

1 **Understanding Food Insecurity in Kinshasa During the COVID-19 Pandemic**

2 Pierre Z. Akilimali^{1,2,*}, Benito Kazenza², Francis Kabasubabo¹, Landry Egbende², Steve
3 Botomba², Dynah M. Kayembe¹, Branly K. Mbunga², Nguyen Toan Tran^{3,4} and Désiré K.
4 Mashinda⁵

5

6 ¹Patrick Kayembe Research Center, Kinshasa School of Public Health, University of

7 Kinshasa, Kinshasa, P.O. Box 11850, Democratic Republic of the Congo;

8 dirchkayembe@gmail.com (D.M.K.); fkabasu13@gmail.com (F.K.)

9 ²Department of Nutrition, Kinshasa School of Public Health, University of Kinshasa,

10 Kinshasa, P.O. Box 11850, Democratic Republic of the Congo; landry.egbende@unikin.ac.cd

11 (L.E.); benito.kazenza@unikin.ac.cd (B.K.); steve.botomba@unikin.ac.cd (S.B.);

12 branly.mbunga@unikin.ac.cd (B.J.M)

13 ³Australian Centre for Public and Population Health Research, Faculty of Health, University

14 of Technology Sydney, Sydney, P.O. Box 123, NSW 2007, Australia;

15 nguyentoan.tran@uts.edu.au

16 ⁴Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Rue Michel-Servet 1, 1206 Geneva,

17 Switzerland; nguyentoan.tran@uts.edu.au

18 ⁵Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Kinshasa School of Public Health, University

19 of Kinshasa, Kinshasa, P.O. Box 11850, Democratic Republic of the Congo;

20 desire.mashinda@unikin.ac.cd

21 ***Corresponding Author**

22 Email: pierretulanejp@gmail.com

23

24 **Abstract**

25 **Introduction:** Food insecurity is a vital issue, especially in places like Kinshasa.

26 Additionally, food insecurity has been worsened by the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly in
27 low- and middle-income countries. Thus, this study examined food insecurity in Kinshasa
28 after the peak of the pandemic to understand food insecurity in post-pandemic recovery
29 efforts and the possible implications for public health policies for future pandemics similar to
30 COVID-19.

31 **Methods:** This study was conducted in Kinshasa with a representative sample of 2,160
32 households selected from 36 enumeration areas. We interviewed participants from different
33 areas and used a questionnaire to ask them about their food situation. Interviews were
34 conducted with the head of each household or their designated representative by 150 master's
35 students using tablets powered by the SurveyCTO application. Household food security status
36 was evaluated through the Household Food Insecurity Access Scale. A logistic regression
37 model was developed to assess household risk factors associated with food insecurity.

38 **Results:** Most people we talked to were over 40 years old, and many lived in households
39 with fewer than six people. About a third of the households were overcrowded. Factors
40 associated with food insecurity included being a household head aged over 50 years,
41 insufficient living space, lower socioeconomic status, and residing in slum areas (AOR: 1.38;
42 95% CI: 1.06–1.79). In 2022, 12,627,424 individuals faced food insecurity in Kinshasa,
43 including 8,829,820 individuals who experienced severe food insecurity.

44 **Conclusion:** Living conditions play a significant role in food insecurity. Governments need
45 to do more to help people, especially those living in crowded areas. To combat economic
46 restrictions that lead to food insecurity during crises, policymakers and implementing
47 partners should enhance food assistance programs, such as cash transfers and food supply
48 initiatives, focusing on overcrowded households and the informal job sector.

49

50 **Keywords:** Slum areas, Food security, Kinshasa, Post-pandemic recovery

51

52 **Key Messages**

53 **What is already known on this topic**

54 This study emphasizes the multifaceted nature of food security, defined as the continuous
55 access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food, comprising availability, accessibility,
56 utilization, and stability. Food insecurity, resulting from unmet needs in any of these
57 dimensions, correlates with poor health outcomes and increased mortality. The global
58 COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated food insecurity, particularly in low- and middle-income
59 countries, with rates exceeding 50%. Factors such as poverty, living conditions, low income,
60 lack of livestock, large household size, and psychological factors contribute significantly.
61 While prior studies in the Democratic Republic of the Congo exist, they are limited, often
62 focusing on specific groups. This study aims to comprehensively assess household food
63 security in Kinshasa during the post-COVID-19 period, identifying associated factors for a
64 more nuanced understanding.

65 **What this study adds**

66 This study adds to the existing literature by investigating the prevalence and determinants of
67 food insecurity during a global health crisis, employing the Household Food Insecurity
68 Access Scale for assessment. It contributes novel insights by examining the prevalence and
69 severity of food insecurity in Kinshasa, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, offering a
70 unique context for understanding the impact of a global health crisis on household food
71 security.

72 **How this study might affect research, practice, or policy**

73 The study recommends implementing cash transfer strategies for vulnerable households,

74 particularly those with informal jobs and young children, based on significant associations
75 between lower socioeconomic status and food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic.
76 Another recommendation is to expand food assistance programs for overcrowded households
77 and the informal job sector, addressing the high prevalence of food insecurity in slum areas.
78 Other social and structural determinants of food security, such as women’s empowerment and
79 access to water and electricity, should be further researched.

80

81 **INTRODUCTION**

82 Food security is achieved “when all people, at all times, have physical, social, and economic
83 access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food
84 preferences for an active and healthy life” [1–3]. This broad definition emphasizes four
85 distinct dimensions of food security: availability, accessibility, and utilization of food, in
86 addition to the stability of each of these factors, which refers to the ability to withstand
87 shocks to the broader food system [1, 4]. Food insecurity occurs when at least one of these
88 domain needs is not met, during which the experience at the household level may be
89 temporary or longer [5–7]. Access to adequate food is a core social determinant of health, and
90 food insecurity is related to poor nutritional intake and higher mortality rates [2, 6]. Even
91 temporary reductions in food security can affect long-term health and cause a loss of human
92 capital, from which it can take years to recover [8].

93 The recent COVID-19 pandemic has increased the level of food insecurity worldwide,
94 and low- and middle-income countries have been most affected [8]. More than 50% of
95 households experienced food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic [2, 6–8], and at the
96 household level, it remains a major issue in many developing countries, particularly those in
97 Africa. Although food insecurity remains high in low- and middle-income countries, many
98 factors, such as poverty, exacerbate food insecurity. Food insecurity is also a significant risk

99 factor for non-adherence to treatment such as antiretroviral therapy among HIV-infected
100 individuals [9]. In contrast, factors such as living situation, low income, lack of livestock,
101 high household size, and psychological situation (anxiety and depression) were principal
102 aspects associated with food insecurity [2, 5, 8, 10].

103 Previous studies on food security have been conducted in the Democratic Republic of
104 the Congo (DRC) over the past decade, but they have often been limited in scope, focused on
105 specific demographic groups, or conducted on a relatively small scale. Further, these studies
106 predate the COVID-19 pandemic and are often characterized by descriptive rather than
107 analytical approaches. In the first half of 2020, Performance Monitoring for Action reported a
108 40% prevalence of food insecurity in the city of Kinshasa [11]. However, all urban residents
109 do not uniformly experience food insecurity, and marginalized cities, commonly referred to
110 as “slums,” represent the most significant examples of urban poverty in developing nations
111 and are often the most impacted. Consequently, there is a pressing need to conduct a
112 comprehensive assessment of food security on a broader scale, especially following the peak
113 of the COVID-19 pandemic, and to delve into the factors contributing to food insecurity.

114 Slums are typically defined by homes that are hazardous, unhealthy, unstable, and
115 overcrowded, without access to basic infrastructure and services. Slum residents in the city
116 experience more health issues compared to non-slum residents [12]. As urban populations
117 grow in developing countries, with the increasing population in informal urban areas in
118 megacities worldwide, specific urban health intervention measures are crucial, particularly
119 during times of crisis [12]. It is crucial to research and compare food insecurity levels
120 between slum and non-slum residents, especially considering the health implications of
121 urbanization and the potential exacerbation of these differences by events like the COVID-19
122 pandemic. The informal sector has grown vital for many individuals in the DRC due to the
123 fast population expansion and a persistent shortage of legitimate job opportunities. Just 2.5%

124 of employees work in the formal sector, and in 2021, the informal economy accounted for
125 around 42% of the nation's GDP [13]. The lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic
126 impacted workers in the informal sector, potentially affecting their food security.
127 Consequently, it is essential to comprehend food insecurity in post-pandemic recovery efforts
128 and its possible implications for public health policies for future pandemics similar to
129 COVID-19. Hence, the primary objective of this study is to gain insights into the status of
130 food insecurity at the household level in Kinshasa during the COVID-19 pandemic and to
131 identify the associated factors.

132

133 **METHODS**

134 **Settings and conceptual framework**

135 The DRC is the fourth most populous country in Africa [14]. Kinshasa, the capital of the
136 DRC, is classified as one of the world's "megacities." In 2022, the metro area population of
137 Kinshasa was comprised of 15,628,000 individuals [15]. Subsequently, Kinshasa ranks as
138 Africa's third-largest metropolis, following Lagos and Cairo, and is among the continent's
139 fastest-growing urban regions [14]. Kinshasa is segmented into 35 Health Zones, each of
140 which is further divided into Health Areas. Insufficient access to water and sanitation,
141 together with inadequate hygiene practices, malnutrition, and food insecurity, are identified
142 as some of the primary risk factors contributing to mortality and disability in the country. The
143 DRC reported its initial confirmed case of COVID-19 on March 10, 2020. As of September
144 3, 2022, there were a total of 92,942 cases, with 92,940 confirmed cases and 1,357 deaths,
145 resulting in a case-fatality rate of 1.5% [16].

146 This study aligns with the conceptual framework of food security, which encompasses
147 food availability influenced by crop production, livestock holdings, and market access; food
148 access involving off-farm income and credit access; vulnerability to food shortages due to

149 shock, livestock holding, and income levels; and utilization determined by age, sex, education
150 level, and household size.

151 **Study design**

152 We conducted a community-based cross-sectional study spanning July 27 to August 3, 2022.
153 The survey had a two-stage cluster sampling design. Census enumeration areas (EAs) were
154 randomly selected in the first stage using the National Statistical Institute sampling frame.
155 Data were collected in 36 EAs in Kinshasa. Each EA was divided into “segments” to
156 streamline the field workers’ efforts. Each segment was intended to consist of approximately
157 500 households and be surveyed by a specific team. The number of segments in each EA was
158 calculated by dividing the total number of households in the EA by the average segment size
159 of 500 households. Within the selected EA or segment, a listing of all households was
160 obtained and used to randomly select 60 households (second stage). In the selected
161 households, the head of the household or their designated representative was interviewed on
162 the day of the survey. In total, 2,160 households were sampled across 36 EAs, with 60
163 households chosen from the EAs or segments. Finally, this study included 2,020 households
164 (response rate of 94%).

165 **Data collection**

166 Data collection was conducted by 150 master’s students from the Kinshasa School of Public
167 Health (KSPH) using tablets with the SurveyCTO program. They were taught research tools,
168 ethics, and linguistic issues. The master’s students, who acted as interviewers, also received
169 instruction on how to administer questionnaires during two training sessions conducted by the
170 research team as part of their training. Interviews were conducted in Lingala, the local
171 language in Kinshasa, or French. We employed reverse translation, with the assistance of
172 bilingual academics, to assure linguistic and conceptual equivalency while translating things
173 from French to Lingala. Information was gathered and examined anonymously. The survey

174 questionnaire did not include any personal identities of the participants. The primary
175 respondent at the household level was either the head of the household or their designated
176 representative on the day of the survey. If a selected household was inaccessible or lacked a
177 capable person to participate in the interview, interviewers were directed to make three
178 separate visits at various times before considering the residence as absent or vacant.

179 KSPH teaching staff that act as supervisors played a vital role in overseeing the
180 interviewers and maintaining data quality in the field. The collected data were routinely
181 checked by supervisors before being transmitted to the server. This process occurred every
182 evening during the data collection phase. Supervisors conducted quality control visits to
183 verify the correctness and completeness of data. It was a method of verifying if the master's
184 student had interviewed the appropriate respondents effectively. Quality control visits were
185 conducted on 5% of the households in each EA. The quality check was conducted using a
186 brief questionnaire that solely contained questions from the Household Food Insecurity
187 Access Scale (HFIAS).

188 The master's students were trained to verify the completeness and quality of their work,
189 and the supervisors reviewed all data forms before their submissions. Forms containing
190 omissions and clear errors were sent back to the master's student through their supervisor for
191 rectification or further review. The forms were checked for errors or inconsistencies at the
192 time of data entry. Additionally, the central team conducted daily data visualization using the
193 SurveyCTO server to provide timely feedback throughout the data collection period.

194

195 **Measurements**

196 *Sociodemographic variables*

197 The sociodemographic variables included age, sex, ethnicity, size of household, annual
198 household income, relationship status, employment status at the time of the survey, and

199 whether the housing was located in an informal settlement (slums) [17]. Overcrowded
200 households were defined as those with four or more persons living in one room. Conversely,
201 a household was deemed to have sufficient living space when three or fewer people were
202 living in one room.

203 ***Food security***

204 Household food security status was estimated using the HFIAS [18], which is a validated
205 instrument that distinguishes food-insecure households from food-secure households across
206 different cultural contexts. The Nutrition Risk Screening 2002 tool comprises nine questions
207 designed to reflect the following universal domains of the experience of food insecurity: (1)
208 anxiety and uncertainty about household food supply, (2) insufficient quality (including
209 variety and preferences for the type of food consumed), and (3) insufficient food intake and
210 its physical consequences. The current results are presented in the following categorical
211 format: (1) food secure, (2) mildly food insecure, (3) moderately food insecure, and (4)
212 severely food insecure [19]; we dichotomized these categories into food insecure versus food
213 secure. The dependent variable (household food security status) was a dichotomous variable
214 that was assigned a value of 1 if the household was food secure and 0 otherwise. The
215 Cronbach's alpha was 0.94, demonstrating excellent internal consistency. The HFIAS has
216 been utilized in prior research in the DRC [9]. Our study used the version that was previously
217 translated into Lingala and the three other local languages.

218 While household food insecurity estimates provide an overall picture of a household's
219 access to food, they may not accurately reflect individual experiences within the household.
220 Factors such as intra-household distribution of resources and varying dietary needs can
221 impact individual food security. To gain a more nuanced understanding, combining
222 household-level data with individual-level information or conducting separate assessments
223 for individuals within the household may be more informative.

224 **Data analysis**

225 All statistical analyses were conducted using STATA 17 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).
226 Initially, we determined an overview of participants' sociodemographic characteristics, both
227 in their entirety and categorized by food security status. This involved employing cross-
228 tabulations and chi-square tests to identify significant differences between non-slum and slum
229 households. Significant differences in food security status were evaluated using chi-square
230 tests. To assess household susceptibility to food insecurity as the primary outcome variable, a
231 multivariable logistic regression model was developed. Factors associated with food
232 insecurity in bivariate analysis were entered into a logistic regression model to obtain
233 adjusted odds ratios (AOR) and their 95% confidence intervals (95%CI). To assess how the
234 association between slum neighborhood and food insecurity might differ by living space
235 status, an interaction term between living space status and slum residence was included in the
236 multivariable model, and the log-likelihood ratio test was used to assess its significance.

237 The Breslow-day test for assessing the interaction effect was used. If it was found to be
238 significant at $p < 0.05$, separate multivariate regression analyses were performed by type of
239 neighborhood. The interactions between living space status and slum residence, between
240 living space status and wealth index, and between wealth index and slum residence did not
241 suggest heterogeneity between slum and non-slum residents. All the statistical analyses were
242 conducted using Stata Version 17.0. SVY procedures in Stata and were used to account for
243 the sampling design and selection weights. ORs and 95% CIs were estimated from the
244 regression parameters. Variance-inflation factors were calculated to test for multicollinearity,
245 with the highest found to be 2.65. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$.

246 **Ethical considerations**

247 The study was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Helsinki
248 Declaration. The master's students were trained to obtain informed consent. Respondents

249 who could not express themselves in French were offered consent forms in their preferred
250 language. Ethical clearance was obtained from the ethical review board of the KSPH (no.
251 ESP/CE/71B/2022). Each participant had the informed consent form read aloud to them and
252 provided verbal consent. To standardize the informed consent process for illiterate
253 participants, we opted for verbal consent witnessed by a third party. The third party ensured
254 that the consent was read to the subject, who then freely agreed to participate in the study.
255 The participant was provided with a signed copy of the consent form to retain. The consent
256 acquisition process was sanctioned by the ethics committee. This study did not involve any
257 individuals under the age of 18. Information was gathered and examined anonymously. The
258 survey form did not include any personal identifying of participants, and the participants were
259 notified that their involvement was optional. They have the liberty to either accept, decline
260 participation, or withdraw at any time without facing any consequences.

261

262 **RESULTS**

263 **Participants' characteristics**

264 Overall, most individuals identified as the head of the household and were at least 40 years
265 old (72%). Almost three-quarters of the participants were men (73.6%) and married (72.5%),
266 and 60% had a schooling level between secondary school and university. Table 1 illustrates
267 that the mean household size was six persons or fewer (75%), approximately one-third of the
268 households were overcrowded (29%), and the socioeconomic status (SES) distribution among
269 households was not equal. For these characteristics, the differences between people living in
270 non-slums and people living in slums were statistically significant.

271

272 **Table 1.** Sociodemographic characteristics of the head of the household

Non-slum		Slum		All		<i>p</i>
n	%	n	%	N	%	

Age							.555
Younger than 30 years	39	7.0	80	6.3	119	6.5	
30–39	107	19.2	275	21.7	382	20.9	
40–49	161	28.9	377	29.7	538	29.5	
50 years or older	250	44.9	537	42.3	787	43.1	
Total	557	100.0	1,269	100.0	1,826	100.0	
Sex							.001
Male	387	68.5	982	75.8	1,369	73.6	
Female	178	31.5	314	24.2	492	26.4	
Total	565	100.0	1,296	100.0	1,861	100.0	
Marital status							.037
Married	457	69.9	1,007	73.7	1,464	72.5	
Divorced/separated	58	8.9	121	8.9	179	8.9	
Widowed	80	12.2	161	11.8	241	11.9	
Single	59	9.0	77	5.6	136	6.7	
Total	654	100.0	1,366	100.0	2,020	100.0	
Schooling							< .001
Nothing/primary	78	11.9	393	28.8	471	23.3	
Secondary	224	34.3	574	42.0	798	39.5	
University	338	51.7	353	25.8	691	34.2	
No answer	14	2.1	46	3.4	60	3.0	
Total	654	100.0	1,366	100.0	2,020	100.0	
Religion							< .001
Catholic	178	27.2	252	18.4	430	21.3	
Protestant	112	17.1	168	12.3	280	13.9	
Evangelic	261	39.9	632	46.3	893	44.2	
Other	103	15.7	314	23.0	417	20.6	
Total	654	100.0	1,366	100.0	2,020	100.0	
Size of household							< .001
Six persons or fewer	548	83.8	966	70.7	1,514	75.0	
Seven persons or more	106	16.2	400	29.3	506	25.0	
Total	654	100.0	1,366	100.0	2,020	100.0	
Sufficient living space (not overcrowded)*							< .001
Sufficient living space	515	78.8	916	67.1	1,431	70.8	
Overcrowding	139	21.2	450	32.9	589	29.2	
Quintiles of SES							< .001
Lowest	44	6.7	360	26.4	404	20.0	
Lower	74	11.3	330	24.2	404	20.0	
Middle	124	19.0	281	20.6	405	20.0	
Higher	159	24.3	244	17.9	403	20.0	
Highest	253	38.7	151	11.1	404	20.0	
Total	654	100.0	1,366	100.0	2,020	100.0	

273 Note: * Three or fewer persons per living room: sufficient living space; more than three

274 persons per living room: overcrowding. SES: socioeconomic status.

275

276 **Food security conditions of the household**

277 Significant differences were observed between non-slum and slum households across all food
 278 security measurement items. More than half the households expressed concerns related to
 279 food scarcity, with 66.2% of all households reporting apprehensions about preferred food
 280 availability (non-slum: 59.0, slum: 69.6; $p < .001$). Additionally, 63.7% of the households
 281 reported that a lack of resources prevented household members from consuming their
 282 preferred types of food (non-slum: 52.0, slum: 69.3; $p < .001$). Further, in less than half of the
 283 households, there were instances in which individuals either went to bed hungry (31.0%) or
 284 had to endure an entire day without eating owing to insufficient food (50.4%; Table 2).

285

286 **Table 2.** Households by residence and components of the nine food security conditions

Questions measuring food security	Non-slum		Slum		All		<i>p</i>
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	
Were you concerned that your household did not have enough food?	386	59.0	951	69.6	1,337	66.2	< .001
Have you or someone in your household been unable to eat the types of food you prefer because of a lack of resources?	340	52.0	946	69.3	1,286	63.7	< .001
Did you or someone in your household eat a limited variety of foods because resources were not sufficient?	331	50.6	949	69.5	1,280	63.4	< .001
Have you or someone in your household eaten food that you did not want to eat because of a lack of resources to obtain other types of food?	348	53.2	964	70.6	1,312	65.0	< .001
Did you or someone in your household eat a smaller meal than you would have liked because there was not enough food?	326	49.8	930	68.1	1,256	62.2	< .001
Did you or someone in your household eat fewer meals a day because there was not enough food?	310	47.4	896	65.6	1,206	59.7	< .001
Has it ever happened that the household was without food at all because there were no resources to buy any?	234	35.8	762	55.8	996	49.3	< .001
Did you or someone in your household go to bed hungry because there was not enough food?	203	31.0	688	50.4	891	44.1	< .001
Did you or someone in your household go a	195	29.8	645	47.2	840	41.6	< .001

whole day without eating because there was not
 enough food?

287

288 **Food security conditions of the individuals**

289 Table 3 illustrates that during the COVID-19 pandemic, a similar pattern emerged for
 290 individuals residing in both non-slum and slum areas. Approximately 10% of the participants
 291 expressed concerns regarding insufficient food availability, limited access to preferred foods,
 292 dietary variety, or having fewer meals. Additionally, fewer than 5% experienced the hardship
 293 of going to bed hungry or enduring an entire day without food. Further, in at least 5% of the
 294 households, a complete absence of food was reported, and the absence was primarily
 295 attributable to resource constraints.

296

297 **Table 3.** Food security conditions

Questions measuring food security	Non-slum		Slum		All	
	n	%	n	%	N	%
Were you concerned that your household did not have enough food?	46	7.0	129	9.4	175	8.7
Have you or someone in your household been unable to eat the types of food you prefer because of a lack of resources?	53	8.1	142	10.4	195	9.7
Did you or someone in your household eat a limited variety of foods because resources were not sufficient?	49	7.5	150	11.0	199	9.9
Have you or someone in your household eaten food that you did not want to eat because of a lack of resources to obtain other types of food?	54	8.3	157	11.5	211	10.4
Did you or someone in your household eat a smaller meal than you would have liked because there was not enough food available?	41	6.3	143	10.5	184	9.1
Did you or someone in your household eat fewer meals a day because there was not enough food?	51	7.8	126	9.2	177	8.8
Has it ever happened that the household was without food at all because there were no resources to buy any?	24	3.7	94	6.9	118	5.8
Did you or someone in your household go to bed hungry because there was not enough food?	24	3.7	81	5.9	105	5.2
Did you or someone in your household go a whole day without eating because there was not enough food?	22	3.4	58	4.2	80	4.0

298

299 **Level of food insecurity**

300 Table 4 reveals that only 19.2% of participants were classified as food secure, leaving 80.8%
 301 (100%–19.2%) as food insecure, with 56.5% experiencing severe food insecurity.
 302 Extrapolating these percentages to the estimated population of 15,628,000 in Kinshasa,
 303 12,627,424 individuals ($0.808 * 15,628,000$) were deemed food insecure in 2022, including
 304 8,829,820 individuals experiencing it severely ($0.565 * 15,628,000$).

305 Notably, a marked distinction emerges when comparing residents of non-slum and slum
 306 areas within our sample in terms of severe food insecurity. Among respondents not residing
 307 in slums, around a third (33.8%) experienced severe food insecurity, contrasting sharply with
 308 approximately two-thirds (67.9%) of those living in slums.

309

310 **Table 4.** Distribution of food insecurity in the total population by accessibility pillar

Food insecurity category (access)	Non-slum		Slum		All	
	n	%	n	%	N	%
Food secure	1,058	32.4	938	13.2	1,996	19.2
Slight food insecurity	224	6.9	295	4.2	519	5.0
Moderate food insecurity	881	27.0	1,114	15.7	1,995	19.2
Severe food insecurity	1,104	33.8	4,762	67.0	5,866	56.5
Total	3,268	100.0	7,109	100.0	10,377	100.0

311

312 **Factors associated with food insecurity**

313 Figure 1 illustrates the factors associated with food insecurity. Specifically, individuals aged
 314 50 years or older exhibited a significantly greater likelihood of experiencing food insecurity
 315 (AOR: 2.02; 95% confidence interval (CI): 1.23–3.31) as compared to their counterparts.

316 Conversely, having a sufficient living space was associated with a reduced likelihood of food
 317 insecurity (AOR: 0.56; 95% CI: 0.44–0.77). Additionally, households characterized by lower
 318 SES (AOR lowest: 5.36; 95% CI: 3.29–8.74; AOR low: 3.30; 95% CI: 2.19–4.98; AOR
 319 moderate: 1.97; 95% CI: 1.37–2.84; AOR higher: 1.48; 95% CI: 1.06–2.06) and residing in
 320 slum areas displayed a heightened risk of food insecurity (AOR: 1.38; 95% CI: 1.06–1.79) as
 321 compared to their counterparts. Living in a slum area (AOR: 1.38; 95% CI: 1.06–1.79) was

322 associated with food insecurity.

323

324 **DISCUSSION**

325 This study assessed household food insecurity during the COVID-19 pandemic. Most
326 household heads were aged at least 40 years (72%). The mean household size was six persons
327 or fewer (75%), approximately one-third of the households were overcrowded (29%), and the
328 SES distribution among households was equal. More than half the households were affected
329 by food security conditions during the pandemic, with more than half frequently facing food
330 insecurity. The prevalence of food insecurity was notably high during the pandemic, with
331 significant disparities observed between non-slum and slum areas. Being aged 50 years or
332 older, having an insufficient living space, having a certain SES (poorest, poorer, middle, or
333 wealthier), and residing in a slum area were associated with a heightened risk of food
334 insecurity.

335 These findings align with prior research demonstrating that economic shocks can lead
336 to decreased food accessibility in vulnerable households; thus, the progression of the
337 pandemic made it possible for food security to deteriorate further [2, 4, 6, 8–10, 20, 21].
338 Lockdown measures associated with the pandemic could have disrupted food supply chains
339 and dietary habits, potentially contributing to various forms of malnutrition, including an
340 increased risk of obesity owing to the consumption of highly processed foods and reduced
341 physical activity [2]. Therefore, it is essential to closely monitor the indirect health effects of
342 the COVID-19 pandemic.

343 Food insecurity was more prevalent in informal settlement households, in which more
344 than three-quarters of the households reported having experienced this issue. Limited access
345 to food resources exacerbates the adverse effects of the pandemic and obstructs infection
346 control measures. Focused social protection actions are needed against shock, accounting for

347 household profiles [2, 3, 8]. Vulnerable households, particularly those with informal jobs and
348 young children, could benefit from cash transfer strategies to protect their food security. The
349 expansion of food assistance programs, including cash transfers and food supply initiatives,
350 should target overcrowded households and the informal job sector.

351 The findings related to the worsening trend of food insecurity emphasize the urgent
352 need for policy actions addressing broader factors contributing to food insecurity, such as
353 economic development, infrastructure, and governance. Providing and evaluating not only
354 food assistance but also cash transfer initiatives, at least for the most vulnerable households,
355 is important. A cash transfer strategy for households with informal jobs and children younger
356 than five years may help protect their food security status. Monitoring food insecurity during
357 shock events, particularly among older individuals and households with informal
358 employment, is recommended [3, 8]. Addressing inequities in accessing physical and social
359 infrastructure is crucial for food security beyond household income, as evidenced by Frayne
360 and McCordic’s study in South Africa [22]. Households lacking consistent access to cooking
361 fuel, medical care, electricity, or water, in addition to cash income, demonstrated
362 significantly higher odds of being categorized as food insecure. These results imply that the
363 conditions of an urban environment might better predict and explain food security than
364 income alone. Similarly, Khan et al. highlighted the significance of resilience—such as
365 infrastructure, women empowerment, economic performance, human capital, and emergency
366 workforce—in mitigating the impact of crises, such as natural disasters, in low-income
367 countries [23]. These studies emphasize the need to consider broader social and structural
368 factors in strategies to enhance food security and reduce negative outcomes in large-scale
369 crises.

370 Moreover, addressing interconnected syndemic-like crises warrants a multifaceted
371 approach guided by data-driven strategies grounded in a flexible and intricate systems

372 framework [5]. Importantly, even as the COVID-19 pandemic recedes, its far-reaching
373 economic, health, and societal consequences are expected to persist over an extended period
374 [11].

375 Notably, compared with non-slum households, slum households reported a significantly
376 greater incidence rate of food insecurity. Food insecurity affected more than three-quarters of
377 the slum households. This finding underscores that the COVID-19 pandemic has had adverse
378 effects on food security across the socioeconomic spectrum, with particularly severe
379 consequences for those with low SES. Thus, it is imperative to establish robust mechanisms
380 for monitoring the food insecurity status of households during shock events, paying particular
381 attention to older individuals and households that rely on informal employment. A study
382 conducted in Mexico during the COVID-19 pandemic recommended monitoring for food
383 insecurity in the general population, including critical vulnerable groups such as those with
384 low- and middle-SES [2, 24, 25]. However, it is crucial to acknowledge the limitation of
385 using the SES scale, which may not capture changes in economic circumstances resulting
386 from the pandemic and would instead reflect only pre-pandemic SES.

387 This study had several strengths, including the comprehensive assessment of food
388 insecurity on a large scale during the COVID-19 pandemic, which allows for generalizability
389 across all of Kinshasa and other similar urban centers in the Democratic Republic of Congo
390 and other sub-Saharan countries characterized by the presence of slums and non-slum areas.
391 However, certain limitations must be acknowledged. First, this study did not assess the
392 broader multisectoral impacts of COVID-19 beyond its influence on food security.
393 Additionally, the pre-pandemic food security conditions of households were not evaluated,
394 thereby preventing direct comparisons of conditions before and during the pandemic.

395 Despite employing random sampling, we lack the means to confirm the
396 representativeness of our sample in relation to the population of Kinshasa. The DRC last

397 conducted a census in 1984, and there is no clear indication of whether our sample accurately
398 represents the population of Kinshasa. Gender considerations, albeit rarely openly addressed
399 in the DRC, could impact food security in Kinshasa. This study is also limited by the lack of
400 collected information on gender. Future research should analyze how food insecurity and the
401 factors contributing to it develop, particularly in response to the economic consequences of
402 the COVID-19 pandemic. Social and structural determinants potentially contributing to food
403 security, such as women's empowerment and access to water, electricity, and medical care,
404 should be further researched.

405

406 **CONCLUSION**

407 The COVID-19 pandemic impacted household food security in Kinshasa and has been a
408 primary contributor to heightened food insecurity conditions among households, potentially
409 resulting in adverse consequences. Thus, governments must develop targeted strategies aimed
410 at mitigating household vulnerability during periods of crisis. Additionally, to combat
411 economic restrictions that lead to food insecurity during crises, policymakers and
412 implementing partners might enhance food assistance programs, such as cash transfers and
413 food supply initiatives, focusing on overcrowded households and the informal job sector.

414

415 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

416 AOR: Adjusted odds ratio

417 CI: Confidence interval

418 DRC: Democratic Republic of the Congo

419 EA: Enumeration area

420 HFIAS: Household Food Insecurity Access Scale

421 KSPH: Kinshasa School of Public Health

422 SES: Socioeconomic status

423

424 **DECLARATIONS**

425 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

426 Ethical clearance was obtained from the ethical review board of the Kinshasa School of
427 Public Health (KSPH; no. ESP/CE/71B/2022). Written informed consent was obtained from
428 each respondent during the data collection process. Privacy and confidentiality were
429 maintained throughout this study.

430 **Consent for publication**

431 Informed consent was obtained from all the participants involved in this study.

432 **Availability of data and materials**

433 All the relevant data for this study are available from KSPH. The materials will be made
434 available by the leading author upon request. Dataset can be found also in osf:
435 https://osf.io/h4jt2/?view_only=ad40b39d0f584bf480fb04571ed86b70

436 **Competing interests**

437 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at
438 www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare no support from any organization for the
439 submitted work; no financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest
440 in the submitted work in the previous three years; and no other relationships or activities that
441 could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

442 **Funding**

443 This study was conducted with financial support from the World Bank: ID Projet REDISSE
444 IV: P167817 IDA 64980-ZR and Don IDA D5160-ZR

445 **Authors' contributions**

446 Conceptualization, APZ and MDK; methodology, APZ, TNT, BS, EL, KB, MBK, KF, KDM,
447 and MDK; software, APZ, TNT, KF, and KDM; validation, APZ, TNT, BS, EL, KB, MBK,
448 KF, KDM, and MDK; formal analysis, APZ, TNT, KF, KDM, and MDK; investigation,
449 APZ, TNT, BS, EL, KB, MBK, KF, KDM, and MDK; resources, APZ, BS, EL, KB, MBK,
450 KF, KDM, and MDK; data curation, APZ, KB, KF, KDM, and MDK; writing—original draft
451 preparation: APZ, TNT, BS, EL, KB, MBK, KF, KDM, and MDK; writing—review and
452 editing: APZ, TNT, BS, EL, KB, MBK, KF, KDM, and MDK; visualization, APZ, TNT, KF,
453 KDM, and MDK; supervision, APZ, TNT, and MDK; project administration, APZ and
454 MDK; and funding acquisition, APZ and MDK. All the authors have read and agreed to the
455 final version of the manuscript. All authors consented to the publication of the most recent
456 version of the present article.

457 **Acknowledgments**

458 The authors thank the KSPH students who were involved in data collection. We also thank all
459 respondents for sharing their experiences with us.

460 **Author information**

461 Pierre Akilimali, the corresponding author, is a Professor at the University of Kinshasa
462 School of Public Health.

463

464 **REFERENCES**

- 465 1 Fitzpatrick KM, Harris C, Drawve G, et al. Assessing food insecurity among US
466 adults during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Hunger Environ Nutr* 2021;16:1–18.
- 467 2 Gaitán-Rossi P, Vilar-Compte M, Teruel G, et al. Food insecurity measurement and
468 prevalence estimates during the COVID-19 pandemic in a repeated cross-sectional
469 survey in Mexico. *Public Health Nutr* 2021;24:412–21.

- 470 3 Owens MR, Brito-Silva F, Kirkland T, et al. Prevalence and social determinants of
471 food insecurity among college students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nutrients*
472 2020;12:2515.
- 473 4 Abegaz KH. Determinants of food security: Evidence from Ethiopian rural household
474 survey (ERHS) using pooled cross-sectional study. *Agric & Food Secur* 2017;6:70.
- 475 5 Tomita A, Ramlall S, Naidu T, et al. Major depression and household food insecurity
476 among individuals with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) in South Africa.
477 *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2019;54:387–93.
- 478 6 Sultana A, Kiani A. Determinants of food security at household level in Pakistan. *Afr*
479 *J Bus Manage* 2011;5:12972–9.
- 480 7 Ngema PZ, Sibanda M, Musemwa L. Household food security status and its
481 determinants in Maphumulo local municipality, South Africa. *Sustainability*
482 2018;10:3307.
- 483 8 Gebeyehu DT, East L, Wark S, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on the food security and
484 identifying the compromised food security dimension: A systematic review protocol.
485 *PLOS ONE* 2022;17:e0272859.
- 486 9 Musumari PM, Wouters E, Kayembe PK, et al. Food insecurity is associated with
487 increased risk of non-adherence to antiretroviral therapy among HIV-infected adults
488 in the Democratic Republic of Congo: A cross-sectional study. *PLoS One*. 2014 Jan
489 15;9(1):e85327. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0085327. PMID: 24454841; PMCID:
490 PMC3893174.
- 491 10 Wolfson JA, Leung CW. Food insecurity and COVID-19: Disparities in early effects
492 for US adults. *Nutrients* 2020;12:1648.
- 493 11 University of Kinshasa School of Public Health, the Bill & Melinda Gates Institute for
494 Population and Reproductive Health at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of

- 495 Public Health. Jhpiego. In: Performance monitoring for action (PMA) democratic
496 republic of Congo (Kinshasa & Kongo Central) phase 1: COVID-19 female follow-up
497 survey. 11th version, PMA2020/CD-COVID-19. Baltimore, MD: DRC 2020.
- 498 12 UN-HABITATS. The Challenge of Slums: Global Report on Human Neighborhood
499 2003. Earthscan Publications Ltd.; London, UK: 2003. London and Sterling. [Google
500 Scholar]
- 501 13 Italian Institute for International Political Studies. Kinshasa looks ahead: What
502 prospects for development? December 19, 2023.
503 [https://www.ispionline.it/en/publication/kinshasa-looks-ahead-what-prospects-for-](https://www.ispionline.it/en/publication/kinshasa-looks-ahead-what-prospects-for-development-157291#:~:text=In%20other%20words%2C%20the%20informal,low%2Dincome%20countries%20in%20Africa)
504 [development-](https://www.ispionline.it/en/publication/kinshasa-looks-ahead-what-prospects-for-development-157291#:~:text=In%20other%20words%2C%20the%20informal,low%2Dincome%20countries%20in%20Africa)
505 [157291#:~:text=In%20other%20words%2C%20the%20informal,low%2Dincome%20](https://www.ispionline.it/en/publication/kinshasa-looks-ahead-what-prospects-for-development-157291#:~:text=In%20other%20words%2C%20the%20informal,low%2Dincome%20countries%20in%20Africa)
506 [countries%20in%20Africa](https://www.ispionline.it/en/publication/kinshasa-looks-ahead-what-prospects-for-development-157291#:~:text=In%20other%20words%2C%20the%20informal,low%2Dincome%20countries%20in%20Africa) (Accessed on March 3, 2024).
- 507 14 United Nations. World Population Prospects: The 2015 Revision, Volume II:
508 Demographic Profiles (ST/ESA/SER.A/380) United Nations, Department of
509 Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division; New York, NY, USA:
510 2015. [Google Scholar].
- 511 15 Macrotrends. Kinshasa, Republic of Congo metro area population 1950–2024.
512 [https://www.macrotrends.net/cities/20853/kinshasa/population#:~:text=The%20curre](https://www.macrotrends.net/cities/20853/kinshasa/population#:~:text=The%20current%20metro%20area%20population,a%204.4%25%20increase%20from%202021)
513 [nt%20metro%20area%20population,a%204.4%25%20increase%20from%202021](https://www.macrotrends.net/cities/20853/kinshasa/population#:~:text=The%20current%20metro%20area%20population,a%204.4%25%20increase%20from%202021)
514 (accessed December 1, 2023).
- 515 16 RDC CMR COVID-19, SECRETARIAT TECHNIQUE : Covid-19/ Bulletin n°636
516 dimanche, le 19 Décembre 2021: Situation épidémiologique Covid-19. [Google
517 Scholar].

- 518 17 Akilimali PZ, Tran NT, Gage AJ. Heterogeneity of modern contraceptive use among
519 urban slum and nonslum women in Kinshasa, DR Congo: Cross-sectional analysis. *Int*
520 *J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;18:9400.
- 521 18 Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance Project. Household food insecurity access
522 scale (HFIAS) for measurement of food access: indicator guide version 3. 2007.
523 [https://www.fantaproject.org/monitoring-and-evaluation/household-food-insecurity-](https://www.fantaproject.org/monitoring-and-evaluation/household-food-insecurity-access-scale-hfias)
524 [access-scale-hfias](https://www.fantaproject.org/monitoring-and-evaluation/household-food-insecurity-access-scale-hfias) (accessed December 1, 2023).
- 525 19 Coates J, Swindale A, Bilinsky P. Household food insecurity access scale (HFIAS)
526 for measurement of food access: Indicator guide. Washington, DC: Food and
527 Nutrition Technical Assistance Project, Academy for Educational Development 2007.
- 528 20 Régis GB, Okombi FHO, Bemba ELP, et al. Management of multidrug-resistant
529 tuberculosis in Brazzaville. *Health Sci Dis* 2020;21:12–6 [in French].
- 530 21 Kent K, Murray S, Penrose B, et al. Prevalence and socio-demographic predictors of
531 food insecurity in Australia during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nutrients* 2020;12:2682.
- 532 22 Frayne B, McCordic C. Planning for food secure cities: Measuring the influence of
533 infrastructure and income on household food security in Southern African
534 cities. *Geoforum* 2015;65:1–11.
- 535 23 Khan MTI, Anwar S, Batool Z. The role of infrastructure, socio-economic
536 development, and food security to mitigate the loss of natural disasters. *Environ Sci*
537 *Poll Res* 2022;29:52412–37.
- 538 24 Kakaei H, Nourmoradi H, Bakhtiyari S, et al. Chapter One - Effect of COVID-19 on
539 food security, hunger, and food crisis [Internet]. Dehghani MH, Karri RR, Roy S,
540 editors. ScienceDirect. Elsevier; 2022. p. 3–29. Available from:
541 [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780323913072000055?via%3Di](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780323913072000055?via%3Dihub)
542 [hub](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780323913072000055?via%3Dihub)

543 25 Brown H, Mills S, Albani V. Socioeconomic risks of food insecurity during the
544 Covid-19 pandemic in the UK: Findings from the understanding society covid survey.
545 BMC Public Health 2022;22:590.

546

547 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

548 Figure 1. Forecast plot presenting the associated factors of food insecurity with their adjusted

549 ORs

