**Appendix 5: Inclusion of “Conditions of People Affected by the Crisis”**

Calculating the number of people in need of humanitarian assistance is standard metric of providing humanitarian assistance. The most common data sources include humanitarian needs assessment, an Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) assessment or *cadre harmonise*, displacement data collected in the International Organization for Migration’s (IOM) Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) tool, and information provided from United National High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). In addition, if available, Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs) and Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNOs), which are reports that compile multiple data sources on humanitarian crises, are usually prioritized as a source. However, despite their programmatic importance, indicators reflecting people in need, but were removed from our model building process. Because such calculations are standard in distribution of humanitarian aid, we re-ran the second-order Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) model and included the two ‘condition of the people’ indicators[[1]](#footnote-2) as standalone independent variables (rather than latent constructs, since the two indicators are not correlated). Specifically, we ran the following models CFAs:

* Model 1: Second-order CFA + People in Need + People Affected
* Model 2: Second-order CFA + People in Need
* Model 3: Second-order CFA + People Affected

We compare the model diagnostics of the above model to the second-order CFA in the main text (Appendix Table 5.1). Additionally, we examined descriptive statistics for the severity score calculated by each model; we also evaluated the Pearson correlation coefficient and intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) of each model to that of the second-order CFA in the main text (Appendix Table 5.2). Specifically, we examined an ICC for agreement with two-way mixed affects and fixed raters. The correlations provide insight into the reliability and agreement of the results.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix Table 5.1.** Fit statistics and Factor ladings for each model. Fit statistics include Chi-squared goodness of fit test statistic, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) Index (*GCSI dataset, 2019, N=172*). | | | | | | | | | |
| **Models** | **Model Fit** | | | | **Factor Loadings** | | | | |
| **Chi-squared goodness of fit (degrees of freedom)** | **CFI** | **TLI** | **RMSEA** | **Societal Governance** | **Humanitarian access/safety** | **Impact** | **People in need** | **People affected** |
| Model 1 | 191 (61) | 0.894 | 0.865 | 0.094 | 0.40 | 0.51 | 0.44 | 0.84 | 0.48 |
| Model 2 | 159 (50) | 0.904 | 0.879 | 0.093 | 0.40 | 0.53 | 0.48 | 0.78 | - |
| Model 3 | 137 (50) | 0.924 | 0.900 | 0.101 | 0.77 | 0.55 | 0.20 | - | 0.41 |
| Model in main text | 107 (40) | 0.940 | 0.917 | 0.099 | 0.73 | 0.59 | 0.21 | - | - |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix Table 5.2.** Descriptive statistics for latent severity crisis scores in each model: Median, mean, Pearson correlation coefficient, and intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC), with 95% confidence interval (CI) (*GCSI dataset, 2019, N=172*). | | | | |
| **Models** | **Median** | **Mean** | **Pearson correlation coefficient** | **ICC (95% CI)** |
| Model 1 | 0.45 | 0.47 | 0.63 | 0.63 (0.53-0.71) |
| Model 2 | 0.44 | 0.05 | 0.67 | 0.67 (0.58-0.75) |
| Model 3 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.98 | 0.98 (0.97-0.98) |
| Model in main text | 0.53 | 0.54 | - | - |

Of the models, model 3 had the best fit and was comparable to the second-order CFA (Appendix Table 5.1). In addition, the factor loadings were comparable between these two models. Further evidence of comparability is provided by the descriptive statistics (Appendix Table 5.2); the severity scores from model 3 exhibited strong correlation and agreement with the final model of the main text (Pearson’s correlation coefficient=0.98; ICC=0.98 [95% CI 0.97-0.99]). Collectively, these results suggest that including the indicator for People Affected will generate comparable results to a model that excludes this information.

1. Indicators: *Total People in Need* (referred to in the text as “People in Need”) and *Current humanitarian conditions of total population in the affected area* (referred to in the text as “People Affected”) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)