{0A}<http://sites.tufts.edu/gis/files/2013/11/Watershed-and-Drainage-Delineation-by-Pour-Point.pdf>^{0A}www
24. Unicef. Burkina Faso Humanitarian Situation Report, July 2022. 2022;(September). Available from: [https://www.unicef.org/media/127171/file/Burkina Faso Humanitarian Situation Report, July 2022.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/media/127171/file/Burkina%20Faso%20Humanitarian%20Situation%20Report,%20July%202022.pdf)

25. Syafiq A, Fikawati S, Gemily SC. Household food security during the COVID-19 pandemic in urban and semi-urban areas in Indonesia. *J Heal Popul Nutr* [Internet]. 2022;41(1):1–8. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41043-022-00285-y>
26. Madzorera I, Ismail A, Hemler E, Korte M, Olufemi A, Wang D, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on Nutrition, Food Security and Dietary Diversity and Quality in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Nigeria. *Curr Dev Nutr* [Internet]. 2021;5:234. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2475299123107529>
27. Martin-Shields CP, Stojetz W. Food security and conflict: Empirical challenges and future opportunities for research and policy making on food security and conflict. *World Dev*. 2019;119:150–64.
28. Ziersch A, Walsh M, Due C, Duivesteyn E. Exploring the relationship between housing and health for refugees and asylum seekers in south Australia: A qualitative study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2017;14(9).
29. Mabiso A, Maystadt J-F, Vandercasteelen J, Hirvonen K. Refugees, food security, and resilience in host communities: Transitioning from humanitarian assistance to development in protracted refugee situations. Vol. 2. *Intl Food Policy Res Inst*; 2014.
30. Kumssa A, Jones JF. Human Security Issues of Somali Refugees and the Host Community in Northeastern Kenya. *J Immigr Refug Stud* [Internet]. 2014 Jan 2;12(1):27–46. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2013.810797>
31. Jerin M, Mozumder M. Exploring host community attitudes towards Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh. *Intervention*. 2019;17(2):169–73.
32. McDonald-Wilmsen B, Gifford SM, Webster K, Wiseman J, Casey S. Resettling refugees in rural and regional Australia: Learning from recent policy and program initiatives. *Aust*

- J Public Adm. 2009;68(1):97–111.
33. Nunnery DL, Dharod JM. Potential determinants of food security among refugees in the U.S.: an examination of pre- and post- resettlement factors. *Food Secur* [Internet]. 2017;9(1):163–79. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-016-0637-z>
 34. Markle EA, Rodgers R, Sanchez W, Ballou M. Social support in the cohousing model of community: a mixed-methods analysis. *Community Dev* [Internet]. 2015 Oct 20;46(5):616–31. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2015.1086400>
 35. Lentz C. “ This is Ghanaian Territory!” Land Conflicts in Transnational Localities on the Burkina Faso-Ghana Border. *Universitätsbibliothek Johann Christian Senckenberg*; 2006.
 36. Chalfin B. Border Zone Trade and the Economic Boundaries of the State in North-East Ghana. *Africa (Lond)*. 2001;71(2):202–24.

Supporting information

S1. Survey administered to the Burkina Faso refugee participants

S2. Confirmation of ethics approval




Figure 1

Prevalence of food insecurity among households (%)




Figure 2




Figure 3