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**Unemployment rate in India during COVID-19**

During the COVID-19 pandemic, India experienced significant disruptions in various sectors, leading to fluctuations in the unemployment rate. In April 2020, the unemployment rate soared to around 23.5% due to the nationwide lockdown imposed to curb the spread of the virus. However, as restrictions eased and economic activities resumed, the unemployment rate gradually declined. By the end of 2020, it had dropped to around 9%, although it remained higher than pre-pandemic levels. The exact figures can vary depending on the source and methodology used for calculation.

**During the COVID-19 pandemic**:-

India saw a significant impact on its economy and employment landscape. The strict lockdown measures imposed to curb the spread of the virus led to widespread disruptions across various sectors, resulting in a surge in unemployment.

In April 2020, at the peak of the lockdown, India's unemployment rate spiked to around 23.5%, according to the Center for Monitoring Indian Economy (CMIE). This marked a sharp increase from the pre-pandemic unemployment rate, which was around 7-8%.

As the lockdown measures were gradually eased and economic activities resumed, the unemployment rate began to decline. However, it remained elevated compared to pre-pandemic levels throughout much of 2020 and into 2021.

The exact unemployment figures can vary based on different sources and methodologies used for calculation. Additionally, informal and unorganized sectors, which constitute a significant portion of India's workforce, may not be fully captured in official statistics, leading to underestimations of the actual unemployment rate

Top of FormThe COVID-19 pandemic has had a profound impact on countries worldwide, including India. The first cases in India were reported in January 2020, and by March 2020, the government implemented strict lockdown measures to contain the spread of the virus. These measures included travel restrictions, closure of businesses, and limitations on public gatherings.

The pandemic disrupted various sectors of the Indian economy, leading to job losses, reduced economic activity, and supply chain disruptions. Millions of migrant workers, particularly those employed in informal sectors and daily wage laborers, faced immense challenges due to the sudden loss of income and limited access to essential services.

The healthcare system also faced significant strain due to the surge in COVID-19 cases, with hospitals overwhelmed and shortages of medical supplies reported in some regions. Efforts were made to ramp up testing, enhance healthcare infrastructure, and accelerate vaccination campaigns to curb the spread of the virus and mitigate its impact.

Despite these challenges, India has shown resilience in its response to the pandemic, with efforts to develop indigenous vaccines, implement containment measures, and provide support to affected communities. However, the socioeconomic effects of the pandemic continue to be felt, highlighting the need for sustained efforts to address both the immediate and long-term consequences.

The consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic are multifaceted and extend across various aspects of society, economy, and public health. Some of the significant consequences include:

1. **Public Health Impact:-** COVID-19 has led to millions of infections and deaths worldwide, overwhelming healthcare systems in many countries. The virus has caused severe illness, long-term health complications for some individuals, and significant strain on healthcare workers.

**2. Economic Fallout:-** The pandemic has triggered a global economic downturn, resulting in job losses, business closures, and disruptions to supply chains. Many industries, such as travel, hospitality, and retail, have been particularly hard hit. The economic impact has been felt at both individual and national levels, with millions experiencing financial hardship and governments implementing stimulus measures to support economies.

**3. Social Disruption:-**COVID-19 has caused widespread social disruption, including restrictions on movement, closures of schools and public spaces, and limitations on social gatherings. These measures have affected daily life, social interactions, and mental well-being, leading to increased stress, isolation, and loneliness for many individuals.

**4.Educational Challenges:-** School closures and the shift to remote learning have posed challenges for students, educators, and parents. The digital divide has exacerbated disparities in access to education, with marginalized communities facing greater difficulties in accessing online learning resources.

**5. Global Travel Restrictions:-**To prevent the spread of the virus, many countries have imposed travel restrictions, including border closures, quarantine measures, and flight cancellations. These restrictions have disrupted international travel, tourism, and business activities, impacting economies reliant on tourism and cross-border trade.

**6. Vaccine Inequality:-**Disparities in vaccine distribution and access have emerged, with wealthier countries securing the majority of available vaccine doses while many low- and middle-income countries face challenges in procuring vaccines for their populations. This vaccine inequality prolongs the pandemic and hinders efforts to achieve global immunity.

**7. Long-Term Health Implications**:-While COVID-19 primarily affects the respiratory system, emerging evidence suggests that it may also have long-term health consequences, including effects on the cardiovascular system, neurological function, and mental health. Research is ongoing to understand the full spectrum of long-term effects, commonly referred to as "long COVID."

Addressing the consequences of COVID-19 requires a coordinated and multifaceted approach, including vaccination efforts, public health measures, economic support, and social interventions to mitigate the impact and build resilience in communities.

As of my last update in January 2022, I don't have real-time data on the unemployment rates in Indian states. However, you can find this information from various sources such as government websites, statistical databases like the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO), or reports from organizations like the Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy (CMIE) which regularly publish unemployment data for different states in India. You may also find this information in news articles or reports from reputable economic research institutions.

As of my last update in January 2022, I don't have specific data on COVID-19 related unemployment rates in Indian states. However, during the COVID-19 pandemic, many states in India experienced fluctuations in unemployment rates due to various factors such as lockdowns, restrictions on economic activities, and the overall impact of the pandemic on different sectors of the economy.

To obtain the most recent and accurate data on COVID-19 related unemployment rates in Indian states, you can refer to reports and studies conducted by government agencies, research organizations, or economic think tanks. These sources often analyze the impact of the pandemic on employment and provide state-wise unemployment statistics. Additionally, government websites and dashboards may also provide data on the employment situation during the COVID-19 period.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, India, like many other countries, experienced significant disruptions to its economy, including rising unemployment rates. The impact varied across states due to factors such as the severity of the outbreak, the stringency of lockdown measures, and the structure of the local economy.

Several Indian states with large urban centers and a high concentration of industries such as manufacturing, tourism, and services were particularly affected. States like Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Delhi, and Gujarat faced challenges due to the stringent lockdowns imposed to curb the spread of the virus, leading to layoffs, temporary closures of businesses, and a decline in economic activity.

Conversely, states with a more agrarian economy or those with a significant rural population might have experienced relatively lower levels of unemployment, as agriculture was less impacted by lockdown measures.

To obtain specific data on unemployment rates in Indian states during the COVID-19 pandemic, you can refer to reports and studies conducted by government agencies, research organizations, or economic think tanks. Organizations like the Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy (CMIE) and the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) often provide detailed analyses of employment trends during this period. Additionally, government websites and dashboards may offer data on state-wise unemployment rates and the impact of the pandemic on employment.

1. From an unprecedented health crisis to a deep economic crisis

Evolution and current scale of the health crisis across countries

Following its initial outbreak in the city of Wuhan in China in late 2019, the new coronavirus responsible for the COVID-19 disease – rapidly became a pandemic as it spread to most countries and territories across the world. As of end-August 2020, around 25 million confirmed cases and 840

thousand deaths had been reported worldwide, with G20 economies accounting for 77% of all cases and 82% of all deaths. The daily number of newly confirmed cases peaked in many G20 countries in April, but

was still rising rapidly in India, South Africa and the Latin American G20 economies, and a resurgence of new cases was reported in July in several countries, most notably in the United States.Timing and extent of health containment measures and their impact on mobility.

Even prior to the declaration of a pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) on 11 March 2020, countries around the world started to put in place an unprecedented set of containment measures in order to “flatten the curve” of COVID-19 infections. This was done to avoid a collapse of the health care systems and ultimately contain the number of fatalities.

The timing, nature and scope of containment and mitigation strategies varied substantially across G20 countries (Figure 1), ranging from initial efforts to detect and trace infected individual’s contact with other people through to severe social-distancing measures, including national social and economic “lock-downs” (Hale, 2020[1]). In response to

the early outbreak of the coronavirus on its territory, China was the first country to introduce strict containment measures in early February.

By early April, similar measures had been introduced in the rest

of the G20, although with some differences in timing and stringency.

These measures included restricted movement within countries and across borders and the implementation of social distancing measures,

such as school closures, closure of non-essential businesses, and limits on the size of public gatherings.

Despite varied responses, the measures taken led to an economic shutdown in most countries on a scale not seen in peacetime since the Great Depression.

1. G20 economies have differed in timing and strictness of COVID-19 containment measuresIndex of stringency of containment and closure policies from 0 (no measures taken) to 100 (most stringent).

Note: The stringency index of government lockdown and other social distancing measures to contain the spread of COVID-19 has been constructed as part of the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker project.

It is a weighted sum of eight policy indicators for containment and closure policies, such as school closures and restrictions in movement. G20 economies are listed in order of the earliest date in which the stringency index rose above 25. The index for the EU has been constructed by weighting the index for each individual EU country by its share of the total EU population as at 1 January 2020 (excludes Malta).

Source: (Hale, 2020[1]), data accessed 28 August 2020.

These containment and mitigation measures, as well as public awareness and the fear of contracting COVID-19, had an immediate dampening effect on mobility patterns in all G20 countries. Based on smartphone locations, movements to places of work decreased markedly as of early March, falling by between 30 and 70 per cent to a low point in mid-April .

A pickup in mobility subsequently occurred as lockdowns and other containment measures began to be eased in most countries. Nevertheless, even by late June, fewer people were working at their usual workplaces than prior to the pandemic, with mobility still down between 10 to 40 percent. Korea stands out with a much smaller recorded fall in mobility.

This may reflect the relatively early implementation of containment measures, Similar data for China based on the internet service Baidu also point to a substantial decline in mobility but starting

earlier in late January as containment measures were announced and implemented.

Other data on mobility from Apple, based on the frequency of asking for directions while driving, point to a somewhat larger decline in mobility in Korea. This began earlier than in most other G20 countries but was still less marked than elsewhere. See Apple Mobility Trends Report,including a strategy of rapid and massive testing, tracking and tracing (TTT), to contain the spread of the virus, without stopping economic activity (OECD, 2020[2]).

**Individual mobility fell substantially in most G20 countries**

Weekly average of percentage change in mobility relative to median value during 3 January to 6 February 2020

Note: The data refer to Google data on a person’s location which was deemed to be a workplace.

Source: Google COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports, https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/ (accessed on 15 July 2020).

The result of containment measures, and the subsequent decline in mobility, was a major supply shock, as workers stayed home and many businesses temporarily closed. International supply chains and trade were also disrupted adding to the supply shock even in countries not initially hit by the coronavirus and where it had not yet taken hold. At the same time, demand for many goods and services plummeted, as

households and companies were unable, either physically or financially,to maintain their spending as production fell, jobs were lost and incomes declined, and as growing uncertainty led them to save whatever

they could. This turned the supply shock, very rapidly, into a demand shock.

**Macroeconomic consequences :-**

The impact of the pandemic and containment measures led to a severe contraction in economic activity as many people were unable to go to work and businesses could no longer operate. Industrial production declined on average by around 28% in G20 countries in just two months between

February and April 2020 (Figure 3). Larger declines of between 40 and 60 percent were recorded in India, Indonesia, Italy and South Africa and relatively small declines occurred in Korea and Russia. The data

indicate that a trough in activity occurred in April in all countries except China, where it occurred in February. However, despite a rebound in activity, industrial production in June 2020 remained well below its pre-crisis level with the exception of China and Korea.Figure 3.

Industrial production was severely curtailed by containment measures Percentage change in seasonally adjusted production since February 2020

The data for China refer to December to February and December to June as local lockdowns began already in late January and affected production most severely in February.

Note: The data for Argentina, Indonesia, Mexico, South Africa and Saudi Arabia refer to the manufacturing sector only.Source: OECD, national sources and IHS Markit Manufacturing PMI for Indonesia.Looking ahead, the strength of the recovery remains highly uncertain. It will depend in part on whether a second wave of coronavirus infections can be avoided before an effective treatment or vaccine becomes available. Reflecting this uncertainty, the OECD Economic Outlook (2020[3]) published on 10 June, presented projections based on two equally likely scenarios

**CONCLUSION:-**

In the first “single-hit” scenario, a second wave is avoided, in the “double-hit” scenario, it is not. In both scenarios, G20 economies are projected to contract substantially in 2020 by 5.8% and 7.3%, respectively. Under the single-hit scenario, growth is projected to rebound in 2021 by 5.5%, leaving real GDP for the G20 economy as a whole slightly below the level reached in the last quarter of 2019. The rebound will be weaker at just 3.1% under the double-hit scenario, leaving an even greater gap in real GDP from its pre-crisis level. The gap is even larger when compared with the increase in GDP for 2020 and 2021 that was projected prior to the crisis and this gap is wider for the G20 emerging market economies than for the G20 advanced economies
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