
No effect
9%
Low
14%
Medium
32%
High
45%
High
31%
Medium
30%
Low
26%
No effect
13%
LBE
LBI
LBE
LBI
Percentage of reported economic
loss on land-based systems
Medium
19%
Low
9%
Medium
42%
No effect
36%
High
30%
Low
15%
No effect
13%
High
36%
LBE
LBI
IMTA
Percentage of reported economic loss
on land-based systems with IMTA
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10


No effect
7%
Low
18%
Medium
32%
High
42%
Medium
42%
High
30%
Low
20%
No effect
8%
SBE
SBI
SBE
SBI
Percentage of reported economic
loss on sea-based systems
Medium
18%
No effect
25%
No effect
51%
High
25%
Low
25%
Low
32%
High
10%
Medium
14%
SBE
SBI
IMTA
Percentage of reported economic
loss on sea-based systems with IMTA
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Figure 1.


Low 13%
No effect 17%
No effect 59%
Medium 35%
LBE
LBI
Low 20%
High 35%
Medium 15%
High 6%
Percentage of reported job loss on land-based systems
LBE
LBI
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
High 9%
Medium 14%
No effect 47%
Low 23%
LBE
IMTA
LBI
No effect 54%
Low 31%
Medium 14%
High 8%
Percentage of reported job loss on land-based systems with IMTA


Medium 14%
High 10%
High 30%
Low 26%
Medium 29%
SBE
SBI
Low 21%
No effect 50%
No effect 20%
Percentage of reported job loss on sea-based systems
SBE
SBI
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
Medium 7%
High 14%
No effect 41%
Low 25%
SBE
IMTA
SBI
Low 29%
No effect 54%
High 15%
Medium 15%
Percentage of reported job loss on sea-based systems with IMTA

Figure 2.


LBE
C D B A
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Georgia
Algeria
Sweden
South Africa
Peru
Turkey
India
Brazil
Spain
Tunisia
Nigeria
Mexico
Egypt
Costa Rica
Ireland
China
Venezuela
Portugal
Kuwait
Chile
New Zealand
Malaysia
USA
Finland
Philippines
Transport restriction
Transport price
Consumers
Customers
Middlmen
International markets
Prices decrease
Suppliers
Labors
Infrastructures
Juvanile/fry supply
Auction (licence)
Insurance
Raw Material
Distribution logistic
Market
Production Transformation
Hatchery
LBI
B A C D
Georgia
Pakistan
Maldives
Namibia
Costa Rica
Ireland
Cyprus
Germany
Japan
Philippines
Tunisia
Egypt
Nigeria
India
Turkey
Malaysia
Spain
South Africa
Italy
Peru
Greece
China
Brazil
Sweden
Bangladesh
Algeria
Belgium
Bolivia
Colombia
Poland
UK
Portugal
Argentina
Switzerland
USA
France
Chile
Finland
Ecuador
Norway
New Zealand
Suppliers
Labors
Infrastructures
Juvanile/fry supply
Auction (licence)
Raw Material
Insurance
Transport restriction
Transport price
Customers
Consumers
Middlmen
International markets
Prices decrease
Production Transformation
Hatchery
Distribution logistic
Market
SBE
C D A B
Ecuador
India
New Zealand
Sweden
Montenegro
Argentina
Croatia
South Africa
Spain
Ireland
Egypt
Slovenia
Malaysia
Chile
Brazil
Portugal
Italy
China
UK
USA
Canada
Turkey
Transport restriction
Transport price
Consumers
Middlmen
Customers
International markets
Prices decrease
Auction (licence)
Juvanile/fry supply
Raw Material
Insurance
Suppliers
Infrastructures
Labors
Distribution logistic
Market
Hatchery
Production Transformation
SBI
C D B A
Georgia
South Africa
Croatia
Namibia
Albania
India
Malaysia
Costa Rica
Tunisia
Cyprus
Greece
Spain
Canada
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Algeria
China
Turkey
Brazil
Egypt
UK
Argentina
Sweden
Sao Tome and Princip
Portugal
Norway
France
Transport restriction
Transport price
Customers
Consumers
International markets
Middlmen
Prices decrease
Suppliers
Infrastructures
Labors
Auction (licence)
Juvanile/fry supply
Raw Material
Insurance
Distribution logistic
Market
Production Transformation
Hatchery

Figure 3.


Hatchery
Juvenile fry supply
Raw materials
IMTA YES
Land
Intensive
Insurances
Extensive
Auction licence
Sea
IMTA NO
PC1 (56.28 %)
PC2 (19.40 %)
Internal mitigation measures
Intensive
Sea
Social distancing
Increase work efficiency
IMTA YES
Integrated solutions
Stocking
Hiring
Farm techniques
Farm dimension
Firing
Extensive
Land
IMTA NO
PC1 (41.45 %)
PC2 (13.35 %)
External mitigation measures
Direct sale
Sea
Extensive
IMTA YES
New market str.
New markets
Economic support
Scientist support
Foster supply chain
Land
IMTA NO
Intensive
PC1 (50.51 %)
PC2 (15.19 %)

Figure 4.



LBE
B
A
Georgia
Costa Rica
Peru
Algeria
Sweden
Kuwait
South Africa
India
Nigeria
Spain
Brazil
Turkey
Venezuela
Egypt
Mexico
Tunisia
China
Portugal
USA
Malaysia
New Zealand
Ireland
Finland
Direct sales
Foster supply chain
New markets
Economic support
New market strategies
Scientist support
Social distancing
Increase work efficiency
Stocking
Hiring
Firing
Integrated solution
Farm techniques
Farm dimension
External mitigation measures
Internal mitigation measures
LBI
Georgia
Costa Rica
Germany
Ireland
Algeria
Maldives
Bangladesh
USA
Argentina
France
Cyprus
Pakistan
New Zealand
Ecuador
Turkey
Egypt
Nigeria
India
Spain
Tunisia
Malaysia
China
South Africa
Brazil
Philippines
Portugal
Italy
Sweden
Greece
Japan
Bolivia
Poland
Colombia
UK
Switzerland
Finland
Namibia
Peru
Norway
Chile
Belgium
Economic support
New markets
New market strategies
Direct sales
Foster supply chain
Scientist support
Social distancing
Increase work efficiency
Integrated solution
Stocking
Farm techniques
Farm dimension
Hiring
Firing
External mitigation measures
Internal mitigation measures
SBE
India
Montenegro
Argentina
Chile
South Africa
Brazil
Croatia
Spain
China
Canada
Sweden
Egypt
Ireland
New Zealand
UK
Slovenia
Malaysia
USA
Portugal
Italy
Ecuador
Turkey
Economic support
Direct sales
New markets
Foster supply chain
New market strategies
Scientist support
Social distancing
Increase work efficiency
Stocking
Hiring
Integrated solution
Firing
Farm techniques
Farm dimension
External mitigation measures
Internal mitigation measures
SBI
Georgia
South Africa
Costa Rica
Malaysia
India
Croatia
Italy
Iceland
Albania
Ireland
Turkey
Algeria
Tunisia
Spain
China
Greece
Canada
Egypt
Brazil
Cyprus
Argentina
UK
Sweden
Namibia
Portugal
Norway
France
Economic support
New markets
Direct sales
Foster supply chain
New market strategies
Scientist support
Social distancing
Increase work efficiency
Stocking
Farm dimension
Firing
Integrated solution
Farm techniques
Hiring
External mitigation measures
Internal mitigation measures

Figure 5.

THE AQUACULTURE SUPPLY CHAIN IN THE TIME OF COVD-19 PANDEMIC: VULNERABILITY, RESILIENCE, SOLUTIONS AND PRIORITIES AT THE GLOBAL SCALE

Mangano[1,*], M.C., Berlino[2,3], M., Corbari[2,4], L., Milisenda[1], G., Lucchese[2,3], M., Terzo[2], S., Bosch-Belmar[2], M., Azaza[5], M.S., Babarro[6], J.M.F., Bakiu[7], R., Broitman[8], B.R., Buschmann[9], A.H., Christofoletti[10], R., Dong[11], Y., Glamuzina[12], B., Luthman[13], O., Makridis[14], P., Nogueira[15], A.J.A, Palomo[16], M. G., Dineshram[17],R., Sanchez-Jerez[18], P., Sevgili[19], H., Troell[20], M., AbouelFadl[21], K.J., Azra[22], M.N., Britz[23], P., Carrington[24], E., Celić[3], I., Choi[25], F., Chuanxin[26], Q., Dionísio[27], M.A., Dobroslavić[12], T., Galli[28], P., Giannetto[29], D., Grabowski[25], J.H., Helmuth[25], B., Lebata-Ramos[30], M.J.H., Lim[31], P.T., Liu[32], Y., Llorens[33], S.M., Mirto[34], S., Pećarević[12] M., Pita C.[35,36], M., Ragg[37], N., Ravagnan[38], E., Saidi[39], D., Schultz[25], M., Shaltout[40], Tan[41], S.H., Thiyagarajan[42], R.V., and Sarà[2], G.

[1]Department of Integrated Marine Ecology, Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn, Sicily Marine Centre, Lungomare Cristoforo Colombo (complesso Roosevelt), 90142 Palermo, Italy

[2]Laboratory of Ecology, Earth and Marine Sciences Department, University of Palermo Viale delle Scienze Ed. 16, 90128 Palermo, Italy

[3]National Institute of Oceanography and Applied Geophysics - OGS, Trieste, Italy

[4]Department of Engineering, University of Palermo, Viale delle Scienze, Ed. 8, 90128 Palermo, Italy

[5]Aquaculture Laboratory, National Institute of Marine Science and Technology, 2025 Salammbo, Tunis, Tunisia

[6]Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas IIM-CSIC, Eduardo Cabello 6, 36208 Vigo, Spain

[7]Department of Aquaculture and Fisheries, Agricultural University of Tirana, Tirane, Albania

[8]Departamento de Ciencias, Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez, Viña del Mar Chile & Millenium Institute for Coastal Socio-Ecology (SECOS), Chile

[9]Centro i-mar & CeBiB, Universidad de Los Lagos, Puerto Montt, Chile

[10]Institute of Marine Sciences, Federal University of São Paulo (UNIFESP/IMar), Brazil

[11]The Key Laboratory of Mariculture, Ministry of Education, Fisheries College, Ocean University of China, Qingdao 266003, China

[12]Department of Applied Ecology, University of Dubrovnik, Ćira Carića 4, 20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia

[13]School of Natural Science, Technology and Environmental Studies, Södertörn University, Alfred Nobels allé 7, 141 89 Huddinge, Sweden

[14]Department of Biology, University of Patras, University Campus, Rio Achaias, 26504, Greece

[15]Departamento de Biologia & CESAM, Universidade de Aveiro, Campus de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal

[16]Laboratory of Marine Ecology, Natural History Museum of Argentina, CONICET, Argentina

[17]Biological Oceanography Division, CSIR-National Institute of Oceanography, Dona Paula, Goa 403004, India

[18]Department of Marine Science and Applied Biology, University of Alicante. Ap.C. 99. Spain

[19]Department of Aquaculture, Eğirdir Faculty of Fisheries, Isparta University of Applied Sciences, Çünür, Isparta, Turkey

[20]Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University, Kräftriket 2B, 10691 Stockholm, Sweden and Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, SE-104 05 Stockholm, Sweden

[21]Aquatic ecology Department, Faculty of Fish and Fisheries Technology, Aswan University, Egypt

[22]Institute for Tropical Biodiversity and Sustainable Development (IBTPL), Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, 21030 Terengganu, Malaysia

[23]Rhodes University, Department of Ichthyology and Fisheries Science, Grahamstown, South Africa

[24]Department of Biology and Friday Harbor Laboratories, University of Washington, 620 University Road, Friday Harbor, WA 98250, USA

[25]Northeastern University Marine Science Center 430 Nahant Rd Nahant, MA 01908, USA

[26]South China Sea Fisheries Research Institute, Chinese Academy of Fishery Sciences, China

[27]MARE—Marine and Environmental Sciences Centre, Faculty of Science, University of Lisbon, Campo Grande, 1749-016 Lisbon, Portugal

[28]Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Milano-Bicocca Italy

[29]Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Muğla Sıktı Koçman University, 48000 Muğla, Turkey

[30]Aquaculture Department, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Tigbauan, Iloilo 5021, Philippines

[31]Bachok Marine Research Station, Institute of Ocean and Earth Sciences, University of Malaysia, 16310 Bachok Kelantan, Malaysia

[32]Faculty of Biosciences, Fisheries and Economics, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Norway

[33]Departamento de Ciencia Animal, Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain

[34]Institute of Anthropic Impact and Sustainability in Marine Environment, National Research Council (IAS-CNR), Lungomare Cristoforo Colombo 4521, 90142 Palermo, Italy

[35]International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London, United Kingdom

[36]CESAM – Centre for Environmental and Marine Studies, Department of Environment and Planning, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal

[37]Cawthron Institute, Aquaculture Group, Nelson, New Zealand
[38]NORCE Environment, Nygårdsgaten 112, 5008 Bergen, Norway
[39]Faculty of Natural Sciences and life, Department of Water and Environment, University Hassiba Benbouali of Chlef, Algeria
[40]Faculty of Science, Department of Oceanography, University of Alexandria, Alexandria, Egypt
[41]Centre For Marine & Coastal Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 Penang, Malaysia
[42]The Swire Institute of Marine Science and School of Biological Sciences, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong SAR

***Corresponding author:** M. Cristina Mangano mariacristina.mangano@szn.it

Abstract

The COVID-19 global pandemic has had severe, unpredictable and synchronous impacts on all levels of perishable food supply chains (PFSC), across multiple sectors and spatial scales. Aquaculture plays a vital and rapidly expanding role in food security, in some cases overtaking wild caught fisheries in the production of high-quality animal protein in this PFSC. We performed a rapid global assessment to evaluate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and related emerging control measures on the aquaculture supply chain. Socio-economic effects of the pandemic were analysed by surveying the perceptions of stakeholders, who were asked to describe potential supply-side disruption, vulnerabilities and resilience patterns along the production pipeline with four main supply chain components: a) hatchery, b) production/processing, c) distribution/logistics and d) market. We also assessed different farming strategies, comparing land- vs. sea-based systems; extensive vs. intensive methods; and with and without integrated multi-trophic aquaculture, IMTA. In addition to evaluating levels and sources of economic distress, interviewees were asked to identify mitigation solutions adopted at local / internal (*i.e.,* farm-site) scales, and to express their preference on national / external scale mitigation measures among a set of *a priori* options. Survey responses identified the potential causes of disruption, ripple effects, sources of food insecurity, and

socio-economic conflicts. They also pointed to various levels of mitigation strategies. The collated evidence represents a first baseline useful to address future disaster-driven responses, to reinforce the resilience of the sector and to facilitate the design reconstruction plans and mitigation measures, such as financial aid strategies.

Key words: perishable food supply chain, disruption, economic distress, mitigation measures, integrated multi-trophic aquaculture, stakeholder perceptions, rapid assessment, COVID-19 effects

Introduction

In March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), COVID-19, as a pandemic. Since it was first recognized the virus spread rapidly and globally, causing millions of deaths. In a fight against time to slow the spread and to contain the severe deadly outbreak across the planet, national governments have made enormous efforts, by imposing containment and suppression measures with varying degrees of rapidity and strictness (Guan *et al.*, 2020) with people experiencing unprecedented disruptions to their daily lives. Cumulatively, these responses, aimed at preventing the spread COVID-19, had clear direct and indirect effects on global economic productivity (FAO and CELAC 2020).

The COVID-19 global pandemic has had especially severe impacts on food supply chains (FSCs), among which perishable food supply chains (PFSCs) were the worst hit. Specifically, the pandemic and efforts designed to prevent its spread triggered large, unpredictable, synchronous impacts affecting all levels of the PFSC, acting across multiple sectors and spatial scales. These events thus show all the features of a shock event as risks ranged from humanitarian/social issues to creation of an uncertain business and investment environment (Cottrell *et al.*, 2019). The COVID-19 pandemic affected all four main pillars of food security:

availability, accessibility, utilization, and stability (Laborde *et al*., 2020) with a long-term duration and ripple propagation effects (*i.e.,* both supply shortage and demand shrinkage, leading to simultaneous or sequential forward and backward propagations of disruptions). The COVID-19 outbreak thus represents a special case of FSC disruption (Ivanov, 2020; Li *et al*., 2021 and references therein), with impacts characterised by unpredictable local disruptions, which make preparation and management exceedingly difficult. Dozens of scientific studies, reports and policy briefs have been produced for several nations focusing on disruption of essential services provided by FSCs in the pandemic (see Queiroz *et al*, 2020; Chowdhury *et al*., 2021 and references therein). Approaches have largely relied on online surveys (van Senten *et al*., 2021; Smith *et al*., 2020), but development of non-traditional indicators (White *et al.*, 2021; Love *et al*., 2021), simulations and modelling (Guan *et al*. 2020; Ivanov, 2020; Ivanov & Dolgui, 2020; Stoll *et al*., 2020), and literature reviews (Queiroz *et al*., 2020; Chowdhury *et al*., 2021) have also been carried out. The goals of these reports were to: outline the immediate short-term and preliminary consequences on the environment, societies and economies (GFCM 2020; ILO, 2020a, 2020b; UNCTAD, 2020); describe the larger, unpredictable and synchronous impacts that were recorded; quantify levels of resilience and flexibility (Chenarides *et al*. 2021); disentangle severity of disruptions on various parts of the FSC (*e.g.,* GFCM, 2020; FAO 2020a-d; Love *et al*., 2021); focus on the effects on more vulnerable sectors (*e.g.,* small-scale fisheries, Bennett *et al.*, 2020; small and medium-sized enterprises, Caballero-Morales 2021); and examine the synergistic impacts with anthropogenic stressors such as climate change (Sarà *et al*., 2021). These reports have advocated for novel frameworks and mitigation strategies, recommendations, best practices and tools (Li *et al*., 2021; Love *et al*. 2021; Marusak *et al*., 2021; Nandi *et al*., 2021; Kumar *et al*., 2021; Jamwal & Phulia, 2021) that can help build food system resilience (Love *et al*. 2021, Chenarides *et al*. 2021, Kumar *et al*., 2021, Marusak *et al*., 2021). These efforts have resulted in a number of credible, salient and crucial conclusions aimed at informing policy makers dealing with emergency packages and relief programs to protect domestic economies. Recommendations have been made on how to design emergency government legislation from the perspective of both developing and developed economies (International Monetary Fund https://blogs.imf.org; The World Bank 2020).

However, considerably less is known about challenges of COVID-19 to PFSCs based on seafood aquaculture, which has features which can diverge from those of wild-caught fisheries (Love *et at.*, 2021; White *et al.*, 2021). Here, we present a rapid assessment, performed on a global scale, designed to assess the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and related control measures on the aquaculture supply chain sector. Aquaculture contributes to food security directly by the production of high-quality animal protein, demand for which has been growing worldwide (FAO, 2020e; Naylor *et al.*, 2021). We surveyed the perceptions of stakeholders, including farm owners and managers operating on both sea- and land-based aquaculture systems, and following both intensive (food provided from external sources) and extensive (food produced from within the system with no additional nutritional inputs) strategies. The socio-economic dimensions of PFSC disruptions were analysed based on the reported perceptions of stakeholders of supply-side disruption, vulnerability and resilience patterns along the production pipeline. Four components were included: a) hatchery, b) production / processing, c) distribution / logistics and d) market. In addition to evaluating sources and levels of economic distress, we asked the respondents to indicate the mitigation solutions adopted at local / internal (*i.e.,* farm-site) scale, and to express their preferences on a set of national / external scale mitigation measures. The intent of this rapid assessment was to generate a global snapshot, and to highlight causes of disruption, sources of food insecurity, resilience of food sector, livelihoods, emerging food sectors and socio-economic conflicts that may exacerbate as the pandemic continues. The ultimate goal of the study is to facilitate the design and tailoring of future reconstruction plans and financial aid strategies (*i.e.,* national and international recovery plans) and to address future adaptive and disaster-driven responses to reinforce the resilience of the sector.

Moreover, by surveying systems that did or did not adopt an Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture (IMTA approach), we had the chance to underline the potential power of this practice in enhancing resilience to the aquaculture PFSC and production systems by increasing diversity of species produced, fostering local production (Troell *et al*., 2014) and allowing farmers to circumvent roadblocks in some steps of the aquaculture PFSC. We are unaware of any studies that have tested this hypothesis for aquaculture PFSC, or that have focused on aquaculture PFSC at the global scale.

Methods

A semi-structured questionnaire (study approved by the Ethical Committee at the University of Palermo, UNPA-183-Prot. 767-05/05/2020 n. 1/2020 29/04/2020; see Supplementary Material) was designed, translated into 12 languages (English, Italian, Spanish, Chinese, Croatian, Portuguese, Arabic, Turkish, Swedish, Greek, Divehi, Albanian) and transferred to the online platform Qualtrics (https://www.qualtrics.com). This online survey was distributed to stakeholders through several communication and dissemination channels linked to the aquaculture sector. A brief presentation of the project and authors was added on the first page, to explain the reason for collecting information and the potential outcomes, as well as to obtain the informed consent of the respondents. The web survey distribution lasted three weeks (5 - 29th, May 2020). We decided to keep the survey active during a short temporal window - while the COVID-19 pandemic was fully active in most countries - to ensure a data collection representative of the reactive phase of the emerging crisis and to avoid including any later postpandemic stages and to facilitate a rapid assessment (Sarà *et al.*, 2021) on a time frame in line with severe disruption already evident in other FSCs (Chenarides *et al*., 2021).

Responses were coded as a function of the geographic position of the farms and the typology of the reported aquaculture system. Four categories were selected *a priori*: land based extensive aquaculture (fish, invertebrates, algae etc.; LBE), land-based intensive aquaculture (tanks/ponds; LBI), sea-based extensive aquaculture (mollusc farming, algae, echinoderms etc.; SBE) and sea based intensive aquaculture (cages; SBI). We also asked participants to report whether the system was based on Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture (IMTA), *i.e.*, culture of multiple species belonging to different trophic levels within an intact food web.

With the goal of collecting information on respondents' perceived economic distress, the survey started by asking respondents to report economic and job losses associated with COVID-19 outbreaks (scaled from 1 = no economic loss at all, to 10 = very high economic loss and subsequently ranked into four categories: 1 no effect, 2 – 4 low, 5 – 7 moderate and 8 – 10 high). Consecutive questions were asked to rapidly assess the effects on the four selected stages of the aquaculture PFSC (*i.e.,* hatchery; production / transformation; distribution / logistics; market). To explore potential effects on the four stages, we asked respondents to indicate whether they experienced difficulties (resulting in economic loss, scaled from 1 = no economic loss at all, to 10 = very high economic loss) associated with several stage's specific aspects (Table 1). Participants were also asked to indicate any adopted mitigation responses at a local / internal scale (*i.e.,* farm-based and related to the SC; expressing preference scaled from 1 = not adopted to 10 = very highly adopted; Table 2) and their preferences on potential national / external scale mitigation measures (expressing preference scaled from 1 = not preferred to 10 = very highly preferred; Table 2). Data on economic distress were represented *per* each farming strategy with and without IMTA (Figures 1, 2). We calculated the mean response value to each specific question given by stakeholders grouped by nation (Figures 3, 5) to create heatmaps by using the *“ComplexHeatmap”* package for R (Gu, 2016).

The effect of IMTA in buffering economic distress associated with the four aquaculture PFSC stages (hatchery, production / transformation, distribution / logistic, market) was tested using a 2-way mixed ANOVA with Poisson family error distribution for the discrete dependent variable (economic loss scaled from 1 to 10), considering two predictive variables: “farming strategy” (fixed with four levels LBE, LBI, SBE, SBI) and “IMTA” (fixed, orthogonal to “farming strategy” with two levels, “Yes” and “Not”) (R package “*lme4*”; Bates *et al*., 2015). Once the model was run, we checked for the absence of any pattern dealing with the residuals and their normality distribution. Estimated marginal means (EMMs) for factor combinations were used as a post-hoc test after the mixed ANOVA (R package “*emmeans*”; Russell *et al*., 2021). Principal component analysis (PCA) on a multivariate dataset of answers related to the effects reported *per* aquaculture PFSC stage (hatchery, production / transformation, distribution / logistic, market) and *per* adopted internal farm-site mitigation measures and external potential mitigation measures were computed using the R packages “*vegan*” (Oksanen *et al*., 2020) and “*stats*”. The function “*envfit*”, which fits environmental vectors or factors to an ordination, was used to graphically display correlations between multivariate data sets of answers and explanatory variables (“IMTA Yes” vs “IMTA Not”; “Land-” vs “Sea-based”, and “Intensive” vs “Extensive”). The p-values and correlation values between each explanatory variable and the PCA axis were also calculated. Linear mixed regression models (LMRM) using the “*glmer*” function (R package “*lme4*”; R Core Team, 2020) were used to test for significant correlations between explanatory variables and PCA scores of axes 1 and 2. The “position of farm” (*i.e.,* Country) was used as a random intercept to account for any source of variability linked with the various surveyed countries in ANOVA and LMRM.

Results

The rapid assessment web survey allowed us to cover stakeholder's perceptions worldwide, reaching 52 countries (Figure S1, Supplementary Materials). Complete survey responses were obtained from 585 stakeholders (80% male, 14% female and 6% other) aged from 18 to over 60 years old (4% of 18 - 29 y/o, 28% of 30 - 39 y/o, 32% of 40 - 49 y/o, 30% 50 - 59 of y/o, 6% of > 60 y/o) most reporting a medium / high instruction level (4% primary school, 23% secondary school, 54% university [bachelor or master], 19% PhD). Respondents represented each of the four *a priori* selected farming strategies: 43% land based intensive aquaculture (LBI), 16% land based extensive aquaculture (LBE), 23% sea based intensive aquaculture (SBI) and 18% sea based extensive aquaculture (SBE). One fifth (20%) of the respondents reported using IMTA approaches (22% LBI, 23% LBE, 23% SBI, and 18% SBE).

Participants reported economic distress due to COVID-19 outbreaks in terms of both economic and job losses, with responses differing significantly between farming strategies (see percentages *per* four categories: 1 no effect, 2 – 4 low, 5 – 7 moderate and 8 – 10 high; Figures 1, 2). The highest levels of economic losses were reported by those who used extensive systems both on land and at sea (*i.e.,* LBE 45% and SBE 42%), and the lowest economic loss was reported under IMTA at SBI (10%). The highest percentage of respondents who reported no effects of the pandemic were from IMTA LBE (36%) and SBI (51%; Figure 1) categories. High economic losses in aquaculture systems differed by countries, which varied in which form of aquaculture was most susceptible. Those most vulnerable included LBI and SBE in India and South Africa; LBE in Portugal, Ireland, and Algeria; and SBI in Northern European countries. Therefore, the reported economic loss among the farming strategies was not significant, regardless of whether or not IMTA was used (mixed ANOVA test, factor "farming strategy" df = 3, p = 0.236; factor "IMTA" d = 1, p = 0.625; "Interaction farming strategy / IMTA" df = 3, p = 0.154). There was also variation in job loss among farming strategies in different countries (Figure 2). The highest percentage occurred in the LBE (35%), while the lowest was recorded at LBI (59%). Loss of jobs was significantly correlated with the farming strategy and was significantly, negatively correlated with the presence of IMTA (mixed ANOVA test, factor "farming strategy" df = 3, $p < 0.001$; factor "IMTA" df = 1, p = 0.96; "Interaction farming strategy / IMTA" df = 3, $p < 0.05$). Specifically, without IMTA, the highest loss of job losses was in LBE when compared to the other farming strategies (estimated marginal means tests: LBE vs LBI $p < 0.0001$; LBE vs SBE p = 0.0001; LBE vs SBI $p < 0.004$). Lower values of job loss were reported by farmers who incorporated IMTA (Estimated marginal means tests: IMTA vs no IMTA p = 0.013).

Stakeholders working both at land- and sea-based systems reported major difficulties and associated economic losses related to the "distribution / logistic" and "market" stages of the aquaculture PFSC, specifically with "transportation restriction" and difficulties in introducing products to domestic and "international markets" (Figure 3). PCA performed on a multivariate dataset of answers related to the "hatchery" stage showed that the examined variables were significantly correlated with PCA ordination (PC1 explained 56.28% and PC2 19.40% of the total variance, respectively; Figure 4). "Intensive / extensive" (Chisq = 6.348, df = 1, p = 0.011) and "IMTA" (Chisq = 4.674, df = 1, p = 0.03) were significantly correlated with PCA scores of axis 1, and more specifically the use of IMTA and extensive aquaculture were associated with major difficulties in the juvenile, fry and raw materials supply and with insurance and auction licences respectively, which was also confirmed by personal comments from some of the interviewed farmers (Table 3; Figures 3, 4). When performing PCA ordination on multivariate datasets of answers related to "Production / transformation" (PC1 = 66.61%, PC2 = 22,05%), "Distribution / logistic" (PC1 = 78.48%, PC2 = 21.52%) and "Market" (PC1 = 63.28%, PC2 = 13.27%) stages of the PFSC, none of the explained variables were significantly correlated with PCA ordination scores. Therefore, dealing with economic loss in the production / transformation stage, the respondents reported the imbalance by farm maintenance costs and farm revenues, operational constraints and higher labour costs (see more comments in Table 3; Figure 3). With regard to the market stage, respondents reported higher economic losses associated with liquidity shortages and excessive falls in prices (Table 3; Figure 3).

Participants from all the surveyed farming strategies recognised social distancing and the related working shift as the most commonly adopted internal mitigation measures, followed by an increase in work efficiency. For LBE and SBE operations, stocking was indicated to be the third most commonly adopted mitigation response, followed by hiring and firing, while the adoption of integrated solutions and changes in farming techniques and extent of operations were less commonly used. Growers from LBI and SBI operations placed a higher importance on integrated solutions and changes in farming techniques and dimensions compared to firing (Figure 5). A PCA performed on a multivariate dataset of answers related to "internal mitigation measures" revealed that the examined variables were significantly correlated with PCA ordination (PC1 explained 41.45% and PC2 13.35% of the total variance, respectively; Figure 4). "IMTA" ($\chi^2 = 20.51$, df = 1, $p < 0.001$) was significantly correlated with PCA scores of axis 1, and more specifically the presence of IMTA was associated with a higher score for the following variables: hiring (PC1 0.998, p = 0.001), stocking (PC1 0.902, p = 0.001), integrated-multi trophic solutions (PC1 0.898, p = 0.001), change in farming techniques (PC1 0.798, p = 0.001), increased work efficiency (PC1 0.771, p = 0.001), reduction of farm dimensions (PC1 0.716, p = 0.001), and firing (PC1 0.627, p = 0.001). Specifically, several stakeholders made detailed comments describing their experiences in adopting "changes in farming techniques", "integrated-multi trophic solutions", and "reduction of farm dimension" (see Table 3, Figures 4 and 5).

External mitigation measures showed a very heterogeneous pattern of preference across farming strategies (Figure 5). For LBE operations, direct sales were identified as the most important aspect, followed by the opportunity to foster the supply chain, seeking new markets, requesting economic support and exploring new marketing strategies. For LBI, SBI and SBE operations, direct economic support was identified as the top mitigation approach, followed by direct sales, new market development and new market strategies, and the opportunity to foster the supply chain at sea-based systems. Support from scientists showed the lowest scores across all the investigated farming systems. A PCA performed on a multivariate dataset of answers related to "external mitigation measures" revealed that this variable significantly correlated with PC1, which explained 50.51%, while PC2 explained 15.19% of the total variance, respectively (Figure 4). "IMTA" ($\chi^2 = 8.50$, df = 1, p = 0.003) was significantly correlated with PC1, and more specifically the presence of IMTA was associated with a high score answer of the following variables: new markets (PC1 - 0.949, p = 0.001), new market strategies (PC1 - 0.916, p = 0.001), economic support (PC1 - 0.984, p = 0.001), direct sales (PC1 - 0.611, p = 0.001), scientists support (PC1 - 0.586, p = 0.001), and foster supply chain (PC1 - 0.484, p = 0.001). When asked to indicate their preference for external mitigation measures to be adopted in the future, most stakeholders expressed their preference for "new market strategies" and "foster the supply chain" by providing more extensive comments on the need for "economic support" (see Table 1, Figures 4, 5).

Discussion and Conclusion Our rapid global assessment allowed us to identify specific circumstances that inhibited or created difficulties for stakeholders in their efforts to adapt to the pandemic-induced challenges across the four surveyed farming strategies. Collated data allowed us to describe the effects of the COVID-19 outbreaks propagating along the four analysed stages of the aquaculture PFSC. This analysis identified the primary causal factors of supply shortage (*e.g.,* shortage and higher price of raw material at the hatchery stage; absence of stocking infrastructure at the production stage; transport interruption at the distribution stage) and shrinkage of demand (*e.g*., food industry and market closures at the market stage) as causing negative impacts. These indicate lack of resilience threatening the aquaculture sector and its potential to contribute positively to increasing global demands for protein (FAO, 2020d). The limited options to transport products represented the weakest link of the aquaculture production pipeline across the four surveyed farming strategies, with farmers who paid more for transport being underpaid the most for their products. Both transport restrictions and increases in transportation costs were identified as common causes of disruption propagation both forward - up to the market where the accumulation of perishable biomass with market value lost caused a shrink in demand - and backward - back to the production and hatchery stage with reduction of raw material supply and price increase. The market stage was the second most vulnerable link facing severe disruptions due to the closure of local, national and international markets as well as the stopping of the HoReCA channels (*i.e.,* Hotels, Restaurants and Catering industry). Impacts to this latter channel resulted from sudden and prolonged lockdowns, which propagated forward disruption and was the main cause of demand shrinkage.

The widely reported economic distress propagated both ways along the aquaculture PFSC and across the four analysed stages. Economic loss associated with insurance coverage (*i.e.,* difficulty / insolvency or blocking / abandonment by insurance companies) on the initial hatchery stage, generated a key source of financial instability, as farmers can only produce when they have access to financing. As a primary consequence, not surprisingly, the request for economic support was the most important external mitigation measure identified by respondents. Financial sustainability is essential for stakeholders of the FSC and has been reported among the top risk mitigating strategies for PFSC (Cullen, 2020; Kumar *et al*., 2021).

Following definitions of the fundamental trade-off between FSCs efficiency and resilience by Christopher & Peck (2004), evidence from our global assessment confirmed that aquaculture PFSC - at the surveyed shock stage of the COVID-19 pandemic - failed to maintain the three elements to achieve resilience: agility (*i.e.,* ability to respond rapidly), visibility (*i.e.,* ability to see "end to end" in the pipeline) and increasing velocity (*i.e.,* time/distance reduction). To promote agility and visibility, stakeholders should work to foster more horizontal collaborations, one of the resilience components reported for the land - based FSCs (Marusak *et al*. 2021), by building contingency plans for their operations that include different stakeholders to facilitate cooperation among the FSC stages and different SCs more in general. Contingencies, as well as new opportunities in the market and business environment, should be catalogued, communicated, and exchanged among stakeholders. This will allow clustering of their logistical activities and assets promoting shared transportation, stocking and processing facilities to reach a greater velocity and efficiency, while reducing logistics costs (Pomponi *et al*., 2015).

Practicing social distancing and the reduction of physical interactions have been essential mitigation measures to contain the spread of COVID-19, and not surprisingly were reported as the most widely adopted internal mitigation measures by survey participants across all the farming strategies. Since aquaculture depends on a PFSC characterised by operations that require a lot of human interactions with physical contact, curtailment of human interactions might have been one of the primary causes of job losses.

The collated information allowed the detection of the potential buffering characteristics of IMTA on some surveyed components of economic distress, for example on job losses. IMTA, a promising system in buffering anthropogenic driven shocks (Chopin *et al*., 2001; Sarà *et al*., 2021) and showing economic and ecological resilience by increasing the diversity of farmed species (*i.e.,* farmed species having various trophic levels and functional diversity; Troell *et al*., 2014; Knowler *et al*., 2020), seems to confer larger resilience also to production efficiency at the local scale. The diversified production of products by IMTA offers more than one or two market options and appears to allow farmers to utilize still active sales channels, thereby circumventing roadblocks in some steps of the PFSC as shown by the adopted internal, and preferred external, mitigation measures respectively. While surveyed stakeholders from all the farming strategies expressed less interest in hiring as an internal mitigation measure onsite, farmers using IMTA expressed more interest in adopting hiring as an internal measure, an important response under a social resilience perspective among the COVID-19 shock responses of the aquaculture PFSC. IMTA farmers adopted stocking strategies, a key response to disruption risk, and preferred a more flexible business model as an integrated solution that increased work efficiency. This preventing them from sacrificing too many farm assets (*i.e.,* changes in farming techniques) and preserved the human dimensions of resilience (*i.e.,* firing was a less adopted mitigation measure). Among external mitigation strategies, farmers applying IMTA expressed interest in the exploration of new market strategies and direct sales, scientific support and supply chain promotion, contrary to farmers not applying IMTA who expressed a higher preference for direct economic support from government agencies. Farmers working with IMTA showed higher levels of proactiveness preferring tools typical of "Flexible Business Models" which are considered as one of the best mitigation strategies to cope with disruption risk mitigation in PFSC (Kumar *et al.*, 2021). The one area where IMTA showed lower resilience was in difficulties obtaining juveniles, fry and other raw materials, *i.e.,* the hatchery stage of the supply chain. Therefore, aquaculture based on IMTA appears to suffer more on the first stage of the PFSC. Efforts to shore up the resilience of IMTA-based aquaculture operations should pay close attention to this aspect of the PFSC.

Future of the aquaculture PFSC after the shock: the long path toward resilience

The patterns reported by stakeholders in this rapid assessment constitute a snapshot of the various impacts of COVID-19 pandemic on the aquaculture PFSC at the beginning of the pandemic (first shock phase) and impacts should be monitored more extensively and comprehensively in time and space into the future, in order to create an inventory of actions acting on the "food system resilience action cycle" (*sensu* Tendall *et al.*, 2015). This will be crucial to facilitate resilience in SCs, to capture the full social and economic effects of shocks, and to mitigate external situations (*e.g.,* lockdowns) and policy measures (*e.g*., rapid support of decision-making in a crisis). The lack of baseline information, information flow, transparency, accuracy, management and speed of information have been recognised as maximising the vulnerability of FSCs to risk and shock by several authors (Vlajic *et al*., 2012; White *et al*., 2021). In this context, starting from our collated evidence - reflecting spatial and temporal constrains typical of a rapid assessment - a knowledge baseline should be built to the highest spatial and geographical resolution level possible, considering both more resilient and organised responses from the developed countries and the labour-intensive and less organised responses from the developing countries (Kumar *et al*., 2021; Onuma *et al*., 2020; Love *et al*., 2021). A future comprehensive - collaborative, multisectoral, and transdisciplinary - knowledge baseline also needs to consider all the potential farming strategies as highlighted by our assessment which allowed us to see geographic clusters of responses (with countries from the Global South such as South Africa and India suffering more economic distress). By looking at four stages of the aquaculture PFSC and four farming strategies plus IMTA, we collated a pattern of preference regarding internal and external mitigation measures that clearly suggest the need for more system- and SC stage-based, tailored measures, and which warns against a "one-size-fits-all" approach. Unless national recovery strategies of the aquaculture PFSC and the associated financial efforts are tailored to specific stages and SC stages, (International Monetary Fund https://blogs.imf.org; The World Bank 2020) they are unlikely to be effective.

To avoid wasting the opportunity to change the future direction of the aquaculture sector (Love *et al*., 2021) we believe that future reactive (*i.e.,* absorb, react, restore) and preventive (*i.e.,* learn, build robustness *sensu* Tendal., 2015) shock-based reaction actions - also resulting from any future pandemics (Love *et al*., 2021) - should thus include studies of stakeholder perception, key elements to ensure the engagement in transformations over which resilience thinking can be built (Folke *et al*., 2010).

Vietnam and Indonesia were not included in our rapid assessment, a limitation of this study since both are globally important aquaculture producing countries, although the online survey was distributed to both countries, no responses were received (the circulation of the survey was based on co-authors volunteer effort).

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all the respondents who took the time to take the survey and to many colleagues for their effort done in facilitating the circulation of questionnaires. M.C.M.'s research activity was supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie (grant agreement no. 835589, MIRROR Project). People at the Laboratory of Ecology have been funded by the PRIN-MAHRES project (Ministry of Italian Research; MUR - 017MHHWBN_003 Linea C) and by the Interreg Italia-Malta HARMONY 2016 (Grant C1-3.1-31). C. Pita and A. Nogueira would like to thank FCT/MCTES for the financial support to CESAM (UIDP/50017/2020+UIDB/50017/2020), through national funds. J.M.F. Babarro thanks project PID2019-106008RB-C21 for support through Spanish Government funds. The authors would like to thank also the ERASMUS+-FISHAQU project (No. 610071-EPP-1-2019-1-PT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP). We deeply thank Mr. Gaspare Barbera for his technical feedback during the questionnaire design looking at it under the lens of a stakeholder. We are grateful to QUALTRICS (Inc. USA) Product Specialists based in Italy to have always answered to queries about software technicality. We recognised the wide, prompt and effective support offered by the Ethical Committee at the University of Palermo in assessing the questionnaire.

Author contributions

MCM and GS conceived the study and led the project at all stages. All authors contributed to the execution of the study, participated in circulating the questionnaires throughout their respective national and international networks. MCM and GS with MB, ML, ST, LC, GM coordinated data collection, graphical outputs and statistical analyses. MCM, BH and GS drafted the manuscript, and all authors participated in editing the final revisions.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software, 67(1), 1 – 48.

Bennett, N.J., Finkbeiner, E.M., Ban, N.C., Belhabib, D., Jupiter, S.D., Kittinger, J.N., Mangubhai, S., Scholtens J., Gill, D., Christie, P., 2020. The COVID-19 pandemic, small-scale fisheries and coastal fishing communities. Coastal Management, 48(4), 336 – 347.

Caballero-Morales, S.O., 2021. Innovation as recovery strategy for SMEs in emerging economies during the COVID-19 pandemic. Research in international business and finance, 57, 101396.

Chenarides, L., Manfredo, M., Richards, T.J., 2021. COVID- 19 and Food Supply Chains. Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, 43(1), 270 – 279.

Chopin, T., Buschmann, A.H., Halling, C., Troell, M., Kautsky, N., Neori, A., Kraemer, G.P., Zertuche-González, J.A., Yarish, C., Neefus, C., 2001. Integrating seaweeds into aquaculture systems: a key towards sustainability. Journal of Phycology, 37, 975 – 986.

Chowdhury, P., Paul, S.K., Kaisar, S., Moktadir, M.A., 2021. COVID-19 pandemic related supply chain studies: a systematic review. Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 102271.

Christopher, M., Peck, H., 2004. Building the Resilient Supply Chain. International Journal of Logistics Management 15(2): 1 – 13.

Cottrell, R.S., Nash, K.L., Halpern, B.S., Remenyi, T.A., Corney, S.P., Fleming, A., Fulton, E.A., Hornborg, S., Johne, A., Watson, R.A., Blanchard, J.L., 2019. Food production shocks across land and sea. Nature Sustainability, 2(2), 130 – 137.

Cullen, M.T., 2020. COVID-19 and the risk to food supply chains: how to respond? Rome. http://www.fao.org/3/ca8388en/CA8388EN.pdf.

FAO & CELAC, 2020. Food security under the COVID-19 pandemic. Rome. https://doi.org/10.4060/ca8873en.

FAO, 2020a. COVID-19: Impact on global fish trade. Retrieved from GLOBEFISH - Information and Analysis on World Fish Trade website: http://www.fao.org/in-actio n/globe fish/news-event s/detai ls-news/en/c/12683 37/.

FAO, 2020b. European price report. Retrieved from http://www.fao.org /3/c a789 1en/c a789 1en.pdf.

FAO, 2020c. FAO COVID-19 response and recovery programme. Retrieved from Resource Mobilization website: http://www.fao.org/partnerships/resource-partners/covid -19/en/.

FAO, 2020d. How is COVID-19 affecting the fisheries and aquaculture food systems. Rome. https://doi.org/10.4060/ca8637en.

FAO, 2020e. The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2020. Sustainability in action. Rome. https://doi.org/10.4060/ca9229en.

Folke, C., Carpenter, S.R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., Rockström, J., 2010. Resilience thinking: integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. Ecology and Society 15 (4).

GFCM, 2020. Fisheries and aquaculture in the Mediterranean and Black Sea: A preliminary analysis of the impact of the COVID-19 cri-sis. Retrieved from GLOBEFISH - Information and Analysis on World Fish Trade website: http://www.fao.org/in-action/globefish/news-events/details-news/en/c/1273256/.

Gu, Z., 2016. Complex heatmaps reveal patterns and correlations in multidimensional genomic data. Bioinformatics, 32(18), 2847 – 2849.

Guan, D., Wang, D., Hallegatte, S., Davis, S.J., Huo, J., Li, S., Bai, Y., Lei, T., Xue, Q., Coffman, D., Cheng, D., Chen, P., Liang, X., Xu, B., Lu, X., Wang, S., Hubacek, K., Gong, P., 2020. Global supply-chain effects of COVID-19 control measures. Nature Human Behaviour, 1 – 11.

Ivanov, D., 2020. Predicting the impacts of epidemic outbreaks on global supply chains: a simulation-based analysis on the coronavirus outbreak (COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2) case. Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 136, 101922.

Ivanov, D., Dolgui, A., 2020. Viability of intertwined supply networks: extending the supply chain resilience angles towards survivability. A position paper motivated by COVID-19 outbreak. International Journal of Production Research 58(4): 1 – 12.

ILO, 2020a. COVID-19 has exposed the fragility of our economies. Retrieved from https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_739961/lang--en/index.htm

ILO, 2020b. Monitor: COVID-19 and the world of work (3rd ed.). Retrieved from https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@dcomm/documents/brief ingnote/wcms_743146.pdf.

Jamwal, A., Phulia, V., 2021. Multisectoral one health approach to make aquaculture and fisheries resilient to a future pandemic- like situation. Fish and Fisheries, 22(2), 449 – 463.

Knowler, D., Chopin, T., Martínez-Espiñeira, R., Neori, A., Noce, A., Reid, G., 2020 The economics of Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture (IMTA); where are we now and where do we need to go? Reviews in Aquaculture, 12, 1579 – 1594.

Kumar, A., Mangla, S.K., Kumar, P., Song, M., 2021. Mitigate risks in perishable food supply chains: Learning from COVID-19. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 166, 120643.

Laborde, D., Martin, W., Swinnen, J., Vos, R., 2020. COVID-19 risks to global food security. Science 369, 500 – 502.

Li, Y., Chen, K., Collignon, S., Ivanov, D., 2021. Ripple effect in the supply chain network: Forward and backward disruption propagation, network health and firm vulnerability. European Journal of Operational Research, 291(3), 1117 – 1131.

Love, D.C., Allison, E.H., Asche, F., Belton, B., Cottrell, R. S., Froehlich, H. E., Gephart, J.A., Hicks, C.C., Little, D.C., Nussbaumer, E.M., Pinto da Silva, P., Poulain, F., Rubio, A., Stoll. J.S., Tlusty. M.F., Thorne-Lyman, A.L., Troell, A., Zhang, W., 2021. Emerging COVID-19 impacts, responses, and lessons for building resilience in the seafood system. Global Food Security, 100494.

Marusak, A., Sadeghiamirshahidi, N., Krejci, C.C., Mittal, A., Beckwith, S., Cantu, J., Morris, M., Grimm, J., 2021. Resilient regional food supply chains and rethinking the way forward: Key takeaways from the COVID-19 pandemic. Agricultural Systems, 190, 103101.

Nandi, S., Sarkis, J., Hervani, A. A., Helms, M.M., 2021. Redesigning supply chains using blockchain-enabled circular economy and COVID-19 experiences. Sustainable Production and Consumption, 27, 10 – 22.

Naylor, R.L., Hardy, R.W., Buschmann, A.H., Busch, S.R., Cao, L., Klinger, DH., Little, D.C., Lubchenco, J., Shumway, S.E., Troell, M., 2021. A 20-year retrospective review of global aquaculture. Nature, 591, 551 – 563.

Oksanen J., Blanchet F.G., Friendly M., Kindt R., Legendre P., McGlinn D., Minchin P.R., O'Hara R. B., Simpson G.L., Solymos P., Stevens M.H.H., Szoecs E., Wagner H., 2020. vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.5-7. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan.

Onuma, H., Shin, K.J., Managi, S., 2020. Short-, medium-, and long-term growth impacts of catastrophic and non-catastrophic natural disasters. Economics of Disasters and Climate Change, 1–18.

OHC, 2020. What is one health? Retrieved from https://www.onehealthcommission.org/en/why_one_health/what_is_one_health/.

Pomponi, F., Fratocchi, L., Tafuri, S.R., 2015. Trust development and horizontal collaboration in logistics: a theory based evolutionary framework. Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, 20, 83 – 97.

Queiroz, M.M., Ivanov, D., Dolgui, A., Wamba, S.F., 2020. Impacts of epidemic outbreaks on supply chains: mapping a research agenda amid the COVID-19 pandemic through a structured literature review. Annals of operations research, 1 – 38.

R Core Team, 2020. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.

Russell, V.L., 2021. emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R package version 1.5.4. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans.

G. Sarà, Mangano, M.C., Berlino, M., L. Corbari, Lucchese, M., Milisenda, G., Terzo, S., Azaza, M.S., Babarro, J.M.F., Bakiu, R., Broitman, B.R., Buschmann, A.H., Christofoletti, R., Deidun, A., Dong, Y., Galdies, J., Glamuzina, B., Luthman, O., Makridis, P., Nogueira, A.J.A., Palomo, M.G., Dineshram, R., Rilov, G., Sanchez-Jerez, P., Sevgili, H., Troell, M., AbouelFadl, K.Y., Azra, M.N., Britz, P., Brugere, C., Carrington, E., Celić, I., Choi, F., Qin, C., Dobroslavić, T., Galli, P., Giannetto, D., Grabowski, J., Lebata-Ramos, M. J. H., Lim, P.T., Y. Liu, Llorens, S.M., Maricchiolo, G., Mirto, S., Pećarević, M., Ragg, N., Ravagnan, E., Saidi, D., Schultz, K. , Shaltout, M., Solidoro, C., Tan, S.H., Thiyagarajan, V. Helmuth., B., 2021. The synergistic impacts of anthropogenic stressors and COVID-19 on aquaculture: A current global perspective. Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture, 1 – 13.

Smith, S.L., Golden, A. S., Ramenzoni, V., Zemeckis, D.R., Jensen, O.P., 2020. Adaptation and resilience of commercial fishers in the Northeast United States during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. PloS one, 15(12), e0243886.

Stoll, J.S., Harrison, H.L., De Sousa, E., Callaway, D., Collier, M., Harrell, K., Jones, B., Kastlunger, J., Kramer, E., Kurian, S., Lovewell, M.A., Strobel, S., Sylvester, T., Tolley, B., Tomlinso, A., White, E.R., Young, T., Loring, P. A. (2020). Alternative seafood networks during COVID-19: Implications for resilience and sustainability. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, 5:97.

The World Bank, 2020. World Bank Group's operational response to COVID-19 (coronavirus) – Projects list. Retrieved from https://www.world bank.org/en/about/ what-we-do/brief/ world -bank-group-operational-response-covid-19-coronavirus-projects-list.

Tendall, D.M., Joerin, J., Kopainsky, B., Edwards, P., Shreck, A., Le, Q.B., Kruetli. P., Grant. M., Six, J. 2015. Food system resilience: defining the concept. Global Food Security, 6, 17-23.

Troell, M., Naylor, R.L., Metian, M., Beveridge, M., Tyedmers, P.H., Folke, C., Arrow, K.J., Barrett, S., Crépin, A., Ehrlich, P.R., Gren, Å., Kautsky, N., Levin, S.A., Nyborg, K., Österblom, H., Polasky, S., Scheffer, M., Walker, B.H., Xepapadeas, T., de Zeeuw A., 2014. Does aquaculture add resilience to the global food system? Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111 (37), 13257 – 13263.

UNCTAD, 2020. The Covid-19 Pandemic and the blue economy: New challenges and prospects for recovery and resilience. COVID-19, 8. Retrieved from https://unctad.org/en/Publi%20catio%20nsLib%20rary/ditctedinf%202020d2_en.pdf.

van Senten, J., Engle, C.R., Smith M.A., 2021. Effects of COVID- 19 on US aquaculture farms. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 43(1), 355 – 367.

Vlajic, J.V., van der Vorst, J.G.A.J., Haijema, R., 2012. A framework for designing robust food supply chains. International Journal of Production Economics, 137, 176 – 189.

Vlajic, J.V., Van der Vorst, J. G., Haijema, R., 2012. A framework for designing robust food supply chains. International Journal of Production Economics, 137(1), 176 – 189.

White, E.R., Froehlich, H.E., Gephart, J.A., Cottrell, R.S., Branch, T.A., Agrawal Bejarano, R., Baum, J.K., 2021. Early effects of COVID- 19 on US fisheries and seafood consumption. Fish and Fisheries, 22(1), 232 – 239.

Figure captions

Figure 1. Economic distress due to COVID-19 in term of economic loss, responses are showed per farming strategy (LBE = Land-based extensive, LBI = Land-based intensive, SBE = Sea-based intensive, SBI = Sea-based extensive) with and without Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture (IMTA). Economic loss scaled from 1 = no economic loss at all, to 10 = very high economic loss and here reported as percentages grouped into four categories: 1 no effect, 2–4 low, 5–7 moderate and 8–10 high. Maps report the mean of answers *per* every country.

Figure 2. Economic distress due to COVID-19 in term of job loss, responses are showed per farming strategy (LBE = Land-based extensive, LBI = Land-based intensive, SBE = Sea-based intensive, SBI = Sea-based extensive) with and without Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture (IMTA). Economic loss scaled from 1 = no economic loss at all, to 10 = very high economic loss and here reported as percentages grouped into four categories: 1 no effect, 2–4 low, 5–7 moderate and 8–10 high. Maps report the mean of answers *per* every country.

Figure 3. Heatmaps representing data on the encountered difficulties and related economic loss (scaled from 1 = no economic loss at all, to 10 = very high economic loss) on the four selected stages of the aquaculture perishable food supply chain and related affected aspects. Hatchery: juvenile/fry supply, raw materials, insurance, auctions. Production / transformation: infrastructures, labours failure, suppliers. Distribution / logistic: increase in transportation prices, restriction/block on transportation. Market: price decrease, impossibility/difficulty in selling to national buyers/consumers, international markets, customers and of middlemen. Responses are shown *per* farming strategy (LBE = Land-based extensive, LBI = Land-based intensive, SBE = Sea-based intensive, SBI = Sea-based extensive) with and without Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture (IMTA).

Figure 4. Principal component analysis (PCA) on stakeholder responses on disruption effects (resulting in economic loss, scaled from 1 = no economic loss at all, to 10 = very high economic loss) associated with hatchery stage of the aquaculture PFSC, respectively: lack of juvenile/fry supply; lack of raw materials provision (both in terms of reduction of available raw materials - feeds, packaging material - and price increases); issues with insurance coverage (*i.e.,* difficulty / insolvency or block / cancellation by insurance companies); and / or difficulties in obtaining licences – light blue) depending on the four explored aquaculture systems (land- and sea-based intensive and extensive) with and without IMTA [upper panel]. PCAs stakeholder responses on adopted internal mitigation measures [lower panel left side]and preferred external mitigation measures [lower panel right side].

Figure 5. Heatmaps representing data on the adoption of internal and external mitigation measures (scaled from 1 = no adopted loss at all, to 10 = very high adopted). Internal mitigation measures social distancing, increase work efficiency, hiring, firing, integrated-multi trophic solutions, change in farm techniques, reduction of farm dimension, stocking solutions. External mitigation measures: direct sales, foster supply chain, search new market, demand economic support, explore new market strategies, demand support to scientists. Responses are shown per farming strategy (LBE = Land-based extensive, LBI = Land-based intensive, SBE = Sea-based intensive, SBI = Sea-based extensive) with and without Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture (IMTA).

Table 1. Four selected stages of the aquaculture PFSC and the surveyed associated specific aspects; respondents were asked to report the associated economic loss (scaled from 1 = no economic loss at all, to 10 = very high economic loss)

Hatchery	**Production / transformation**	**Distribution / logistics**	**Market**
Lack of juvenile/fry supply	Lack of infrastructure (e.g., freezers, smoking rooms, packaging, other)	Increases in transportation prices and / or restrictions on transportation availability (*e.g.*, flight cancellation, closure of geographical borders between countries)	Farmed products price decrease / loss (*i.e.,* depreciation due to surplus production or a loss in orders)
Lack of raw materials provision (both in terms of reduction of available raw materials - feeds, packaging material - and price increases)	Labour failures (i.e., seasonal hiring of farmers)		Impossibility / difficulty of selling to national buyers / consumers
Issues with insurance coverage (*i.e.,* difficulty / insolvency or blockage / cancellation by insurance companies)	Difficulties of suppliers in collecting seafood products		Entry into international markets
Difficulties in obtaining licences			Absence of customers in distribution channels (*e.g.*, tourists, schools, restaurants, etc.)
			Difficulty engaging intermediaries

Table 2. List of surveyed mitigation responses at a local / internal scale (*i.e.,* farm-based and related to the supply chain; respondents were asked to report their preference, scaled from 1 = not adopted to 10 = very highly adopted) and list of surveyed preferences on national / external scale mitigation measures (scaled from 1 = not preferred to 10 = very highly preferred).

Mitigation responses at a local / internal scale	Social distancing (*e.g.*, work shifts)	Increase work efficiency	Additional hiring (*e.g.*, new professional profiles)	Firing personnel	Adoption of Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture solutions	Changes in farm techniques	Reduction of farm size (*e.g.*, number of cages or used surface)	Stocking solutions (*e.g.,* freezing and smoking)
Preferences on potential national / external scale mitigation measures	Direct sales to customers	Fostering supply chains	Seeking new markets (*e.g.*, canning industry)	Direct economic support (*e.g.*, economic subsidy from regional or national bodies)	Exploration of new market strategies (*e.g.*, online retail system and brand)	Direct support to scientists		

Table 3 Selected comments reported by interviewed stakeholders, quotations have been reported by interviewed by also reporting the associated country, the farming strategy, the presence or absence of Integrated Multi Trophic Aquaculture – IMTA.

Country	Farming strategy	IMTA/noIMTA	Comment
Hatchery level of the aquaculture PSFC			
Tunisia	SBE	IMTA	*"We are encountering difficulty in quality control of fingerlings before shipping, and more in general difficulty in getting fingerlings for fattening".*
Philippine	LBI	noIMTA	*"The restrictions brought about by the COVID-19 lockdown resulted in materials and other pond inputs being not readily available or could not be transported to the pond areas. Regular inspections and consultation for breeding/spawning induction could not also be conducted due to quarantine measures imposed by the government, thus delaying necessary measures on concerns to be addressed on operational processes. Schedule of fry transfers, grow out preparations, etc. are all delayed because of the COVID-19 situation. Maintenance and development schedules had also been affected, further delaying crop schedules. Only maintenance of natural food organisms and breeding stocks is being done".*
Nigeria	LBI	noIMTA	*"I had to afford more high production costs due to more feeding needed to maintain fishes".*
Ecuador	SBE	noIMTA	*"I had to afford robberies for non-official surveillance".*
Production / transformation level of the aquaculture PSFC			
Sweden	LBI	IMTA	*"No market but continue costing for electricity, water, heat, feed so fish can survive"*
Portugal	SBE	noIMTA	*"Seasonal personnel could not be contracted, leading to significant operational constraints, higher costs and extreme workload for existing personnel".*
Italy	LBI	noIMTA	*"Overload in biomass of the structures for non-sales due to a lack of coordination of placing on the market, lack of coordination of access to credit and management of the 'unsold".*
Market level of the aquaculture PSFC			

Portugal	LBE	IMTA	*“Liquidity shortage due to the loss of money on credit of the restoration channel because many went into insolvency and I will not receive their money. Others cannot fulfil their obligations and will not pay for now”.*
Croatia	SBE	noIMTA	*“70% of the sales depend on the touristic season (we supply the high-end markets (hotels/restaurants etc), 30% and less is for the domestic market, the closure of HoReCA channels and local markets is the main reason of economic loss”.*
Turkey	LBI	noIMTA	*“Imbalance in supply-demand and excessive fall in prices”.*
Internal (farm scale) adopted mitigation measures to cope with COVID-19 disruption			
China	SBE	IMTA	*“I’m increasing the level of mechanization of offshore production, increasing the use of advanced equipment to reduce dependence on people”.*
India	LBI	IMTA	*“I’m planning for low density to avoid risk”.*
Turkey	SBI	noIMTA	*“I’m trying new aquaculture species, producing low-cost products”.*
Egypt	LBE	noIMTA	*“I’m dividing the harvest into different periods”.*
China	LBI	noIMTA	*“I’ll increase varieties with high added value, and improved survival rate”.*
Italy	SBI	noIMTA	*“I will test the introduction of new species such as sea urchins, sea cucumbers, oysters, etc.”.*
External preferred mitigation measures to cope with COVID-19 disruption			
China	SBE	IMTA	*“We are working to expand sales channels, such as e-commerce and live broadcast; change communication methods with customers and internal staff: such as online communication”.*
Italy	SBI	IMTA	*“I suggest a remodelling of the EMFF management system, the provision of measures to support companies, an updating of the National Aquaculture Plan, definition of the role of Productors Organisations at the level of representation in a homogeneous way to other countries, a National Communication Plan on the benefits of farmed fish such as safety, traceability, freshness, inclusion of companies in accelerators, improved access to credit”.*
Italy	LBI	noIMTA	*“We are destinating our products to pet food”.*
China	LBI	noIMTA	*“I suggest strengthening the industry emergency system”.*
India	LBE	noIMTA	*“I suggest creating awareness of the health benefit of shrimp consumption through celebrities. Maintain BMC (Broodstock Maturation Center) cannot depend upon brooder supply chain from other countries to import”.*

India	LBI	noIMTA	*“Increase the use of Artificial Intelligence will be highly helpful during lockdown to monitor the farms during pandemic times”.*
Italy	SBI	noIMTA	*“Incentivize the purchase of farmed fish, finance the activities they produce in a sustainable way and IMTA”.*
Croatia	SBE	noIMTA	*“I suggest that the Government pays us an incentive per kilogram of products produced. And for the bank to write off interest for 9 months this year”.*
Greece	SBI	noIMTA	*“I suggest financial contribution for the maintenance of unsold biomass and for extra airfreight costs”.*
Brazil	LBI	noIMTA	*“I suggest a reduction of government fees so that we can reduce the price and gain market again, with the international crisis scenario the population's purchasing power decreases, so we need to reduce the price to sell again”.*
Brazil	SBE	noIMTA	*“I propose a relief from tax obligations and contribution to Social Security, until the restoration of commercial normality, especially in the operation of restaurants”.*