

Food insecurity and common mental disorders in perinatal women living in low socio-economic settings in Cape Town, South Africa during the COVID-19 pandemic: a cohort study

Zulfa Abrahams (✉ zulfa.abrahams@uct.ac.za)

University of Cape Town <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7336-6009>

Crick Lund

University of Cape Town

Research Article

Keywords: Food security, depression, perinatal, domestic abuse, COVID

Posted Date: December 8th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-692244/v2>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Global Mental Health on February 4th, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1017/gmh.2022.12>.

Abstract

Background

Common mental disorders (CMDs) such as depression and anxiety are highly prevalent during the perinatal period, and are associated with poverty, food insecurity and domestic violence. We used data collected from perinatal women at two time-points during the COVID-19 pandemic to test the hypotheses that (1) socio-economic adversities at baseline would be associated with higher CMD prevalence at follow-up and (2) worse mental health at baseline would be associated with higher food insecurity prevalence at follow-up.

Methods

Telephonic interviews were conducted with perinatal women attending healthcare facilities in Cape Town, South Africa. Multivariable logistic regression analysis was used to model the associations of baseline risk factors with the prevalence of household food insecurity and CMD at 3 months follow-up.

Results

At baseline 859 women were recruited, of whom 217 (25%) were pregnant, 106 (12%) had probable CMD, and 375 (44%) were severely food insecure. At follow-up (n=634), 22 (4%) were still pregnant, 44 (7%) had probable CMD, and 207 (33%) were severely food insecure. In the multivariable regression model, after controlling for confounders, the odds of being food insecure at follow-up were greater in women who were unemployed [OR=2.05 (1.46-2.87); p<0.001] or had probable CMD [OR=2.37 (1.35-4.18); p=0.003] at baseline; and the odds of probable CMD at follow-up were greater in women with psychological distress [OR=2.81 (1.47-5.39); p=0.002] and abuse [OR=2.47 (1.47-4.39); p=0.007] at baseline.

Conclusions

This study highlights the complex bidirectional relationship between mental health and socioeconomic adversity among perinatal women during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Introduction

In low- and middle-income countries (LMIC), common mental disorders (CMDs) such as depression and anxiety disorders are highly prevalent during the perinatal period (Redinger et al., 2018, van Heyningen et al., 2017, van Heyningen et al., 2016) and are associated with several markers of multidimensional poverty, food insecurity (Abrahams et al., 2018, Jebena et al., 2015) and domestic violence (Malan, Spedding & Sorsdahl, 2018). The prevalence appears to fluctuate during pregnancy – with women in the first and third trimester of pregnancy, and those with other children, being at greater risk of depression and anxiety (Yan, Ding & Guo, 2020). Moreover, pregnant women with mild to moderate symptoms of depression during their first and second trimester of pregnancy show a natural remission of symptoms during the perinatal period, even without intervention (Garman, Schneider & Lund, 2019, Lee et al., 2014).

South Africa is characterised by high levels of inequality and multidimensional poverty (Posel, Rogan, 2019, Fransman, Yu, 2019), evidenced by having one of the highest Gini coefficients in the world (The World Bank, 2021). Reflecting this high inequality, South Africa is food secure at a national level, i.e., enough food is being produced and imported to ensure that all South Africans have sufficient food, yet more than 20% of South African households are food insecure (Statistics South Africa, 2019a). Household food insecurity exists when households do not have “physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life” (Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United States, 2001). Based on the 2017 General Household Survey in South Africa, households with the greatest levels of food insecurity are headed by Black Africans, have more than eight household members and are living in urban areas (Statistics South Africa, 2019a).

Late in March 2020, the South African government enforced a national lockdown to curb the spread of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) (South African Government, 2020d). For more than two months the majority of South Africans were confined to their homes, except those performing essential services (South African Government, 2020c, South African Government, 2020b). Even when restrictions started easing in June 2020, many industries remained under lockdown (South African Government, 2020a). The COVID-19 pandemic triggered an increase in unemployment and poverty in South Africa, affecting already vulnerable populations, especially those working in the informal sector who were unskilled and had low levels of education (Rogan, Skinner, 2020). Unemployment rates, which had remained at about 20% for the last decade, rose to 31% by September 2020 (Statistics South Africa, 2021). As a result of the high levels of unemployment, raised food prices and economic decline (Pereira, Oliveira, 2020), acute food insecurity was experienced throughout South Africa (Integrated Food Security Phase Classification, 2021). Food security is especially important for pregnant and lactating women as inadequate nutrition during pregnancy, lactation and infancy is associated with poor infant and child health outcomes (Harper et al., 2020).

The relationship between CMDs and food insecurity is thought to be bidirectional, including during the perinatal period. The social causation hypothesis proposes that those living in poverty and food insecurity develop poor mental health because of exposure to a number of adversities, including stress resulting from their economic difficulties, while the social drift hypothesis proposes that poor mental health causes disability and associated loss of employment together with increased medical expenditure, resulting in a drift into poverty (Ridley et al., 2020, Lund, Cois, 2018). While many studies have reported cross-sectional associations between poverty and CMDs in perinatal women, few studies have used longitudinal designs to examine the bidirectional relationship between mental health and socio-economic risk factors (Lund et al., 2018). To our knowledge, no studies have reported on the relationship between household food insecurity and CMDs in perinatal women living in South Africa during the COVID-19 pandemic. We hypothesized that socio-economic

adversities at baseline would predict higher CMD prevalence at follow-up and in turn that worse mental health experienced at baseline would predict higher food insecurity prevalence at follow-up. To test these hypotheses, we used data collected at two time points from perinatal women living in low socio-economic settings in Cape Town during the COVID-19 pandemic, to explore the association of several baseline risk factors with the prevalence of household food insecurity and CMD experienced at follow-up.

Methods

Setting

This analysis was conducted as part of the Health Systems Strengthening in sub-Saharan Africa (ASSET) study (ASSET, 2020) which included a planned cluster randomised control trial (ISRTC41483663) to evaluate an intervention to strengthen detection, referral and care for antenatal women with probable CMDs and experiences of domestic violence in Cape Town, South Africa. Study sites consisted of 14 midwife obstetric units (MOUs) or basic antenatal care (BANC) clinics that were randomly selected from 23 facilities in the Cape Metropolitan Health District in Cape Town. As part of the study, the clinical notes of 2149 perinatal women were reviewed. Patients' contact details, and gestational and medical history was captured during the review.

All healthcare facilities are managed by the Western Cape Department of Health and offer free antenatal and postnatal care. All facilities are situated in low-resource urban communities, across a large flat area known as the 'Cape Flats' (South African History Online, 2020). Black and Coloured (people of mixed ancestry (Adhikari, 2005)) families were forcibly moved to these areas during the Apartheid era in South Africa, and now reside in low-cost housing and informal settlements, where residents experience high levels of unemployment and poverty (Statistics South Africa, 2017), gang violence (Maringira, Masiya, 2018) and domestic abuse (Malan, Spedding & Sorsdahl, 2018). During the pandemic, a survey among perinatal women living in vulnerable communities in Cape Town, reported that 71% of women were unemployed, and almost 40% of women reported that they had gone to bed hungry due to lack of food in the household (Matlwa Mabaso et al., 2021).

Data collection

Between June and July 2020 (baseline), using the contact details obtained from the clinical notes, perinatal women were telephonically contacted and invited to participate in a telephonic survey. Trained fieldworkers verbally explained the study in participants' home language before seeking informed consent. The following questionnaires were administered to women who consented to participate in the study: (1) a socio-demographic questionnaire, (2) the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) (Cox, Holden & Sagovsky, 1987), (3) a 3-question mental health screening questionnaire (Abrahams et al., 2019), (4) the Household Food Insecurity and Access Scale (HFIAS) (Castell et al., 2015), and (5) the short form of the Composite Abuse Scale (CAS-SF) (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2016). Three months later (follow-up), the same questionnaires were telephonically administered to women who participated in the baseline data collection.

CMD was measured using the EPDS, a ten-question screening tool with a seven-day recall period. It has been validated against the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-IV) (Frances, Widiger & Pincus, 1989, Sheehan et al., 1998) for depression and anxiety in a sample of postnatal women in South Africa (Cox, Holden & Sagovsky, 1987, Lawrie et al., 1998) with a cut-off of ≥ 13 indicating a probable CMD (sensitivity=80%; specificity=76.6%) (Cox, Holden & Sagovsky, 1987).

Psychological distress was measured using a 3-question mental health screening questionnaire with a 14-day recall period. This questionnaire has been validated against the EPDS with a cut-point of ≥ 2 indicating the presence of psychological distress (sensitivity=85.7%; specificity=92.9%) (Abrahams et al., 2019).

Household food insecurity was measured with the HFIAS, a 9-item scale with a 30-day recall period which measures the household's frequency of running out of food or eating inadequate amounts of food (Castell et al., 2015). The HFIAS was used to develop a categorical variable to describe four levels of household food insecurity experienced during the past 30 days: food secure, mildly food insecure, moderately food insecure and severely food insecure (Coates, Swindale & Bilinsky, 2007), as well as a binary variable which differentiates between food secure and food insecure households. Food insecure refers to households that experienced mild, moderate or severe food insecurity.

Domestic violence was measured with the 15-item CAS-SF (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2016), which captures self-reported experiences and the frequency of psychological, physical and sexual abuse. At baseline the recall period was 12 months, while at follow-up women were asked whether they had experienced any form of domestic violence since the previous interview, approximately 3 months earlier.

Data analysis

Data analysis was carried out using STATA/SE statistical software package version 15.1 (StataCorp., College Station, TX, USA). Participants with more than 30% incomplete data were excluded from the analysis. Multiple imputation was used to account for data assumed to be missing at random. Categorical variables were described using frequency and percentages, and associations measured using Chi-square tests.

To test the hypotheses that socio-economic adversities at baseline would predict higher CMD prevalence at follow-up and in turn that worse mental health experienced at baseline would predict higher food insecurity prevalence at follow-up, we used logistic regression to model the associations of several baseline risk factors with the prevalence of food insecurity and CMD at follow-up, as the outcomes. Univariate analysis was used to explore the unadjusted association between covariates and household food insecurity and CMD outcomes. A purposeful selection model building strategy (Zhang, 2016) was used to build the

multivariable model. Starting with an empty model, variables with a p-value of <0.25 (Bursac et al., 2008) in the univariate model were added. Partial likelihood ratio tests were used to compare the models.

Ethical approval

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee at the Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Cape Town (Ref No: 139/2018) and the Psychiatry, Nursing and Midwifery Research Ethics Subcommittee at Kings College London (Ref No: 17/18-7807). The Western Cape Department of Health approved the use of the research sites (Ref No: WC_201807_008). Consent forms were available in English, Afrikaans and isiXhosa. All participants were informed that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time without consequences. Women who screened positive for CMDs or experiences of domestic violence or severe food insecurity, were provided with a resource list of organisations that provided telephonic counselling and support. No financial incentives were provided for participating in the study.

Results

At baseline 859 perinatal women were recruited and participated in telephonic interviews. Three months later 635 (74%) women participated in the follow-up telephonic interviews. The women who were lost-to-follow-up were no longer contactable on the cell phone number used at baseline. Those lost to follow-up were not significantly different to those who participated in the follow-up interviews with regards to age ($p=0.557$), employment status ($p=0.059$), number of children (0.557), receiving financial support from their partner ($p=0.144$) and number of people per sleeping room ($p=0.618$). At follow-up (**Table 1**), significantly more women were unemployed (71% vs. 54%; $p<0.001$) and had already given birth (95% vs. 74%; $p<0.001$), compared to baseline. Significantly fewer women experienced psychological distress (14% vs. 26%; $p<0.001$) and had a probable CMD (7% vs. 12%; $p<0.001$) at follow-up, compared to baseline. At follow-up the prevalence of food insecurity had significantly reduced ($p<0.001$). More women were food secure (31% vs. 19%) and mildly food insecure (13% vs. 9%), while fewer women were moderately (24% vs. 28%) and severely food insecure (33% vs. 44%) at follow-up, compared to baseline. Experiences of any form of domestic abuse decreased significantly (12% vs. 21%; $p<0.001$) from baseline to follow-up.

In the cross-sectional analysis, at baseline, several markers of multidimensional poverty and worse mental health were significantly higher in women who were food insecure compared to those who were food secure. These markers included being unemployed (58% vs. 39%; $p<0.001$), receiving a child support grant (50% vs. 39%; $p=0.012$), having ≥ 5 people per sleeping room (8.5% vs. 5%; $p=0.005$), experiencing psychological distress (30% vs. 13%; $p<0.001$), having a probable CMD (14% vs. 4%; $p<0.001$) and experiencing physical abuse (15% vs. 9%; $p<0.001$) (**Table 2**). At follow-up the pattern remained the same - significantly more women who were food insecure were unemployed (56% vs. 40%; $p<0.001$), received a child support grant (51% vs. 38%; $p=0.002$), experienced psychological distress (16% vs. 8%; $p=0.003$), had a probable CMD (9% vs. 4%; $p=0.042$) and experienced physical abuse (11% vs. 4%; $p=0.003$), compared to those who were food secure. In addition, at follow-up significantly fewer women who were food insecure had planned their pregnancy (34% vs. 43%; $p=0.031$), while significantly more women who were food insecure were HIV-infected (23% vs. 12%; $p=0.002$), compared to those who were food secure.

In the cross-sectional analysis, at baseline, significantly more women with CMD were of mixed ancestry (45% vs. 27%; $p<0.001$), were still pregnant (32% vs. 24%; $p=0.009$), experienced psychological distress (76% vs. 19%; $p<0.001$), were food insecure (93% vs. 79%; $p<0.001$) and experienced any form of abuse (42% vs. 18%; $p<0.001$) compared to those without CMD (**Table 3**). At follow-up significantly more women with CMD experienced psychological distress (67% vs. 10%; $p<0.001$), were food insecure (83% vs. 68%; $p=0.042$) and experienced psychological abuse (30% vs. 8%; $p<0.001$), physical abuse (17% vs. 8%; $p=0.025$), or any form of abuse (30% vs. 10%; $p<0.001$), compared to those without CMD.

In the multivariable longitudinal model with food security as the outcome variable (**Table 4**), after controlling for confounders (age, ethnicity, number of children, having a planned pregnancy, and the number of people per sleeping room), the odds of being food insecure were greater in women who were unemployed [OR=2.05 (95% CI: 1.46-2.87); $p<0.001$] and those with a probable CMD [OR=2.37 (95%CI: 1.35-4.18); $p=0.003$] at baseline. In the multivariable longitudinal model with CMD as the outcome variable (**Table 5**), after controlling for age, the odds of experiencing CMD were greater in women who experienced psychological distress [OR=2.60 (95% CI: 1.38-4.92); $p=0.002$] and any form of abuse [OR=2.38 (95% CI: 1.24-4.58); $p=0.009$] at baseline. Similar results were obtained when conducting sensitivity analysis using the EPDS scores as a continuous variable in a linear regression model – psychological distress [$\beta=1.66$ (95% CI: 0.86-2.47); $p<0.001$] and any form of abuse [$\beta=1.81$ (95% CI: 0.90-2.71); $p<0.001$].

Discussion

We used data collected at two time-points, three months apart, during the COVID-19 pandemic in Cape Town, South Africa to identify social, economic and mental health related variables associated with food insecurity and CMD in perinatal women attending public healthcare facilities situated in low socio-economic communities. At baseline, we found that 80% of perinatal women lived in food insecure households, 21% experienced domestic violence and 12% had a probable CMDs. Three months later the prevalence of food insecurity, domestic violence and probable CMD was significantly lower. In cross-sectional analysis at both baseline and follow-up, we found that food insecurity was significantly associated with race, several markers of multidimensional poverty (including employment status, receipt of grants, and number of people per sleeping room), probable CMD, psychological distress and experiences of domestic abuse; while CMD was significantly associated with experiencing psychological distress, food insecurity and abuse. These cross-sectional associations reflect a clustering of socio-economic adversity and worse mental health, which has been observed in previous perinatal studies (Abrahams et al., 2018, Malan, Spedding & Sorsdahl, 2018). Using multivariable logistic regression modelling, we found that being unemployed or having a probable CMD at baseline significantly increased the odds of being food insecure at follow-up, while experiencing abuse or psychological distress at baseline significantly increased the odds of CMD at follow-up.

Following the strict lockdown imposed by the South African government in March 2020, the World Health Organisation praised South Africa for its effective fight against COVID-19 (eNCA, 2020). However, the same lockdown measures used to curb the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic, disproportionately affected those living in low resource settings (Laborde, Martin & Vos, 2020). In South Africa, where 29% of the population were already unemployed (Statistics South Africa, 2019b) and 35% of employed individuals worked in the informal sector, the lockdown plunged millions more into unemployment, poverty and food insecurity (Rogan, Skinner, 2020). In June 2020, when the lockdown restrictions had just started easing, we found that 54% of perinatal women in our baseline sample were unemployed and 80% were living in food insecure households. Three months later, we found that the number of unemployed had risen by 16%, yet the proportion of women living in food insecure households had decreased by 11%. The decrease in the proportion of food insecure households is likely due to measures the South African government employed, such as providing unemployed individuals who were over 18 years with a COVID-19 social relief and distress grant, valued at R350 (25 USD) per month (Baskaran, Borat & Köhler, 2020). In addition, the South African government (Western Cape Government, 2021), as well as several non-profit organisations, distributed thousands of food parcels and food vouchers to those in need (Matlwa Mabaso et al., 2021, Gift of the Givers Foundation, 2021, Siyabonga Africa, 2021, DG Murray Trust, 2021).

Even though the levels of food insecurity were significantly lower at follow-up, more than two thirds of the perinatal women were still living in food insecure households. In South Africa, persistent food insecurity is associated with the double burden of malnutrition, where undernutrition co-exists with overweight and obesity in the same household and is characterised by an overweight or obese mother living with her underweight, wasted or stunted child (Popkin, Corvalan & Grummer-Strawn, 2020). Pregnant and lactating women, with their increased nutrient requirements, are particularly vulnerable to malnutrition (Desyibelew, Dadi, 2019), which can take the form of underweight or obesity. Malnutrition is associated with anaemia, hypertension and haemorrhage in the mother and pre-term delivery, low birth weight and intrauterine growth retardation in infants (Papathakis, Singh & Manary, 2016).

We found that both the prevalence of CMDs and experiences of psychological distress decreased between baseline and follow-up. Similar prevalence estimates have been reported in studies on postnatal CMDs from Ethiopia (Dadi et al., 2020) and Zimbabwe (January, Burns & Chimbari, 2017) where the prevalence ranged between 9% and 34%. The low prevalence of CMDs at baseline and follow-up is likely because the majority of women were in the third trimester of pregnancy or had already given birth, as studies have found that mild to moderate symptoms of depression improve during the last trimester of pregnancy and after birth (Garman, Schneider & Lund, 2019, Christensen et al., 2011), and that the prevalence of depression is higher during pregnancy compared to after childbirth (Underwood et al., 2016).

While we found that food insecurity was significantly associated with CMD at baseline and follow-up, in our multivariable model, being food insecure at baseline did not significantly increase the odds of CMD at follow-up. Our findings reflect a complex picture in which some socio-economic risk factors, particularly domestic violence predict CMD prevalence; and CMD predicts worse socio-economic outcomes such as food insecurity. However, this is not always the case, for example not all markers of socio-economic adversity increase the odds of CMD at follow-up in our multivariable analysis – even when we conducted sensitivity analysis using the EPDS scores as a continuous variable in a linear regression model.

To interpret these findings in context, several systematic reviews have described the impact of food insecurity on poor mental health. The studies included in the reviews provide evidence that food insecurity increases the risk of common mental disorders throughout the life cycle (Pourmotabbed et al., 2020, Trudell et al., 2021, Weaver, Hadley, 2009, Jones, 2017). Qualitative studies report that food insecurity is experienced as acute psychological suffering, with overwhelming feelings of shame (Weaver, Hadley, 2009). These findings are in keeping with the social causation pathway which hypothesizes that unfavourable social and economic conditions such as poverty, food insecurity and domestic violence increases the risk of poor mental health (Lund, Cois, 2018). While many studies have examined the social causation pathway, few studies investigated the impact of poor maternal mental health on food insecurity. A study in Cape Town reported that the odds of household food insecurity were four times greater in pregnant women who were depressed (Abrahams et al., 2018), and a birth cohort study, located in a small city outside Cape Town reported that maternal depression in a predominantly Black African community significantly predicted perceived household food insecurity (OR=1.08; p<0.01) (Pellowski et al., 2017). Our study found that having a probable CMD increased the subsequent odds of household food insecurity. Our results are in keeping with the social drift hypothesis which proposes that people living with a mental illness drift into poverty due to the stigma of mental illness, increased spending on healthcare, and reduced income generating potential associated with the disability of their mental illness (Lund, Cois, 2018).

Our study has strengths and limitations. We interviewed women attending 14 randomly selected MOUs and BANC clinics in low resource settings in Cape Town. This allowed us to generalise our findings to low resource settings in Cape Town, instead of being limited to a smaller population. Interviewer bias may be present as 14 fieldworkers were telephonically trained to administer the questionnaires and we were not able to assess inter-rater reliability. A second limitation was the low follow-up rate, with one quarter of baseline participants lost to follow-up. However, they were not significantly different to those who were not lost to follow-up with regards to several socio-demographic characteristics measured at baseline. We did not have a control group, which would have allowed us to better understand the effect of the COVID-19 lockdown on the women's mental health and experiences of food insecurity. We did not do any qualitative interviews which would have helped us understand the relationship between poor mental health and food insecurity. Our follow-up time period was relatively short, limiting any causal inference we could infer from the longitudinal analysis.

Further research is needed to better understand how experiences of mental health problems lead to food insecurity and malnutrition among pregnant and lactating women, as well as to investigate the long-term effects of food insecurity on mothers and infants born during the pandemic.

Conclusions

This study provides evidence that perinatal women with poor mental health and adverse social and economic challenges are at an increased risk of drifting into poverty and food insecurity. While the lockdown restrictions imposed during the COVID-19 pandemic may have decreased COVID-related illness and death, it came at a high price for those living in already vulnerable circumstances. The effect of the high levels of food insecurity and related poor mental health of

pregnant and lactating women during the COVID-19 pandemic indicates the need for interventions to address both mental health and food insecurity among pregnant women in low resource settings.

Declarations

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to the women who participated in the study for generously giving their time and energy to complete interviews. We thank Mbali Mohlamonyane for coordinating the data collection and Sonet Boisits for providing mental health support to the data collectors.

Financial support: The ASSET study is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Global Health Research Unit on Health System Strengthening in Sub-Saharan Africa, King's College London (GHRU 16/136/54).

Conflict of interest: None

Authorship: ZA and CL proposed and designed the study. ZA performed the data analysis and prepared the first draft of the manuscript. CL reviewed all drafts of the manuscript and provided input. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Ethical Standards Disclosure: This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving research study participants were approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Cape Town (139/2018) and the Psychiatry, Nursing and Midwifery Research Ethics Subcommittee at Kings College London (17/18-7807). In addition, the Western Cape Department of Health approved the use of the research sites (WC_201807_008). Verbal informed consent was obtained from all subjects/patients. Verbal consent was witnessed and formally recorded.

Tables

Table 1: Socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of participants at baseline and follow-up

	Baseline (n=859) n (%)	Follow-up (n=635) n (%)	P-value*
Age			
<18 Years	46 (5.4)	37 (5.8)	0.959
18-24 years	260 (30.3)	186 (29.3)	
25-35 years	464 (54.0)	344 (54.2)	
>35 years	89 (10.4)	68 (10.7)	
Ethnicity			
Black African	609 (70.9)	476 (75.0)	0.082
Mixed ancestry	250 (29.1)	159 (25.0)	
Other children			
No children	325 (37.8)	240 (37.8)	0.925
1-2 children	442 (51.5)	323 (50.9)	
≥3 children	92 (10.7)	72 (11.3)	
Planned pregnancy	309 (36.0)	231 (36.4)	0.872
Employment status			
Employed	338 (39.4)	151 (23.8)	<0.001
Unemployed	466 (54.3)	450 (70.9)	
Student	55 (6.4)	34 (5.4)	
Financial support from partner	346 (40.3)	264 (41.7)	0.572
Any social support grant	454 (52.9)	334 (52.6)	0.923
Child support grant	414 48.2	299 47.1	0.671
People per sleeping room			
1-2 people	420 (48.9)	310 (48.8)	0.825
3-4 people	372 (43.3)	270 (42.5)	
>=5 people	67 (7.8)	55 (8.7)	
HIV-infected	156 (18.2)	126 (19.8)	0.412
Pregnancy status			
Pregnant	217 (25.3)	22 (3.5)	<0.001
Post birth	631 (73.5)	603 (95.0)	
Miscarriage/Stillbirth	11 (1.3)	10 (1.6)	
Psychological distress**	226 (26.3)	87 (13.7)	<0.001
Probable CMD***	106 (12.3)	46 (7.2)	0.001
Household food insecurity access prevalence (HFIAP)			
Food secure	165 (19.2)	195 (30.7)	<0.001
Mildly food insecure	80 (9.3)	81 (12.8)	
Moderately food insecure	239 (27.8)	152 (23.9)	
Severely food insecure	375 (43.7)	207 (32.6)	
Domestic violence			
Psychological abuse	138 (16.1)	60 (9.5)	<0.001
Physical abuse	121 (14.1)	54 (8.5)	0.001
Sexual abuse	14 (1.6)	5 (0.8)	0.151
Any form of abuse	179 (20.8)	78 (12.3)	<0.001

*Chi-squared test

**≥2 on the 3-question mental health screening questionnaire

*** Common mental disorder, ≥ 13 on the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS)

Table 2: Bivariate associations with food security prevalence at baseline and follow-up

	Baseline			Follow-up		
	Food secure n (%) 165 (19.2)	Food insecure* n (%) 694 (80.8)	P-value**	Food secure n (%) 195 (30.7)	Food insecure n (%) 440 (69.3)	P-value**
Age						
<18 years	12 (7.3)	34 (4.9)	0.434	11 (5.6)	26 (5.9)	0.060
18-24 years	52 (31.5)	208 (30.0)		68 (34.9)	118 (26.8)	
25-35 years	88 (53.3)	376 (54.2)		103 (52.8)	241 (54.8)	
>35 years	13 (7.9)	76 (10.9)		13 (6.7)	55 (12.5)	
Ethnicity						
Black	104 (72.8)	505 (63.0)	0.013	118 (60.5)	358 (81.4)	<0.001
Mixed ancestry	61 (27.2)	189 (37.0)		77 (39.5)	82 (18.6)	
Other children						
No children	78 (47.3)	247 (35.6)	0.005	87 (44.6)	153 (34.8)	0.010
1-2 children	78 (47.3)	364 (52.4)		95 (48.7)	228 (51.8)	
≥ 3 children	9 (5.4)	83 (12.0)		13 (6.7)	59 (13.4)	
Planned pregnancy	67 (21.7)	242 (78.3)	0.168	83 (42.6)	148 (33.6)	0.031
Employment status						
Employed	82 (49.7)	256 (36.9)	<0.001	111 (56.9)	166 (37.7)	<0.001
Unemployed	64 (38.8)	402 (57.9)		79 (40.5)	248 (56.4)	
Student	19 (11.5)	36 (5.2)		5 (2.6)	26 (5.9)	
Financial support from partner	78 (47.3)	268 (38.6)	0.042	96 (49.2)	16 (38.4)	0.011
Any social support grant	75 (54.5)	379 (45.4)	0.034	78 (40.0)	232 (52.7)	0.003
Child support grant	65 (39.4)	349 (50.3)	0.012	74 (37.9)	225 (51.1)	0.002
People per sleeping room						
1-2 people	99 (60.0)	321 (46.3)	0.005	107 (54.9)	203 (46.1)	0.083
3-4 people	58 (35.2)	314 (45.2)		76 (39.0)	194 (44.1)	
≥ 5 people	8 (4.9)	59 (8.5)		12 (6.2)	43 (9.8)	
HIV-infected	23 (13.9)	133 (19.2)	0.118	23 (11.8)	103 (23.4)	0.001
Pregnancy status						
Pregnant	60 (36.4)	157 (22.6)	0.001	12 (6.2)	10 (2.3)	0.037
Post birth	103 (62.4)	528 (76.1)		179 (91.8)	424 (96.4)	
Miscarriage/stillbirth	2 (1.2)	9 (1.3)		4 (2.0)	6 (1.4)	
Psychological distress***	21 (12.7)	205 (29.5)	<0.001	15 (7.7)	72 (16.4)	0.003
Probable CMD****	7 (4.2)	99 (14.3)	<0.001	8 (4.1)	38 (8.6)	0.042
Domestic violence						
Psychological abuse	19 (11.5)	119 (17.2)	0.077	14 (7.2)	46 (10.4)	0.193
Physical abuse	15 (9.1)	106 (15.3)	0.040	7 (3.6)	47 (10.7)	0.003
Sexual abuse	0	14 (2.0)	0.066	0	5 (1.1)	0.135
Any form of abuse	24 (14.5)	155 (22.3)	0.027	15 (7.7)	63 (14.3)	0.019

*Food insecure (mild, moderate and severely food insecure)

**Chi-squared test

*** ≥ 2 on the psychological distress questionnaire

**** Common mental disorder, ≥ 13 on the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS)

Table 3: Bivariate cross-sectional associations with common mental disorder (CMD) at baseline and follow-up

	Baseline			Follow-up		
	With CMD* n (%) 106 (12.3)	Without CMD n (%) 753 (87.7)	P-value**	Food secure n (%) 46 (7.2)	Food insecure n (%) 589 (92.8)	P-value**
Age						
<18 years	7 (6.6)	39 (5.2)	0.231	3 (6.5)	34 (5.8)	0.083
18-24 years	23 (21.7)	237 (31.5)		6 (13.0)	180 (30.6)	
25-35 years	64 (60.4)	400 (53.1)		32 (69.6)	312 (53.0)	
>35 years	12 (11.3)	77 (10.2)		5 (10.9)	63 (10.7)	
Ethnicity						
Black	58 (54.7)	551 (73.2)	<0.001	32 (72.7)	413 (73.9)	0.867
Mixed ancestry	48 (45.3)	202 (26.8)		12 (27.3)	146 (26.1)	
Other children						
No children	35 (33.0)	290 (38.5)	0.456	16 (34.8)	224 (38.0)	0.199
1-2 children	57 (53.8)	385 (51.1)		28 (60.9)	295 (50.1)	
≥3 children	14 (13.2)	78 (10.4)		2 (4.4)	70 (11.9)	
Planned pregnancy	33 (31.1)	276 (36.7)	0.267	18 (39.1)	231 (36.2)	0.687
Employment status						
Employed	41 (38.7)	297 (39.4)	0.875	15 (32.6)	232 (39.4)	0.579
Unemployed	57 (53.8)	409 (54.3)		27 (58.7)	321 (54.5)	
Student	8 (7.6)	47 (6.2)		4 (8.7)	36 (6.1)	
Financial support from partner	41 (38.7)	305 (40.5)	0.720	16 (34.8)	249 (42.3)	0.321
Any social support grant	57 (53.8)	371 (49.3)	0.385	25 (54.4)	288 (48.9)	0.476
Child support grant	56 (52.8)	358 (47.5)	0.308	25 (54.4)	279 (47.4)	0.361
People per sleeping room						
1-2 people	56 (52.8)	364 (48.3)	0.665	23 (50.0)	287 (48.7)	0.478
3-4 people	43 (40.6)	329 (43.7)		17 (37.0)	253 (43.0)	
≥5 people	7 (6.6)	60 (8.0)		46 (13.0)	49 (8.3)	
HIV-infected	20 (18.9)	136 (18.1)	0.840	11 (23.9)	1158 (19.5)	0.472
Pregnancy status						
Pregnant	34 (32.1)	183 (24.3)	0.009	2 (4.4)	20 (3.4)	0.272
Post birth	68 (64.2)	563 (74.8)		42 (91.3)	561 (95.3)	
Miscarriage/stillbirth	4 (3.8)	7 (0.9)		2 (4.4)	8 (1.4)	
Psychological distress***	80 (75.5)	146 (19.4)	<0.001	31 (67.4)	56 (9.5)	<0.001
Food insecure	99 (93.4)	595 (79.02)	<0.001	38 (82.6)	402 (68.2)	0.042
Domestic violence						
Psychological abuse	37 (34.9)	101 (13.4)	<0.001	14 (30.4)	46 (7.8)	<0.001
Physical abuse	33 (31.1)	88 (11.7)	<0.001	8 (17.4)	46 (7.8)	0.025
Sexual abuse	8 (7.6)	6 (0.8)	<0.001	1 (2.2)	4 (0.7)	0.269
Any form of abuse	44 (41.5)	135 (17.9)	<0.001	14 (30.4)	64 (10.9)	<0.001

* ≥13 on the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS)

**chi-squared test

***≥2 on the psychological distress questionnaire

Table 4: Logistic regression model: Baseline characteristics associated with the prevalence of food insecurity at follow-up

	Unadjusted model		Multivariable model	
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value
18-24 years [ref: <18 years]	0.83 (0.41-1.69)	0.610		
25-35 years [ref: <18 years]	1.13 (0.57-2.22)	0.733		
>35 years [ref: <18 years]	2.55 (1.09-5.95)	0.031	2.55 (1.36-4.77)	0.003
Black [ref: Coloured]	1.83 (1.28-2.63)	0.001	2.33 (1.57-3.44)	< 0.001
1-2 child [ref: no children]	1.40 (1.0-1.95)	0.051		
≥3 children [ref: no children]	2.84 (1.58-5.08)	< 0.001	1.98 (1.08-3.64)	0.026
Planned pregnancy	0.74 (0.54-1.03)	0.078	0.69 (0.49-0.97)	0.033
Unemployed [ref: employed]	1.96 (1.41-2.74)	< 0.001	2.05 (1.46-2.87)	< 0.001
Student [ref: employed]	1.38 (0.71-2.70)	0.347		
Financial support from partner	0.75 (0.55-1.03)	0.079		
Child support grant	1.37 (0.99-1.87)	0.052		
Any social support grant	1.40 (1.02-1.92)	0.037		
3-4 people/sleeping room [ref: 1-2]	1.51 (1.09-2.11)	0.014	1.48 (1.06-2.08)	0.022
≥5 people/sleeping room [ref: 1-2]	1.54 (0.84-2.77)	0.151		
HIV-infected	1.86 (1.23-2.81)	0.003		
Post birth [ref: pregnant]	1.54 (1.08-2.20)	0.017		
Miscarriage/stillbirth [ref: pregnant]	1.04 (0.29-3.76)	0.942		
Psychological distress*	1.72 (1.20-2.47)	0.003		
Probable CMD**	1.90 (1.14-3.19)	0.015	2.37 (1.35-4.18)	0.003
Psychological abuse	1.45 (0.94-2.25)	0.093		
Physical abuse	1.03 (0.65-1.64)	0.904		
Sexual abuse	1.55 (0.38-6.24)	0.540		
Any abuse	1.33 (0.89-1.97)	0.160		

* ≥ 2 on the psychological distress questionnaire
 ** ≥ 13 on the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS)

Table 5: Logistic regression model: Baseline characteristics associated with the prevalence of CMD at follow-up

	Unadjusted model		Multivariable model	
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value
18-24 years [ref: <18 years]	0.38 (0.09-1.58)	0.183	0.37 (0.15-0.90)	0.029
25-35 years [ref: <18 years]	1.16 (0.34-4.00)	0.811		
>35 years [ref: <18 years]	0.90 (0.20-3.99)	0.889		
Black [ref: Coloured]	0.94 (0.47-1.87)	0.865		
1-2 child [ref: no children]	0.33 (0.70-2.52)	0.383		
≥ 3 children [ref: no children]	0.40 (0.089-1.78)	0.229		
Planned pregnancy	0.13 (0.61-2.1)	0.687		
Unemployed [ref: employed]	1.30 (0.68-2.5)	0.430		
Student [ref: employed]	1.72 (0.54-5.47)	0.359		
Financial support from partner	0.73 (0.39-1.37)	0.323		
Child support grant	1.32 (0.72-2.42)	0.363		
Any social support grant	1.24 (0.68-2.27)	0.477		
3-4 people/sleeping room [ref: 1-2]	0.84 (0.44-1.60)	0.595		
≥ 5 people/sleeping room [ref: 1-2]	1.53 (0.59-3.94)	0.381		
HIV-infected	1.29 (0.64-2.63)	0.473		
Post birth [ref: pregnant]	1.47 (0.69-3.12)	0.321		
Miscarriage/stillbirth [ref: pregnant]	4.41 (0.82-23.91)	0.085		
Psychological distress*	3.36 (1.83-6.18)	<0.001	2.60 (1.38-4.92)	0.003
Food secure**	1.42 (0.70-2.88)	0.337		
Psychological abuse	2.75 (1.42-5.31)	0.002		
Physical abuse	2.53 (1.26-5.12)	0.010		
Sexual abuse	6.78 (1.64-28.05)	0.008		
Any abuse	3.06 (1.64-5.71)	<0.001	2.38 (1.24-4.58)	0.009

* ≥ 2 on the psychological distress questionnaire

References

- Abrahams, Z., Lund, C., Field, S. & Honikman, S. 2018, "Factors associated with household food insecurity and depression in pregnant South African women from a low socio-economic setting: a cross-sectional study", *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 363-372.
- Abrahams, Z., Schneider, M., Field, S. & Honikman, S. 2019, "Validation of a brief mental health screening tool for pregnant women in a low socio-economic setting", *BMC psychology*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 77.
- Adhikari, M. 2005, *Not white enough, not black enough: Racial identity in the South African coloured community*, Ohio University Press.
- ASSET 2020, , *Maternal mental health and violence against women in South Africa* [Homepage of King's Global Health Institute], [Online]. Available: <https://healthasset.org/wp6/> [2020, September/29].
- Baskaran, G., Bhorat, H. & Köhler, T. 2020, "South Africa's Special COVID-19 Grant: A Brief Assessment of Coverage and Expenditure Dynamics", .
- Bursac, Z., Gauss, C.H., Williams, D.K. & Hosmer, D.W. 2008, "Purposeful selection of variables in logistic regression", *Source code for biology and medicine*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1-8.
- Castell, G.S., Rodrigo, C.P., de la Cruz, Joy Ngo & Bartrina, J.A. 2015, "Household food insecurity access scale (HFIAS)", *Nutricion hospitalaria*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 272-278.
- Christensen, A.L., Stuart, E.A., Perry, D.F. & Le, H. 2011, "Unintended pregnancy and perinatal depression trajectories in low-income, high-risk Hispanic immigrants", *Prevention science*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 289-299.
- Coates, J., Swindale, A. & Bilinsky, P. 2007, August 2007-last update, *Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) for measurement of food access: Indicator guide* [Homepage of Food and nutrition technical assistance project (FANTA)], [Online]. Available: http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/eufao-fsi4dm/doc-training/hfias.pdf [2020, August/24].
- Cox, J.L., Holden, J.M. & Sagovsky, R. 1987, "Detection of postnatal depression: development of the 10-item Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale", *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 150, no. 6, pp. 782-786.
- Dadi, A.F., Mwanri, L., Woodman, R.J., Azale, T. & Miller, E.R. 2020, "Causal mechanisms of postnatal depression among women in Gondar town, Ethiopia: application of a stress-process model with generalized structural equation modeling", *Reproductive health*, vol. 17, pp. 1-15.

- Desyibelew, H.D. & Dadi, A.F. 2019, "Burden and determinants of malnutrition among pregnant women in Africa: A systematic review and meta-analysis", *PLoS one*, vol. 14, no. 9, pp. e0221712.
- DG Murray Trust 2021, 3 November-last update, *Digital food vouchers for social relief of distress* [Homepage of DGMT], [Online]. Available: <https://dgmt.co.za/food-vouchers/> [2021, 20 May].
- eNCA 2020, 23 April-last update, *WHO commends SA on COVID-19 response as death toll rises to 65* [Homepage of aNCA], [Online]. Available: <https://youtu.be/qn0519ihuWQ> [2021, 20 May].
- Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United States 2001, *The state of food insecurity in the world 2001*, FAO, Rome, Italy.
- Ford-Gilboe, M., Wathen, C.N., Varcoe, C., MacMillan, H.L., Scott-Storey, K., Mantler, T., Hegarty, K. & Perrin, N. 2016, "Development of a brief measure of intimate partner violence experiences: the Composite Abuse Scale (Revised)—Short Form (CASR-SF)", *BMJ open*, vol. 6, no. 12, pp. e012824.
- Frances, A.J., Widiger, T.A. & Pincus, H.A. 1989, "The development of DSM-IV", *Archives of General Psychiatry*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 373-375.
- Fransman, T. & Yu, D. 2019, "Multidimensional poverty in South Africa in 2001–16", *Development Southern Africa*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 50-79.
- Garman, E.C., Schneider, M. & Lund, C. 2019, "Perinatal depressive symptoms among low-income South African women at risk of depression: trajectories and predictors", *BMC pregnancy and childbirth*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 202.
- Gift of the Givers Foundation 2021, , *Covid-19 Intervention* [Homepage of Gift of the Givers Foundation], [Online]. Available: <https://giftofthegivers.org/disaster-response/covid-19/> [2021, 20 May].
- Harper, A.J., Rothberg, A., Chirwa, E., Sambu, W. & Mall, S. 2020, "The relationship between antenatal food insecurity, fetal and postnatal growth: findings from the South African National Income Dynamics Study", .
- Integrated Food Security Phase Classification 2021, , *South Africa: Acute Food Insecurity Situation - Impact of COVID-19 on food security* [Homepage of Integrated Food Security Phase Classification], [Online]. Available: <http://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1153024/> [2021, 19 May].
- January, J., Burns, J. & Chimbari, M. 2017, "Primary care screening and risk factors for postnatal depression in Zimbabwe: A scoping review of literature", *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 294-298.
- Jebena, M.G., Taha, M., Nakajima, M., Lemieux, A., Lemessa, F., Hoffman, R., Tesfaye, M., Belachew, T., Workneh, N. & Kebede, E. 2015, "Household food insecurity and mental distress among pregnant women in Southwestern Ethiopia: a cross sectional study design", *BMC pregnancy and childbirth*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 250.
- Jones, A.D. 2017, "Food insecurity and mental health status: a global analysis of 149 countries", *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 264-273.
- Laborde, D., Martin, W. & Vos, R. 2020, "Poverty and food insecurity could grow dramatically as COVID-19 spreads", *International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Washington, DC*, .
- Lawrie, T., Hofmeyr, G., De Jager, M. & Berk, M. 1998, "Validation of the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale on a cohort of South African women", *South African Medical Journal*, vol. 88, no. 10, pp. 1340-1344.
- Lee, C., Stroo, M., Fuemmeler, B., Malhotra, R. & Østbye, T. 2014, "Trajectories of depressive symptoms over 2 years postpartum among overweight or obese women", *Women's Health Issues*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 559-566.
- Lund, C., Brooke-Sumner, C., Baingana, F., Baron, E.C., Breuer, E., Chandra, P., Haushofer, J., Herrman, H., Jordans, M. & Kieling, C. 2018, "Social determinants of mental disorders and the Sustainable Development Goals: a systematic review of reviews", *The Lancet Psychiatry*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 357-369.
- Lund, C. & Cois, A. 2018, "Simultaneous social causation and social drift: Longitudinal analysis of depression and poverty in South Africa", *Journal of affective disorders*, vol. 229, pp. 396-402.
- Malan, M., Spedding, M.F. & Sorsdahl, K. 2018, "The prevalence and predictors of intimate partner violence among pregnant women attending a midwife and obstetrics unit in the Western Cape", *Global Mental Health*, vol. 5.
- Maringira, G. & Masiya, T. 2018, "Persistence of Youth Gang Violence in South Africa", *The African Review*, vol. 45, pp. 164-179.
- Matlwa Mabaso, K., Laurenzi, C., Menyatsoe, M., Gemmell, K., Manda, S. & Tomlinson, M. 2021, *COCARE Maternal Support Study - Investigating hunger and mental health among pregnant women in the Cape Metro area during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic*, Grow Great, Midrand, South Africa.
- Papathakis, P.C., Singh, L.N. & Manary, M.J. 2016, "How maternal malnutrition affects linear growth and development in the offspring", *Molecular and cellular endocrinology*, vol. 435, pp. 40-47.
- Pellowski, J.A., Barnett, W., Kuo, C.C., Koen, N., Zar, H.J. & Stein, D.J. 2017, "Investigating tangible and mental resources as predictors of perceived household food insecurity during pregnancy among women in a South African birth cohort study", *Social science & medicine*, vol. 187, pp. 76-84.

- Pereira, M. & Oliveira, A.M. 2020, "Poverty and food insecurity may increase as the threat of COVID-19 spreads", *Public health nutrition*, vol. 23, no. 17, pp. 3236-3240.
- Popkin, B.M., Corvalan, C. & Grummer-Strawn, L.M. 2020, "Dynamics of the double burden of malnutrition and the changing nutrition reality", *The Lancet*, vol. 395, no. 10217, pp. 65-74.
- Posel, D. & Rogan, M. 2019, "Inequality, social comparisons and income aspirations: Evidence from a highly unequal country", *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 94-111.
- Pourmotabbed, A., Moradi, S., Babaei, A., Ghavami, A., Mohammadi, H., Jalili, C., Symonds, M.E. & Miraghajani, M. 2020, "Food insecurity and mental health: a systematic review and meta-analysis", *Public health nutrition*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 1778-1790.
- Redinger, S., Norris, S., Pearson, R., Richter, L. & Rochat, T. 2018, "First trimester antenatal depression and anxiety: prevalence and associated factors in an urban population in Soweto, South Africa", *Journal of developmental origins of health and disease*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 30-40.
- Ridley, M., Rao, G., Schilbach, F. & Patel, V. 2020, "Poverty, depression, and anxiety: Causal evidence and mechanisms", *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, vol. 370, no. 6522, pp. 10.1126/science.aay0214.
- Rogan, M. & Skinner, C. 2020, "The COVID-19 crisis and the South African informal economy: 'Locked out' of livelihoods and employment", *African Centre for Cities Working Paper (15 July)*, , pp. 14.
- Sheehan, D., Lecrubier, Y., Sheehan, K.H., Sheehan, K., Amorim, P., Janavs, J., Weiller, E., Hergueta, T., Baker, R. & Dunbar, G. 1998, "Diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10", *J Clin Psychiatr*, vol. 59, pp. 22-33.
- Siyabonga Africa 2021, , *Food vouchers - Emergency relief for those going hungry right now* [Homepage of Siyabonga Africa], [Online]. Available: <https://www.siyabongafrica.org.za/> [2021, 20 May].
- South African Government 2020a, , *Disaster Management Act: Regulations: Alert level 3 during the Coronavirus COVID-19 lockdown* [Homepage of South African Government], [Online]. Available: <https://www.gov.za/coronavirus/alert-level-3> [2020, September/4].
- South African Government 2020b, 9 April 2020-last update, *Preseident Cyril Ramaphosa: Extension of Coronavirus COVID-19 lockdown to the end of April* [Homepage of South African Government], [Online]. Available: <https://www.gov.za/speeches/president-cyрил-ramaphosa-extension-coronavirus-covid-19-lockdown-end-april-9-apr-2020-0000> [2020, April/28].
- South African Government 2020c, 23 March 2020-last update, *President Cyril Ramaphosa: Escalation of measures to combat Coronavirus COVID-19 pandemic* [Homepage of South African Government], [Online]. Available: <https://www.gov.za/speeches/president-cyрил-ramaphosa-escalation-measures-combat-coronavirus-covid-19-pandemic-23-mar> [2020, April/28].
- South African Government 2020d, 15 March 2020-last update, *President Cyril Ramaphosa: Measures to combat Coronavirus COVID-19 epidemic* [Homepage of South African Government], [Online]. Available: <https://www.gov.za/speeches/statement-president-cyрил-ramaphosa-measures-combat-covid-19-epidemic-15-mar-2020-0000> [2020, April/28].
- South African History Online 2020, 11 September 2020-last update, *Cape Flats, Cape Town* [Homepage of South African History Online], [Online]. Available: <https://www.sahistory.org.za/place/cape-flats-cape-town> [2020, September/15].
- Statistics South Africa 2021, *Quarterly labour force survey - Quarter 3: 2020*, Statistics South Africa, Pretoria.
- Statistics South Africa 2019a, *Towards measuring the extent of Food Security in South Africa*, Statistics South Africa, Pretoria.
- Statistics South Africa 2019b, 29 October-last update, *Unemployment rises slightly in the third quarter of 2019* [Homepage of Department of Statistics South Africa], [Online]. Available: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/?p=12689> [2021, 10 June].
- Statistics South Africa 2017, *Poverty trends in South Africa: An examination of absolute poverty between 2006 and 2015*, Statistics South Africa, Pretoria.
- The World Bank 2021, 18 March 2021-last update, *The Wrlld Bank in South Africa*. Available: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/southafrica/overview#:~:text=South%20Africa%20remains%20a%20dual,does%20not%20generate%20suffi> [2021, 13 May].
- Trudell, J.P., Burnet, M.L., Ziegler, B.R. & Luginaah, I. 2021, "The impact of food insecurity on mental health in Africa: A systematic review", *Social science & medicine*, , pp. 113953.
- Underwood, L., Waldie, K., D'Souza, S., Peterson, E.R. & Morton, S. 2016, "A review of longitudinal studies on antenatal and postnatal depression", *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 711-720.
- van Heyningen, T., Honikman, S., Myer, L., Onah, M.N., Field, S. & Tomlinson, M. 2017, "Prevalence and predictors of anxiety disorders amongst low-income pregnant women in urban South Africa: a cross-sectional study", *Archives of women's mental health*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 765-775.

van Heyningen, T., Myer, L., Onah, M., Tomlinson, M., Field, S. & Honikman, S. 2016, "Antenatal depression and adversity in urban South Africa", *Journal of affective disorders*, vol. 203, pp. 121-129.

Weaver, L.J. & Hadley, C. 2009, "Moving beyond hunger and nutrition: a systematic review of the evidence linking food insecurity and mental health in developing countries", *Ecology of Food and Nutrition*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 263-284.

Western Cape Government 2021, , *Humanitarian relief - Food parcels* [Homepage of Western Cape Government], [Online]. Available: <https://coronavirus.westerncape.gov.za/food-relief> [2021, 20 May].

Yan, H., Ding, Y. & Guo, W. 2020, "Mental Health of Pregnant and Postpartum Women During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis", *Frontiers in psychology*, vol. 11, pp. 3324.

Zhang, Z. 2016, "Model building strategy for logistic regression: purposeful selection", *Annals of translational medicine*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 111.