

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Food insecurity and mental health of women during COVID-19: Evidence from a developing country

Tabassum Rahman^{1*}, M. D. Golam Hasnain¹, Asad Islam²

1 School of Medicine and Public Health, College of Health, Medicine and Wellbeing, The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, Australia, **2** Centre for Development Economics and Sustainability, Department of Economics, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

* Tabassum.Rahman@uon.edu.au

Abstract

Background

This study examines the association between food insecurity and mental health of women during the COVID-19 pandemic in a resource poor setting.

Materials and methods

Data were collected at two time-points (wave 1 and 2) from 2402 women, one per household, participating in a larger study during extended COVID-19 lockdown in the rural areas of the southwest region of Bangladesh. The primary outcome of the analyses is the association between food insecurity, measured using the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), and stress level, measured using the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), for women during the lockdown. General awareness about COVID-19 and attitude towards prescribed preventive measures were also measured since COVID-19 health concerns could exacerbate food insecurity.

Results

An individual-level evaluation of the effect of wave 2 FIES score on PSS score showed that worsening of the food security status increasing the stress level of the participants (95% CI: 1.61; 2.13; p-value: <0.001). Additionally, a significant negative association was observed between the PSS score and change in food security status between the two waves (Coefficient: -1.15, 95% CI: -1.30; -0.99, p-value: <0.001), indicating that deterioration in food security status over the pandemic period increasing the stress level. At the village level, the results showed a similar pattern. General awareness around ways coronavirus spreads was high, yet there were misperceptions at a higher level. Maintaining hand hygiene, wearing face masks outside the home, and going outside only when necessary were widely practised. Fewer respondents could maintain a 1.5-metre distance from others in the outside and maintained cough and sneeze etiquette.

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Rahman T, Hasnain MDG, Islam A (2021) Food insecurity and mental health of women during COVID-19: Evidence from a developing country. PLoS ONE 16(7): e0255392. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255392>

Editor: Yuka Kotozaki, Iwate Medical University, JAPAN

Received: November 9, 2020

Accepted: July 15, 2021

Published: July 29, 2021

Peer Review History: PLOS recognizes the benefits of transparency in the peer review process; therefore, we enable the publication of all of the content of peer review and author responses alongside final, published articles. The editorial history of this article is available here: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255392>

Copyright: © 2021 Rahman et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its [S1–S3 Tables](#) and [S1 Dataset](#) files.

Funding: AI has been funded by Monash University Faculty Research Group Grant. TR and MGH

collaborated in this research work with AI. The funders did not have any input into any aspect of this manuscript.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Conclusion

The results indicate a higher stress level, a potential contributor to poor mental health, as food insecurity deteriorated. Policy initiatives in ameliorating immediate food insecurity during crises, improving long-term wellbeing, and expanding the reach of mental health support are warranted.

Introduction

During any crisis, be it health or economic [1, 2] or environmental [3, 4], people tend to suffer an increased level of stress, anxiety, and other psychological problems that threaten their overall wellbeing. During health crises such as the *Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome* (SARS) outbreak in the early 2000s, the H1N1 influenza pandemic in the late 2000s, and the Ebola outbreak in the last decade, people suffered psychological disorders including a high level of stress, anxiety, and depressive symptoms [5–7]. In West Africa, Ebola survivors experienced much psychological distress, including depression, anxiety, anger, grief, guilt, flashbacks, sadness, worthlessness, substance addiction, suicidal tendencies, and self-stigmatisation [7]. Such health crises were also observed to usher in food insecurity via disruptions in economic activities [8–25].

Experts call for early planning, research, and supportive measures to tackle the impact of COVID-19 on mental health, particularly due to the isolation it may cause [26]. Previous studies show that prolonged isolation may result in several psychological problems, including acute stress, post-traumatic stress symptom, psychological distress, depressive symptoms, stress, and emotional disturbance, and can have a lasting psychological impact [27]. In varying degrees, a lockdown was widely adopted to curb the spread of coronavirus. Millions living in developing countries found themselves trading-off between keeping safe from the virus and poverty and hunger [28]. Apart from the high human cost, the COVID-19 pandemic has led to a global economic crisis, to a large extent due to lockdown and disruption of economic activities that ensued and massive public health and social safety cost. Experts predict income loss and food insecurity in countries where poverty is widespread and are reliant on the informal sector [29]. Bangladesh, where this study was conducted, had an extended lockdown from 26 March to 30 May 2020 [30]. It was estimated that about 52% of the Bangladeshi population was at the risk of becoming poor, and about five million people may have been driven into poverty due to the pandemic [31]. The economic disruption caused by COVID-19 and the lockdown that followed was likely to impact Bangladesh's food security scenario, with 31% of its population either moderately or severely food insecure even before the pandemic [32]. Consequently, with the rise of poverty and food insecurity, the health effects, particularly on women and children, such as anemia [33] and prevalence of thinness among women of reproductive age, malnutrition [34, 35], stunting and wasting of children [33] may potentially follow suit. There has been ample evidence on the influence of food insecurity on the mental health of individuals. In a study that included data from 149 countries, Jones (2017) found that food insecurity has a dose-response relationship with poor mental health status regardless of socio-economic and demographic characteristics coming from 11 regions, indicating that the relationship holds across cultural contexts [36]. Food insecure individuals were found to have higher odds of experiencing adverse psychosocial conditions such as sadness, worry, stress, anger, and lower odds of experiencing positive psychosocial conditions such as enjoyment, feeling well-rested, being treated with respect. In another study that included data from 147

countries, Frongillo et al. (2019) found that prevalence of food insecurity was strongly negatively associated with subjective wellbeing, measured using daily experience index, with variation in magnitude among developed and developing countries likely due to other relevant factors [37]. Thus, food insecurity can potentially have adverse effects not only on an individual's physical health but also on mental health [21, 38, 39].

A strong positive association was previously found between income and experience of food insecurity and common mental disorders among women in low and middle-income countries [2]. The variation of magnitude by which sex alters the association between food insecurity and mental health status is unclear, with literature demonstrating poorer mental health status among women than men or no effect [36]. However, the rationale for conducting this study with women has been driven by evidence that shows Bangladeshi women have low nutritional status and poorer mental health than men, particularly in rural areas [40, 41] and women's pivotal role in managing household food shortage in developing countries including Bangladesh [42–44].

As the COVID-19 pandemic set in, information has been abundant, often not evidence-based and spurious, misleading people to adopt harmful practices and trivialise the risks of the disease [45, 46]. Knowledge and attitude have profound significance in influencing compliance to healthful practice, such as maintaining hand hygiene in developing countries [47–49]. Additionally, a lack of knowledge about a specific physical condition or disease can harbour misconceptions and stigma about the disease and hinder help-seeking. Lack of awareness at the community level impede social acceptance, fuel stigma, induce fear in individuals, deter disease disclosure, and care seeking [50, 51]. Paradoxically, knowing about a disease and its potential after effects could induce paralysing fear and denial to such an extent that it could interfere with the reception of health messages, hinder care seeking and care provisions, and encourage people to disregard the existence of the disease altogether [52–54]. Understanding knowledge and attitude, including stigma, is critical in assessing and testing likely patients and maintaining the practice of COVID-19 preventive measures. In Bangladesh, women, particularly in rural areas, lack access to authentic health information [55, 56] due to their limited access to information in general [57] and lower access to technology [58]. Women are predominantly caregivers for children and elderly family members at home. Thus, exploring women's knowledge and attitude regarding COVID-19 can provide important insight into infection prevention and containment in women, children and the elderly in rural Bangladesh.

Mental stress may occur due to emotional or physical stressors [59]. There are various ways stress and its impact have been conceptualised and studied from epidemiological, psychological, and biological perspectives, employing different methodologies [59–61]. Despite these differences, there is substantial evidence that mental stress, through various pathways, can affect individuals mental and physical health, and thus, overall wellbeing [59, 60, 62]. Our study is based on the evidence on food insecurity during economic crises, health crises such as epidemics and COVID-19 pandemic, and the evidence on mental health outcomes related to food insecurity. Economic crises and shocks may lead to food insecurity due to supply shortage, food price volatility, and income loss, compromising people's purchasing power [63–67]. Health crises can also lead to food insecurity as observed during and after previous epidemics such as HIV/AIDS, ebola influenza, scurvy and cassava virus [8, 15, 17, 19, 22, 25, 68–70]. The economic corollaries of COVID-19 have had a significant adverse effect on food security scenario [13, 14, 18, 20, 23, 24] particularly in the developing countries [9–12, 16, 18, 21, 28]. Given the influence of food insecurity on mental health [2, 36, 37, 71], it is critical to examine the association between food insecurity and women's mental health in the context of COVID-19 in Bangladesh where food insecurity is common, and women have poor mental health outcomes. In this study, we present evidence from rural areas of Bangladesh, where we examined

the association between food insecurity and women's mental health, that is, their perceived stress level, during COVID-19. Taking food insecurity as a potential stressor during the lockdown, we hypothesise that more food insecure women will experience a higher stress level. We also measured awareness about coronavirus among women and their compliance with the health directives, and their association with food security and mental health.

Materials and methods

Study design and sample

This study is part of a larger study to understand the health and wellbeing during COVID-19. A total of 9,847 rural households (response rate 78%), chosen at random from a panel of households interviewed during the pre-COVID-19 period, were surveyed (wave 1) in the southwest region of Bangladesh, 260 km from the national capital Dhaka. The data were collected between 14 April and 3 May 2020, three weeks after a lockdown was imposed. These households have very similar characteristics and are representative of rural household surveys by the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics [72]. A subsample of households with female respondents was re-surveyed (wave 2) following three to four weeks the first survey to understand their mental health and monitor any changes in food security status as the lockdown continued. A total of 2402 women (response rate about 95%) from the same number of households were surveyed in wave 2. Surveys were conducted over the phone in compliance with COVID-19 preventive measures. Non-participation was due to not receiving the calls. Enumerators hold at least a bachelor degree and previously collected similar data in the study area. Additional training was provided on telephone interviewing. Oral consent was obtained before the interview as obtaining written consent was not feasible due to COVID-19 health directives imposed by the government during the lockdown. Calls were scheduled at times that were nominated as most convenient by the participants. Reporting of evidence has been guided by the STROBE statement [73].

Outcome variables

We examined two important and immediate concerns mentioned frequently during the pandemic: food insecurity as a proxy for the financial stress of the poor people and mental health. By observing households during the lockdown, we measured the potential association between food insecurity and the mental health outcome, i.e. stress level among women. Food insecurity was measured using the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) in wave 1 and 2 surveys [74]. The mental health data were collected during wave 2 using the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) and adapted to use in Bangladesh [75]. In addition to food insecurity and mental health, we measured knowledge level on COVID-19 (16 items), attitude level to COVID-19 (10 items), and income loss experienced due to COVID-19.

PSS scale was chosen based on previous study findings and applicability in the context of Bangladesh. However, the previously validated versions were validated and used in special populations, predominantly in urban areas [76, 77]. FIES was previously used to conduct a multi-country study [78]. PSS and FIES scales were adapted for this study considering the cultural and linguistic aspects of stress and food insecurity experiences. The adaptation process was completed in three steps. Firstly, the first author (TR) translated the original PSS scale in Bengali. The translated version was then shared with the co-authors (MGH and AI). The first stage of translation was finalised after discussion among the authors. FIES was translated in Bengali following the same steps. Being born and raised in the study region, AI provided critical guidance at this stage about the perception of stress and food insecurity in study locations.

At the second step, AI shared the PSS and FIES with research collaborators based in the study locations. The group of researcher collaborators included both women and men from the communities participating in this study. This group considered each question of PSS and FIES carefully as to what they might mean to the study participants given their sociodemographic characteristics. The group suggested some changes in wording. In the third step, TR prepared second drafts of the questionnaire, incorporating changes suggested in the previous step. Subsequently, the translated scales were finalised upon discussion among all authors. Pilot testing was not feasible due to lockdown and the time-critical nature of the study. However, the community members' involvement in the scale adaptation process helped prepare the scales for the study context, taking into account the cultural perceptions and verbal expressions of stress and food insecurity.

The knowledge and attitude questions were developed by the first author (TR) consulting the World Health Organization (WHO) [79, 80], Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) [81], and the government of Bangladesh [82] online resources, including daily updates and reports and manuals. The questions were finalised and approved after repeated discussion among all authors. Moreover, the authors have experience working in social development and health with rural communities across Bangladesh and thus have relevant insight into knowledge and attitudes around health issues.

Statistical analysis

We examined the knowledge level based on True-False (0–1) dichotomous responses. The attitude level was analysed by dichotomising participants' responses to Yes-No (0–1). Scores on these for each participant were calculated by summing up scores for all items of two scales separately. Food security scores were measured on dichotomous responses, Yes-No (0–1), and by summing up scores on all items to obtain a total score. A change in food security status between wave 1 and wave 2 was measured by subtracting the wave 2 value from wave 1. A negative change in values was defined as food security conditions worsened over two surveys; a positive change indicates an improvement, and a zero-score is defined as no change. A 10-item PSS was used to measure mental health status. Each item was measured on a 5-point scale between 0 and 4. Thus, the total score lay between 0 and 40. The higher the score, the more the level of perceived stress. To capture the mental health status, we asked respondents PSS items about the time frame of “in the last 7 days”.

Participant characteristics were summarised using descriptive statistics. Frequency and percentages were used for dichotomous variables. Mean and standard deviation or median and interquartile range were used for continuous variables, based on the distribution of the data. A descriptive analysis, from both the individual and village level, knowledge and attitude level and PSS scores were also performed using similar descriptive statistics.

To measure the effect of food security status (measured via FIES score during wave 2) on participant's stress level (measured via PSS score during wave 2), a univariable linear regression model was used. Two separate univariable linear regression models were used to measure the effect of knowledge and attitude level on COVID-19 (measured during wave 2) on PSS score. The effect of wave 2 food security status on participants' knowledge and attitude level of participants were also measured using two univariable linear regression models. In addition, three mixed-effects linear regression modellings were used to assess the relationship between wave 2 FIES scores and knowledge level, attitude level, and PSS score. Each model included individual family and village level random effects to address the correlation of the outcomes. The models were also adjusted for the age, level of education, monthly income and the respective scores of the participants. Finally, to measure the effect of change in food security status

(measured via subtracting the wave 2 FIES score from wave 1 FIES score) on the PSS, knowledge and attitude scales, three separate univariable linear regression models were used. All the regression models were conducted using both the individual and village level data using robust standard error. Another three mixed-effects linear regression modelling was used to assess the relationship between changes in FIES scores and knowledge level, attitude status, and PSS score. Each model included individual family and village level random effects to address the correlation of the outcomes. The models were also adjusted for the age, level of education, monthly income and respective scores of the participants. All statistical analyses were conducted using Stata 14.0 version, and p-value <0.05 was considered as a statistically significant level.

Ethics approval

Ethics approval was obtained from the Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee (Project ID: 24746).

Result

A total of 2402 female responders across 357 villages were included as participants of the study. The average age of the participants was 38 years (SD \pm 8 years), and among them, 993 (42%) participants were above 40 years of age. The median number of family members was 4 (3–5). The majority of the household heads were day labourer, 789 (33%) and small businessmen 564 (24%) followed by farming on own land 413 (17%), farming on other people's land 246 (10%), private job 107 (4%), Government job 77 (3%) and others 206 (9%). The median formal education year of the participants was 8 (8–10) years. About 91% of participants (2096 out of 2,402) can read at least, wherein 1896 (88%) participants mentioned that they could read and write. The median monthly income was \$82.15 (\$67.65–\$115.99) (Based on the rate at OANDA on 15/01/2021). During wave 1 majority of the participants, 1604 (67%) had a FIES score of 2 (Moderately food insecurity), followed by 418 (17%) with the score 1 (Mildly food insecurity), 197 (8%) with the score of 3 (Severe food insecurity), and 183 (8%) with the score of 0 (No food insecurity). On the other hand, during wave 2, 1336 (56%) participants had a FIES score of 2, the number and rate for scores 0, 1, and 3 were 507 (21%), 380 (16%), and 179 (7%) respectively. Also, 829 (35%) participants reported that their food security status worsens (a negative change in FIES score from wave 1 to wave 2) over the pandemic period. [Fig 1](#) shows the difference in various food security status between the two waves, and a significant difference in the proportions of participants was observed in the food secure, mildly insecure, and moderately insecure groups. [S1 Table](#) described the participant characteristics based on the change in food security status over the pandemic period.

A descriptive overview of knowledge, attitude, and stress level

The descriptive statistics containing the 35 statements are shown in Tables 1–3. The categories of statements were grouped as follows: Knowledge Level on COVID-19 (KLC-19) comprised 16 statements, Attitude Level on COVID-19 (ALC-19) comprised nine statements, and Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) comprised of ten statements. The following section discussed the item-wise descriptive statistics of KLC-19, ALC-19, and PSS.

Knowledge level on COVID-19 (KLC-19). More than 90% of the participants mentioned that the following statements were true: “People of all ages can be affected by this virus” (KLC-19:1), “Coronavirus spread from one person to another” (KLC-19:3), “There is no vaccine for this virus” (KLC-19:5), and “We can be saved if we stay at home” (KLC-19:7), ([Table 1](#)). Importantly, in the statements of “The person who is affected should be blamed or ostracised” (KLC-




Fig 1. Food security status across wave 1 and wave 2.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255392.g001>

19:8), and “Whoever comes to this country from abroad spreads this virus” (KLC-19:11) 79% and 88% of participants respectively mentioned these two as true statements. However, 59% and 65% of participants disagreed with the following two statements: “If anyone dies due to coronavirus, he/she cannot be buried in this village” (KLC-19:6), and “If you sin, you get coronavirus” (KLC-19:9). Forty-five per cent of the participants agreed with the statement that “Anyone who gets affected by corona will die” (KLC-19:2), while 56% agreed that “If anyone in the para (community) gets affected, all other people in the para will also get affected” (KLC-19:4). About half of the participants believe that “This virus is a curse” (KLC-19:10). A similar

Table 1. Frequency of the statement related with knowledge level on COVID-19 (KLC-19).

	Knowledge items	False, n (%)	True, n (%)	Don't Know, n (%)
KLC-19: 1	People of all ages can be affected by this virus	29 (1)	2362 (98)	11 (0.5)
KLC-19: 2	Anyone who gets affected by corona will die	1263 (53)	1082 (45)	57 (2)
KLC-19: 3	Corona virus spreads from one person to another	21 (1)	2374 (99)	7 (0.5)
KLC-19: 4	If anyone in the para gets affected, all other people of the para will also get affected	1009 (42)	1347 (56)	46 (2)
KLC-19: 5	There is no vaccine for this virus	70 (3)	2226 (93)	106 (4)
KLC-19: 6	If anyone dies due to coronavirus, he/she cannot be buried in this village	1415 (59)	797 (33)	190 (8)
KLC-19: 7	We can be saved if we live at home	55 (2)	2334 (97)	13 (1)
KLC-19: 8	The person who is affected should be blamed or ostracised	455 (19)	1898 (79)	49 (2)
KLC-19: 9	If you sin, you get coronavirus	1555 (65)	367 (15)	480 (20)
KLC-19: 10	This virus is curse	834 (35)	1164 (48)	404 (17)
KLC-19: 11	Whoever comes to this country from abroad spreads this virus	234 (10)	2105 (88)	63 (3)
KLC-19: 12	I won't make any matrimonial relation in future to the coronavirus affected family	1146 (48)	1083 (45)	173 (7)
KLC-19: 13	No one will make matrimonial relation with us if anyone from my family gets corona	1125 (47)	1046 (44)	231 (10)
KLC-19: 14	If I am affected, no one will give me jobs in the future	1208 (50)	952 (40)	242 (10)
KLC-19: 15	People who are poor, get this virus	2286 (95)	57 (2)	59 (2)
KLC-19: 16	People who are rich get this virus	2300 (96)	37 (2)	65 (3)

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255392.t001>

Table 2. Frequency of the statement related with attitude level on COVID-19 (ALC-19).

	Attitudinal items	No, n (%)	Yes, n (%)
ALC-19:1	Getting more anxious while interacting with friends and relatives	331 (14)	2071 (86)
ALC-19:2	Getting anxious when someone is coming to the house	89(4)	2313 (96)
ALC-19:3	Getting anxious about going to the crowds	65 (3)	2337 (97)
ALC-19:4	Wash your hands more often	18 (1)	2384 (99)
ALC-19:5	Do not get outside except it is necessary	454 (19)	1948 (81)
ALC-19:6	Keep at least 2 feet distance with others in the outside	1261 (53)	1141 (47)
ALC-19:7	Use a mask if go outside	246 (10)	2156 (90)
ALC-19:8	Use tissue or handkerchief to cough or sneeze	1601 (67)	801 (33)
ALC-19:9	Do not hug or handshake with anyone	1363 (57)	1039 (43)

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255392.t002>

proportion (45%) agreed to the following statements: “I won’t make any matrimonial relationship with a coronavirus affected family” (KLC-19:12), and “No one will make matrimonial relationship with us if anyone from my family gets corona” (KLC-19:13). Forty per cent of participants thought getting infected with the virus would affect their prospects for employment in the future (KLC-19:14). Finally, a very small proportion of participants (2%) agreed with the following two statements “People who are poor, get this virus” (KLC-19:15), and “People who are rich, gets this virus” (KLC-19:16).

Attitude level on COVID-19 (ALC-19). In wave 2, almost all the participants (99%) mentioned that they washed their hands more often (ALC-19:4), and 90% of participants reported using a mask when they went outside (ALC-19:7) (Table 2). More than 95% of participants mentioned that they felt anxious to go outside (ALC-19:2), and when someone came to their house (ALC-19:3). About 86% of the participants mentioned that they got anxious while interacting with friends and relatives (ALC-19:1). About 81% of participants mentioned that they did not go outside except for necessary works (ALC-19:5), wherein only 47% mentioned that they kept at least a 1.5-metre distance from others when outside (ALC-19:6). Additionally, only 43% of participants mentioned that they did not hug or handshake with anyone (ALC-19:9) and 33% mentioned that they used tissue or handkerchief to cough or sneeze (ALC-19:8).

Perceived stress scale (PSS). Table 3 shows that nearly 40% of participants mentioned that they could solve their problem (PSS: 4), things were going as they wanted (PSS: 5), and they knew that they had control over everything (PSS: 8). On the other hand, about 15% of

Table 3. Frequency of the statement related with perceived stress scale (PSS).

	In the last 7 days, how often	Never/Almost never (%)	Sometimes (%)	Fairly often/Very often (%)
PSS: 1	have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?, n (%)	676 (28)	1344 (56)	382 (16)
PSS: 2	have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?, n (%)	1233 (51)	804 (33)	365 (15)
PSS: 3	how often have you felt nervous and stressed?, n (%)	516 (21)	1240 (52)	646 (27)
PSS: 4	have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?, n (%)	430 (18)	1032 (43)	940 (39)
PSS: 5	have you felt that things were going your way?, n (%)	432 (18)	988 (41)	982 (41)
PSS: 6	have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?, n (%)	657 (27)	1087 (45)	658 (27)
PSS: 7	have you been able to control irritations in your life?, n (%)	687 (29)	1164 (48)	551 (23)
PSS: 8	have you felt that you were on top of things?, n (%)	417 (17)	1040 (43)	945 (39)
PSS: 9	have you been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control?, n (%)	1161 (48)	950 (40)	291 (12)
PSS: 10	have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?, n (%)	636 (26)	1189 (50)	577 (24)

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255392.t003>

participants mentioned that in the last seven days, they often thought that they did not have control (PSS:2) and got angry about things they could not control (PSS: 9). Sixteen per cent of participants mentioned that in the last seven days, they often got angry (PSS: 1), 27% mentioned they often got panicked (PSS: 3), and 24% thought that their problem was getting out of control (PSS: 10). When participants were asked how often they thought that they could keep up with everything, only 27% mentioned that they could do so often (PSS: 6), while they could manage their irritated feeling, only 23% answered that they could do it frequently (PSS:7).

Effect of wave 2 FIES score on KLC-19, ALC-19 and PSS scores at the individual and village level. At the individual level, the mean value of PSS, KLC-19 and ALC-19 score were 19.39 (SD = \pm 4.41), 0.63 (SD = \pm 0.16) and 0.75 (SD = \pm 0.15) respectively. At the village level, the mean values of the PSS, KLC-19 and ALC-19 score were almost similar to individual level; 19.52 (SD = \pm 2.29), 0.63 (SD = \pm 0.09) and 0.75 (SD = \pm 0.09).

At the individual level, when evaluating the effect of wave 2 FIES score on PSS, KLC-19, and ALC-19, PSS score showed a significant increase of 1.87 (95% CI: 1.61; 2.13; p-value: 0.000) for each unit increase of wave 2 FIES score, indicating that worsening the level of food security status increasing the stress level of the participants (Table 4). The effect of KLC-19 and ALC-19 scores on PSS score were statistically non-significant. While measuring the effect of wave 2 FIES score on KLC-19 and ALC-19 score, a statistically significant effect was observed between wave 2 FIES score and KLC-19 (Coefficient: -0.03; 95% CI: -0.04; -0.02; p-value: <0.001), indicating that worsening of food security status was negatively associated with the knowledge level of the participants on COVID-19. Findings from the village level analyses were also almost similar to the individual level (Table 4).

When performing a mixed effect linear regression model, a significant positive association was observed between the PSS score and change in food security status (Coefficient: 1.80, 95% CI: -1.42; -0.98, p-value: <0.001). On the other hand, the effect of change in food security status over KLC-19 was significant (Coefficient: -0.46, 95% CI: -0.62; -0.29, p-value < 0.001) but non-significant for the ALC-19 score (Coefficient: -0.03, 95% CI: -0.14; 0.07, p-value: 0.495). A detailed description of the mixed effect model results has been described in S2 Table.

Effect of the change in FIES score (from wave 1 to wave 2) on KLC-19, ALC-19 and PSS scores at the individual and village level. At the individual level, a significant negative association was observed between the PSS score and change in food security status (Coefficient: -1.15, 95% CI: -1.30; -0.99, p-value: <0.001), indicating that worsening the food security status over the pandemic period increasing the stress level of the participants. The effect of the change in FIES score on KLC-19 and ALC-19 were non-significant (Table 5). The analysis results at the village level were also similar to the individual level analysis (Table 5).

When performing a mixed effect linear regression model, a significant negative association was observed between the PSS score and change in food security status (Coefficient: -1.20, 95%

Table 4. Effect of wave 2 FIES score on PSS, KLC-19 and ALC-19 scores.

List of Scores	Individual level Model [#]	Village level Model [#]	Mixed Model ^{^@}
PSS score	1.87 (1.61; 2.13); p = <0.001*	1.34 (0.46; 2.22); p = 0.003*	1.80 (1.48; 2.11); p = <0.001*
KLC-19 score	-0.03 (-0.04; -0.02); p = <0.001*	-0.03 (-0.06; 0.00); p = 0.052	-0.46 (-0.62; -0.29); p = <0.001*
ALC-19 score	0.00 (-0.01; 0.00); p = 0.350	-0.01 (-0.04; 0.02); p = 0.418	-0.04 (-0.14; 0.07); p = 0.495

[#]Univariable linear regression models were applied.

[^]Mixed-effects linear regression modelling was used.

[@]Models were adjusted for the age, level of education, monthly income and respective scores of the participants.

^{*}Each model included individual family and village level random effects.

^{*}p-value <0.05 considered as significant.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255392.t004>

Table 5. Effect of change in FIES score from wave 1 to wave 2 on PSS, KLC-19 and ALC-19 scores.

List of Scores	Individual level Model [#]	Village level Model [#]	Mixed Model ^{§^@}
PSS score	-1.15 (-1.31; -0.99); p = <0.001*	-1.02 (-1.52; -0.53); p = <0.001*	-1.20 (-1.42; -0.98); p = <0.001*
KLC-19 score	0.00 (0.00; 0.01); p = 0.233	0.00 (-0.02; 0.03); p = 0.722	0.05 (-0.09; 0.19); p = 0.482
ALC-19 score	0.00 (0.01; 0.00); p = 0.115	0.00 (-0.02; 0.02); p = 0.704	-0.03 (-0.12; 0.05); p = 0.445

[#]Univariable linear regression models were applied.

[§]Mixed-effects linear regression modelling was used.

[^]Models were adjusted for the age, level of education, monthly income and respective scores of the participants.

[@]Each model included individual family and village level random effects.

*p-value <0.05 considered as significant.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255392.t005>

CI: -1.42; -0.98, p-value: <0.001). On the other hand, the effect of change in food security status over KLC-19 was non-significant (Coefficient: 0.05, 95% CI: -0.09; 0.19, p-value: 0.482) but significant for the ALC-19 score (Coefficient: -0.03, 95% CI: -0.12; 0.05, p-value: 0.445). A detailed description of the mixed effect model results has been described in [S3 Table](#).

Discussion

In this research, we measured the association between food security and mental health i.e. level of perceived stress of women in the rural areas of Bangladesh. Studies that previously investigated mental health in relation to food security in rural areas of Bangladesh focused on depression and food and nutrition status [83] and depression and anxiety symptoms of women and their families in relation to food insecurity and intimate partner violence [84]. The level of perceived stress increases with a negative change in food security status over four weeks between surveys during COVID-19 lockdown in Bangladesh. The findings indicate that stress levels may deteriorate with exacerbating food insecurity due to COVID-19 lockdown and restrictions, which may affect mental health. The general awareness around who could contract coronavirus, how it spreads, and a vaccine not being available to prevent infection seemed high among the participants (Table 1). This may be due to public awareness efforts by both government and non-government organisations, and potentially the use of electronic and social media at the household and community levels. There were still misperceptions at a high level. Half of the respondents were against the burial of a person who died of coronavirus. Also, perceptions about people infected with the virus, overseas returnees, or travellers' role in spreading the virus, and the perceived consequences of infection demonstrate misconceptions. While this is true that the absence of proper measures for containment, such as quarantining patients and isolating others who came into contact with an infected person, can spread the virus, our findings indicate that infected individuals may experience stigma in the community. Stigmatisation may work in two ways: on the one hand, stigmatising others who are infected (e.g. blaming/ostracising, unwilling to consider for matrimony), and fearing stigmatisation on self or family (e.g. fearing less prospect regarding matrimony and employment). On the other hand, stigma can potentially contribute to health inequalities by obstructing social support, resources, and health care, including care for stress, psychological and behavioural problems, and perpetuating poor health outcomes [53, 54]. A statistically significant negative association between deteriorating food security status and knowledge level was found, which may suggest health related knowledge lost relevance when household food insecurity became even more concerning. Therefore, there is a need for more public awareness about coronavirus, preventive measures, and consequences of infections based on scientific evidence, along with initiatives to combat food insecurity.

We found a positive attitude towards maintaining hand hygiene (99%), wearing face masks outside the home (90%), and going outside only when it was necessary (81%), with a significantly high proportion of respondents practising these to keep themselves safe from the infection (Table 2). However, these responses are to be interpreted with caution as they are self-reported and might have social desirability bias. On the contrary, fewer respondents were able to maintain a 1.5-metre distance from others on the outside (43%) and maintained cough and sneeze etiquette (33%). This, on the one hand, suggests a possible low level of compliance around and lack of awareness of the importance of these critical preventive measures; on the other hand, indicate the challenges people may have been facing in complying with some of the measures in a densely populated, resources poor setting like Bangladesh [85].

Food insecurity was found to be associated with loss of income as the pandemic hit and the lockdown set in; consequently, the concern over managing household finance outweighs concern over health [86]. It is assuring that only a fifth of the respondents could not follow the 'stay at home'. Women's caregiving responsibilities at home and an additional burden of care during the pandemic may have played a part in this instance [87]. On the contrary, with widespread loss of livelihood, health becomes less of a priority for some and may make it harder for them to stay home with no or very limited income and increasing food insecurity [28]. Thus, this is not to imply a lack of concern for health as worries about visiting crowded places, having visitors in their house, and interacting with relatives and friends are also there [86].

This study makes an important contribution to the study of women's mental health in relation to food security in rural, resource-poor settings in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic (Tables 4 and 5). Evidence on mental health problems is scarce in Bangladesh, and such problems are often not considered serious health problems. Due to the stigma attached to mental health problems, the extent of the problem is often underreported [41]. Women are more vulnerable than men to have mental health problems in both urban and rural settings [41]. In our sample, the majority of the participants reported moderate to high perceived stress. The gender-based inequities in Bangladesh result in women having lower access to resources, lower decision-making power, and disparities in legal, economic, and political institutions that put women in a uniquely vulnerable position in time of crises [88]. These factors are likely to negatively impact the mental health of women in rural settings where gender norms are expected to be more rigid, and recognition of mental health needs and access to mental health care is low [41].

We detected a negative correlation between change in food security status and PSS score, which means that worsening the food security status was associated with a higher perceived stress level (Fig 1). These findings give strength to the evidence that mental health problems are prevalent among socially disadvantaged people, especially women in Bangladesh, regardless of family size [40]. Food insecurity was found to be associated with anxiety and depression among women in rural areas of Africa [89]. Evidence of food insecurity affecting the mental wellbeing of women is also available in the context of other developing countries [90, 91]. Food insecurity was found to be linked with a higher risk of mental illness in both women (18.4%) [95% CI 16.7–20.1] and men (13.5%) [95% CI 11.9–15.2], which may be even high because of social isolation [71]. Jones (2017) found that individuals who experienced mild, moderate and severe food insecurity have higher odds of stress, 1.8, 2.6 and 3.5 respectively, in reference to food security across different world regions [36]. A review conducted on the evidence of psychological effects of quarantine from ten countries found that longer (i.e. >10 days) duration of quarantine and inadequate supplies can lead to poorer mental health outcomes [27]. While this study's participants were not in quarantine, they experienced an extended period of lockdown which may result in prolonged isolation and feeling of uncertainty.

Climatic conditions such as cyclones or floods, which frequently happen in Bangladesh, are important factors to consider for examining the food security of households [92]. This study

sample was drawn from a region in Bangladesh which experienced cyclone 'Amphan' just after the first wave of survey [93]. However, the wave 2 survey was conducted about three weeks after the cyclone. While the livelihood, food security and mental health situation could be affected by the disaster we believe that the results reported in the paper are not significantly affected by cyclone 'Amphan'. There are several reasons. First, people in this region frequently face natural disasters and are very much adaptive to changes caused by cyclones [94]. Second, only limited number of the sample we surveyed during wave 2 was directly affected by this cyclone. Still, there are reasons to expect that the mental health of women is affected by the cyclone. To the extent cyclone, Amphan had a lasting effect, our results would be subject to bias, and one should interpret the results with caution. Note also that our results are not affected by any political and social unrest since it was relatively a peaceful time in Bangladesh politics.

This evidence needs to be interpreted in the context of prolonged lockdown in resource-poor settings. We collected the PSS data when Bangladesh had been in lockdown for more than six weeks. While lockdown can help prevent the spread of disease, it can impose a significant financial burden on individuals. In Bangladesh, millions experienced income loss due to massive disruption in economic activities [95]. People in developing countries, particularly the poor, appeared to have been bearing the manifold burden of COVID-19 at the health and economic front, including poverty and food insecurity [28], which can lead to common mental illness [2]. Mental health impacts overall health and wellbeing to a great extent. To a varying degree, acute and chronic stress can impact the immune system [62]. Therefore, a higher risk of an elevated stress level due to food insecurity and potential exacerbation of stress due to social isolation may make women more vulnerable to the coronavirus and other health problems.

Currently, there is limited mental health service in magnitude and reach [41]. There are some NGO initiatives of providing tele-counselling during the COVID-19 pandemic [96]. However, such services that incur a cost might not be suitable for poorer groups who do not have enough resources to buy food, even if they felt the need to seek help. From a public health point of view, it is critical to have evidence on the COVID-19 pandemic's effect on the mental health for the most vulnerable groups so that necessary support services can be developed, relevant policies can be formulated, and resources can be allocated towards mental health care. Thus, there is an urgent need for immediate support to ameliorate food insecurity and for more research to generate evidence highlighting the need of the marginalised women living in rural areas of Bangladesh to inform and support policymakers with necessary insights. Some interventions demonstrated promising results in improving the psychological wellbeing of women in similar settings [97, 98]. Similar interventions could be tried in the post-COVID-19 period in Bangladesh to develop potential strategies for mental health care.

Strength and limitation

Our study contributes new evidence on change in food security status and mental health of women living in rural areas using FIES and PSS at two time-points during the COVID-19 lockdown by measuring the implication of change in food security on stress levels. As the sample households share similar characteristics and are thus, representative of rural households in Bangladesh, the results can be generalisable to the rural household in other parts of the country. Our findings can offer insight into the mental health status of women in similar low income, resource-poor settings. Our study is not free of limitations. Due to the pandemic, we do not have any counterfactuals; thus, we are unable to examine any causal relationship. Although we found a statistically significant effect of change in food security on stress levels, we were unable to adjust for some potential confounders such as the burden of household chores during the lockdown, children's education and domestic violence due to unavailability

of data. These factors might have contributed to the higher stress level. Collecting this information over the phone was not feasible due to sensitive nature of the information, which might contribute to the deterioration of the situation. We also had to limit the survey time over the phone, in an attempt of not to take too much of the participants' time, and hence could not collect many related valuable data despite our best efforts. Therefore, the presence of other stressors, as indicated by Frongillo et al. (2019), needs to be considered while interpreting this evidence [37]. This is the first study that used PSS solely with women in the context of rural Bangladesh. Thus, there is scope for further research for scale refinement. However, our findings did not differ significantly from existing literature on Bangladesh, though very limited [40, 41]. This study seeks to contribute to addressing this critical evidence gap.

Conclusion

Household food insecurity during crises may put women living in rural areas under stress. Addressing food insecurity is critical in ensuring the physical health of the people and their mental health. Collaborative actions are warranted from the relevant government and non-government agencies to initiate public policy dialogue around ensuring food security for the poor during crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic and in the long-term. Distribution of food during crises targeting food insecure, poor households needs urgent consideration. At the same time, NGOs and policymakers should consider interventions providing psychological counselling to support rural women's mental health. They are often neglected and become more vulnerable at times of such crises. Given that food, insecurity is common in Bangladesh and women's critical role in managing household food shortage, community-based awareness-raising activities on the significance of mental health in overall wellbeing, the importance of help-seeking, and available support services could be beneficial.

Supporting information

S1 Table. Description of participant status based on the change in food security status (Improved, No Change, Worsen).

(DOCX)

S2 Table. Mixed effect model result of wave 2 FIES score on PSS, KLC-19, and ALC-19 scores.

(DOCX)

S3 Table. Mixed effect model result of change in FIES score from wave 1 to wave 2 on PSS, KLC-19, and ALC-19 scores.

(DOCX)

S1 Dataset.

(XLS)

Acknowledgments

The research team acknowledges the cooperation received from the study participants and the members of the community in the course of this work.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Asad Islam.

Formal analysis: Tabassum Rahman, M. D. Golam Hasnain.

Methodology: Asad Islam.

Resources: Tabassum Rahman.

Software: Tabassum Rahman, M. D. Golam Hasnain.

Supervision: Asad Islam.

Writing – original draft: Tabassum Rahman.

Writing – review & editing: M. D. Golam Hasnain, Asad Islam.

References

1. Mucci N, Giorgi G, Roncaioli M, Perez JF, Arcangeli G. The correlation between stress and economic crisis: a systematic review. *Neuropsychiatric disease and treatment*. 2016; 12:983. <https://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S98525> PMID: 27143898
2. Lund C, Breen A, Flisher AJ, Kakuma R, Corrigall J, Joska JA, et al. Poverty and common mental disorders in low and middle income countries: A systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2010; 71(3):517–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.04.027> PMID: 20621748
3. Ho RC, Zhang MW, Ho CS, Pan F, Lu Y, Sharma VK. Impact of 2013 south Asian haze crisis: study of physical and psychological symptoms and perceived dangerousness of pollution level. *BMC psychiatry*. 2014; 14(1):81. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-14-81> PMID: 24642046
4. Stain HJ, Kelly B, Carr VJ, Lewin TJ, Fitzgerald M, Fragar L. The psychological impact of chronic environmental adversity: Responding to prolonged drought. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2011; 73(11):1593–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.09.016> PMID: 22005316
5. Cowling BJ, Ng DM, Ip DK, Liao Q, Lam WW, Wu JT, et al. Community psychological and behavioral responses through the first wave of the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic in Hong Kong. *The Journal of infectious diseases*. 2010; 202(6):867–76. <https://doi.org/10.1086/655811> PMID: 20677945
6. Chua SE, Cheung V, McAlonan GM, Cheung C, Wong JW, Cheung EP, et al. Stress and psychological impact on SARS patients during the outbreak. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2004; 49(6):385–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370404900607> PMID: 15283533
7. James PB, Wardle J, Steel A, Adams J. Post-Ebola psychosocial experiences and coping mechanisms among Ebola survivors: a systematic review. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*. 2019; 24(6):671–91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.13226> PMID: 30843627
8. Alders R, Awuni JA, Bagnol B, Farrell P, de Haan N. Impact of avian influenza on village poultry production globally. *Ecohealth*. 2014; 11(1):63–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-013-0867-x> PMID: 24136383
9. Barrett CB. Actions now can curb food systems fallout from COVID-19. *Nature Food*. 2020; 1(6):319–20.
10. Ceballos F, Kannan S, Kramer B. Impacts of a national lockdown on smallholder farmers' income and food security: Empirical evidence from two states in India. *World Development*. 2020; 136:105069.
11. de Brauw A, Hirvonen K, Abate GT. Food and nutrition security in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia during COVID-19 pandemic: July 2020 report: Intl Food Policy Res Inst; 2020.
12. Elsahoryi N, Al-Sayyed H, Odeh M, McGrattan A, Hammad F. Effect of Covid-19 on food security: A cross-sectional survey. *Clinical nutrition ESPEN*. 2020; 40:171–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnesp.2020.09.026> PMID: 33183533
13. Fan S. Preventing global food security crisis under COVID-19 emergency. International Food Policy Research Institute blog Recuperado de <https://www.ifpri.org/blog/preventing-global-food-security-crisis-under-covid-19-emergency>. 2020.
14. Glauber J, Laborde Debucquet D, Martin W, Vos R. COVID-19: Trade restrictions are worst possible response to safeguard food security. IFPRI book chapters. 2020:66–8.
15. Ivers LC, Cullen KA, Freedberg KA, Block S, Coates J, Webb P, et al. HIV/AIDS, undernutrition, and food insecurity. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2009; 49(7):1096–102. <https://doi.org/10.1086/605573> PMID: 19725790
16. Kansime MK, Tambo JA, Mugambi I, Bundi M, Kara A, Owuor C. COVID-19 implications on household income and food security in Kenya and Uganda: Findings from a rapid assessment. *World development*. 2020; 137:105199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105199> PMID: 32982018
17. Kelly JD, Richardson ET, Drasher M, Barrie MB, Karku S, Kamara M, et al. Food insecurity as a risk factor for outcomes related to ebola virus disease in Kono District, Sierra Leone: a cross-sectional study. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*. 2018; 98(5):1484–8. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.17-0820> PMID: 29557329

18. Laborde D, Martin W, Vos R. Poverty and food insecurity could grow dramatically as COVID-19 spreads. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Washington, DC. 2020.
19. Mtika MM. The AIDS epidemic in Malawi and its threat to household food security. *Human organization*. 2001;178–88.
20. Pereira M, Oliveira AM. Poverty and food insecurity may increase as the threat of COVID-19 spreads. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2020; 23(17):3236–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980020003493> PMID: 32895072
21. Siwatu GO, Palacios-Lopez A, Mcgee KR, Amankwah A, Vishwanath T, Azad MAK. Impact of covid-19 on Nigerian households: baseline results. World Bank Group, Washington, DC. 2020.
22. Stanturf JA, Goodrick SL, Warren ML Jr, Charnley S, Stegall CM. Social vulnerability and Ebola virus disease in rural Liberia. *PLoS One*. 2015; 10(9):e0137208. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0137208> PMID: 26325519
23. Sulser T, Dunston S. COVID-19-related trade restrictions on rice and wheat could drive up prices and increase hunger IFPRI blog [Internet]2020. [cited 2021]. Available from: <https://www.ifpri.org/blog/covid-19-related-trade-restrictions-rice-and-wheat-could-drive-prices-and-increase-hunger#:~:text=The%20modeling%20suggests%20that%20prices,in%202020%20as%20a%20result>.
24. Swinnen J, McDermott J. Covid-19 and Global Food Security. *EuroChoices*. 2020.
25. Weiser SD, Young SL, Cohen CR, Kushel MB, Tsai AC, Tien PC, et al. Conceptual framework for understanding the bidirectional links between food insecurity and HIV/AIDS. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2011; 94(6):1729S–39S. <https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.111.012070> PMID: 22089434
26. Holmes EA, O'Connor RC, Perry VH, Tracey I, Wessely S, Arseneault L, et al. Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2020.
27. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *The Lancet*. 2020; 395(10227):912–20.
28. Ravallion M. Could Pandemic Lead to Famine? Project Syndicate, Apr. 2020; 15:2020.
29. Bank W. Global Economic Prospects, June 2020. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2020.
30. Bangladesh W. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) Bangladesh situation reports 2020 [Available from: [https://www.who.int/bangladesh/emergencies/coronavirus-disease-\(covid-19\)-update/coronavirus-disease-\(covid-2019\)-bangladesh-situation-reports](https://www.who.int/bangladesh/emergencies/coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-update/coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-bangladesh-situation-reports).
31. Shah J. COVID-19 may drive 5m to poverty. Prothom Alo. 2020.
32. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2020. 2020.
33. FAO. Regional Overview of Food Security and Nutrition in Africa 2017. The food security and nutrition–conflict nexus: building resilience for food security, nutrition and peace. Accra.; 2017.
34. Lukwa AT, Siya A, Zblon KN, Azam JM, Alaba OA. Socioeconomic inequalities in food insecurity and malnutrition among under-five children: within and between-group inequalities in Zimbabwe. *BMC Public Health*. 2020; 20(1):1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7969-5> PMID: 31898494
35. Ebaidalla EM. Inequality of opportunity in child health in Sudan: Across-region study. WIDER Working Paper; 2019. Report No.: 9292567225.
36. Jones AD. Food insecurity and mental health status: a global analysis of 149 countries. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2017; 53(2):264–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2017.04.008> PMID: 28457747
37. Frongillo EA, Nguyen HT, Smith MD, Coleman-Jensen A. Food Insecurity Is More Strongly Associated with Poor Subjective Well-Being in More-Developed Countries than in Less-Developed Countries. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2019; 149(2):330–5. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxy261> PMID: 30597047
38. McAuliffe S, Ray S, Fallon E, Bradfield J, Eden T, Kohlmeier M. Dietary micronutrients in the wake of COVID-19: an appraisal of evidence with a focus on high-risk groups and preventative healthcare. *BMJ nutrition, prevention & health*. 2020; 3(1):93. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjnp-2020-000100> PMID: 33235973
39. Perez-Escamilla F, de Toledo Vianna RP. Food Insecurity and the Behavioral and Intellectual Development of Children: A Review of the Evidence. *Journal of Applied Research on Children*. 2012; 3(1):9.
40. Hosain GM, Chatterjee N, Ara N, Islam T. Prevalence, pattern and determinants of mental disorders in rural Bangladesh. *Public health*. 2007; 121(1):18–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2006.06.018> PMID: 17055545
41. Hossain MD, Ahmed HU, Chowdhury WA, Niessen LW, Alam DS. Mental disorders in Bangladesh: a systematic review. *BMC psychiatry*. 2014; 14(1):216. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-014-0216-9> PMID: 25073970

42. Kabeer N, Huq L. The power of relationships: Love and solidarity in a landless women's organisation in rural Bangladesh. *IDS Bulletin*. 2010; 41(2):79–87.
43. Kalansooriya C, Chandrakumara D. Women's role in household food security in rural Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*. 2014; 1(1):41–54.
44. Schmeer KK, Piperata BA, Rodríguez AH, Torres VMS, Cárdenas FJC. Maternal resources and household food security: evidence from Nicaragua. *Public health nutrition*. 2015; 18(16):2915–24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980014003000> PMID: 25563386
45. Galvão J. COVID-19: the deadly threat of misinformation. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2021; 21(5): E114. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30721-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30721-0) PMID: 33031753
46. Zarocostas J. How to fight an infodemic. *The Lancet*. 2020; 395(10225):676. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30461-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30461-X) PMID: 32113495
47. Dajaan DS, Addo HO, Ojo L, Amegah KE, Loveland F, Bechala BD, et al. Hand washing knowledge and practices among public primary schools in the Kintampo Municipality of Ghana. *International Journal Of Community Medicine And Public Health*. 2018; 5(6):2205.
48. Kuberan A, Singh AK, Kasav JB, Prasad S, Surapaneni KM, Upadhyay V, et al. Water and sanitation hygiene knowledge, attitude, and practices among household members living in rural setting of India. *Journal of natural science, biology, and medicine*. 2015; 6(Suppl 1):S69. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0976-9668.166090> PMID: 26604623
49. Rabbi SE, Dey NC. Exploring the gap between hand washing knowledge and practices in Bangladesh: a cross-sectional comparative study. *BMC public health*. 2013; 13(1):89. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-13-89> PMID: 23363772
50. Tran D-S, Odermatt P, Singphuangphet S, Druet-Cabanac M, Preux P-M, Strobel M, et al. Epilepsy in Laos: knowledge, attitudes, and practices in the community. *Epilepsy & Behavior*. 2007; 10(4):565–70.
51. Islam A, Pakrashi D, Vlassopoulos M, Wang LC. Stigma and Misconceptions in the Time of the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Field Experiment in India. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2020; 278:1133966.
52. Cheung E. An outbreak of fear, rumours and stigma: psychosocial support for the Ebola virus disease outbreak in West Africa. *Intervention*. 2015; 13(1):70–6.
53. Hatzenbuehler ML, Phelan JC, Link BG. Stigma as a fundamental cause of population health inequalities. *American journal of public health*. 2013; 103(5):813–21. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.301069> PMID: 23488505
54. Stangl AL, Earnshaw VA, Logie CH, van Brakel W, Simbayi LC, Barré I, et al. The Health Stigma and Discrimination Framework: a global, crosscutting framework to inform research, intervention development, and policy on health-related stigmas. *BMC medicine*. 2019; 17(1):31. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-019-1271-3> PMID: 30764826
55. Haque M, Hossain S, Ahmed KR, Sultana T, Chowdhury HA, Akter J. A comparative study on knowledge about reproductive health among urban and rural women of Bangladesh. *Journal of family & reproductive health*. 2015; 9(1):35. PMID: 25904966
56. Hossain M, Mani KK, Sidik SM, Shahar HK, Islam R. Knowledge and awareness about STDs among women in Bangladesh. *BMC public health*. 2014; 14(1):775. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-14-775> PMID: 25081860
57. Schuler SR, Islam F, Rottach E. Women's empowerment revisited: a case study from Bangladesh. *Development in practice*. 2010; 20(7):840–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2010.508108> PMID: 20856695
58. Ahmed T, Rizvi SJR, Rasheed S, Iqbal M, Bhuiya A, Standing H, et al. Digital Health and Inequalities in Access to Health Services in Bangladesh: Mixed Methods Study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2020; 8(7):e16473. <https://doi.org/10.2196/16473> PMID: 32706736
59. Cohen S, Gianaros PJ, Manuck SB. A stage model of stress and disease. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 2016; 11(4):456–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616646305> PMID: 27474134
60. Chrousos GP. Stress and disorders of the stress system. *Nature reviews endocrinology*. 2009; 5(7):374. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrendo.2009.106> PMID: 19488073
61. Lazarus RS. From psychological stress to the emotions: A history of changing outlooks. *Annual review of psychology*. 1993; 44(1):1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.44.020193.000245> PMID: 8434890
62. Olf M. Stress, depression and immunity: the role of defense and coping styles. *Psychiatry Research*. 1999; 85(1):7–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1781\(98\)00139-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1781(98)00139-5) PMID: 10195312
63. Bruening M, MacLehose R, Loth K, Story M, Neumark-Sztainer D. Feeding a family in a recession: food insecurity among Minnesota parents. *American journal of public health*. 2012; 102(3):520–6. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300390> PMID: 22390517

64. Huang J, Kim Y, Birkenmaier J. Unemployment and household food hardship in the economic recession. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2016; 19(3):511–9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980015001603> PMID: 26028335
65. Naylor RL, Falcon WP. Food security in an era of economic volatility. *Population and development review*. 2010; 36(4):693–723. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2010.00354.x> PMID: 21174866
66. Rosegrant MW, Ringler C. Asian economic crisis and the long-term global food situation. *Food Policy*. 2000; 25(3):243–54.
67. Verpoorten M, Arora A, Stoop N, Swinnen J. Self-reported food insecurity in Africa during the food price crisis. *Food Policy*. 2013; 39:51–63.
68. Cheung E, Mutahar R, Assefa F, Ververs M-T, Nasiri SM, Borrel A, et al. An epidemic of scurvy in Afghanistan: assessment and response. *Food and nutrition bulletin*. 2003; 24(3):247–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/156482650302400302> PMID: 14564929
69. Legg J. Emergence, spread and strategies for controlling the pandemic of cassava mosaic virus disease in east and central Africa. *Crop protection*. 1999; 18(10):627–37.
70. Prudencio YC, Al-Hassan R. The food security stabilization roles of cassava in Africa. *Food Policy*. 1994; 19(1):57–64.
71. Martin M, Maddocks E, Chen Y, Gilman S, Colman I. Food insecurity and mental illness: disproportionate impacts in the context of perceived stress and social isolation. *Public health*. 2016; 132:86–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2015.11.014> PMID: 26795678
72. Ahmed F, Islam A, Pakrashi D, Rahman T, Siddique A. Determinants and Dynamics of Food Insecurity During COVID-19. *Food Policy*. 2020; In Press:102066.
73. Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *International journal of surgery*. 2014; 12(12):1495–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.013> PMID: 25046131
74. Ballard TJ, Kepple AW, Cafiero C. The food insecurity experience scale: development of a global standard for monitoring hunger worldwide. Rome: FAO. 2013.
75. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. Perceived stress scale. *Measuring stress: A guide for health and social scientists*. 1994; 10:1–2.
76. Islam MN. Psychometric properties of the bangla version of pss-10: Is it a single-factor measure or not? *Hellenic Journal of Psychology*. 2020; 17:015–34.
77. Mozumder MK. Validation of Bengali perceived stress scale among LGBT population. *BMC psychiatry*. 2017; 17(1):314. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1482-0> PMID: 28851332
78. Smith MD, Rabbitt MP, Coleman-Jensen A. Who are the world's food insecure? New evidence from the Food and Agriculture Organization's food insecurity experience scale. *World Development*. 2017; 93:402–12.
79. Organization WH. Coronavirus 2020 [Available from: https://www.who.int/health-topics/coronavirus#tab=tab_1].
80. Organization WH. A guide to preventing and addressing social stigma associated with COVID-19 2021 [Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/a-guide-to-preventing-and-addressing-social-stigma-associated-with-covid-19?gclid=Cj0KCQiA9P__BRC0ARIsAEZ6irhtJ2-UNphNA3iKTQMj53AMte3OqaT4stVIX9S375ViuQ4xl5S9vZYaAlrxEALw_wcB].
81. Frontières MS. Coronavirus 2021 [Available from: <https://www.msf.org/coronavirus>].
82. Institute of Epidemiology DCaR. Corona Info 2021 [Available from: https://corona.gov.bd/?gclid=Cj0KCQiA9P__BRC0ARIsAEZ6irgFuNHWD0miTbkXCqR9gBRHB3PpUSwQTM-mlBcnj_tixIzWLiNU85gaArhcEALw_wcB].
83. Sparling TM, Waid JL, Wendt AS, Gabrysch S. Depression among women of reproductive age in rural Bangladesh is linked to food security, diets and nutrition. *Public health nutrition*. 2020; 23(4):660–73. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980019003495> PMID: 31915095
84. Hamadani JD, Hasan MI, Baldi AJ, Hossain SJ, Shiraji S, Bhuiyan MSA, et al. Immediate impact of stay-at-home orders to control COVID-19 transmission on socioeconomic conditions, food insecurity, mental health, and intimate partner violence in Bangladeshi women and their families: an interrupted time series. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2020; 8(11):e1380–e9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(20\)30366-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30366-1) PMID: 32857955
85. Ravallion M. Economics & Poverty 2020 [21 June 2020]. Available from: <https://economicsandpoverty.com/2020/05/25/can-the-worlds-poor-protect-themselves-from-the-new-coronavirus/>.
86. Rahman T, Ahmed F, Pakrashi D, Siddique A, Islam A. Income loss and wellbeing during COVID-19 lockdown in rural Bangladesh: Evidence from large household surveys Bangladesh Development Studies. 2020; Working paper.

87. Bahn K, Cohen J, van der Meulen Rodgers Y. A Feminist Perspective on COVID-19 and the Value of Care Work Globally. *Gender, Work & Organization*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12459> PMID: [32837001](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32837001/)
88. Juran L, Trivedi J. Women, gender norms, and natural disasters in Bangladesh. *Geographical Review*. 2015; 105(4):601–11.
89. Hadley C, Patil CL. Food insecurity in rural Tanzania is associated with maternal anxiety and depression. *American Journal of Human Biology: The Official Journal of the Human Biology Association*. 2006; 18(3):359–68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.20505> PMID: [16634017](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16634017/)
90. Patel V, Kirkwood BR, Pednekar S, Weiss H, Mabey D. Risk factors for common mental disorders in women: Population-based longitudinal study. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2006; 189(6):547–55. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.106.022558> PMID: [17139040](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17139040/)
91. Seino K, Takano T, Mashal T, Hemat S, Nakamura K. Prevalence of and factors influencing posttraumatic stress disorder among mothers of children under five in Kabul, Afghanistan, after decades of armed conflicts. *Health and quality of life outcomes*. 2008; 6(1):29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-6-29> PMID: [18433474](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18433474/)
92. Barrett CB. *Food security and sociopolitical stability*. Oxford Scholarship Online: OUP Oxford; 2013.
93. Ebrahim SH, Rahman NM, Imtiaz R, Gozzer E, Alqahtani SA, Ahmed Y, et al. Forward planning for disaster-related mass gatherings amid COVID-19. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2020; 4(9):e379–e80. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(20\)30175-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30175-3) PMID: [32795405](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32795405/)
94. Ayeb-Karlsson S, van der Geest K, Ahmed I, Huq S, Warner K. A people-centred perspective on climate change, environmental stress, and livelihood resilience in Bangladesh. *Sustainability Science*. 2016; 11(4):679–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-016-0379-z> PMID: [30174739](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30174739/)
95. Abi-Habib M. Millions had risen out of poverty. Coronavirus is pulling them back. *New York Times* April. 2020;30.
96. Mariam E, Chowdhury ZF. Tele-counselling support can help tackle Covid-19 mental health issues. *The Daily Star*. 2020 25 July 2020.
97. Rahman A, Khan MN, Hamdani SU, Chiumento A, Akhtar P, Nazir H, et al. Effectiveness of a brief group psychological intervention for women in a post-conflict setting in Pakistan: a single-blind, cluster, randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2019; 393(10182):1733–44.
98. Rahman A, Malik A, Sikander S, Roberts C, Creed F. Cognitive behaviour therapy-based intervention by community health workers for mothers with depression and their infants in rural Pakistan: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2008; 372(9642):902–9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(08\)61400-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61400-2) PMID: [18790313](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18790313/)