Maternal and child healthcare-seeking among victims of violence in armed conflict: A matched case-control study in northeast Nigeria*

Max Schaub, *University of Hamburg & WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Germany*
Gbadebo Collins Adeyanju, *University of Erfurt, Germany*
Aisha Aliyu Abulfathi, *University of Maiduguri & University of Maiduguri Teaching Hospital, Nigeria*
Musa Muhammad Bello, *Bayero University & Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital, Nigeria*
Lennart Kasserra, *University of Konstanz, Germany*
Aminatu Ayaba Kwaku, *Bayero University & Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital, Nigeria*
Muhammad Ibrahim Jalo, *Women and Children Hospital, Damaturu, Nigeria*
Ahmad Mahmud, *Modibbo Adama University & Modibbo Adama University Teaching Hospital, Nigeria*
Pia Schrage, *University of Erfurt, Germany*
Rabiu Ibrahim Jalo, *Bayero University & Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital, Nigeria*
Liliana Abreu, *University of Konstanz, Germany*

Introduction: Armed conflict severely impacts health, with indirect deaths often exceeding direct casualties by a factor of 2 to 4, disproportionately affecting women and children. Although the magnitude of these effects is well-documented, the mechanisms driving them remain insufficiently understood. This study shifts the focus from supply-side factors, such as the destruction of infrastructure, to demand-side processes, particularly healthcare-seeking behavior, and from broader conflict exposure to individual-level violent victimization.

Methods: Data come from a representative survey (n=3,006) of caregivers of young children in northeastern Nigeria, a region heavily affected by armed insurgency. Unlike previous studies, our survey included dedicated measures of victimization, health-seeking outcomes, and mediating factors within a single instrument, enabling precise measurement and analysis. A matched case-control design (651 cases and 651 controls) was used to assess the impact of individual-level victimization on maternal and child healthcare-seeking behavior, and causal mediation analysis to identify the mechanisms linking victimization to health outcomes.

Results: Victimization was widespread, with 21% of respondents (n=651) having experienced a severe form of violence in the past 3 years. While maternal healthcare-seeking behavior appeared unaffected, victimization significantly reduced healthcare-seeking for child health. Children of victimized caregivers were markedly less likely to be fully immunized (OR: 0.43, $p<0.001$) and to receive care at government health facilities (OR: 0.23, $p<0.001$). This decline was primarily driven by increased distrust in the health system (PM: 0.42–0.70, $p<0.05$), stemming from negative experiences during the conflict, particularly health worker absenteeism and victimization by state security forces.

Conclusion: Addressing fear and mistrust is key to improving healthcare-seeking in conflict-affected populations. Efforts should focus on providing security for government-run health facilities, reducing violence against civilians by state security forces, and restoring trust in healthcare and state institutions. Future research should explore effective strategies for achieving these objectives.

*We thank the respondents for sharing their experiences, the interviewers for their diligent work, and Merike Blofield and Sara Tomczyk for comments. This study was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) and the German Alliance for Global Health Research (GLOHRA) under the ViVac project (Nº01KA2405A), and by the Ideas and Venture Fund of the University of Hamburg (NºUHH/VP3/4/424).

Introduction

Studies of armed conflict and health have documented the devastating negative health effects of exposure to violence. Estimates suggest that indirect deaths from conflict (e.g., due to malnutrition and diseases) often exceed direct casualties by a factor of two to four [1–3], with women and children disproportionately affected [3–5]. While these broad patterns are well documented, gaps remain in our understanding of why violence has such detrimental health consequences. The best-documented explanations focus on supply-side factors: armed conflict is accompanied by the large-scale destruction of critical infrastructure, leaving affected populations without essential services and vulnerable to the spread of infectious diseases [6–9]. In addition, health workers frequently flee conflict-affected areas, further limiting the availability of medical services [7, 10–13]. Looking beyond such supply-side dynamics, recent research has shifted the focus to demand-side factors, particularly how exposure to violence affects healthcare-seeking behavior, defined as utilization of health services in armed conflict settings [12, 14–18]. Exposure to violence can induce fear, scholars have argued, leading individuals to reduce their movement and limit their pursuit of maternal and child healthcare [17–19]. Moreover, individuals living in conflict-affected regions often report lower trust in government institutions, a key predictor of healthcare utilization [17, 20–22].

In this regard, Nigeria represents a particularly relevant case. The country faces multiple forms of armed conflict, including the Boko Haram insurgency in the Northeast, recurrent clashes between farmers and herders in the Middle Belt, separatist agitation in the Southeast, and criminal banditry in the Northwest [23, 24]. These conflicts have had profound repercussions for the health system, ranging from the destruction of facilities and the displacement of health workers to interruptions in immunization programs and disease surveillance [25, 26]. In the Northeast, where our study is situated, healthcare capacity has been particularly strained, with many communities reliant on humanitarian organizations whose reach remains inconsistent due to insecurity [27, 28]. Existing research on Nigeria underscores the severity of these challenges: attacks on health services have contributed to elevated maternal and child mortality, malnutrition, and outbreaks of preventable diseases such as cholera and measles [29, 30]. Studies also document the psychological toll of conflict, including high levels of post-traumatic stress and depression among displaced populations [31, 32].

Against this backdrop, the present study contributes to this literature, but shifts the focus from broader exposure to violence—typically measured as proximity to attacks—to individual-level violent victimization. Even though victimization is one of the most direct consequences of exposure to armed conflict, its impact on healthcare-seeking has not been explicitly assessed. In conflict settings, large numbers of individuals suffer from attacks themselves or observe family members being killed or otherwise harmed. Our study systematically measures such instances of victimization and assesses their relationship with healthcare-seeking behavior. Additionally, we advance existing research by explicitly identifying and modeling potential pathways through which victimization translates into reduced healthcare-seeking, focusing on trauma, fear, and mistrust. It is well established that victimization can lead to persistent trauma, with survivors exhibiting significantly higher rates of post-traumatic stress symptoms, even decades after exposure [33–35]. As a consequence of trauma,

victims may under-utilize healthcare services [36, 37]. It is also plausible that violent victimization may increase fear of further victimization, discouraging individuals from leaving their homes to seek health care for themselves, their partner, or their children [19, 37, 38]. Similarly, victimization can erode trust in healthcare institutions. This may be because of negative experiences with healthcare services during the conflict or a generalization of mistrust from one state institution (e.g., the security forces that failed them) to other state institutions, such as government-provided health care. Distrustful individuals will stop using health services, e.g., by refusing to vaccinate their children [39, 40], or they will seek non-government-run alternatives [41, 42]. In order to consistently track these potential mediation effects, our study included measures for all of these dimensions in the same survey instrument.

Methods

Data Data come from a representative household survey (n=3,006) conducted in August and September 2024 in the three northeastern Nigerian states of Adamawa, Borno, and Yobe (see Figure 1). The region has been severely affected by an armed insurgency for the last 15 years [43, 44]. And while the security situation has stabilized somewhat in recent years, sporadic attacks on government and civilian targets persist, including raids by armed extremists on villages and attacks on hospitals [45]. In each state, two local government areas (LGAs, comparable to counties) were randomly selected, weighting by population size. Within each LGA, three political wards (out of 10 to 20) were chosen using the same weighting approach. Due to security constraints, three wards had to be replaced during data collection with random replacements. The primary sampling units (PSUs) were determined by a population-weighted draw of 500×500 m grid cells, which generated interviewer starting points proportional to population size. Household recruitment followed a random walk with a 2:1 skip pattern. Sampling weights were generated to adjust for any over- or under-representation of PSUs in the final sample, ensuring unbiased summary statistics. Additional information about the survey, in line with the STROBE reporting guidelines [46], can be found in the supplementary information (SI), and replication data and code are available on OSF [47].

Figure 1: Overview of study area



Note: The figure shows the northeastern Nigerian states of Adamawa, Borno, and Yobe in the regional context.

The target population for our survey were parents (men and women) of young children. In each household, a single person was chosen for interview. To be eligible for the interview, a person had to be the primary caregiver of a child 5 years of age or younger. Interviews were conducted by trained interviewers in the local language (Hausa) using a pre-tested questionnaire. Participants

were informed in advance of the sensitive nature of some of the questions included in the survey, and were informed that they could end the survey or skip individual questions at any time. Only individuals who gave their explicit informed consent were interviewed. Participants provided demographic information, answered questions about maternal and child health, and reported on experiences of violence and attitudes toward government and health care institutions. For child health, we focused on the youngest child in the family, aged at least one year. For maternal health, we asked female respondents to report on their own experiences and male respondents to report on their partners' experiences. The survey and data collection protocol were approved by the National Health Research Ethics Committee of Nigeria (NHREC), the respective authorities of the three states, and the University of Konstanz, Germany.

Patient and public involvement The research project built on knowledge gained from qualitative fieldwork with focus group participants and key informants (community leaders and healthcare workers). These interviews provided important input for defining the final set of questions included in the survey. The data and findings will be disseminated through a series of workshops, the first of which was held in Kano, Nigeria, in January 2025, and which are open to specialists from Nigerian ministries, NGOs, and journalists.

Study design and statistical approach For the analysis, we adopted a matched case-control study design. Cases were individuals who reported being victimized in the past three years, while controls were matched non-victimized individuals. For matching, we used propensity score matching with one control per case (1:1 matching). For statistical modeling, we considered both conditional and unconditional logistic regression. Conditional logit relies only on within-pair variation, offering a rigorous approach to causal inference, but it discards a substantial portion of the data and limits flexibility for mediation analysis. The causal mediation framework we employ [48] requires an outcome model that can accommodate continuous and multiple mediators. Because conditional logit removes stratum-specific intercepts, it complicates estimation of mediated effects and precludes the inclusion of mediators that do not vary within pairs. By contrast, unconditional logistic regression allows us to estimate the outcome model required for mediation analysis [49].

We therefore opted for unconditional models as our default specification, applied to matched data with adjustment for the matching variables and clustering of standard errors at the matched-pair level [50, 51]. Robustness checks using conditional logistic regression are reported in Section H, SI; substantively, both approaches yield very similar estimates.

We matched on the demographic characteristics of the respondent (sex, age, education, number of children) and of the child in question (sex, age). Second, to isolate the *demand* for health care, we also accounted for determinants of healthcare supply. Specifically, we included the self-reported walking distance (in minutes) to the nearest clinic and the remotely measured geographic distance between the interview locations and georeferenced clinic and hospital locations. [52]. We further included several health indicators in our matching function to capture the relative quality of services, namely diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis (DPT3) and measles vaccination coverage, malaria and

malnutrition prevalence, and the under-five mortality rate [53–57].[1] These indicators were recorded at the 500m×500m grid cell level, the same scale used for sampling. Finally, we included covariates that are known determinants of armed violence, notably population density, accessibility (measured as the distance to the nearest major road), and state reach (measured as the distance to the regional capital) [58].

Matching was performed using the logit of the propensity score, with a caliper set at 20% of the standard deviation (SD) of the propensity score, corresponding to an absolute value of 0.2 [59]. This procedure successfully matched the full set of cases (n=651) while achieving excellent balance – none of the mean differences were statistically significant, and all standardized mean differences were below 7% (see Table S5 and Figure S2 in the SI).[2]

Our analysis relates violent victimization to indicators of healthcare-seeking for maternal and child health. Violent victimization was assessed using a survey question asking whether the respondent or a household member had been "directly affected by organized violence" in the past three years. Organized violence was defined as violence perpetrated by "members of an organized group, such as an extremist group or armed bandits." Respondents were further instructed that being "affected" meant being "either the target or witness of violence." Following this question, we asked whether respondents would mind sharing what had happened to them or their household member. We coded individuals as violently victimized if they reported that they or their household members were physically assaulted, had a household member killed, were kidnapped/abducted, were threatened with violence, or experienced sexual violence.

As the core outcomes, our study focused on four key indicators of maternal and child healthcare-seeking. These were i) utilization of antenatal care and ii) facility-based childbirth (delivery in a healthcare facility) for maternal healthcare-seeking, and iii) adherence to the recommended child immunization schedule and iv) use of government health facilities for child healthcare-seeking. Antenatal care use was operationalized as respondents reporting that they received four or more antenatal care visits, the number recommended by the Nigerian Ministry of Health. Facility-based birth is measured as respondents reporting that the child in focus was born in a health clinic or hospital. To measure immunization coverage, interviewers checked the child's official immunization card to verify whether they had received the full schedule of vaccinations recommended by the Nigerian Ministry of Health. To operationalize the use of government health facilities, we recorded whether individuals used a health facility for any of their children in the past 6 months, and the type of health facility they visited. We then coded reported use of government clinics or hospitals as one, and use of private clinics, traditional healers, and clinics run by religious institutions or other nongovernmental organizations as zero.

[1] A full description of the included contextual covariates can be found in Table S14 in the SI.

[2] Applying a much stricter caliper (0.025) results in a similar number of matched pairs (647 vs. 651), indicating that most pairs are very closely matched.

Mediators

In addition to these outcomes, we examined three potential mediating mechanisms: trauma, fear, and mistrust. The hypothesized causal framework is shown in Figure 2. Following prior research in conflict settings, trauma is most often assessed in terms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and related symptomatology, typically using standardized instruments such as the Harvard Trauma Questionnaire or the PTSD Checklist (PCL) [60, 61]. PTSD reflects the psychological sequelae of past traumatic events [62], and in our study it was measured using the locally validated PCL-8 scale [63]. Fear, by contrast, captures a forward-looking perception of continued threat, closely linked to the anticipation of future violence rather than past exposure [64]. In previous work, fear has been operationalized through self-reports of avoidance behaviors or through predicted local violence risk in conflict-affected settings [17, 19, 65]. We followed the self-report approach by asking respondents directly about their perceived likelihood to become victims of violence again in the future. The third mediator, institutional mistrust refers to the erosion of confidence in the state's ability or willingness to fulfill its protective and service-providing roles [66, 67]. Victimization implies that the state has failed in its role as protector, which may undermine confidence not only in security institutions but also in other state services such as healthcare. This spillover matters for health outcomes: mistrustful individuals are less likely to seek care, follow medical advice, or vaccinate their children [17, 21, 42, 68]. To capture this dimension, our survey included a question on whether respondents' trust in healthcare workers had increased, decreased, or remained unchanged over the past three years. The full wording of all survey questions can be found in Table S13 in the SI.

To conduct the mediation analysis, we adopt the causal mediation framework proposed by Imai et al. [48]. In practice, we use the unconditional logistic regression outcome model as the basis for the mediation analysis. We estimate separate regression models for each mediator conditional on victimization and covariates, and then decompose the total effect into the natural indirect effect (mediation pathway), the direct effect, and the proportion mediated (PM). To account for the hypothesized presence of multiple mediators, we include the respective other mediators as controls in each model [69].

Figure 2: Hypothesized causal framework



Note: The figure shows the hypothesized causal relations explored in this paper. Individual victimization is hypothesized to influence healthcare-seeking behavior through trauma, fear, and mistrust.

Finally, we conducted a complementary regression analysis to identify predictors of declining trust in healthcare workers. The outcome was a binary indicator of whether respondents reported that their trust in healthcare workers had decreased over the past three years. We estimated our standard matched logistic regression models with predictors including reported absenteeism of healthcare workers, exposure to violence by security forces, fear for security at health facilities, worry about undue political influence on the health system, and the provision of free healthcare provided by NGOs. All models adjust for the same sociodemographic covariates used in the main models. All predictors were measured through self-report survey items (full wording in Table S13, SI). This analysis allows us to examine more directly the contextual factors underlying loss of trust, which emerged as the key mediator in our main models.

Results

Sample demographics Table 1 provides summary statistics for our sample, victimization rates, healthcare-seeking behaviors, and other variables reported in this study. The table reports averages after applying sample weights. The corresponding raw frequencies are reported in the text. As shown, of the 3,006 respondents, 71% (n=2,172) were female and 29% (n=834) were male, with an average age of 36 years. Caregivers provided information on 3,006 children, of whom 48% (n=1,448) were female and 52% (n=1,558) male, with a mean age of 2.5 years.

Figure 3: Prevalence and type of violent victimization



Note: The figure shows the prevalence and types of violent victimization suffered by respondents at the hands of armed actors, n=3,006. The data are representative of Adamawa, Borno, and Yobe states, Nigeria.

Victimization prevalence Table 1 and Figure 3 also show the prevalence of different types of victimization in our sample. Common forms of victimization include physical assault, experienced by 11.1% (n=338) of respondents, and the killing or kidnapping of a household member, experienced by 4.9% (n=155) and 4.5% (n=129) of respondents, respectively. Most importantly, overall no fewer than 21% of respondents (n=651) reported being victimized by some form of severe violence, underscoring the importance of considering the impact of individual-level victimization on healthcare-seeking behavior, rather than examining only broader exposure to conflict.

Healthcare-seeking As for the prevalence of healthcare-seeking for child and maternal health, full childhood immunization coverage was 61% (n=1,563), significantly below the global average of over 80% [70]. Antenatal care was relatively high compared to other Nigerian states, with 77% (n=2,129) of women attending at least four recommended visits during pregnancy [71]. Children were born in a health clinic or hospital in 61% (n=1,559) of cases, slightly below the 70% estimated

Table 1: Summary statistics for sample demographics, predictors, outcomes, and mediators

	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Count
Sample demographics					
Respondent female	0.71	0.45	0.00	1.00	3,006
Respondent age	36.19	10.52	15.00	82.00	3,006
Child female	0.48	0.50	0.00	1.00	3,006
Child age	2.49	1.30	1.00	5.00	3,006
Victimization prevalence					
Victimized during armed violence	0.21	0.41	0.00	1.00	3,006
Healthcare-seeking behavior					
Child fully vaccinated	0.62	0.48	0.00	1.00	3,006
Recommended antenatal care	0.77	0.42	0.00	1.00	3,006
Birth at medical facility	0.61	0.49	0.00	1.00	3,006
Used government clinic for child	0.80	0.40	0.00	1.00	2,196
Child health outcomes					
Child had health issue when born	0.03	0.16	0.00	1.00	3,006
Child had health issue during last year	0.24	0.43	0.00	1.00	3,006
Mediators					
Fear of victimization	0.47	0.50	0.00	1.00	3,006
Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)	0.24	0.43	0.00	1.00	3,006
Loss of trust in healthcare workers	0.19	0.39	0.00	1.00	3,006
Predictors of loss of trust					
State security perpetrator	0.08	0.27	0.00	1.00	3,006
Feared for security at health facility	0.03	0.18	0.00	1.00	3,006
Worried about undue influence	0.11	0.31	0.00	1.00	3,006
Free healthcare provided by NGO	0.08	0.27	0.00	1.00	3,006
Absenteeism of healthcare workers	0.19	0.40	0.00	1.00	3,006

Note: Summary statistics for the main outcome and treatment variables used in the study. Reduced number of observations in variable "Used government clinic for child" due to question only asked of individuals reporting use of health care. Statistics for all variables, including covariates, can be found in Table S4 in the Supplementary Information (SI), and balance statistics, which list values for cases and controls separately in line with the STROBE [46] statement, are shown in Table S5, SI.

for births in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) [72]. Use of government facilities for child health care was reported by 80% (n=1,805) of respondents, reflecting the dominance of the public health sector in the country. Other measures included in the the table are discussed below.

Statistical results Figure 4 shows the results of the matched case-control logistic regression model, which examines the relationship between healthcare-seeking behavior and violent victimization. Victimization does not significantly affect whether respondents attended the recommended number of prenatal care visits (OR: 1.25, 95% CI: 0.93–1.69). Contrary to expectations, the likelihood that a child born to victimized caregivers was delivered in a health clinic or hospital was slightly *higher* than among matched non-victimized individuals (OR: 1.30, 95% CI: 1.01–1.66). However, this result lacks full robustness across alternative model specifications (see Section J in the SI). Thus, healthcare-seeking for maternal health does not differ significantly between victimized and non-victimized individuals. In contrast, there are strong differences in healthcare-seeking for children's

health. Children of victimized caregivers were significantly less likely to be fully vaccinated (OR: 0.43, 95% CI: 0.32–0.57). A striking difference emerged in healthcare-seeking *patterns*: children of victimized caregivers were far less likely to be taken to government-run clinics compared to private facilities (OR: 0.23, 95% CI: 0.14–0.39).

Figure 4: Effect of violent victimization on healthcare-seeking behavior and child health



Note: Coefficient plots from a regression of indicators of healthcare-seeking for maternal and child health, and of child health outcomes, on violent victimization. Reported coefficients are odds ratios after unconditional logistic regression using the matched sample of cases and controls. Average values for the matched data for healthcare-seeking are shown in the SI, Figure S1, full regression results are reported in Table S6, and conditional logistic regression results are shown in Figure S3 and Table S7. Full regression results for health outcomes are shown in Table S8, SI. Markers are point estimates, lines 95% confidence intervals. Standard errors clustered at the level of the matched pair.

Figure 4 also shows that victimization has consequences for child health. Children of caregivers who experienced violence were less likely to be fully healthy at birth (OR: 5.47, 95% CI: 2.64–11.34) and more likely to have recently suffered from health issues such as respiratory, digestion, or coordination problems; or hearing and vision problems (OR: 1.48, 95% CI: 1.10–1.99).

To confirm the validity of our findings, we conducted a number of robustness checks. First, conditional logistic regression yields very similar estimates to our main unconditional models: antenatal care (OR = 1.14, 95% CI: 0.89–1.45 vs. 1.08), skilled birth attendance (OR = 1.26, 95% CI: 1.01–1.59 vs. 1.18), full child vaccination (OR = 0.50, 95% CI: 0.40–0.63 vs. 0.43), and use of government facilities for child care (OR = 0.17, 95% CI: 0.10–0.28 vs. 0.23). Second, restricting the analysis to female respondents produced substantively unchanged results (Table S9). Third, applying small-area (500×500 m) fixed effects likewise yielded very similar estimates (Table S10, SI). This implies that our findings hold even when comparing closely matched individuals living in the same local area, where healthcare supply factors should be constant, making it highly unlikely that the observed differences in healthcare-seeking behavior are driven by variation in service availability rather than the effects of victimization.

Mediation analysis What explains the lower healthcare-seeking for child health and the shift away from government healthcare among victimized respondents? To investigate this, we examined three

key factors discussed in the literature: i) fear of future victimization, which may lead to avoidance behavior; ii) poor mental health, which may impair individuals' ability to engage in healthcare-seeking behavior; and iii) loss of trust in healthcare personnel, which may prevent victimized individuals from engaging with government institutions.

Table 2: Mediation analyses

Dependent variable:	Child fully vaccinated			Used government clinic for child		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Mediator:	FearVict	PTSD	DistrustMed	FearVict	PTSD	DistrustMed
Nat. indirect effect	-0.001	-0.001	-0.041**	-0.030***	0.003	-0.089***
	(-0.011, 0.009)	(-0.010, 0.009)	(-0.073, -0.009)	(-0.050, -0.010)	(-0.002, 0.008)	(-0.137, -0.041)
Total effect	-0.096***	-0.082***	-0.128***	-0.073**	-0.052*	-0.127***
	(-0.150, -0.042)	(-0.138, -0.026)	(-0.174, -0.082)	(-0.138, -0.008)	(-0.110, 0.006)	(-0.173, -0.080)
Proportion mediated (PM)	0.01	0.01	0.32**	0.41*	-0.06	0.70***
	(-0.09, 0.12)	(-0.11, 0.13)	(0.03, 0.61)	(-0.04, 0.86)	(-0.17, 0.06)	(0.25, 1.16)
N	1,302	1,302	1,302	979	979	979

Note: Mediation analysis for the effect of violent victimization on child healthcare-seeking. Models 1–3 show mediation analyses for our indicator as to whether a child is fully vaccinated, Models 4–6 show mediation analyses for the effect of victimization on child healthcare-seeking at government health clinics or hospitals. Nat. indirect effect stands for natural indirect (mediated) effect. FearVict records respondents reporting fear of future violence, PTSD measures respondents suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, and DistrustMed records whether respondents report a loss of trust in healthcare workers. Reported coefficients are marginal effects after logistic regression. Matched sample of victimized and non-victimized respondents. Proportions mediated do not sum to 100 since baseline values vary (the total effect is conditional on controlling for the other mediators). Standard errors clustered at the level of the matched pair, 95% confidence intervals in parentheses, * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 2 shows the extent to which the effect of violent victimization on child health is mediated by these three factors. For childhood vaccination rates, neither fear of future victimization (PM: 0.01, 95% CI: -0.09–0.12) nor PTSD (PM: 0.01, 95% CI: -0.11–0.13) mediated the effect of victimization, despite all proposed mediators being strongly predicted by violent victimization, as shown in Table S12 in the SI, and prior work documenting or suggesting a mediating role for trauma [73–78]. This divergence may reflect features of our setting and measurement: PTSD symptoms were captured with the PCL-8, which may underrepresent avoidance and numbing domains most relevant to preventive care, while contextual constraints such as staff absenteeism, politicization of services, and indeed fear and distrust, may act more proximally on care-seeking behavior than trauma [17, 19].

Supporting this idea, loss of trust in healthcare workers emerges as a strong and statistically significant mediator, explaining approximately one third (PM: 0.32, 95% CI: 0.03–0.61) of the effect of victimization. The mediation pattern is more complex for children's healthcare-seeking in government facilities. Here, 41% of the effect of victimization (controlling for other mediators) could be attributed to perceived insecurity, a result that approaches conventional statistical significance (PM: 0.41, 95% CI: -0.04–0.86). PTSD, once again, does not mediate the effect of victimization (PM: -0.06, 95% CI: -0.17–0.06). However, mistrust in healthcare providers has an extraordinarily strong mediating effect, explaining no less than 70% of the conditional effect of victimization (PM: 0.70, 95% CI: 0.25–1.16). Our analysis thus confirms the importance of fear and especially trust

as important mediators. While these results align with previous research, they provide stronger empirical evidence linking both factors directly to victimization rather than to general exposure to armed violence. In contrast, despite its theoretical plausibility and prior empirical support, in our setting poor mental health (PTSD) does not explain the negative impact of victimization on healthcare-seeking for children.

Determinants of the loss of trust in healthcare workers Given the important role of a loss of trust in mediating healthcare-seeking behavior, we investigated its underlying determinants in the final step of our analysis. A key finding was that loss of trust in health workers was strongly correlated with loss of trust in other state institutions. Specifically, individuals who lose trust in the government (OR: 35.76, 95% CI: 23.72, 53.91) and insecurity forces (OR: 23.76, 95% CI: 17.43, 32.38) were significantly more likely to lose trust in healthcare providers. These findings suggest that distrust in healthcare workers extends beyond the health sector, reflecting a broader erosion of trust in state institutions. This generalized distrust may result from a perceived failure of the government or security forces to protect individuals from violence, leading victims to associate the healthcare system with the same institutions they hold responsible for their victimization.

Second, we regress the indicator for loss of trust in healthcare workers on several conflict-related experiences reported in our survey. Specifically, we focus on whether distrust is linked to: i) violent victimization at the hands of state security forces, ii) healthcare workers absenteeism when respondents sought medical assistance, iii) fear for personal safety while at a health facility, iv) concerns that health facilities were unduly influenced by the government, or v) receiving free healthcare from nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

Victimization by state security forces is alarmingly common in our sample. Among those who experienced violence, more than one-third of victimized respondents (38%) – equivalent to 8% (n=212) of the full sample, see Table 1 – reported that state security forces were the perpetrators. Such experiences are likely to undermine trust in the government, which in turn may spill over to health workers [66, 79, 80].

Figure 5: Determinants of loss of trust in healthcare workers



Note: Coefficient plots from a regression of the indicator for loss of trust in healthcare workers on various potential explanatory variables. Reported coefficients are odds ratios after unconditional logistic regression using the matched sample of cases and controls. Markers are point estimates, lines 95% confidence intervals. Standard errors clustered at the level of the matched pair.

Similarly, health worker absenteeism, experienced by 17% (n=527) of respondents, has previously been found to correlate with lower levels of trust [81]. Concerns about the security of health facilities, cited by 4% (n=122) of respondents, and about undue political influence on health facilities, cited by 13% (n=396) of respondents, may also contribute to mistrust. In contrast, receiving free healthcare from NGOs, reported by 9% (n=272) of respondents, may have the opposite effect. Previous research suggests that humanitarian interventions providing free medical care can mitigate the negative effects of conflict exposure [18], and it is plausible that access to such services helps to restore trust in healthcare workers [68].

Figure 5 shows the results of the regression analysis. The dominant factors explaining the loss of trust in healthcare are victimization by state security forces (OR: 30.23, 95% CI: 17.64–51.81) and absenteeism of healthcare workers (OR: 13.43, 95% CI: 9.58–18.85). Other significant, but less pronounced, predictors include: feeling unsafe when seeking healthcare (OR: 2.01, 95% CI: 1.10–3.70) and worrying about undue political influence on the healthcare system (OR: 1.50, 95% CI: 1.02–2.20). Meanwhile, receiving free healthcare is associated with a relative gain in trust, but not significantly so (OR: 0.76, 95% CI: 0.47–1.22). Overall, the results clearly show how failed attempts to access healthcare and negative experiences with other government institutions contribute to a decline in trust.

Conclusion

Our study advances the literature on the health effects of armed conflict in three key ways. First, we focus explicitly on the effects of individual-level victimization, a quantitatively significant yet often overlooked consequence of armed conflict. Unlike broad measures of exposure to conflict, which are often defined in terms of proximity to violent events, victimization is a more direct and specific experience. In our sample, 21% of respondents reported experiencing severe forms of victimization, such as being violently attacked or having a household member killed. These respondents exhibit markedly different healthcare-seeking behaviors compared to non-victimized (but still conflict-exposed) individuals living in close proximity, underscoring the importance of looking beyond general exposure.

Second, echoing other recent research [9, 15–19, 22], we focus on demand-side effect, i.e., healthcare-seeking, rather than on supply-side factors such as the destruction of infrastructure. By adjusting for healthcare supply factors, such as proximity to health facilities or availability of health workers, and by using small-area fixed effects, we effectively isolated the effect of violence on the demand for healthcare. We found that while maternal health-seeking was resilient to victimization, child health outcomes showed acute vulnerability, with children of victimized caregivers having significantly lower vaccination rates and much lower rates of presentation to government health facilities. This is consistent with other studies that have found that pediatric care tends to be neglected in conflict-affected areas [18, 82].

Third, looking beyond top-level associations, we present strong evidence for a mechanism by which individual-level victimization translates into lower healthcare-seeking for child health and a shift in healthcare-seeking away from government-run facilities: a loss of trust in healthcare workers. We found that the loss of trust was most strongly associated with absenteeism among healthcare workers and instances of violent victimization by state security forces. Contrary to theoretical expectations [36, 37], victimization-induced trauma did not mediate the relationship between victimization and healthcare-seeking behavior.

As always, this study is not without limitations. For one, the cross-sectional nature of the data limits our ability to definitively establish causality. Although the matched case-control design strengthens causal inference, we cannot completely rule out the possibility that unobserved confounders may have influenced the results. In addition, the study focuses on a specific region in Nigeria, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other conflict-affected contexts. Future research should examine these relationships in different settings and strengthen causal inference by using longitudinal data to track causal pathways linking victimization, trust, and health-seeking behaviors over time.

While more research is needed to validate the results, our findings suggest several policy priorities. A first area of intervention is to prevent the loss of trust. Our findings suggest that to achieve this goal, at least basic emergency services should be provided throughout a violent conflict, and security forces should exercise the utmost discipline and care to avoid harming civilians. A second area of intervention is to mitigate the consequences where trust has already been lost and healthcare-seeking for children has been reduced. While other work has found that aid provided by NGOs can help counteract the negative effects of exposure to armed conflict on trust [18, 68], our evidence suggests that such aid may not be sufficient to rebuild trust among actual victims.

This calls for a deeper exploration of how trust might be rebuilt. One possible strategy is targeted child health interventions, for instance in the form of community engagement strategies [83–85], which could help rebuild state-community relations. Political science research also suggests that legal accountability for perpetrators is important for rebuilding trust [86], and that listening exercises that explicitly acknowledge suffering can be used to restore trust in the state after conflict [87–89], although it remains unclear whether these effects would extend to the health sector. Such interventions should be tested for their effectiveness in rebuilding trust in health workers, and specific tools developed.

Evidence from other conflict-affected contexts suggests that interventions can be designed to both improve health outcomes and rebuild trust in service delivery. Community Health Worker (CHW) programs in Afghanistan and Zimbabwe, which relied on locally recruited workers and participatory planning, have been shown to improve immunization coverage and strengthen community confidence in the health system [90–92]. In the Nigerian context, similar models could be adapted by training displaced persons or youth volunteers as health promoters in internally displaced persons (IDP) camps and host communities. Another example comes from Syria, where the establishment of gender-sensitive "Safe Spaces" and female-run clinics provided secure environments that addressed

psychosocial and cultural barriers, resulting in greater maternal healthcare uptake [93–96]. Comparable strategies in Nigeria could involve mobile units staffed by female health workers to enhance access and trust among women in conservative and insecure areas. Finally, conflict-sensitive vaccination campaigns in the Democratic Republic of Congo, which engaged community and religious leaders to counter misinformation, successfully increased polio immunization rates [97–100]. In northern Nigeria, such approaches could help overcome vaccine hesitancy and insecurity by involving local leaders, ensuring the neutrality of health teams, and integrating psychosocial support into primary care. While promising, these strategies require careful adaptation to Nigeria's sociopolitical realities, including close collaboration with religious institutions and strict avoidance of coercive associations with military actors.

Ultimately, our findings underscore that in contexts of protracted conflict, rebuilding trust is as central to improving health outcomes as restoring supply, and future interventions should be rigorously evaluated with this dual objective in mind.

References

[1] Hazem Adam Ghobarah, Paul Huth, and Bruce Russett. "The Post-War Public Health Effects of Civil Conflict". *Social Science & Medicine* 59.4 (Aug. 1, 2004), pp. 869–884 (cit. on p. 2).

[2] Iris Kesternich et al. "The Effects of World War II on Economic and Health Outcomes Across Europe". *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 96.1 (2014), pp. 103–118 (cit. on p. 2).

[3] Zachary Wagner et al. "Women and Children Living in Areas of Armed Conflict in Africa: A Geospatial Analysis of Mortality and Orphanhood". *The Lancet Global Health* 7.12 (Dec. 1, 2019), e1622–e1631. pmid: 31669039 (cit. on p. 2).

[4] Thomas Plümper and Eric Neumayer. "The Unequal Burden of War: The Effect of Armed Conflict on the Gender Gap in Life Expectancy". *International Organization* 60.3 (July 2006), pp. 723–754 (cit. on p. 2).

[5] Mevlude Akbulut-Yuksel. "War during Childhood: The Long Run Effects of Warfare on Health". *Journal of Health Economics* 53 (May 1, 2017), pp. 117–130 (cit. on p. 2).

[6] Zaryab Iqbal and Christopher Zorn. "Violent Conflict and the Spread of HIV/AIDS in Africa". *The Journal of Politics* 72.1 (Jan. 1, 2010), pp. 149–162 (cit. on p. 2).

[7] Adanna Chukwuma and Uche Eseosa Ekhator-Mobayode. "Armed Conflict and Maternal Health Care Utilization: Evidence from the Boko Haram Insurgency in Nigeria". *Social Science & Medicine* 226 (Apr. 1, 2019), pp. 104–112 (cit. on p. 2).

[8] Shanna A. Kirschner and Amelia B. Finaret. "Conflict and Health: Building on the Role of Infrastructure". *World Development* 146 (Oct. 1, 2021), p. 105570 (cit. on p. 2).

[9] Daniel Meierrieks and Max Schaub. "Terrorism and Child Mortality". *Health Economics* 33.1 (2024), pp. 21–40 (cit. on pp. 2, 12).

[10] Susan McKay. "The Effects of Armed Conflict on Girls and Women". *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 4.4 (Dec. 1, 1998), pp. 381–392 (cit. on p. 2).

[11] Sima L. Sharara and Souha S. Kanj. "War and Infectious Diseases: Challenges of the Syrian Civil War". *PLOS Pathogens* 10.11 (Nov. 13, 2014), e1004438 (cit. on p. 2).

[12] Primus Che Chi et al. "Perceptions of the Effects of Armed Conflict on Maternal and Reproductive Health Services and Outcomes in Burundi and Northern Uganda: A Qualitative Study". *BMC International Health and Human Rights* 15.1 (Apr. 3, 2015), p. 7 (cit. on p. 2).

[13] Thomas Druetz et al. "Effects of Terrorist Attacks on Access to Maternal Healthcare Services: A National Longitudinal Study in Burkina Faso". *BMJ Global Health* 5.9 (Sept. 1, 2020), e002879. pmid: 32978211 (cit. on p. 2).

[14] James I Price and Alok K Bohara. "Maternal Health Care amid Political Unrest: The Effect of Armed Conflict on Antenatal Care Utilization in Nepal". *Health Policy and Planning* 28.3 (May 1, 2013), pp. 309–319 (cit. on p. 2).

[15] Pontius Bayo et al. "Maternal and Neonatal Health Care Service Utilisation in the Wake of Active Conflict and Socio-Economic Downturn in Torit County, Republic of South Sudan: A Multimethod Locally Driven Study". *African Journal of Reproductive Health* 25.3s (3s Oct. 14, 2021), pp. 30–42 (cit. on pp. 2, 12).

[16] Olabayo Ojeleke et al. "The Impact of Armed Conflicts on Health-Care Utilization in Northern Nigeria: A Difference-in-Differences Analysis". *World Medical & Health Policy* 14.4 (2022), pp. 624–664 (cit. on pp. 2, 12).

[17] Max Schaub. "Violent Conflict and the Demand for Healthcare: How Armed Conflict Reduces Trust, Instills Fear, and Increases Child Mortality". *Social Science & Medicine* 359 (Oct. 1, 2024), p. 117252 (cit. on pp. 2, 6, 10, 12).

[18] Gbadebo Collins Adeyanju et al. "Armed Violent Conflict and Healthcare-Seeking Behavior for Maternal and Child Health in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Systematic Review". *PLOS One* (Feb. 2025), p. 2024.03.11.24304112 (cit. on pp. 2, 12, 13).

[19] Augustin Tapsoba. "The Cost of Fear: Impact of Violence Risk on Child Health during Conflict". *Journal of Development Economics* 160 (Jan. 1, 2023), p. 102975 (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 6, 10, 12).

[20] Adanna Chukwuma, Thomas J. Bossert, and Kevin Croke. "Health Service Delivery and Political Trust in Nigeria". *SSM - Population Health* 7 (Apr. 1, 2019), p. 100382 (cit. on p. 2).

[21] Nik Stoop, Kalle Hirvonen, and Jean-Francois Maystadt. "Institutional Mistrust and Child Vaccination Coverage in Africa". *BMJ Global Health* 6.4 (Apr. 1, 2021), e004595. pmid: 33926893 (cit. on pp. 2, 6).

[22] Tingkai Zhang et al. "Does Armed Conflict Lead to Lower Prevalence of Maternal Health-Seeking Behaviours: Theoretical and Empirical Research Based on 55 683 Women in Armed Conflict Settings". *BMJ Global Health* 8.8 (Aug. 23, 2023). pmid: 10.1136/bmjgh-2023-012023 (cit. on pp. 2, 12).

[23] Centre for Democracy and Development. *Multiple Nodes, Common Causes: National Stocktake of Contemporary Insecurity and State Responses in Nigeria*. Report. 2022 (cit. on p. 2).

[24] Human Rights Watch. *World Report 2024: Nigeria*. Country chapter. 2024 (cit. on p. 2).

[25] Ayodele O. Albert and Andrew O. Thaddaeus. "The nexus of banditry, farmer-herder clashes and insecurity in Nigeria: Causes, consequences and policy responses". *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science* (2025), pp. 2083–2090. DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS.2025.905000164 (cit. on p. 2).

[26] Paul Timipa Igoli et al. "Impact of armed conflict on immunization and disease surveillance in Nigeria". *Conflict and Health* 17 (2023), p. 88. DOI: 10.1186/s13031-023-00588-w (cit. on p. 2).

[27] Aisha Ahmed. *A silent wildfire: The unfolding crisis of acute malnutrition among children in Northeast Nigeria*. Conference presentation, Florence Nightingale's Annual Week. 2025. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.32379.63526 (cit. on p. 2).

[28] Health Sector Working Group Nigeria. *Northeast Nigeria Humanitarian Response: Health Sector Bulletin (June 2025)*. ReliefWeb. 2025 (cit. on p. 2).

[29] R. O. Adesola et al. "Navigating Nigeria's health landscape: Population growth and its health implications". *Environmental Health Insights* 18 (2024), p. 11786302241250211. DOI: 10.1177/11786302241250211 (cit. on p. 2).

[30] Bashir H. Gulumbe et al. "Cholera outbreaks in conflict-hit regions of Northern Nigeria: An overview". *Afro-Egyptian Journal of Infectious and Endemic Diseases* 13.2 (2023), pp. 134–142. DOI: 10.21608/aeji.2023.205724.1286 (cit. on p. 2).

[31] V. O. Femi-Lawal et al. "Effects of armed conflicts and insecurity on the mental health of Nigerians". *Commentary* 3.1 (2023), p. 53. DOI: 10.56101/rimj.v3i1.53 (cit. on p. 2).

[32] U. U. Ibrahim, A. A. Aliyu, O. A. Abdulhakeem, et al. "Prevalence of Boko Haram crisis-related depression and post-traumatic stress disorder symptomatology among internally displaced persons in Yobe State, Nigeria". *Journal of Mental Health in Africa* 5.2 (2023), pp. 145–162 (cit. on p. 2).

[33] Joop T. V. M. de Jong et al. "Lifetime Events and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in 4 Postconflict Settings". *JAMA* 286.5 (Aug. 1, 2001), pp. 555–562 (cit. on p. 2).

[34] Phuong N Pham, Harvey M Weinstein, and Timothy Longman. "Trauma and PTSD Symptoms in Rwanda: Implications for Attitudes toward Justice and Reconciliation". *JAMA: the journal of the American Medical Association* 292.5 (Aug. 4, 2004), pp. 602–612. pmid: 15292086 (cit. on p. 2).

[35] Richard Neugebauer et al. "Post-Traumatic Stress Reactions among Rwandan Children and Adolescents in the Early Aftermath of Genocide". *International Journal of Epidemiology* 38.4 (Aug. 1, 2009), pp. 1033–1045 (cit. on p. 2).

[36] Uchenna Nworah et al. "Afghanistan and Iraq War Veterans' Health Care Needs and Their Underuse of Health Care Resources: Implications for Psychiatric-Mental Health Nurses". *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services* 52.6 (June 2014), pp. 42–49 (cit. on pp. 3, 13).

[37] Marije J. Splinter et al. "Prevalence and Determinants of Healthcare Avoidance during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Population-Based Cross-Sectional Study". *PLOS Medicine* 18.11 (Nov. 23, 2021), e1003854 (cit. on pp. 3, 13).

[38] Cynthia S. Minkovitz et al. "Maternal Depressive Symptoms and Children's Receipt of Health Care in the First 3 Years of Life". *Pediatrics* 115.2 (Feb. 1, 2005), pp. 306–314 (cit. on p. 3).

[39] Ebenezer Obadare. "A Crisis of Trust: History, Politics, Religion and the Polio Controversy in Northern Nigeria". *Patterns of Prejudice* 39.3 (2005), pp. 265–284 (cit. on p. 3).

[40] Ayodele Samuel Jegede. "What Led to the Nigerian Boycott of the Polio Vaccination Campaign?" *PLOS Medicine* 4.3 (Mar. 20, 2007), e73 (cit. on p. 3).

[41] Anna Petherick. “Ebola in West Africa: Learning the Lessons”. *The Lancet* 385.9968 (Feb. 14, 2015), pp. 591–592. pmid: 25682526 (cit. on p. 3).

[42] Marcella Alsan and Marianne Wanamaker. “Tuskegee and the Health of Black Men”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133.1 (Feb. 1, 2018), pp. 407–455 (cit. on pp. 3, 6).

[43] Abimbola Adesoji. “The Boko Haram Uprising and Islamic Revivalism in Nigeria”. *Africa Spectrum* 45.2 (Aug. 1, 2010), pp. 95–108 (cit. on p. 3).

[44] Wisdom Oghosa Iyekekpolo. “Boko Haram: Understanding the Context”. *Third World Quarterly* 37.12 (Dec. 1, 2016), pp. 2211–2228 (cit. on p. 3).

[45] F. S. Sofia and E. Chris. “Suspected Female Suicide Bombers Death Toll Rises to 32 in Nigeria”. *BBC News* (2024) (cit. on p. 3).

[46] Erik von Elm et al. “The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: Guidelines for Reporting Observational Studies”. *The Lancet* 370.9596 (Oct. 20, 2007), pp. 1453–1457 (cit. on pp. 3, 8).

[47] Max Schaub, Gbadebo Collins Adeyanju, and Liliana Abreu. *Replication Data for "Maternal and Child Health-Seeking among Victims of Violence in Armed Conflict: A Matched Case-Control Study in Northeast Nigeria"*. https://osf.io/6de2r/?view_only=6d65cbe2e1244aa393b50dd4738d0f25: OSF, Feb. 16, 2025 (cit. on p. 3).

[48] Kosuke Imai, Luke Keele, and Dustin Tingley. “A General Approach to Causal Mediation Analysis”. *Psychological Methods* 15.4 (2010), p. 309 (cit. on pp. 4, 6).

[49] Tyler J. VanderWeele and Eric J. Tchetgen Tchetgen. “Mediation Analysis With Matched Case-Control Study Designs”. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 183.9 (May 1, 2016), pp. 869–870 (cit. on p. 4).

[50] Neil Pearce. “Analysis of Matched Case-Control Studies”. *BMJ* 352 (Feb. 25, 2016), p. i969. pmid: 26916049 (cit. on p. 4).

[51] Chia-Ling Kuo, Yinghui Duan, and James Grady. “Unconditional or Conditional Logistic Regression Model for Age-Matched Case–Control Data?” *Frontiers in Public Health* 6 (Mar. 2, 2018) (cit. on p. 4).

[52] OpenStreetMap contributors. *Nigeria Roads (OpenStreetMap Export)*. Accessed: 2024-12-02. Licensed under Open Database License (ODbL). Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT), 2024 (cit. on p. 4).

[53] Jonathan F Mosser et al. “Mapping Diphtheria-Pertussis-Tetanus Vaccine Coverage in Africa, 2000–2016: A Spatial and Temporal Modelling Study”. *The Lancet* 393.10183 (May 4, 2019), pp. 1843–1855 (cit. on p. 5).

[54] Alyssa N. Sbarra et al. “Mapping Routine Measles Vaccination in Low- and Middle-Income Countries”. *Nature* 589.7842 (Jan. 2021), pp. 415–419 (cit. on p. 5).

[55] Daniel J Weiss et al. “Mapping the Global Prevalence, Incidence, and Mortality of Plasmodium Falciparum, 2000–17: A Spatial and Temporal Modelling Study”. *The Lancet* 394.10195 (July 27, 2019), pp. 322–331 (cit. on p. 5).

[56] Aaron Osgood-Zimmerman et al. “Mapping Child Growth Failure in Africa between 2000 and 2015”. *Nature* 555.7694 (Feb. 28, 2018), pp. 41–47. pmid: 29493591 (cit. on p. 5).

[57] Roy Burstein et al. “Mapping 123 Million Neonatal, Infant and Child Deaths between 2000 and 2017”. *Nature* 574.7778 (7778 Oct. 2019), pp. 353–358 (cit. on p. 5).

[58] Carl Müller-Crepon. "State Reach and Development in Africa since the 1960s: New Data and Analysis". *Political Science Research and Methods* (Nov. 10, 2021), pp. 1–10 (cit. on p. 5).

[59] Peter C Austin. "Optimal Caliper Widths for Propensity-Score Matching When Estimating Differences in Means and Differences in Proportions in Observational Studies". *Pharmaceutical Statistics* 10.2 (Mar. 2011), pp. 150–161. pmid: 20925139 (cit. on p. 5).

[60] Cindy Darzi and John Hunsley. "The reliability of the Harvard Trauma Questionnaire: A reliability generalization meta-analysis". *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 73.6 (2017), pp. 609–620. DOI: 10.1002/jclp.22324 (cit. on p. 6).

[61] Joseph Christy et al. "The PTSD Checklist (PCL): A comprehensive review of psychometric properties across diverse populations". *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 34.2 (2021), pp. 254–268. DOI: 10.1002/jts.22666 (cit. on p. 6).

[62] Zachary Steel et al. "Association of torture and other potentially traumatic events with mental health outcomes among populations exposed to mass conflict and displacement: a systematic review and meta-analysis". *JAMA* 302.5 (2009), pp. 537–549. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2009.1132 (cit. on p. 6).

[63] Timothy J. Geier et al. "Validation of Abbreviated Four- and Eight-Item Versions of the PTSD Checklist for DSM-5 in a Traumatically Injured Sample". *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 33.3 (2020), pp. 218–226 (cit. on p. 6).

[64] Dan W. Grupe and Jack B. Nitschke. "Uncertainty and anticipation in anxiety: an integrated neurobiological and psychological perspective". *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 14.7 (2013), pp. 488–501. DOI: 10.1038/nrn3524 (cit. on p. 6).

[65] Bengt B. Arnetz et al. "Workplace violence prevention in healthcare: standards, research, and guidance". *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety* 48.4 (2022), pp. 190–196. DOI: 10.1016/S1553-7250(22)00032-0 (cit. on p. 6).

[66] Alexander De Juan and Jan Henryk Pierskalla. "Civil War Violence and Political Trust: Microlevel Evidence from Nepal". *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 33.1 (Feb. 1, 2016), pp. 67–88 (cit. on pp. 6, 11).

[67] Mikko Mattila and Lauri Rapeli. "Just Sick of It? Health and Political Trust in Western Europe". *European Journal of Political Research* 57.1 (2018), pp. 116–134 (cit. on p. 6).

[68] Robert A. Blair, Benjamin S. Morse, and Lily L. Tsai. "Public Health and Public Trust: Survey Evidence from the Ebola Virus Disease Epidemic in Liberia". *Social Science & Medicine* 172 (Jan. 1, 2017), pp. 89–97 (cit. on pp. 6, 12, 13).

[69] Tyler VanderWeele and Stijn Vansteelandt. "Mediation Analysis with Multiple Mediators". *Epidemiologic Methods* 2.1 (Jan. 3, 2014), pp. 95–115 (cit. on p. 6).

[70] Camille E. Jones. "Routine Vaccination Coverage — Worldwide, 2023". *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 73 (2024) (cit. on p. 7).

[71] Richard Gyan Aboagye et al. "Health Insurance Coverage and Timely Antenatal Care Attendance in Sub-Saharan Africa". *BMC Health Services Research* 22.1 (Feb. 11, 2022), p. 181 (cit. on p. 7).

[72] Gary Joseph et al. "Inequalities in the Coverage of Place of Delivery and Skilled Birth Attendance: Analyses of Cross-Sectional Surveys in 80 Low and Middle-Income Countries". *Reproductive Health* 13.1 (June 17, 2016), p. 77 (cit. on p. 8).

[73] Jeanne L. Alhusen. "Intimate partner violence during pregnancy: maternal and neonatal outcomes". *Journal of Women's Health* 24.1 (2015), pp. 52–59. DOI: 10.1089/jwh.2014.4872 (cit. on p. 10).

[74] Brittany Jamieson. "Exposure to interpersonal violence during pregnancy and its association with women's prenatal care utilization: A meta-analytic review". *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 21.5 (2020), pp. 904–921. DOI: 10.1177/1524838018806511 (cit. on p. 10).

[75] Allison Testa. "Intimate partner violence and barriers to prenatal care". *Social Science & Medicine* 316 (2023), p. 115591. DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115591 (cit. on p. 10).

[76] Jennifer Waldron et al. "Trauma symptoms and antenatal care engagement in pregnant women exposed to violence". *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 37.13-14 (2022), NP12123–NP12147. DOI: 10.1177/08862605211067423 (cit. on p. 10).

[77] Maria Christou-Ergos, Kerrin E. Wiley, and Julie Leask. "Traumatic events and vaccination decisions: A systematic review". *Vaccines* 10.6 (2022), p. 911. DOI: 10.3390/vaccines10060911 (cit. on p. 10).

[78] Maria Christou-Ergos, Julie Leask, and Kerrin E. Wiley. "Association between traumatic life events and vaccine hesitancy: A cross-sectional Australian study". *Public Health* 216 (2023), pp. 1–6. DOI: 10.1016/j.puhe.2023.05.004 (cit. on p. 10).

[79] Pauline Grosjean. "Conflict and Social and Political Preferences: Evidence from World War II and Civil Conflict in 35 European Countries". *Comparative Economic Studies* 56.3 (2014), pp. 424–451 (cit. on p. 11).

[80] Elsa Voytas and Benjamin Crisman. "State Violence and Participation in Transitional Justice: Evidence from Colombia". *Journal of Peace Research* 61.6 (Nov. 1, 2024), pp. 1069–1084 (cit. on p. 11).

[81] Larissa Klootwijk et al. "Absenteeism of Healthcare Workers in Primary Healthcare in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Scoping Review". *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management* n/a.n/a (2025) (cit. on p. 12).

[82] Anu Rammohan et al. "Exposure to Conflicts and the Continuum of Maternal Healthcare: Analyses of Pooled Cross-Sectional Data for 452,192 Women across 49 Countries and 82 Surveys". *PLOS Medicine* 18.9 (Sept. 28, 2021), e1003690 (cit. on p. 12).

[83] Alastair K. Ager et al. "Health Service Resilience in Yobe State, Nigeria in the Context of the Boko Haram Insurgency: A Systems Dynamics Analysis Using Group Model Building". *Conflict and Health* 9.1 (Oct. 5, 2015), p. 30 (cit. on p. 13).

[84] Anna Durrance-Bagale et al. "Community Engagement in Health Systems Interventions and Research in Conflict-Affected Countries: A Scoping Review of Approaches". *Global Health Action* 15.1 (Dec. 31, 2022), p. 2074131. pmid: 35762841 (cit. on p. 13).

[85] Liliana Abreu et al. "Mistrust, Violence, and Patriarchy: Perceived Barriers to Maternal and Child Healthcare Access in Conflict-Affected Northern Nigeria". Working paper. 2025 (cit. on p. 13).

[86] Risa Kitagawa. "From Political Violence to Political Trust? How Transitional Justice Affects Citizen Views of Government". *International Studies Quarterly* 67.1 (Mar. 1, 2023), sqad013 (cit. on p. 13).

[87] Marc L Hutchison and Kristin Johnson. "Capacity to Trust? Institutional Capacity, Conflict, and Political Trust in Africa, 2000–2005". *Journal of Peace Research* 48.6 (Nov. 1, 2011), pp. 737–752 (cit. on p. 13).

[88] Alissandra T Stoyan et al. "Trust in Government Institutions: The Effects of Performance and Participation in the Dominican Republic and Haiti". *International Political Science Review* 37.1 (Jan. 1, 2016), pp. 18–35 (cit. on p. 13).

[89] Pui-Hang Wong. "How Can Political Trust Be Built after Civil Wars? Evidence from Post-Conflict Sierra Leone". *Journal of Peace Research* 53.6 (Nov. 1, 2016), pp. 772–785 (cit. on p. 13).

[90] Said Ahmad Maisam Najafizada, Ronald Labonté, and Ivy Lynn Bourgeault. "Community health workers of Afghanistan: a qualitative study of a national program". *Conflict and Health* 8 (2014), p. 26. DOI: 10.1186/1752-1505-8-26 (cit. on p. 13).

[91] Nathan P. Miller et al. "Assessing community health worker service delivery in humanitarian settings". *Conflict and Health* 14 (2020), p. 73. DOI: 10.1186/s13031-020-00325-1 (cit. on p. 13).

[92] S. Hemat et al. "A framework for community health worker optimisation in conflict settings: prerequisites and possibilities from Northwest Syria". *BMJ Global Health* 8.8 (2023), e011837. DOI: 10.1136/bmjgh-2023-011837 (cit. on p. 13).

[93] Mohsen Abbasi-Kangevari et al. "Gender-sensitive clinics and safe spaces increase maternal care uptake in conflict settings". *Conflict and Health* 14 (2020), p. 50. DOI: 10.1186/s13031-020-00324-2 (cit. on p. 14).

[94] A. A. Abujaber et al. "Female-run clinics and improved maternal health during the Syrian conflict". *Health Policy and Planning* 36.10 (2021), pp. 1509–1518. DOI: 10.1093/heapol/czab078 (cit. on p. 14).

[95] N. Chowdhary et al. "Mobile gender-sensitive health units: bridging the access gap in crisis". *BMJ Global Health* 7.5 (2022), e008098. DOI: 10.1136/bmjgh-2022-008098 (cit. on p. 14).

[96] R. Mourtada et al. "Syrian refugee women's access to family planning services in Lebanon during overlapping crises". *BMC Women's Health* 21 (2021), p. 475. DOI: 10.1186/s12905-023-02613-8 (cit. on p. 14).

[97] Obinna Ezezika et al. "Community-led approaches to polio immunization in conflict-affected areas: lessons from the DRC". *Vaccine* 40.17 (2022), pp. 2424–2432. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2022.02.012 (cit. on p. 14).

[98] Mohammed Sabahelzain et al. "Community leaders' role in promoting vaccination in conflict zones". *Vaccine* 43 (2025), pp. 1200–1208. DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2025.01.005 (cit. on p. 14).

[99] Isis Riddle and Safiya Obeegadoo. "Faith and immunization: leveraging religious leaders to improve child health in the DRC". *American Journal of Public Health* 115.3 (2025), e190–e198. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2024.306255 (cit. on p. 14).

[100] World Health Organization African Region. *Conflict-sensitive vaccination strategies in fragile settings: Practical guidance*. Technical document. 2023 (cit. on p. 14).

Supplementary Information (SI) for "Maternal and child healthcare-seeking among victims of violence in armed conflict: A matched case-control study in northeast Nigeria"

Table of Contents

A	Consensus statement	1
B	STROBE reporting checklist for case-control study	3
C	Sample size and participation rates	4
D	Summary statistics	5
E	Descriptive outcomes	6
F	Balance statistics	7
G	Regression output	8
H	Conditional logistic regression	9
I	Consequences for child health	10
J	Robustness checks	11
K	Direct effect on mediators	14
L	Survey question wording	15

A Consensus statement

Table S1: Consensus statement

Category/Question	Response
Study Conceptualisation	
How does this study address local research and policy priorities?	Our study examines maternal and child health in three states in northeastern Nigeria.This was already an area of active research for all the Nigerian institutions involved in the study, and is therefore closely aligned with local priorities.The focus on the health impact of armed violence is particularly important because of the high burden that the armed insurgency has placed on local populations and health workers, and the fact that health outcomes have deteriorated in the wake of the insurgency. A better understanding of the reasons for this is crucial to improving service delivery and health outcomes.
How were local researchers involved in study design?	Local researchers participated in the conceptualization and design. The VIVAC team held its first meeting at Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital, Nigeria, in February 2023.The research idea was fully discussed and inputs were provided by all members, including national and international collaborators.
Research Management	
How has funding been used to support the local research team(s)?	Funding supported training in research ethics, research methods, and grant writing, with some courses offered online.
Data Acquisition and Analysis	
How are research staff who conducted data collection acknowledged?	State enumerators, supervised by state coordinators, generated the data. Their contributions earned them authorship, and all contributors beyond the authors were acknowledged.
How have members of the research partnership been provided with access to study data?	Partners accessed study data through a cloud-based platform with secure login credentials per state and for the Nigeria Project Lead.
How were data used to develop analytical skills within the partnership?	Shared data were reviewed and discussed both formally and informally, including communication between state coordinators and the national team leader for clarifications.
Data Interpretation	
How have research partners collaborated in interpreting study data?	All results were interpreted with state teams to ensure local relevance. Findings were discussed in bi-weekly research team meetings.
Drafting and Revising for Intellectual Content	
How were research partners supported to develop writing skills?	Partners participated in report and manuscript writing. After fieldwork, team members documented activities, lessons learned, and challenges to guide future research.
How will research products be shared to address local needs?	Findings will be shared with local stakeholders on an ongoing basis, disseminated through meetings in all states, and published for easy access by the public. A first dissemination meeting was held in January 2025 with representatives of the maternal and child health services in the Ministries of Health of Adamawa, Borno and Yobe states, the WHO Nigeria Country Office and the National Primary Healthcare Development Agency (NPHCDA).
Authorship	
How is the leadership, contribution, and ownership of this work by LMIC researchers recognized?	Leadership and ownership were established through appropriate authorship positions. More than half (7/11) of co-authors are LMIC researchers.

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

Category/Question	**Response**
How have early career researchers across the partnership been included? How has gender balance been addressed within the authorship?	At least 3 national collaborators are early career researchers with fewer than 10 publications. They were given priority in authorship. The team is gender-balanced, with 5 of 11 authors being female, ensuring diversity, equity, and inclusion.
Training	
How has the project contributed to training of LMIC researchers?	Five LMIC co-authors received training in health research ethics, research methods, and data analysis at the start of the project. Enumerators were trained in interviewing methods – skills that will be transferable to future work.
Infrastructure	
How has the project contributed to improvements in local infrastructure?	The project provided 24 data collection tablets and 6 digital audio recorders to Bayero University & Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital, Nigeria.
Governance	
What safeguarding procedures were used to protect local study participants and researchers?	Participants were interviewed in safe environments. Security personnel were employed in high-risk areas, ensuring researchers' safety.

B STROBE reporting checklist for case-control study

Table S2: STROBE reporting

Reporting Item	Item Nr.	Reporting Item	Page Nr.
Title	#1a	Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
Abstract	#1b	Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	1
Background / rationale	#2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4
Objectives	#3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4
Study design	#4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	#5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	5
Eligibility criteria	#6a	Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls.	5
Eligibility criteria	#6b	For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	6
	#7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6–7
Data sources / measurement	#8	For each variable of interest give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement)	6–7, SI 15–19
Bias	#9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	9
Study size	#10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	5, SI 4
Quantitative variables	#11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses	8, SI 15–19
Statistical methods	#12a	Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	6, 9
Statistical methods	#12b	Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	SI 11
Statistical methods	#12c	Explain how missing data were addressed	SI 5
Statistical methods	#12d	If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	6
Statistical methods	#12e	Describe any sensitivity analyses	SI 11–13
Participants	#13a	Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study	SI 4
Participants	#13b	Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	SI 4
Participants	#13c	Consider use of a flow diagram	SI 4
Descriptive data	#14a	Give characteristics of study participants	8, SI 5
Descriptive data	#14b	Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	SI 5
Outcome data	#15	Report numbers in each exposure category	SI 7
Main results	#16a	Give unadjusted estimates and confounder-adjusted estimates	SI 13
Main results	#16b	Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
Main results	#16c	Consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk	NA
Other analyses	#17	Report other analyses done	10, SI 11–13
Key results	#18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11–12
Limitations	#19	Discuss limitations of the study, considering bias or imprecision	12
Interpretation	#20	Give a cautious overall interpretation	12
Generalisability	#21	Discuss the generalisability of the study results	12
Funding	#22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders	3

C Sample size and participation rates

Sample size considerations

For estimating the prospective sample size, we used the share of fully vaccinated children as the target outcome since we knew that we would be able to record this outcome with high fidelity (by reviewing immunization cards). Sampling size was based on the assumption that this share would be 60% in the non-victimized population, a figure derived from the Nigerian team's previous experience with smaller case numbers. Our goal was to detect a 10% point lower vaccination rate among victimized individuals with 0.8 power and 95% confidence. To do this, we would need 388 individual cases (i.e., individuals who were victims of armed violence). Assuming the rate of victimization to be 20%, we therefore would need to recruit a minimum of 388/.2=1,940 individuals. A further consideration was that this sample size would also allow the use of four times the number of treated units from which to select matched controls, a ratio well in line with the relevant literature [1]. As these numbers are highly sensitive to small deviations from the assumptions, we decided to aim for a sample size of n=3,000, i.e., a sample size that is 1,000 observations larger.

Participation rates

We attempted to recruit a total of 3,438 individuals. In 432 cases, recruitment attempts were unsuccessful or observations had to be excluded for quality reasons, for a total sample size of 3,006. The breakdown of the reasons for exclusion is provided in Table S3.

Table S3: Survey participation rates

Total contact attempts made	3,438
Total unsuccessful/excluded	432
*Reason for exclusion**	
No one at home	109
Refused	12
Incomplete	121
Too short	155
Incorrect location	158
Complete observations	3,006
Participation rate	87%

*Numbers do not add up to "Total unsuccessful/excluded" because several reasons can apply to the same observation.

D Summary statistics

Table S4: Summary statistics, full table

	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Count
Variables in focus					
Victimized during armed violence	0.21	0.41	0.00	1.00	3,006
Child fully vaccinated	0.62	0.48	0.00	1.00	3,006
Recommended antenatal care	0.77	0.42	0.00	1.00	3,006
Birth at medical facility	0.61	0.49	0.00	1.00	3,006
Used government clinic for child	0.80	0.40	0.00	1.00	2,196
Child had health issue when born	0.03	0.16	0.00	1.00	3,006
Child had health issue during last year	0.24	0.43	0.00	1.00	3,006
PTSD according to PCL8-5 index	0.24	0.43	0.00	1.00	3,006
Loss of trust in healthcare workers	0.19	0.39	0.00	1.00	3,006
State security perpetrator	0.08	0.27	0.00	1.00	3,006
Feared for security at health facility	0.03	0.18	0.00	1.00	3,006
Worried about undue influence	0.11	0.31	0.00	1.00	3,006
Free healthcare provided by NGO	0.08	0.27	0.00	1.00	3,006
Absenteeism of healthcare workers	0.19	0.40	0.00	1.00	3,006
Control variables					
Female	0.71	0.45	0.00	1.00	3,006
Age	36.19	10.52	15.00	82.00	3,006
Education	2.67	1.53	1.00	8.00	3,006
Number of children	5.18	3.86	1.00	60.00	3,006
Child female	0.48	0.50	0.00	1.00	3,006
Age of child	2.49	1.30	1.00	5.00	3,006
Muslim	0.76	0.42	0.00	1.00	3,006
Walking time to closest health facility	32.54	32.86	0.00	280.00	3,006
N healthcare facilities	0.20	0.45	0.00	2.00	3,006
DPT-3 coverage	0.29	0.15	0.05	0.44	3,006
Measles vaccination coverage	54.23	6.19	29.68	63.86	3,006
Under-5 mortality	19.42	1.59	16.48	23.47	3,006
Underweight prevalence	25.63	6.98	16.09	40.59	3,006
Malaria prevalence, age 0-4	0.34	0.21	0.19	1.31	3,006
Female education, age 20-24	4.95	1.20	1.66	6.85	3,006
Population density	59.94	52.66	0.00	190.20	3,006
Distance to major road	2.24	4.66	0.01	28.22	3,006
Road distance to regional capital	2.03	1.60	0.00	5.37	3,006

Note: Summary statistics for variables used in the study. Individual-level variables recoded to binary from survey questions reproduced in Table S13 below. Missing values coded as zero. Reduced number of observations in variable "Used government clinic for child" due to question only asked of individuals reporting use of health care.

E Descriptive outcomes

Figure S1: Descriptive differences in healthcare-seeking



(a) Recommended antenatal care

(b) Birth at medical facility

(c) Child fully vaccinated

(d) Used government clinic for child

Note: The figure shows the descriptive differences in healthcare-seeking between victimized and non-victimized respondents in the matched sample with 651 cases and 651 controls.

F Balance statistics

Table S5: Balance after matching

	Not victimized			Victimized			
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	Diff
Female	651	0.762	0.426	651	0.774	0.418	0.012
Age	651	34.207	10.123	651	33.955	9.511	-0.252
Education	651	2.367	1.506	651	2.333	1.555	-0.034
Number of children	651	4.416	2.946	651	4.206	2.961	-0.210
Child female	651	0.452	0.498	651	0.464	0.499	0.012
Age of child	651	2.307	1.242	651	2.255	1.331	-0.052
Muslim	651	0.720	0.449	651	0.737	0.440	0.017
Walking time to closest health facility	651	39.564	36.560	651	38.296	37.501	-1.267
N healthcare facilities	651	0.124	0.374	651	0.124	0.340	0.000
DPT-3 coverage	651	0.238	0.131	651	0.232	0.130	-0.006
Measles vaccination coverage	651	50.164	10.939	651	50.047	10.799	-0.116
Under-5 mortality	651	20.505	1.498	651	20.569	1.493	0.064
Underweight prevalence	651	28.156	4.852	651	28.488	4.865	0.332
Malaria prevalence, age 0-4	651	0.405	0.246	651	0.403	0.242	-0.003
Female education, age 20-24	651	4.139	1.257	651	4.075	1.245	-0.064
Population density	651	28.657	34.462	651	29.387	36.097	0.731
Distance to major road	651	3.417	5.812	651	3.205	5.686	-0.212
Road distance to regional capital	651	2.545	1.513	651	2.468	1.463	-0.077

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. *Note:* No statistically significant differences in Table.

Figure S2: Standardized mean differences between cases and controls



Note: The figure shows the remaining standardized mean bias between cases and controls after matching.

G Regression output

Table S6: Effect of violent victimization on healthcare-seeking behavior

	(1) AntenRec	(2) BirthMed	(3) ChildVacc	(4) ChildGov
Victimized during armed violence	1.25	1.30**	0.43***	0.23***
	[0.93,1.69]	[1.01,1.66]	[0.32,0.57]	[0.14,0.39]
Female	1.75***	1.27	1.97***	0.38**
	[1.17,2.62]	[0.89,1.81]	[1.33,2.91]	[0.17,0.83]
Age	1.01	1.02**	1.02*	0.98
	[0.99,1.03]	[1.00,1.04]	[1.00,1.03]	[0.95,1.02]
Education	1.05	1.12**	1.21***	1.32***
	[0.93,1.19]	[1.03,1.22]	[1.10,1.33]	[1.14,1.53]
Number of children	0.92**	0.92***	1.00	1.27***
	[0.87,0.98]	[0.88,0.97]	[0.95,1.05]	[1.07,1.50]
Child female	1.28	1.01	0.85	1.03
	[0.94,1.74]	[0.78,1.31]	[0.64,1.12]	[0.67,1.58]
Age of child	0.90	1.01	2.04***	1.31**
	[0.79,1.02]	[0.91,1.12]	[1.77,2.37]	[1.05,1.65]
Muslim	0.53**	1.19	0.38***	0.19***
	[0.32,0.90]	[0.76,1.86]	[0.24,0.61]	[0.07,0.53]
Walking time to closest health facility	0.99***	1.00	1.01***	0.98***
	[0.98,1.00]	[1.00,1.01]	[1.00,1.01]	[0.97,0.99]
N healthcare facilities	0.97	1.70**	0.96	0.52**
	[0.51,1.82]	[1.09,2.66]	[0.63,1.45]	[0.30,0.90]
DPT-3 coverage	0.07	0.00***	0.29	3.72
	[0.00,8.42]	[0.00,0.00]	[0.01,13.98]	[0.01,2238.21]
Measles vaccination coverage	0.94**	1.05**	1.01	0.88**
	[0.89,0.99]	[1.00,1.10]	[0.96,1.07]	[0.80,0.97]
Under-5 mortality	0.62***	0.82*	0.93	0.90
	[0.48,0.81]	[0.66,1.03]	[0.74,1.16]	[0.61,1.32]
Underweight prevalence	1.24***	0.99	1.10	0.85
	[1.08,1.43]	[0.89,1.11]	[0.98,1.24]	[0.68,1.07]
Malaria prevalence, age 0-4	2.85	0.31**	1.42	3.11
	[0.58,14.00]	[0.12,0.84]	[0.52,3.86]	[0.43,22.44]
Female education, age 20-24	2.81***	2.38***	2.01***	0.65
	[1.66,4.77]	[1.55,3.67]	[1.24,3.28]	[0.24,1.73]
Population density	1.01	0.99**	1.00	0.99
	[1.00,1.02]	[0.99,1.00]	[1.00,1.01]	[0.98,1.00]
Distance to major road	1.02	0.92***	0.93***	1.05
	[0.94,1.10]	[0.88,0.97]	[0.89,0.98]	[0.94,1.17]
Road distance to regional capital	0.91	1.03	1.13	1.94**
	[0.60,1.38]	[0.76,1.41]	[0.83,1.53]	[1.08,3.47]
N	1,302	1,302	1,302	979

Note: Regression results for main analysis presented in Figure 4. AntenRec records whether a woman followed the recommended schedule of antenatal care visits, BirthMed records whether the child in focus was born in a medical facility, ChildVacc measures whether a child was fully vaccinated, and ChildGov measures whether a government clinic/hospital was used for the child. Reported coefficients are odds ratios, standard errors clustered at the level of the matched pair, 95% confidence intervals in brackets, * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

H Conditional logistic regression

Table S7: Effect of violent victimization on healthcare-seeking behavior

	(1) AntenRec	(2) BirthMed	(3) ChildVacc	(4) ChildGov
Victimized during armed violence	1.14	1.26**	0.50***	0.17***
	[0.89,1.45]	[1.01,1.59]	[0.40,0.63]	[0.10,0.28]
N	530	602	636	248

Note: Replication of main analysis presented in Table S6 using conditional logistic regression models. AntenRec records whether a woman followed the recommended schedule of antenatal care visits, BirthMed records whether the child in focus was born in a medical facility, ChildVacc measures whether a child was fully vaccinated, and ChildGov measures whether a government clinic/hospital was used with the child. Reported coefficients are odds ratios, standard errors clustered at the level of the matched pair, 95% confidence intervals in brackets, * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Figure S3: Effect of violent victimization on healthcare-seeking behavior, using conditional logistic regression models



Note: Replication of main analysis presented in Figure 4 using conditional logistic regression models. Also see Table S7. Coefficient plots from a regression of indicators of health seeking for maternal and child health on violent victimization. Reported coefficients are odds ratios after logistic regression using the matched sample of cases and controls. Markers are point estimates, lines 95% confidence intervals. Standard errors clustered at the level of the matched pair.

I Consequences for child health

Table S8: Effect of violent victimization on child health outcomes

	Unconditional logit		Conditional logit	
	(1) BornIssue	(2) ChildIssue	(3) BornIssue	(4) ChildIssue
Victimized during armed violence	5.47***	1.48***	6.00***	1.36**
	[2.64,11.34]	[1.10,1.99]	[2.96,12.15]	[1.04,1.77]
Female	0.64	0.94		
	[0.34,1.18]	[0.64,1.37]		
Age	1.00	0.97***		
	[0.96,1.03]	[0.95,0.98]		
Education	0.97	1.14**		
	[0.79,1.20]	[1.03,1.25]		
Number of children	1.02	1.12***		
	[0.90,1.15]	[1.06,1.18]		
Child female	0.75	0.90		
	[0.43,1.30]	[0.67,1.21]		
Age of child	1.30**	1.12*		
	[1.06,1.60]	[0.99,1.26]		
Muslim	8.10***	0.85		
	[2.73,24.08]	[0.47,1.52]		
Walking time to closest health facility	1.01***	1.01***		
	[1.00,1.02]	[1.00,1.02]		
N healthcare facilities	1.51	1.00		
	[0.63,3.60]	[0.65,1.52]		
DPT-3 coverage	0.00	0.00***		
	[0.00,6.01]	[0.00,0.11]		
Measles vaccination coverage	1.14***	1.00		
	[1.04,1.25]	[0.94,1.05]		
Under-5 mortality	1.51	1.11		
	[0.92,2.48]	[0.86,1.44]		
Underweight prevalence	0.71***	0.81***		
	[0.57,0.89]	[0.70,0.93]		
Malaria prevalence, age 0-4	0.68	1.30		
	[0.14,3.44]	[0.45,3.78]		
Female education, age 20-24	0.50	1.22		
	[0.17,1.41]	[0.74,2.01]		
Population density	1.00	0.99**		
	[0.98,1.01]	[0.98,1.00]		
Distance to major road	0.96	0.89***		
	[0.87,1.06]	[0.84,0.95]		
Road distance to regional capital	1.45	1.02		
	[0.81,2.60]	[0.70,1.50]		
N	1,302	1,302	126	448

Note: Effect of violent victimization on child health outcomes. BornIssue records whether a child was born with a health issue (was premature; had lower-than-normal birthweight; or had other health issue) or was born healthy, ChildIssue records whether the child had one an health issue (breathing or other respiratory problems; eating or swallowing problems; stomach/intestinal problems, constipation, or diarrhea; repeated or chronic physical pain, including headaches or other back or body pain; problems using their hands or legs; problems with coordination or moving around; toothaches; deafness or problem with hearing; blindness or problem seeing; another, different health problem) during the past 12 months, or no health issue. Models 1–2 are unconditional logistic regressions, Models 3–4 are conditional logistic regressions. Reported coefficients are odds ratios, standard errors clustered at the level of the matched pair, 95% confidence intervals in brackets, * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

J Robustness checks

Table S9: Effect of violent victimization on healthcare-seeking behavior, female respondents only

	(1) AntenRec	(2) BirthMed	(3) ChildVacc	(4) ChildGov
Victimized during armed violence	1.25	1.10	0.46***	0.20***
	[0.85,1.82]	[0.81,1.49]	[0.33,0.65]	[0.11,0.39]
Age	1.01	1.03***	1.01	0.97
	[0.98,1.03]	[1.01,1.05]	[0.99,1.04]	[0.93,1.02]
Education	1.01	1.11*	1.18***	1.37***
	[0.87,1.19]	[1.00,1.23]	[1.05,1.33]	[1.15,1.63]
Number of children	0.92**	0.85***	1.03	1.32**
	[0.85,0.99]	[0.79,0.92]	[0.96,1.10]	[1.07,1.63]
Child female	1.31	0.91	0.79	1.07
	[0.90,1.90]	[0.67,1.22]	[0.57,1.09]	[0.65,1.77]
Age of child	0.88	0.98	1.97***	1.28*
	[0.75,1.03]	[0.86,1.11]	[1.65,2.34]	[0.99,1.67]
Muslim	0.78	1.25	0.32***	0.17**
	[0.42,1.47]	[0.75,2.08]	[0.18,0.55]	[0.04,0.68]
Walking time to closest health facility	0.99***	1.00	1.01*	0.97***
	[0.98,0.99]	[0.99,1.01]	[1.00,1.02]	[0.96,0.99]
N healthcare facilities	0.95	1.75**	0.86	0.64
	[0.42,2.18]	[1.08,2.83]	[0.53,1.42]	[0.34,1.20]
DPT-3 coverage	0.10	0.00***	0.30	20.80
	[0.00,31.60]	[0.00,0.00]	[0.00,22.25]	[0.02,28367.68]
Measles vaccination coverage	0.98	1.06**	1.03	0.88**
	[0.92,1.04]	[1.01,1.12]	[0.97,1.09]	[0.79,0.99]
Under-5 mortality	0.55***	0.78*	0.94	0.84
	[0.40,0.75]	[0.60,1.01]	[0.73,1.22]	[0.55,1.29]
Underweight prevalence	1.25***	0.99	1.08	0.84
	[1.06,1.46]	[0.86,1.12]	[0.94,1.24]	[0.64,1.10]
Malaria prevalence, age 0-4	1.11	0.32*	1.19	2.60
	[0.18,6.84]	[0.10,1.00]	[0.37,3.79]	[0.32,21.08]
Female education, age 20-24	2.13**	2.14***	1.90**	0.51
	[1.15,3.94]	[1.30,3.53]	[1.08,3.36]	[0.17,1.53]
Population density	1.00	0.99**	1.00	0.99
	[0.99,1.02]	[0.98,1.00]	[1.00,1.01]	[0.98,1.00]
Distance to major road	1.03	0.91***	0.94**	1.05
	[0.95,1.13]	[0.86,0.96]	[0.89,0.99]	[0.95,1.17]
Road distance to regional capital	0.89	1.04	1.01	1.95*
	[0.54,1.45]	[0.73,1.49]	[0.72,1.40]	[1.00,3.84]
N	1,000	1,000	1,000	761

Note: Replication of main analysis presented in Table S6 restricting the sample to female respondents only, i.e., subsetting to female respondents. AntenRec records whether a woman followed the recommended schedule of antenatal care visits, BirthMed records whether the child in focus was born in a medical facility, ChildVacc measures whether a child was fully vaccinated, and ChildGov measures whether a government clinic/hospital was used with the child. Reported coefficients are odds ratios, standard errors clustered at the level of the matched pair, 95% confidence intervals in brackets, * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table S10: Effect of violent victimization on healthcare-seeking behavior, small-area fixed effects model

	(1) AntenRec	(2) BirthMed	(3) ChildVacc	(4) ChildGov
Victimized during armed violence	0.83	1.16	0.44***	0.24***
	[0.55,1.25]	[0.83,1.62]	[0.31,0.62]	[0.12,0.48]
Female	1.09	1.15	1.70**	0.47
	[0.65,1.82]	[0.73,1.80]	[1.06,2.70]	[0.17,1.33]
Age	1.01	1.01	1.02*	1.00
	[0.99,1.04]	[0.99,1.04]	[1.00,1.04]	[0.96,1.04]
Education	1.04	1.13**	1.20***	1.31**
	[0.90,1.20]	[1.00,1.27]	[1.07,1.36]	[1.02,1.68]
Number of children	0.91***	0.96	0.98	1.16***
	[0.84,0.97]	[0.90,1.01]	[0.92,1.05]	[1.04,1.30]
Child female	1.16	0.99	0.77	1.21
	[0.80,1.67]	[0.74,1.33]	[0.56,1.06]	[0.65,2.26]
Age of child	0.91	1.00	2.16***	1.28
	[0.78,1.05]	[0.89,1.13]	[1.84,2.52]	[0.94,1.74]
Muslim	0.82	1.10	0.69	0.95
	[0.42,1.62]	[0.63,1.93]	[0.36,1.32]	[0.20,4.39]
Walking time to closest health facility	0.99	1.00	1.02**	1.00
	[0.98,1.00]	[0.99,1.01]	[1.00,1.03]	[0.98,1.03]
N	702	955	995	382
500×500 m FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Replication of main analysis presented in Table S6 including small-area (500×500 m) fixed effects. AntenRec records whether a woman followed the recommended schedule of antenatal care visits, BirthMed records whether the child in focus was born in a medical facility, ChildVacc measures whether a child was fully vaccinated, and ChildGov measures whether a government clinic/hospital was used with the child. Reported coefficients are odds ratios, standard errors clustered at the level of the matched pair, 95% confidence intervals in brackets, * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table S11: Effect of violent victimization on healthcare-seeking behavior, female respondents only

	(1) AntenRec	(2) BirthMed	(3) ChildVacc	(4) ChildGov
Victimized during armed violence	1.18	1.24**	0.45***	0.24***
	[0.94,1.48]	[1.01,1.53]	[0.36,0.56]	[0.17,0.33]
Female	1.55***	1.28**	1.56***	1.00
	[1.22,1.96]	[1.03,1.60]	[1.24,1.95]	[0.68,1.47]
Age	1.00	1.01	1.02***	0.99
	[0.99,1.01]	[1.00,1.02]	[1.01,1.03]	[0.98,1.01]
Education	1.15***	1.23***	1.26***	1.22***
	[1.07,1.24]	[1.16,1.30]	[1.18,1.34]	[1.10,1.34]
Number of children	0.97**	0.97**	0.99	1.18***
	[0.94,0.99]	[0.94,1.00]	[0.96,1.01]	[1.10,1.25]
Muslim	0.60***	1.11	0.47***	0.59
	[0.41,0.88]	[0.81,1.53]	[0.34,0.66]	[0.29,1.20]
Child female	1.15	0.99	0.81**	1.16
	[0.95,1.39]	[0.85,1.17]	[0.69,0.96]	[0.91,1.49]
Age of child	0.94	1.02	1.61***	1.14**
	[0.87,1.02]	[0.95,1.09]	[1.49,1.74]	[1.01,1.29]
Walking time to closest health facility	0.99***	1.00	1.00*	0.99***
	[0.99,0.99]	[0.99,1.00]	[0.99,1.00]	[0.98,0.99]
N healthcare facilities	0.76*	1.51***	0.90	0.69***
	[0.57,1.01]	[1.19,1.90]	[0.71,1.15]	[0.52,0.91]
DPT-3 coverage	0.12	0.00***	0.32	0.22
	[0.01,2.46]	[0.00,0.01]	[0.02,4.52]	[0.00,16.76]
Measles vaccination coverage	0.98	1.07***	1.05***	0.87***
	[0.94,1.01]	[1.04,1.11]	[1.02,1.09]	[0.83,0.92]
Under-5 mortality	0.72***	1.15**	0.84**	0.87
	[0.61,0.86]	[1.01,1.31]	[0.73,0.96]	[0.70,1.07]
Underweight prevalence	1.17***	0.99	1.02	1.00
	[1.08,1.28]	[0.93,1.06]	[0.95,1.10]	[0.87,1.14]
Malaria prevalence, age 0-4	4.75***	0.25***	0.20***	3.33**
	[1.68,13.38]	[0.14,0.43]	[0.11,0.35]	[1.09,10.17]
Female education, age 20-24	2.20***	2.37***	1.11	1.60*
	[1.58,3.09]	[1.81,3.09]	[0.82,1.49]	[0.94,2.74]
Population density	1.00	0.99***	1.00	0.99**
	[1.00,1.00]	[0.99,0.99]	[1.00,1.00]	[0.99,1.00]
Distance to major road	1.00	0.97***	0.98*	1.07
	[0.95,1.04]	[0.94,0.99]	[0.95,1.00]	[0.98,1.17]
Road distance to regional capital	0.81**	0.84**	1.16*	2.08***
	[0.66,1.00]	[0.72,0.98]	[0.98,1.36]	[1.44,3.00]
N	3,006	3,006	3,006	2,196

Note: Replication of main analysis presented in Table S6 using the unadjusted/full sample, i.e., not using propensity score matching. AntenRec records whether a woman followed the recommended schedule of antenatal care visits, BirthMed records whether the child in focus was born in a medical facility, ChildVacc measures whether a child was fully vaccinated, and ChildGov measures whether a government clinic/hospital was used with the child. Reported coefficients are odds ratios, standard errors clustered at the level of the matched pair, 95% confidence intervals in brackets, * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

K Direct effect on mediators

Table S12: Effect of violent victimization on mediators

	Unconditional logit			Conditional logit		
	(1) FearVict	(2) PTSD	(3) DistrustMed	(4) FearVict	(5) PTSD	(6) DistrustMed
Victimized during armed violence	1.22*	2.23***	14.54***	1.26**	2.05***	11.46***
	[0.97,1.54]	[1.73,2.88]	[10.03,21.08]	[1.00,1.57]	[1.61,2.62]	[7.79,16.87]
Female	2.03***	0.59***	0.97			
	[1.46,2.81]	[0.43,0.82]	[0.64,1.47]			
Age	1.00	0.99	1.00			
	[0.98,1.02]	[0.98,1.01]	[0.98,1.02]			
Education	0.81***	1.15***	0.95			
	[0.74,0.88]	[1.06,1.25]	[0.86,1.05]			
Number of children	0.94**	1.02	0.90***			
	[0.89,1.00]	[0.98,1.07]	[0.84,0.95]			
Child female	0.89	0.88	0.98			
	[0.71,1.12]	[0.68,1.13]	[0.73,1.33]			
Age of child	0.83***	1.18***	0.90*			
	[0.75,0.91]	[1.06,1.32]	[0.80,1.02]			
Muslim	0.92	1.24	3.32***			
	[0.61,1.39]	[0.82,1.89]	[1.92,5.75]			
Walking time to closest health facility	1.01***	0.99**	0.99***			
	[1.01,1.02]	[0.99,1.00]	[0.98,1.00]			
N healthcare facilities	0.76	0.94	1.93***			
	[0.51,1.13]	[0.63,1.41]	[1.25,3.00]			
DPT-3 coverage	0.25	0.02**	0.46			
	[0.01,12.31]	[0.00,0.96]	[0.00,44.42]			
Measles vaccination coverage	1.03	0.99	1.05			
	[0.98,1.08]	[0.95,1.04]	[0.99,1.11]			
Under-5 mortality	1.22*	1.08	0.94			
	[0.99,1.52]	[0.87,1.34]	[0.73,1.22]			
Underweight prevalence	0.98	0.86***	1.04			
	[0.87,1.09]	[0.77,0.96]	[0.91,1.19]			
Malaria prevalence, age 0-4	16.55***	1.11	0.01***			
	[4.64,58.96]	[0.42,2.95]	[0.00,0.07]			
Female education, age 20-24	1.12	1.22	0.96			
	[0.73,1.73]	[0.79,1.86]	[0.57,1.61]			
Population density	1.01***	0.99**	0.99***			
	[1.00,1.02]	[0.99,1.00]	[0.98,0.99]			
Distance to major road	0.95*	1.00	1.08			
	[0.89,1.01]	[0.95,1.05]	[0.98,1.18]			
Road distance to regional capital	0.92	1.41**	1.16			
	[0.69,1.24]	[1.05,1.90]	[0.80,1.67]			
N	1,302	1,302	1,302	618	586	698

Note: Effect of violent victimization on proposed mediators. Models 1–3 are unconditional logistic regressions, Models 4–6 are conditional logistic regressions. FearVict records respondents reporting reporting fear of future violence, PTSD measures respondents suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, and DistrustMed records whether respondents report a loss of trust in healthcare workers. Reported coefficients are odds ratios, robust standard errors with 95% confidence intervals in brackets, * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

L Survey question wording

Table S13: Question wording for victimization, main outcomes, and mediators

Variable Name	Question Text	Answer Options
Violent victimization		
Affected Organized Violence	In the last 3 years, have you or any member of your household been directly affected by organized violence?	1 Yes, I have been directly affected several times; 2 Yes, I have been directly affected once or twice; 3 No, I have never been affected by an extremist group or armed bandits; 4 Not sure; 5 Rather not answer
Mind Sharing Violence	Do you mind sharing what happened to you or your household member?	1 ...was/were physically assaulted; 2 ...had a household member killed; 3 ...was/were kidnapped/abducted; 4 ...witnessed someone else being killed; 5 ...was/were threatened with violence; 6 ...experienced sexual violence; 7 ...was/were forced to leave our home; 8 ...lived in constant fear of attack; 9 ...was/were forcefully recruited by an armed group; 10 Other; 11 Don't want to say
Role State Security Forces	What was the role of state security forces (the police, the army) in this experience of violence?	1 They perpetrated it; 2 They helped to push the perpetrators back; 3 They did very little/nothing about it; 4 Don't know/don't want to say
Help After Violence	After this experience, did you receive help from official agencies, like the (local) government, police, or the health service?	1 Police checked on me/us or followed up; 2 Received material support (e.g., food, shelter) from local government; 3 Medical services reached out to me; 4 Received medical help after visiting a healthcare facility; 5 No, did not receive help; 6 Don't want to say
Fear Becoming Victim	How much do you personally fear becoming a victim of violence (again) in the near future?	1 Very much; 2 Somewhat; 3 Not very much; 4 Not at all
Maternal healthcare-seeking		
Institutionalized Birth	Where was [Name Child] birthed?	1 In a health facility; 2 At home; 3 At traditional birth attendant's place; 4 Not sure
Antenatal Care	Did you/your wife get any antenatal care during your pregnancy with [Name Child]?	1 Yes; 2 No; 3 Not sure

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

Variable Name	Question Text	Answer Options
Visits Antenatal Care	How often did you go for antenatal visits or were visited by a nurse or doctor to receive antenatal care during the last trimester (the last 3 months) of your pregnancy?	1 Weekly; 2 Every 2 weeks; 3 Once per Month; 5 Only once or twice; 6 Did never go/ was never visited
NGO support	During pregnancy and since [Name Child] was born: did you/your wife receive medical support from a local or international NGO?	1 No, no medical help from either; 2 Yes, medical help from a local NGO; 3 Yes, medical help from an international NGO; 4 Yes, medical help from both local and international NGOs; 5 Don't know
Experience Seeking Healthcare	Thinking about your experiences with seeking healthcare for your children or for you/your wife over the last 3 years. Which of the following have you experienced?	1 Arrived at clinic/hospital, but no healthcare worker was there to help us; 2 Received care for injuries inflicted by violence (e.g., bullet wounds or cuts); 3 Was at health facility that lacked even basic supplies, such as clean water; 4 Feared for my security while staying at a health facility; 5 Did not know healthcare workers well because I am new in this area; 6 Worried that healthcare facilities are unduly influenced by the government; 7 Had care or medicine provided for free by an NGO; 8 Was impressed by the courage of the healthcare workers
Child healthcare-seeking		
Usual Health Facility Child	Where do you mostly go if your children are sick?	1 Private clinic/hospital; 2 Government clinic/hospital; 3 Traditional healer; 4 NGO clinic; 5 Other; 6 None
Use Health Facility Child	Have you used a health facility in the last 6 months for your children?	1 Yes; 2 No; 3 Not sure
Use Government Clinic Child	Which type of facility did you visit?	1 Private clinic/hospital; 2 Government clinic; 3 Traditional healer; 4 Church/mosque clinic; 5 NGO clinic; 6 Other
Child health		
Health Child Born	When [Name Child] was born, s/he...	1 ...was a healthy baby; 2 ...was premature; 3 ...had a lower-than-normal birthweight; 4 ...was stillborn; 5 ...had another health issue; 6 [DON'T READ] Not sure

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

Variable Name	Question Text	Answer Options
Health Issues Child	Has [Name Child] had health issues during the past 12 months?	1 Breathing or other respiratory problems (such as wheezing or shortness of breath); 2 Eating or swallowing because of a health condition; 3 Digesting food, including stomach/intestinal problems, constipation, or diarrhea; 4 Repeated or chronic physical pain, including headaches or other back or body pain; 5 Using their hands or legs; 6 Coordination or moving around; 7 Toothaches; 8 Deafness or problem with hearing; 9 Blindness or problem seeing; 10 Others different from the above; 11 None of the above
Trust		
Trust Government	How much do you trust the national government?	1 Not at all; 2 Just a little; 3 Somewhat; 4 A lot; 5 [DON'T READ] Don't know
Change Trust Government	Over the past 3 years, how has your trust in the national government changed, if at all?	1 My trust in the national government decreased; 2 My trust in the national government increased; 3 My level of trust in the national government remained about the same; 4 [DON'T READ] Not sure/Don't know
Trust Security Forces	How much do you trust the state security forces, such as the army and the police?	1 Not at all; 2 Just a little; 3 Somewhat; 4 A lot; 5 Don't know/Haven't heard enough
Change Trust Security Forces	Over the past 3 years, how has your trust in the security forces changed, if at all?	1 My trust in the security forces decreased; 2 My trust in the security forces increased; 3 My level of trust in the security forces remained about the same; 4 [DON'T READ] Not sure/Don't know
Trust Healthcare Workers	How much do you trust healthcare workers (such as doctors, nurses, etc.) and health clinics?	1 Not at all; 2 Just a little; 3 Somewhat; 4 A lot; 5 [DON'T READ] Don't know
Change Trust Healthcare Workers	Over the past 3 years, how has your trust in healthcare workers and health clinics changed, if at all?	1 My trust in healthcare workers and health clinics decreased; 2 My trust in healthcare workers and health clinics increased; 3 My level of trust in healthcare workers and health clinics remained about the same; 4 [DON'T READ] Not sure/Don't know
PCL8-5 items		
Memories	Repeated, disturbing, and unwanted memories of the stressful experience?	1 Not at all; 2 A little bit; 3 Moderately; 4 Quite a bit; 5 Extremely

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

Variable Name	Question Text	Answer Options
Feeling Upset	Feeling very upset when something reminded you of the stressful experience?	1 Not at all; 2 A little bit; 3 Moderately; 4 Quite a bit; 5 Extremely
Avoiding Memories	Avoiding memories, thoughts, or feelings related to the stressful experience?	1 Not at all; 2 A little bit; 3 Moderately; 4 Quite a bit; 5 Extremely
Avoiding Reminders	Avoiding external reminders of the stressful experience?	1 Not at all; 2 A little bit; 3 Moderately; 4 Quite a bit; 5 Extremely
Strong Negative Beliefs	Having strong negative beliefs about yourself, other people, or the world?	1 Not at all; 2 A little bit; 3 Moderately; 4 Quite a bit; 5 Extremely
Loss Of Interest	Loss of interest in activities that you used to enjoy?	1 Not at all; 2 A little bit; 3 Moderately; 4 Quite a bit; 5 Extremely
Feeling Jumpy	Feeling jumpy or easily startled?	1 Not at all; 2 A little bit; 3 Moderately; 4 Quite a bit; 5 Extremely
Difficulty Concentrating	Having difficulty concentrating?	1 Not at all; 2 A little bit; 3 Moderately; 4 Quite a bit; 5 Extremely
Individual-level controls		
Gender	What is your gender identity?	1 Male; 2 Female; 3 Other
Age	What year were you born?	[Number]
Education	What kind of education did you receive?	1 No formal schooling; 2 Informal schooling only (including Koranic schooling); 3 Primary school completed; 4 Secondary school/high school completed; 5 Post-secondary qualifications, other than university, e.g., a diploma or degree from a polytechnic school or college; 6 Bachelor's degree; 7 Master's degree; 8 Don't know
Religion	What is your religion?	1 Christian; 2 Muslim; 3 Other; 4 None
Number Children	How many children do you have?	[Number]
Sex Child	What is the sex of [Name Child]?	1 Male; 2 Female
Age Child	And how old is [Name Child]?	1 year; 2 years; 3 years; 4 years; 5 years
Walking Time Health Facility	How long does it take to get to the closest health clinic or health center where you can seek help if your children are ill?	[Number of minutes]

Table S14: Context-level determinants of healthcare supply

Indicator	**Description**
Health clinics and hospitals	Nigeria country-wide primary, secondary, and tertiary health care facility points and names and functional status, Reference: GRID3 Nigeria and partners [2].
DPT-3 vaccine coverage	Africa Diphtheria-Pertussis-Tetanus Vaccine Coverage Geospatial Estimates, produced using data from 183 population-based household surveys conducted in Africa between 2000 and 2016 that included dose-specific information on DPT coverage (from vaccine cards or maternal recall in the absence of vaccine cards) and subnational geographical location for children ages 12-59 months. 2016 data used as control. Reference: Mosser et al. [3].
Measles vaccine coverage	First-dose coverage of measles-containing vaccine (MCV1) at the 5x5 km-level between 2000-2019. Estimates were produced using data on vaccination coverage and geographical locations from 354 household-based surveys. 2019 data as control. Reference: Sbarra et al. [4].
Child (under 5) mortality	Mortality probability for children under-5, recorded at the 5x5 km-level between 2000-2017; estimates produced using data on child mortality from censuses and several household survey series. Survey sources used include the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) and UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) series, and other country-specific surveys. 2017 data used as control. Reference: Burstein et al. [5].
Malnutrition prevalence	Prevalence of being underweight in children under 5, both wasting (low weight-for-height, indicates recent severe weight lost) and stunting (low height-for-age, early or long-term poor nutrition). 2015 data. Reference: Osgood-Zimmerman et al. [6].
Child malaria prevalence	Prevalence of Plasmodium Falciparum in the age group 0 to 4 2000-2019. 2019 data used as control. References: Weiss et al. [7] and Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), Malaria Atlas Project [8].
Female education	Mean years of education of females aged 20-24. Data from 2015. Reference: Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) [9].
Population density	Estimated total number of people per grid-cell. 2020 data. References: Stevens et al. [10], WorldPop and Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN) [11], Dooley et al. [12], Bondarenko et al. [13], and Ecopia.AI and Technologies [14].
Distance to roads	Proximity to major road based on Open Street Map data. 2024 data. Reference: OpenStreetMap contributors [15].
State reach	Indicator for state reach, operationalized as road travel time to regional capital. References: Müller-Crepon, Hunziker, and Cederman [16] and Müller-Crepon [17].

References SI

[1] Shenyang Guo and Mark W. Fraser. *Propensity Score Analysis: Statistical Methods and Applications*. 2. ed. Advanced Quantitative Techniques in the Social Sciences Series. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2015. 421 pp. (cit. on p. 4).

[2] GRID3 Nigeria and partners. *Nigeria: Health Care Facilities in Nigeria*. Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX). Nigeria country-wide primary, secondary, and tertiary health care facility points and names and functional status. HDX, 2018 (cit. on p. 19).

[3] Jonathan F Mosser et al. "Mapping Diphtheria-Pertussis-Tetanus Vaccine Coverage in Africa, 2000–2016: A Spatial and Temporal Modelling Study". *The Lancet* 393.10183 (May 4, 2019), pp. 1843–1855 (cit. on p. 19).

[4] Alyssa N. Sbarra et al. "Mapping Routine Measles Vaccination in Low- and Middle-Income Countries". *Nature* 589.7842 (Jan. 2021), pp. 415–419 (cit. on p. 19).

[5] Roy Burstein et al. "Mapping 123 Million Neonatal, Infant and Child Deaths between 2000 and 2017". *Nature* 574.7778 (7778 Oct. 2019), pp. 353–358 (cit. on p. 19).

[6] Aaron Osgood-Zimmerman et al. "Mapping Child Growth Failure in Africa between 2000 and 2015". *Nature* 555.7694 (Feb. 28, 2018), pp. 41–47. pmid: 29493591 (cit. on p. 19).

[7] Daniel J Weiss et al. "Mapping the Global Prevalence, Incidence, and Mortality of Plasmodium Falciparum, 2000–17: A Spatial and Temporal Modelling Study". *The Lancet* 394.10195 (July 27, 2019), pp. 322–331 (cit. on p. 19).

[8] Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), Malaria Atlas Project. *Global Malaria Incidence, Prevalence, and Mortality Geospatial Estimates 2000-2019*. Seattle, United States of America: Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), 2020. DOI: 10.6069/CG0J-2R97 (cit. on p. 19).

[9] Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). *Africa Educational Attainment Geospatial Estimates 2000-2015*. Seattle, United States: Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), 2018 (cit. on p. 19).

[10] F. R. Stevens et al. "Disaggregating Census Data for Population Mapping Using Random Forests with Remotely-Sensed and Ancillary Data". *PLoS ONE* 10.2 (2015), e0107042. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0107042 (cit. on p. 19).

[11] WorldPop and Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN). *Global High Resolution Population Denominators Project*. Funded by The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (OPP1134076). University of Southampton; University of Louisville; Université de Namur; Columbia University, 2018 (cit. on p. 19).

[12] C. A. Dooley et al. *Gridded maps of building patterns throughout sub-Saharan Africa, version 1.1*. Source of building footprints: "Ecopia Vector Maps Powered by Maxar Satellite Imagery" © 2020. Southampton, UK: University of Southampton, 2020. DOI: 10.5258/SOTON/WP00677 (cit. on p. 19).

[13] M. Bondarenko et al. *wpgpRFPMS: Random Forests Population Modelling R Scripts, version 0.1.0*. Southampton, UK, 2020. DOI: 10.5258/SOTON/WP00665 (cit. on p. 19).

[14] Ecopia.AI and Maxar Technologies. *Digitize Africa Data*. 2020 (cit. on p. 19).

[15] OpenStreetMap contributors. *Nigeria Roads (OpenStreetMap Export)*. Accessed: 2024-12-02. Licensed under Open Database License (ODbL). Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT), 2024 (cit. on p. 19).

[16] Carl Müller-Crepon, Philipp Hunziker, and Lars-Erik Cederman. "Roads to Rule, Roads to Rebel: Relational State Capacity and Conflict in Africa". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 65.2–3 (Feb. 1, 2021), pp. 563–590 (cit. on p. 19).

[17] Carl Müller-Crepon. "State Reach and Development in Africa since the 1960s: New Data and Analysis". *Political Science Research and Methods* (Nov. 10, 2021), pp. 1–10 (cit. on p. 19).