

Social Safety Nets, Women's Economic Achievements and Agency

A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

🗦 Amber Peterman, Jingying Wang, Kevin Kamto Sonke, and Janina Steinert

Abstract

There are increasing calls for social safety nets (SSNs) to be designed and implemented to promote women's economic inclusion and agency, contributing to closing gender disparities globally. We investigate the extent to which SSNs achieve these goals and explore design and contextual features that promote impacts. We aggregate results from 1,067 effect sizes from 106 publications, representing 202,974 women across 42 low- and middle-income countries. We show robust and highly significant pooled effects for all outcomes (hedges' g = 0.103, p<0.001), with similar magnitude of effects for economic achievement and agency domains. These effects are robust for asset transfers, unconditional cash transfers and social care services, while those for public works are of comparable magnitude but marginally significant. Impacts for conditional cash transfers and in-kind transfers are small and either marginally significant or insignificant. Impacts on economic achievement are driven by productive work (participation and intensity), savings, assets and expenditures, while those for agency are driven by voice, autonomy and decision-making. We conclude that SSNs have the ability to enhance women's economic inclusion and agency, however vary by intervention type. Nonetheless, challenges remain in implementation of gender-sensitive designs, as well as data gaps for certain regions, contexts and outcomes, which should be closed in future evaluations.

KEYWORDS

Social safety nets, cash transfers, women, empowerment, systematic review, meta-analysis

Social Safety Nets, Women's Economic Achievements and Agency: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Amber Peterman

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Center for Global Development (amberpeterman@gmail.com)

Jingying Wang Department of Sociology, University of Zurich

Kevin Kamto Sonke Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University

Janina Steinert

TUM School of Social Sciences and Technology, Technical University of Munich

We thank colleagues at CGD and within the larger portfolio on gender 'cash' and 'care' for helpful comments and discussions at the inception of this work, including Megan O'Donnell, Shelby Bourgault, Mayra Buvinic, Eeshani Kandpal and Kehinde Ajayi (CGD), Victoria Kiasyo Isika (Innovations for Poverty Action) and Maren Duvendack (University of East Anglia). Participants at the International Association for Feminist Economics (IAFFE) 2023 annual conference in Cape Town and at the Association of Public Policy and Management (APPAM) 2023 annual conference in Atlanta provided helpful comments. We thank all authors who were willing to share additional information and data on their primary studies included in this review. The Center for Global Development is grateful for contributions from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation in support of this work. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not the policies or views of affiliated institutions.

Amber Peterman, Jingying Wang, Kevin Kamto Sonke, and Janina Steinert. 2024. "Social Safety Nets, Women's Economic Achievements and Agency: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." CGD Working Paper 684. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development. https://www.cgdev.org/publication/social-safety-nets-womens-economic-achievements-and-agency-systematic-review-and-meta

CENTER FOR GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT

2055 L Street, NW Fifth Floor Washington, DC 20036

> 1 Abbey Gardens Great College Street London SW1P 3SE

> > www.cgdev.org

Center for Global Development. 2024.

The Center for Global Development works to reduce global poverty and improve lives through innovative economic research that drives better policy and practice by the world's top decision makers. Use and dissemination of this Working Paper is encouraged; however, reproduced copies may not be used for commercial purposes. Further usage is permitted under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

The views expressed in CGD Working Papers are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the board of directors, funders of the Center for Global Development, or the authors' respective organizations.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Methodology	4
2.1 Sample construction	4
2.2 Searches and selection of studies	5
2.3 Study extraction	6
2.4. Standardization of effect sizes	7
2.5. Meta-analysis and meta-regression	8
3. Results	10
3.1 Sample description	10
3.2 Assessing publication bias	15
3.3 Pooled effect sizes	16
3.4 Meta-regression results	18
3.5 Cost-benefit results	20
4. Discussion and policy implications	21
References	26
Appendix A. Supplementary information and analysis	31
Appendix B. Scopus search strings in eligible languages	61

Figures

1.	PRISMA flow diagram	11
2.	Geographical distribution of overall effect sizes	. 12
3.	Pooled effects by SSN type (top) and outcome indicator (bottom)	. 17
A1.	Conceptual framework linking social safety nets to women's agency and economic achievements	. 31
A2.	Number of publications over time	. 31
A3.	Doi plot assessing publication bias	32
A4.	Violin plots for combined effects by social safety net type	32

Tables

1.	Sample characteristics	14
2.	RVE Meta-regression results across all outcomes by publication, implementation and effect characteristics	19
A1.	Summary of related meta-analyses on women's economic achievement and agency outcomes (2013–2023)	
A2.	Inclusion and exclusion criteria	34
A3.	Revised Joanna Briggs Institute quality assessment for experimental studies	
A4.	Indicator definitions for characteristics at the publication, intervention and effect level	
A5.	Publication details ordered by country of study and year of publication	
A6.	Pooled effect sizes for all social safety net interventions	46
A7.	Pooled effect sizes across all outcomes by different social safety net interventions	46
A8.	Pooled effect sizes for social safety net interventions by different outcome categories of economic achievements and agency	47
A9.	Pooled effect sizes for economic achievement and agency domains by social safety net intervention types	48
A10	Summary of cost-benefit analysis in included studies	49

1. Introduction

Social safety nets (SSNs), including cash, in-kind and asset transfers, are widely used policy instruments to promote household economic security, resiliency to shocks and investment in human capital (Bastagli et al., 2019; Hidrobo et al., 2018). Alongside their ability to cost-effectively reach and promote dignity and inclusion among marginalized populations, an increasingly recognized advantage of SSNs is their ability to address drivers of gender inequality (Peterman et al., 2020; UNICEF Office of Research-Innocenti, 2020). Advocates for a gender-sensitive approach to design and implementation of SSNs have argued for provisions at the systems, policy and program levels that consider and seek to close gender disparities across a wide range of outcomes (Cookson et al., 2023; Gavrilovic et al., 2022; UN Women, 2019). Evidence supports these efforts, showing that carefully designed interventions can have multi-faceted positive effects for women, including transforming her economic status via participation in the labor force, increasing income and building wealth stores, as well as increasing her sense of agency via participation in household and community decision-making. Nonetheless, governments and international stakeholders have struggled to put these recommendations into practice. For example, during the unprecedented pandemic response, among 3,099 global social protection and labor market responses planned, adapted or implemented through 2021, less than 20% took gender into account (Gavrilovic et al., 2022).¹ As investment in SSNs increasingly responds to global shocks, including conflict and climate change, better understanding of their potential to reverse gender gaps is needed.

Do SSNs increase women's economic achievements and promote their agency within households and communities? Previous reviews suggest they can (Bastagli et al., 2019; Halim et al., 2023; Perera et al., 2022; Peterman et al., 2020). However, to date, reviews have presented only narrative results, and there has been no comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis able to aggregate evidence across SSN typologies, geographies and outcomes. In addition, existing reviews point to weaknesses in the evidence base, in terms of measurement of outcomes, regional and program design gaps. For example, a review of SSNs in the Africa region noted that among 162 indicators of women's empowerment across 17 studies, 95% were decision-making indicators, which typically capture a small sub-set of financial decisions at the household level, and have been criticized for their measurement weaknesses (Peterman et al., 2020).² Further, studies captured in previous reviews are dominated by cash transfers, rather than modalities including in-kind transfers, public works or other instruments. In addition, multiple reviews set out to aggregate evidence on the role of design and implementation components in delivering impacts for women, however numerous reviews conclude the evidence base is too mixed or too thin to make firm conclusions (Bastagli et al.,

¹ Figures are from the UNDP and UN Women Global Gender Response Tracker (November 2021 update). Attention to gender is categorized as either targeting women's economic security or supporting unpaid care.

² In particular, measurement work suggests conventional decision-making indicators (typically measuring only involvement in basic household expenditure decisions) fail to capture nuances in agency experienced by women in different settings (Bonilla et al., 2017). In addition, they highlight the problematic nature of assigning meaning to joint versus sole decisions and motivation behind decisions, and significant differences across spouses regarding opinions about who takes the same decisions, among others (Ambler et al., 2021; Bernard et al., 2020; Seymour & Peterman, 2018).

2019; Peterman et al., 2020). Finally, some studies point to potential adverse effects or unintended consequences of SSN for women, warranting further examining regarding if these trends hold across multiple studies. A common example raised is the potential of cash transfers with conditions or requirements for participation in complementary programming resulting in increased women's burden of unpaid care, reinforcing her involvement in childcare or domestic work (Cookson, 2018; Molyneux, 2006). It is possible that interventions which appear 'successful' in terms of household-level impacts could simultaneously result in no or adverse effects for women specifically, or increased inequality across household members.

The objective of this study is to synthesize evidence on the effectiveness of SSNs on women's economic achievements and agency in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). We define SSNs broadly following the World Bank's Atlas of Social Protection Indicators of Resilience and Equity (ASPIRE) categorization of non-contributory programming to include seven instruments, namely: 1) unconditional cash transfers (UCTs), 2) conditional cash transfers (CCTs), 3) food, vouchers or consumable in-kind transfers, 4) productive asset transfers, 5) public works, 6) fee waivers and subsidies and 7) social care services (World Bank, 2018). Employing a systematic review and metaanalysis of experimental evaluations, we answer the following questions: 1) What is the direction and magnitude of impact of SSNs on women's economic achievements and agency?; 2) How do these impacts vary according to SSN instrument, outcome measure, as well as enablers and barriers related to intervention and evaluation designs, target group and context?; 3) What are the costbenefit calculations accompanying these interventions? and 4) What are key research gaps that would help strengthen understanding of how SSNs can promote and increase women's economic achievements and agency? We define economic achievements and agency broadly to capture multidimensional aspects of each concept and seek to provide a comprehensive view of evidence to inform future investment and policy.

We conceptualize the relationship between SSNs and our key outcomes stemming from direct access, use and control over economic benefits, as well as exposure to knowledge, skills or social capital via complementary programming (Figure A1). The conceptual framework stresses the importance of gender-informed design and operational features for both economic components and complementary programming. These may include, among others, the extent of gender-targeting for economic benefits, suitability of operations in catering for women's needs and safety in implementation, as well as the gender-sensitivity of complementary programming. Increases in women's resources may in turn lead to agency over life decisions, and ultimately lead to her economic achievements, including work, ownership of assets, personal expenditure and savings in her name. Interventions may also have potential spillovers on household members and communities, for example, impacts on her children (schooling, health) or local economy effects. Moderators, or initial conditions at the individual, household and community levels underly the chain of impacts, which may strengthen or weaken impacts. In addition, gender norms within communities or society at large may interact with mechanisms of impact directly, as changes in women's available resources

and endowments may likewise trigger resistance or acceptance from existing power holders. In this review, we provide empirical evidence of impacts on agency and economic achievements, as well as aim to inform how intervention and research design, as well as contextual factors might influence these impacts.

We aggregate results from 1,067 effect sizes found in 106 publications, representing 85 studies and 202,974 women across 42 LMICs. Literature is relatively recent, with nearly 60% of included papers published in the last five years (2019 or after)-indicating a quickly emerging and dynamic field. We find robust evidence that SSNs improve women's economic achievements (hedges' g = 0.105, p<0.001, n = 660) and agency (hedges' g = 0.103, p < 0.001, n = 405). Pooled effects show that impacts from UCTs, asset transfers and social care are the most robust (hedges g's of 0.133, 0.124 and 0.122, respectively), while public works are comparative in magnitude, but only weakly significant, likely in part due to lower power (hedges' g = 0.159, p<0.10, n = 59). Finally, impacts from CCTs and food, vouchers and in-kind transfers are positive, but smaller and either weakly significant or insignificant. Pooled effects for the domain of economic achievement show strong effects for assets, savings, expenditures, labor force participation and productive work intensity (e.g., hours worked or earnings). On the other hand, impacts for debt and loans and care work intensity are insignificant and care work participation has insufficient power to estimate effects. Pooled effects for the domain of agency show that voice, autonomy and decision-making are robust and significant, while aspirations and leadership have insufficient power to estimate effects. Meta-regressions investigating study, intervention and outcome-level factors show few significant predictors of impacts. Studies conducted in South Asia and in Europe and Centra Asia are more likely to show impacts (as compared to sub-Saharan Africa), however the latter is driven by relatively few studies. CCTs and those in pilot phases are less likely to show impacts, and interventions with economic plus components are more likely to show impacts.

Our results speak to two distinct literatures. The first strand of literature seeks to understand which interventions are most promising to build women's agency and economic achievements. Our results align with a narrative review of 160 experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations from LMICs, aimed at identifying what works to enhance women's agency (including measures of economic, social and political standing) (Chang et al., 2020). Among 16 different intervention types examined, four were selected as having 'strong or moderately strong' evidence across multiple forms of agency, including cash and in-kind transfers and the graduation approach, both which fall under our definition of SSNs. We also find that cash transfers (specifically if unconditional) and asset transfers are promising interventions to increase women's agency, however have less strong conclusions for in-kind transfers. Our review also builds on meta-analyses examining effects of economic interventions more broadly on women's agency or economic standing. We summarize five recent efforts in Table A1, which demonstrate overall variable effects. Results from previous meta-analyses show that our pooled effects are comparable to those found for vocational training interventions and their impacts on women's employment and earnings, but are consistently higher and more impactful than those found for microcredit and savings interventions and their impacts

on a range of similar economic and agency outcomes (Brody et al., 2015; Duvendack et al., 2023; Lwamba et al., 2022; Stöterau et al., 2022; Vaessen et al., 2014). The second strand of literature aims to unpack under what circumstances SSNs can improve women's outcomes and how they can be better designed and implemented to leverage gender equality impacts. Previous narrative reviews and practice-based recommendations have suggested that targeting women, ensuring a benefits are of sufficient value, incorporating key complementary programming and attention to gender in operations and implementation matters (Bastagli et al., 2019; Gavrilovic et al. 2022; Perera et al., 2022; Peterman et al., 2020). However, like our study, pervious reviews suggest that for many design and contextual factors, more research is needed to make firm conclusions. While our study shows that overall impacts of SSN on women's economic achievement and agency are promising, however many gaps remain. There are fewer rigorous qualifying studies on food, voucher and in-kind transfers, on public works and social care interventions. Further, there are few studies from the Middle East and North Africa, from East Asia and the Pacific, and from conflict or pandemic settings. In addition, few studies measure care work outcomes, or outcomes of aspirations, voice and leadership, indicating additional evidence is needed to demonstrate SSN potential to change these dimensions. Finally, more mixed-method work is needed to explore and unpack the mechanisms of change and important program design and operational components which may lead to favorable outcomes.

2. Methodology

2.1 Sample construction

Inclusion and exclusion criteria for qualifying studies and impact estimates was pre-specified in a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol and informed by the conceptual framework (Figure A1, PROSPERO #CRD42022382158).³ We briefly describe these criteria with respect to eight parameters: intervention, setting, population, outcomes, methodology, time frame, type of publication and language. The study focused on SSNs, broadly following the World Bank's ASPIRE categorization of non-contributory programming, including: Unconditional and conditional cash transfers, food, vouchers or in-kind transfers, productive asset transfers, public works programs, fee waivers and subsidies, and social care services (World Bank, 2018). We include interventions implemented as stand-alone or those bundled with 'plus' or complementary programming (e.g., layered trainings, benefits or linkages to other health, social or economic services), as long as the associated impacts included at least one SSN intervention.⁴ The latter is often the case for 'graduation programs,' which typically include a lumpy asset transfer (livestock), in addition to monthly or bi-monthly

³ The protocol was registered in December 2022 and available on the PROSPERO website—no amendments were made after this date: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42022382158.

⁴ We recognize the complexities of including evaluations of SSN which have many other bundled benefits, both multiple economic benefits, as well as diverse complementary programming. However, a minority of studies evaluate a single SSN alone (59% of our intervention arms have at least one plus component). Therefore, we aim to unpack this in analysis directly, while acknowledging that undoubtably we miss nuance across intervention types.

consumption support (UCTs), and a bundle of additional training or group-based activities. We included studies in LMICs which measured adult women's outcomes (samples primarily over the age of 18 years). Qualifying outcomes included measures of women's economic empowerment or agency. Categories of economic empowerment followed the CGD's economic empowerment compendium (Buvinić et al., 2020), in the following eight domains: 1) labor force participation, 2) productive work intensity, earnings or quality (e.g., type of contract, level of benefits etc.), 3) unpaid care work, 4) unpaid work intensity or quality, 5) savings, 6) debt or loans, 7) assets, 8) expenditures. Categories of agency followed the conceptualization by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's model of empowerment (van Eerdewijk et al., 2017), in the following five domains: 1) decision making, 2) autonomy and self-efficacy, 3) aspiration and goals, 4) voice and 5) leadership. For each category and domain, aggregate indicators or indices were also considered as long as they included a majority of qualifying indicators. Experimental studies were included which measured intent-to-treat (ITT) effects, whereas quasi-experimental or non-experimental studies, as well as those measuring only treatment-on-the-treated (TOT) effects were excluded. Academic articles published in journals, as well as grey literature including technical reports, working papers, pre-prints and discussion papers were included, as long as they sufficiently explain and present methodology and results. Studies in English, French or Spanish were included from 2003 onwards.⁵ Table A2 presents inclusion and exclusion criteria in greater detail.

2.2 Searches and selection of studies

Search strings were built using key words for intervention type, population, outcome, methodology and setting and piloted in English using three databases. Searches were subsequently conducted in English across six databases comprising both social science and public health repositories starting in January and ending in February 2023 (Scopus, Embase, EconLit, Web of Science, PubMed and Google Scholar). Searches in French and Spanish were produced using professional translators and replicated in Scopus, the database with the largest number of hits and largest compilation of non-English articles (see Appendix B for search strings in English, French and Spanish). Following Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines, automated searches in English were conducted on a monthly basis in Scopus and integrated up until December 1, 2023. In addition, studies were compiled from websites of leading organizations working on primary impact evaluations of SSNs, through identification of prior and derivative works of nine SSN review papers using artificial intelligence literature review tools (www. connectedpapers.com), from existing evidence gaps maps and solicitation from experts in the gender and SSN field (Bastagli et al., 2019; Buvinić & Furst-Nichols, 2016; Buvinić & O'Donnell, 2019;

⁵ From previous reviews and from our understanding of the evolution of experimental impact evaluations considering gender in the SSN literature, starting from 2003 ensured few (if any) publications would be left out.

Eggers del Campo & Steinert, 2022; Halim et al., 2023; Laszlo, 2019; Lwamba et al., 2022; Perera et al., 2022; Peterman et al., 2020).⁶

Studies were screened and assessed for eligibility using Covidence (https://www.covidence.org/) software and documented using PRISMA guidelines. Titles and abstracts of studies were screened by reviewer 1 in discussion with reviewer 2 where studies required a second opinion. Full texts of retrieved studies were further assessed for eligibility by reviewer 1 and qualifying effects within each eligible study were agreed upon by both reviewer 1 and 2. Full texts of studies not available or additional supplementary information were solicited from corresponding or lead authors directly. For the purpose of extraction and analysis, articles and papers examining the same impact evaluation were considered as one study, whereas papers presenting data from different impact evaluations were considered unique studies.⁷

2.3 Study extraction

A detailed guide was developed to facilitate standardized extraction of study components and piloted by all study authors. Primary extraction was randomly assigned to either reviewer 3 or 4 with secondary checks of all information completed by either reviewer 1 or 2.⁸ Where papers were missing critical information necessary to calculate standard effect sizes or required complementary characteristics, corresponding or lead authors were contacted directly to obtain missing information. Papers or effects were dropped if information was not obtained after a second follow-up email. Costing estimates were extracted for a sub-set of studies reporting any qualifying measure, including any formal analysis of the following: a) benefit-cost ratio (BCR), b) internal rate of return (IRR), c) net present value, d) cost-effectiveness or e) economic multiplier. The inclusion approach for different cost-related estimates was purposefully flexible to allow a diversity of methodological approaches, however required the comparison of costs to some form of benefits originating from the economic component of the SSN. Studies were assessed for risk of bias at using a modification of the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal tool for

⁶ Organizational websites searched include: World Bank Open Knowledge Repository, the World Bank Gender Innovation Labs, the Asian Development Bank, the InterAmerican Development Bank, the African Development Bank, J-PAL, Innovations for Poverty Action, the International Food Policy Research Institute, Oxford Policy Management, SocialProtection.org the Transfer Project and UNICEF Office of Research–Innocenti.

⁷ In other words, if five papers analyzed the original *Progresa* evaluation data (1997–2001), these papers would all be included if they presented unique impacts (outcomes over time) and are considered one study. In this case, impacts were only included once, typically the first time they were published. Exceptions were if earlier publications omitted essential information (sample sizes, indicator definitions) or used modelling types which were incompatible with producing standardized effect sizes. Therefore, to be included, each paper needed to include unique estimates, rather than replicating estimates which already existed in previous publications. For pure replication studies, a different criterion was applied, whereby papers could still qualify for inclusion if they produced qualitatively different impacts (reversing either significance or sign of the impact). Within our pool of eligible studies, no replication effort met these criteria, thus our sample does not include dedicated papers that engage in pure replication.

⁸ In exceptional cases, primary extraction was completed by reviewer 1 or 2—primarily in cases with complex study designs or with analysis requiring extra steps to complete extractions (e.g., analysis included both men and women with heterogeneity analysis or where replication of study results with primary data were required to produce full information).

experimental studies (Aromataris & Munn, 2020).9 Table A3 presents the revised criteria (scores range from 0-10) and deviations from the original tool. Deviations were primarily to accommodate standard practice for social science experimental studies, which are typically unable to include aspects like blinding of participants or implementers to the treatment condition after the baseline period (these criteria are more relevant for health or medical trials which use dedicated placebo treatments).

2.4. Standardization of effect sizes

To aggregate estimates across studies, we standardized treatment effects for all outcomes. Standardized effect sizes are scale-free measures that allow comparing the magnitude and direction of treatment effects from different studies. In the case that publications present results using follow-up means only, we transformed treatment effects into the standardized mean difference (SMD), Cohen's d, calculated as:

$$d = \frac{Yt - Yc}{SD_{pooled}} \tag{1}$$

whereby Yt and Yc represent the means in the treatment and control group and SD_{proded} is the pooled standard deviation.¹⁰

Treatment effects expressed as unstandardized regression coefficients β were converted to Cohen's d using:

$$d = \frac{\beta}{SD_{pooled}}$$
(2)

whereby *SD*_{pooled} is given by:

$$SD_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{\frac{sd^{2}(nt+nc-1) - \beta^{2}(nt^{*}nc)}{nt+nc}}{nt+nc-2}}$$
(3)

Treatment effects expressed as standardized regression coefficients were first translated into unstandardized regression coefficients¹¹ and then converted to Cohen's d.

⁹ As pre-specified, we do not exclude any eligible studies based on the results of the quality assessment alone-however control for this in meta-regression results. We follow a modified version of cut points from previous studies using the JBI tool for experimental studies as follows: low (<50% items 'Yes'), medium (50–70% items 'Yes') and high (>70% items 'Yes') (Islam et al., 2020).

¹⁰ SD_{pooled} is given by: $\frac{st^2(nt-1)+sc^2(nc-1)}{sc^2(nc-1)}$ where st and sc represent the standard deviations of the outcome in the nc + nt - 2treatment and control group and where *nc* and *nt* represent the sample sizes in each group.

¹¹ Standardized regression coefficients are converted to unstandardized coefficients by: $\beta = \beta_{standardized} \frac{sy}{sx}$ where sy is the

standard deviation of the independent and sx the standard deviation of the dependent variable.

Treatment effects expressed as odds ratios (OR) were converted to d using:

$$d = \frac{\left(\ln(OR)\sqrt{3}\right)/}{\pi} \tag{4}$$

Lastly, we converted all Cohen's d into Hedges' g values, which are corrected for potential bias that could result from small sample sizes, applying the following formula (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001):

$$g = d\left(1 - \frac{3}{4N - 9}\right) \tag{5}$$

where N is the total sample size, summarized across treatment and control group. All items were coded such that higher scores (values) equaled more favorable economic achievement and agency. For example, we conceptualize additional hours of unpaid care work as an adverse outcome, thus we reverse code the category for unpaid care work intensity. In addition, we code any single indicator as reverse if the construction of the outcome variable is unexpectedly signed (e.g., woman's lack of agency or unemployment, rather than an expression of agency as a positive construct or engagement in employment).

2.5. Meta-analysis and meta-regression

We used robust variance estimation (RVE) as an advanced meta-analytic technique. The RVE model allowed us to account for the nested structure of our data in which multiple outcomes were measured for the same sample of individuals in one study. Specifically, RVE corrects standard errors for dependency within studies that present multiple relevant effect estimates per outcome type (Hedges et al., 2010; Tipton, 2013). Our unit of analysis were 85 study clusters, comprising a total 1,067 effect size estimates, where reported effects for the same study are nested within the study cluster and assumed to correlate with each other. The correlated-effects RVE model accounts for the variation within and between study clusters as well as for the number of effect sizes per cluster by using weights, w_{ij} . We followed the convention of assuming a within-cluster correlation of r = 0.8 (Tipton, 2013).

The final RVE model is then given by:

$$g_{ij} = \alpha + v_j + \varepsilon_{ij} \tag{6}$$

where g_{ij} is the estimated effect size *i* in the study cluster *j*, α denotes the mean of the distribution of true effects across all clusters, v_j is a study-level random effect, $var(v_j)$ is the between-study variance in true effects, and ε_{ij} represents the residual for the *i*th effect size in the *j*th study cluster. The pooled Hedges'g estimate is given by g_{ij} , for all studies the qualifying outcome of interest. We estimated the RVE model (1) pooled across all outcome and SSN types, (2) disaggregated by outcome types (first

by domain of economic achievement vs. agency, then all outcome indicator categories separately), and (3) disaggregated by SSN type. Quantitative measures of heterogeneity (τ^2), which captures the between-study variance, and consistency (I²), which estimates the percentage of between-study variance resulting from heterogeneity rather than random error, are also reported.

To unpack the contribution of characteristics of the target group and setting, evaluation, and of the intervention design on impacts, we conducted an RVE meta-regression. We grouped characteristics on three levels: publication, intervention and effect. At the study level, we tested the region and income group of the country of study, level of fragility of study setting (post-conflict, COVID-19 or pandemic, active conflict) and urbanicity of study setting. At the intervention level, we tested if the SSN type, implementer, scale of program, value of economic benefit, targeting of the program (e.g., if poverty-targeted, if gender-targeted), inclusion of a plus component, defined as any complementary layered or integrated program activity (as well as the type of plus programming: training, economic, health or other), and whether it was gender-neutral or gender-sensitive, and the age of the women included in the sample were associated with heterogeneity in effect sizes. At the effect level, we tested the outcome category, duration of intervention at follow-up measurement and time post-intervention at follow-up measurement. The latter two categories helped unpack if the length of intervention is important and if effects fade or sustain over time after the intervention ends. Table A4 gives detailed descriptions of these indicators.

For the RVE meta-regression, we augmented the model from equation (5) by including each of the above characteristics as "moderators" (or covariates). The resulting mixed-effects model takes the following form:

$$g_{ij} = \alpha + X'\beta + v_j + \varepsilon_{ij}$$
⁽⁷⁾

where X'_{ij} is a vector of publication-, intervention-, and effect-level covariates included in the RVE meta-regression. We first ran a separate regression for each covariate independently, controlling for publication type, year of publication splines (published before 2015 or published after 2019), quality assurance (if medium or low quality) and if the publication was an individual RCT (instead of cluster). In a second model, we additionally controlled for factors at each level, running three regressions for each of study, intervention and effect-level characteristics. Due to sample size issues, we were unable to run fully adjusted models aggregating covariates across all levels. As noted in Table A4, we had missing observations for three characteristics for which information was not reported in publications (urban setting, age of woman and value of transfer). We replaced these missing observations with the average or modal category and ran sensitivity analysis controlling for missingness, however results are robust to this variation, as well as using reduced samples of effects with non-missing values.

Meta-analyses and -regressions were only performed if the degrees of freedom (df) were greater than 4, as simulations have shown that the approximation of the variance distribution is not valid if df<4 (Tipton, 2015). To maximize power, we only ran meta-regressions for pooled outcomes (both economic achievement and agency), as pooled effect sizes showed very similar significance and magnitude of effects across the two domains. Lastly, we assessed publication bias based on visual inspection of a Doi plot and LFK index to identify and quantify potential asymmetry of study effects (Furuya-Kanamori et al., 2018; Shamim et al., 2023). Doi plots have emerged as a new method for detecting publication bias in meta-analyses and were found to have better diagnostic accuracy and sensitivity as compared to funnel plots and the Egger's regression test, particularly if heterogeneity between studies is high (Harrer et al., 2022). The analyses were implemented in R 4.3.1 using the packages "robumeta" for the main analyses and "metasens" for the assessment of publication bias.

3. Results

3.1 Sample description

The final sample for the analysis is 1,067 effect sizes from 106 papers, representing 85 studies and 202,974 women (Figure 1).¹² The majority of papers are published journal articles (75 or 71%), while the remaining are working papers or pre-prints (23 or 22%) and technical reports (8 or 8%). The sample was compiled from 4,898 references (4,026 from databases and 872 from other sources). After removal of 1,215 duplicates, a total of 3,683 abstracts were screened and 316 full texts were screened. Among papers assessed for eligibility via full text screening, the most common reasons for exclusion were the paper did not report on an eligible outcome (43%), did not evaluate an eligible intervention (21%) or reported effects in the wrong population (19%, typically among men, children or a pooled sample). Approximately 4% of studies were dropped because of other reasons, including incomplete reporting and low confidence in study results or all qualifying effects being outliers (hedges g ≤ -1 or ≥ 1).¹³ Despite conducting primary searches in French and Spanish, 100% of the publications in the final analysis sample were in English.

¹² As the sample sizes can vary within each study, based on the measurement of a particular outcome and the length of follow-up, among others, we computed the total number of women by first calculating the maximum sample for treatment and control across outcomes within a single study, summing them and then totaling across studies.

¹³ In total, 33 observations, or approximately 3% of the sample are dropped which have Hedges' g outside the acceptable range. All but two of these coefficients are positive, indicating that dropping outliers is a conservative approach to estimating pooled effects.

FIGURE 1. PRISMA flow diagram



* Websites included: World Bank open knowledge repository, World Bank Gender Innovation Labs, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, African Development Bank, JPAL, Innovations for Poverty Action, UNICEF Innocenti, Oxford Policy Management, the International Food Policy Research Institute, Socialprotection.org, and the Transfer Project.

Table 1 (panel A) reports sample descriptives at the publication-level (n = 106) and by type of SSN. The majority of publications examine UCTs (n = 60 or 57%) and CCTs (n = 22 or 21%), with fewer publications evaluating asset transfers (n = 17 or 16%), social care (n = 11 or 11%), food, vouchers or in-kind transfers, as well as public works (n = 7 or 7%).¹⁴ Figure A2 shows the evolution of papers across years by publication type. Publications cover a total of 42 countries, the majority of which are in sub-Saharan Africa (52%), followed by South Asia (19%) and Latin America and the Caribbean (18%), with a relatively smaller number representing the Middle East and North Africa (6%), East Asia and the Pacific (5%) or Europe and Central Asia (1%). There is some regional divergence by SSN type, with a greater percentage of CCTs and in-kind transfers in Latin America and the Caribbean (45% and 57%) and a greater percentage of asset transfer interventions in South Asia (53%). Figure 2 displays the geographic variation of effects across countries in a bubble map. Most publications focus on lower-middle income settings (52%), followed by low-income (32%) and upper-middle income (15%) settings. A minority of studies take place in fragile settings (19%) or urban settings, with overall approximately a third of studies including at least some or all the sample in urban areas.



FIGURE 2. Geographical distribution of overall effect sizes

Notes: Distribution of effects (n = 1,067) across 42 countries; including 55% of all impacts in sub-Saharan Africa, 24% in South Asia, 11% in Latin America and the Caribbean, 8% in the Middle East and North Africa, 2% in East Asia and the Pacific and less than 1% in Europe and Central Asia.

Table 1 (panel B) summarizes characteristics of study intervention arms (n = 121). Overall, governments were the primary implementers (39%), followed by NGOs or UN agencies (34%) and research teams themselves (27%). Approximately half of intervention arms were assessed as mid-level in scale, while the other half were roughly equally split between pilot and at-scale implementation. The average total value of economic benefits over implementation periods studied

¹⁴ Note, percentages do not sum to 100%, as some publications evaluate interventions with multiple treatment arms studying different types of SSNs, or layer multiple SSNs within an intervention package. Overall, there are 19 papers that evaluate graduation programs, these overlap marginally with UCT studies (23% percent are graduation programs) and more heavily with asset transfer studies (71% are graduation programs).

is USD \$463, which was relatively larger in public works arms and asset transfer arms (just over USD \$700) and relatively smaller in CCT arms (USD \$278). Most intervention arms were poverty targeted in some way (65%), as well as gender targeted (72%), including targeting adolescent girls or women as mothers, caregivers, entrepreneurs, or female-headed households. Most interventions also have some form of plus component (59%, 21% with a gender-neutral plus component and 37% with a gender sensitive plus component) with asset transfers and CCTs showing greater likelihood of complementary programming (84% and 70%, respectively), while public works and care services show lower likelihood of the same (13% and 42%, respectively). Plus components were the most likely to be training or informational (44% of all interventions), or include other types of economic (13%), health or protection (10%) or other programming (11%). Most women in the study sample were in the reproductive ages, with only 17% younger than 24 years old (youth) and 14% over the age of 40 years.

Table 1 (panel C) summarizes characteristics of effects (n = 1,067). Effects were split 62% (38%) across economic achievement (agency). Within the economic achievement domain, the largest category of indicators are productive work intensity (29% of all effects), followed by labor force participation (12%), assets (5%) and savings (5%). Few studies measured care work participation, debt or loans, or aggregate economic achievement measures (1% each). Within the agency domain, the largest category of indicators are decision-making (21%), followed by autonomy and self-efficacy (12%) and voice (5%). Very few studies measure aspirations and goals, or leadership. Overall CCTs, public works and social care interventions are more likely to measure economic outcomes (ranging from 67–82%), whereas UCTs, in-kind transfers and asset transfers are more likely to measure agency outcomes (ranging from 41-75%). The average effect relates to interventions that last an average of 13 months (range 1-60 months), with 55% of interventions lasting 12 months or longer. The average effect was collected approximately 14 months after interventions ended (range: 0-140, or nearly 12 years), with 50% of effects being collected 12 months or longer post-intervention. Table A5 gives further details of each publication, including authors, year or publication, country of study, intervention type and name, number of aggregate impacts included in the meta-analysis (total and by domain) and overall quality assessment score. Overall, quality assessments deemed studies to be overwhelmingly high quality, likely reflecting general standardized design and reporting for experimental studies in the development field. The mean overall score among included studies is 82% and over 72% of papers qualifying as 'high quality' (>70% of items scoring 'Yes').¹⁵

¹⁵ The quality assessment scores ranged from 60% (7 studies) to 100% (5 studies), with 90% being the modal category (37 studies). The highest scoring single items were for true randomization (item 1), baseline balance (item 2) and comparability of outcome measurement between study arms (item 8), while the lowest were for reporting on appropriate power (item 9) and blinding of participants and data collectors at baseline (items 3 and 4). Quality assurance scores by study are reported in Table A5.

	All	UCTs	CCTs	Food, Voucher or In-kind	Asset Transfer	Public Works	Social Care
Panel A: Publication-level							
Ν	106	60	22	7	17	7	11
Year of publication							
Before 2015	0.13	0.12	0.27	0.00	0.12	0.14	0.00
Between 2015–2019	0.59	0.63	0.32	0.57	0.29	0.71	0.91
After 2019	0.46	0.45	0.23	0.43	0.24	0.71	0.73
Region							
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.52	0.62	0.36	0.14	0.29	0.29	0.36
South Asia	0.19	0.28	0.05	0.14	0.53	0.14	0.27
Latin America & the Caribbean	0.18	0.07	0.45	0.57	0.12	0.00	0.27
Middle East & North Africa	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.14	0.00	0.29	0.09
East Asia & Pacific	0.05	0.02	0.09	0.00	0.06	0.14	0.00
Europe & Central Asia	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.00
Income group							
Low-income	0.32	0.42	0.05	0.14	0.29	0.14	0.45
Lower-middle income	0.53	0.52	0.64	0.43	0.65	0.57	0.36
Upper-middle income	0.15	0.07	0.32	0.43	0.06	0.29	0.18
Fragile setting (any)	0.19	0.22	0.18	0.57	0.12	0.14	0.18
Urban setting (any)	0.31	0.25	0.36	0.43	0.12	0.29	0.55
Panel B: Intervention arm-le	vel						
Ν	121	65	23	9	19	8	12
Implementer							
Government	0.39	0.38	0.52	0.11	0.16	0.50	0.50
NGO, UN or other	0.34	0.32	0.30	0.67	0.63	0.13	0.17
Researchers	0.27	0.29	0.17	0.22	0.21	0.38	0.33
Scale of implementation							
Pilot	0.27	0.22	0.39	0.33	0.26	0.38	0.17
Mid-level	0.50	0.52	0.48	0.44	0.32	0.38	0.58
At scale	0.23	0.26	0.13	0.22	0.42	0.25	0.25
Value of economic benefit							
Total value (USD)	463	513	278	400	705	722	525
First tercile	0.38	0.40	0.39	0.22	0.26	0.25	0.42
Second tercile	0.35	0.28	0.52	0.44	0.21	0.25	0.42
Third tercile	0.27	0.32	0.09	0.33	0.53	0.50	0.17
Targeting							
Poverty targeting	0.65	0.69	0.78	0.56	0.79	0.38	0.50
Gender targeting	0.72	0.68	0.83	0.67	0.47	0.50	1.00

TABLE 1. Sample characteristics

	All	UCTs	CCTs	Food, Voucher or In-kind	Asset Transfer	Public Works	Social Care
Plus components							
Gender-neutral	0.21	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.42	0.00	0.33
Gender-sensitive	0.37	0.42	0.48	0.44	0.42	0.13	0.08
Economic	0.13	0.17	0.17	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.17
Health or protection	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.17
Training or information	0.44	0.43	0.57	0.67	0.53	0.13	0.25
Other	0.11	0.15	0.00	0.11	0.32	0.00	0.08
Female sample age							
Age: <=24 years	0.17	0.14	0.30	0.11	0.05	0.25	0.08
Age: 25–39 years	0.68	0.68	0.48	0.89	0.74	0.38	0.92
Age: 40+ years	0.14	0.15	0.22	0.00	0.16	0.38	0.00
Panel C: Effect-level							
Ν	1067	632	159	112	216	59	105
Domain: economic	0.62	0.59	0.67	0.25	0.53	0.75	0.82
Labor force participation	0.12	0.09	0.14	0.09	0.06	0.47	0.16
Productive work intensity	0.29	0.26	0.42	0.09	0.20	0.24	0.39
Care work participation	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09
Care work intensity	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.11
Savings	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.01	0.06	0.00	0.02
Debt or loans	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01
Assets	0.05	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.17	0.00	0.03
Expenditure	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01
Aggregate economic	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00
Domain: Agency	0.38	0.41	0.33	0.75	0.47	0.25	0.18
Decision making	0.21	0.24	0.06	0.38	0.35	0.08	0.10
Autonomy & self-efficacy	0.12	0.13	0.11	0.29	0.05	0.10	0.05
Aspirations & goals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00
Voice	0.05	0.04	0.15	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.04
Leadership	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Aggregate agency	0.38	0.41	0.33	0.75	0.47	0.25	0.18
Duration of intervention							
12+ months	0.55	0.65	0.47	0.46	0.68	0.07	0.70
Time post-intervention at sur	vey						
12+ months	0.50	0.54	0.44	0.43	0.85	0.17	0.39

Notes: CCT = conditional cash transfer; UCT = unconditional cash transfer.

3.2 Assessing publication bias

Publication bias may occur if studies are selected by journals or self-censored by authors based on the direction and statistical significance of the estimated treatment effect. We assessed evidence of publication bias based on a Doi plot and LFK index (see Figure A3). In the absence of publication bias, the Doi plot should be visually symmetrical and the value of the LFK index should not lie outside the range of -1 to 1. Based on inspection of the Doi plot and an accompanying LFK index of 0.77, we conclude that our findings are likely not biased due to omitted studies.

3.3 Pooled effect sizes

Figure 3 summarizes overall pooled effects sizes across SSN interventions disaggregated by SSN modality (top) and by indicators (bottom). Tables A6 and A7 give details for these estimations, including overall estimates and disaggregated by SSN modality. Impacts overall for all SSN modalities (top) are positive and highly significant with a hedges g of 0.103 (95% confidence interval [CI] 0.08–0.13, p<0.001). When disaggregated by type of SSN, pooled effects show that impacts from UCTs (n = 632), asset transfers (n = 216) and social care (n = 105) are the most robust (hedges g's of 0.133, 0.124 and 0.122, respectively) with significance levels at the p<0.001. In addition, the pooled coefficient on public works (n = 59) is large in magnitude, but only weakly significant (hedges g 0.133 [95% CI -0.03-0.29] at p<0.10). Finally, impacts from CCTs (n = 159) and in-kind transfers (n = 112) are positive, but relatively smaller and either weakly significant or insignificant. The different pooled effect sizes for SSN types are also summarized using violin plots in Figure A4. Plots show the highest variability of effect sizes for UCT and public work interventions. Overall, heterogeneity between studies was high with most I² values in the 80% to 95% range and most τ^2 values exceeding 0.02, thus pointing to substantial variability between studies, including diversity in interventions, settings, study designs, or operationalization of outcome measures. Table A8 replicates these effects by domain of outcome, showing relatively consistent impacts across economic achievement and agency, with some exceptions. For example, in-kind transfer results are driven by the agency domain (as there are too few impacts in the economic achievement domain to estimate pooled effects). Alternatively, impacts for care services and public works are driven by the economic achievement domain, as there are too few impacts in the agency domain to estimate effects.

Figure 3 also displays impacts by indicator type and domain (bottom), showing similar magnitude of hedges g's for economic achievement (0.105) and agency domains (0.103, p<0.001 for both measures). Table A9 shows details underlying these estimates with panel A reporting on economic achievements and panel B reporting on agency outcomes. In terms of economic achievements, there are strong effects for savings (hedges g 0.225 [95% CI 0.13–0.32]), assets (hedges g 0.220 [95% CI 0.12–0.32]), expenditures (hedges g 0.158 [95% CI 0.07–0.24]), labor force participation (hedges g 0.089 [95% CI 0.05–0.13]) and productive work intensity (hedges g 0.061 [95% CI 0.03–0.09]), all at the p<0.001 level. Impacts for debt and loans and care work intensity are insignificant and care work participation has insufficient power to estimate effects. In terms of pooled effects for agency outcomes, robust and significant effects are seen for voice (hedges g 0.172 [95% CI 0.05–0.30]), autonomy and self-efficacy (hedges g 0.114 [95% CI 0.04–0.19]) and decision-making (hedges g 0.095 [95% CI 0.04–0.15]) at the p<0.001 level. Meanwhile, aspirations and goals, as well as leadership have insufficient power to estimate effects. Similar to previous pooled estimates, most I² values are in the 80% to 95% range, and most r² values exceeding 0.02, thus pointing to substantial heterogeneity and variability between studies.



FIGURE 3. Pooled effects by SSN type (top) and outcome indicator (bottom)

Notes: Pooled effect sizes are calculated using standardized impacts and reported with 95% confidence intervals; Full results are reported in Tables A6–A8; Estimate for fee waivers (top) and for care work participation, aspirations and goals and leadership (bottom) are not shown due to insufficient power to calculate effects; p<0.10, p<0.05, p<0.01, p<0.01.

3.4 Meta-regression results

Table 2 reports RVE meta-regression results by background characteristics, using a set of basic controls consisting of paper and study quality factors (left panel) and extended controls at each level (study, intervention and effect-levels, right panel).¹⁶ At the study-level, there is clear indication that effects from Europe and Central Asia are more likely to be higher in magnitude, as compared to sub-Saharan Africa, as well as for South Asia in extended control model (although of much lower magnitude). However, these effects for Europe and Central Asia are largely driven by a handful of studies, thus should be interpreted with caution. At the intervention-level, there is clear consistent evidence that CCTs are less likely to be effective as compared to UCTs, as well as pilot interventions (as compared to mid-level interventions, only significant in the extended control model). In addition, there is weakly significant evidence that interventions with economic plus components are more likely to be effective in both basic and extended control models. At the effect-level, as compared to productive work intensity, labor force participation, savings, assets, expenditure and voice are associated with higher magnitude effects, in extended control models. In addition, in the basic control model, effects measured at more 12 or more months post-intervention are less likely to be effective (in comparison to shorter-term follow-ups). No other effect-level outcomes show significance. We conduct a variety of robustness checks varying the cut offs and functional form of these indicators, however find no additional meaningful correlations.¹⁷ I² values exceed 90% in all cases, pointing to substantial heterogeneity and variability between studies and suggesting that covariates do not sufficiently explain this variation.

¹⁶ We ran sensitivity analyses with an alternative to our pre-specified model—to assess the robustness of results. Instead of the RVE model, we estimated a multi-level model with standard errors clustered at the study level (based on the R package "metafor"). The pooled effect sizes are very consistent across our main findings, with only slight changes in magnitude of effects, largely showing the RVE model is slightly more conservative as compared to the multi-level model. The meta-regression results (Table 2) show some slight differences in significance of correlates, however are also largely consistent. Focusing on the extended control model, the weakly significant and negative coefficient on South Asia, CCTs, economic plus components and labor force participation become insignificant, while coefficients for 'other' plus components and care work participation which were previously insignificant, become positive and significant. The latter results reinforce the few consistent design and contextual factors that seem to matter for overall impacts.

¹⁷ For example, we use continuous variables, as well as additional splines to test woman's age, duration of the intervention, and post-intervention time period. We use logged and USD values for the value of the economic benefit, controlling additionally for whether the benefit value was reported in purchasing power parity (PPP). In addition, we try disaggregated sub-categories of fragility (conflict, COVID-19, natural disaster, post-conflict) and aggregated indicators for plus components. Finally, we ran the analysis by SSN type controlling for if the intervention was categorized as a graduation program, in order to see if this particular program typology was driving results. In both cases for UCTs and asset interventions, the intercept remains positive and significant while controlling for an indicator of graduation programming.

TABLE 2. RVE Meta-regression results across all outcomes by publication, implementation and effect characteristics

	Basic Controls			Extended Controls		
	Coef	SE	1 ²	Coef	SE	1 ²
Panel A: Study-level						
Region (omitted = sub-Saharan Africa)						
South Asia	0.050	(0.03)	91.86%	0.063+	(0.03)	92.06%
Latin America & the Caribbean	-0.045	(0.03)	u	-0.027	(0.05)	"
Middle East & North Africa	-0.019	(0.05)	u	0.005	(0.05)	u
East Asia & Pacific	-0.062	(0.04)	u	-0.042	(0.05)	u
Europe & Central Asia	0.512***	(0.03)	u	0.516***	(0.05)	u
Income group (omitted = lower-middle)						
Low-income	0.029	(0.03)	91.72%	0.041	(0.04)	u
Upper-middle income	-0.012	(0.03)	u	0.008	(0.04)	u
Fragile setting	-0.027	(0.04)	91.95%	-0.036	(0.05)	u
Urban setting	-0.025	(0.03)	91.95%	-0.007	(0.03)	u
Panel B: Intervention arm-level						
Intervention type (omitted = UCT)						
ССТ	-0.078*	(0.03)	91.77%	-0.099**	(0.03)	92.61%
Food, voucher or in-kind	-0.047	(0.03)	u	-0.043	(0.06)	u
Asset transfer	0.019	(0.03)	u	0.006	(0.04)	u
Public works	0.014	(0.06)	u	0.052	(0.06)	u
Social care services	-0.018	(0.03)	u	0.010	(0.05)	u
Implementer (omitted = NGO, UN or othe	er)					
Government	-0.001	(0.03)	91.95%	-0.009	(0.04)	u
Researchers	-0.011	(0.04)	u	-0.052	(0.05)	u
Scale of implementation (omitted = mid-	level)					
Pilot	-0.052	(0.03)	91.79%	-0.078*	(0.04)	u
At scale	-0.012	(0.03)	u	-0.022	(0.03)	u
Value of economic benefit (omitted = first	t tercile)					
Second tercile	-0.030	(0.03)	91.94%	-0.039	(0.03)	u
Third tercile	-0.009	(0.03)	u	-0.021	(0.04)	u
Targeting approach						
Poverty targeted	-0.012	(0.03)	92.00%	0.018	(0.04)	u
Gender targeted	0.004	(0.03)	u	-0.001	(0.04)	u
Plus components (omitted = no Plus)						
Gender-neutral	-0.007	(0.06)	u	0.010	(0.06)	u
Gender-sensitive	0.012	(0.05)	u	0.047	(0.06)	u
Economic	0.077+	(0.04)	u	0.089+	(0.05)	u
Health	0.018	(0.05)	u	0.006	(0.06)	u
Training	-0.003	(0.04)	u	-0.009	(0.04)	u
Other	0.008	(0.04)	u	-0.024	(0.05)	u
Female sample age (omitted = ≤24 years	;)					
Age: 25-39 years	-0.019	(0.03)	92.01%	-0.056	(0.04)	u
Age: 40+ years	0.019	(0.05)	u	0.010	(0.06)	u

	Bas	ic Contro	ols	Extended Contro		
	Coef	SE	1 2	Coef	SE	 ²
Panel C: Effect-level						
Outcome category (omitted = productiv	e work intens	sity)				
Labor force participation	0.059*	(0.02)	91.14%	0.052*	(0.02)	91.25%
Care work participation	0.234	(0.16)	u	0.230	(0.16)	u
Care work intensity	-0.032	(0.03)	u	-0.038	(0.03)	u
Savings	0.171**	(0.04)	u	0.159**	(0.04)	u
Debt or loans	0.056	(0.09)	u	0.068	(0.10)	u
Assets	0.161**	(0.04)	u	0.167**	(0.04)	u
Expenditure	0.128+	(0.06)	u	0.125+	(0.06)	u
Decision making	0.059⁺	(0.03)	u	0.048	(0.03)	u
Autonomy & self-efficacy	0.037	(0.04)	u	0.029	(0.04)	u
Voice	0.137*	(0.04)	u	0.142*	(0.04)	u
Duration of the intervention (omitted = <12 months)						
12+ months	0.040	(0.03)	91.93%	0.032	(0.03)	u
Time post intervention at survey (omitte	d = <12 mont	hs)				
Over 12+ months	-0.044+	(0.02)	91.91%	-0.027	(0.02)	u

Notes: CCT = conditional cash transfer; SE = standard error; UCT = unconditional cash transfer; 'p<0.10, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001. All estimates are from regressions with n = 1,067 effects and 85 studies; I² estimates are entered once per model and apply to the remaining estimates in each category; Basic control estimates are separate regressions run by background characteristic, controlling for publication type, year of publication splines, indicator for low or medium quality assurance and if the publication was an individual RCT (instead of cluster). Extended control estimates additionally control for all other covariates at the same level (study, intervention or effect).

3.5 Cost-benefit results

A total of 24 papers (or 23%) representing 22 studies (or 26%) reported on some measure of costbenefit within studies (Table A10).¹⁸ Due to the low percentage of studies reporting these measures, as well as the diversity of measures reported, we summarize these in narrative form. The most common measure reported was BCR (18 studies), followed by IRR (12 studies), cost-effectiveness (5 studies), net present value (4 studies) and economic multipliers (2 studies). Table A10 presents these studies sorted by size of BCR (the most commonly reported measure), followed by remaining measures. Studies reporting cost-benefit results are overwhelmingly UCTs or asset transfers (or a combination of the two), while the remaining are CCTs (two studies), public works (one study) or social care services (1 study). Overall, BCRs (or range of estimates) are positive and include within bounds a number greater than one in all but one study—ranging from a high of 16.9 for a UCT in Tunisia (Gazeaud et al., 2022) to –1.98 for a combined asset and in-kind transfer in Honduras (Banerjee et al., 2015). Studies use a variety of methods and assumptions in calculations; however,

¹⁸ The two studies which include multiple papers reporting cost-benefit analysis over different time periods (initial and longer-term follow-ups) are from Ghana (Banerjee et al., 2015, 2022) and Afghanistan (Bedoya et al., 2019, 2023). These studies both report BCRs in both study periods, with slightly decreasing measures (from 1.33 to a high of 1.22 in Ghana and from 2.3 to 1.1 in Afghanistan). This is likely due to updated assumptions regarding dissipation rates over time.

only two (in Egypt and Nicaragua) take into account women's labor force participation or earnings in the benefit calculations, while most base calculations exclusively on household consumption and asset accumulation. As interventions typically deliver a wide range of additional benefits, including women's economic activity, which contributes directly to households' ability to increase wellbeing and insure against shocks, this indicates BCR summarized here are likely lower bounds. Ten studies report exclusively positive IRR estimates, ranging from a high of 73% in a UCT in Niger (Bossuroy et al., 2022), to a low of 6% in an asset transfer and UCT intervention in Ghana (Banerjee et al., 2015). The two remaining studies report IRR lower bounds that include negative values, however these occur under assumptions that impacts would dissipate immediately or after two years (Bossuroy et al., 2022; Botea et al., 2023). The IRRs for most reported interventions indicate most interventions would pay for themselves (break even points) after a nominal number of years. Five studies reported cost-effectiveness measures, typically comparing different study treatment arms. For example, a UCT versus micro-franchising experiment in urban Kenya targeting young women reported UCT arms were generally more cost effective (Brudevold-Newman et al., 2017). However, in two other UCT experiments, the cost-effectiveness of a psychological plus component alone (Orkin et al., 2023), or a 'full package' arm including numerous plus components was found to be 1.6 to 1.7 times higher than the UCT alone (Bossuroy et al., 2022). Finally, economic multipliers in two different UCTs in Zambia were found to be 1.6 to 1.7, indicating households spent or saved 60 to 70% more than they received via transfers (Handa, Natali et al., 2018). Despite these promising results, as previously mentioned, few studies explicitly included gender-specific benefits in their measures (five studies included at least one woman's outcome in calculations and three focused on women's outcomes). This indicates the benefits to women aggregated in this review, and gender equality considerations more generally, are largely absent from cost-benefit calculations.

4. Discussion and policy implications

We investigate the extent to which SSNs improve women's economic achievements and agency, aggregating results from 1,067 effect sizes from 106 papers, representing 85 studies and 202,974 women. These interventions largely take place in rural settings, target populations in poverty or ultra-poverty and include gender-targeting as part of their design. Our first research objective was to demonstrate overall effects across studies. We show robust highly significant pooled effects across outcomes (hedges' g = 0.103, p<0.001), with similar magnitude of effects for economic achievement and agency outcomes. These effect sizes are similar to those found on aggregate in previous meta-analyses of vocational training on women's employment and earnings (50 studies, pooled effect size: 0.109; Stöterau et al., 2022), however smaller than those found for economic self-help groups (7 studies, pooled effect size: 0.18; Brody et al., 2015), and larger than those found for microcredit and savings interventions (17 [12] studies, pooled effect sizes: 0.027 economic empowerment [0.019 agency]; Duvendack et al., 2023). They are also similar to effect sizes found for the impact of cash transfers on subjective wellbeing and mental health (45 studies, pooled effect size: 0.13; McGuire

et al., 2022) or for economic empowerment interventions on intimate partner violence (16 studies, pooled effect size: 0.09; Eggers del Campo & Steinert, 2022). Our analysis reflects a substantial increase in the evidence-base from pervious reviews aggregating gender outcomes and reinforce for policymakers that SSNs benefit women, increasing their agency and economic standing.

When examining effects by outcome category, we see strong support for SSNs boosting and benefiting women's productive work and labor force participation, savings, assets and expenditures. These favorable impacts align with previous reviews and analyses of cash transfers in LMICsshowing little evidence of adverse 'dependency' effects, whereby participants may seek to reduce work effort due to hand outs (Banerjee et al., 2017; Handa, Daidone et al., 2018). In addition, we show no evidence of increased care work intensity and of increased debt or loans (both with null effects). While the former is unambiguously an adverse outcome for women, the latter may depend on context. For example, while it may be beneficial for women to access and take out loans to finance investment, it is also possible that conditions of predatory loans will causes stress, increasing indebtedness and adverse coping behaviors for women and households. While it would be more encouraging to see reductions in care work intensity, signaling a possible shift in norms around men's involvement in domestic work or childcare—the number of studies which measure care work on the intensive margin is still relatively low (12 studies)—indicating more evidence is needed. We also see strong evidence for positive impacts on voice, autonomy and self-efficacy and decisionmaking—yet lack sample sizes to be able to estimate effects on aspirations and goals, or leadership. Decision-making indicators make up a relatively smaller proportion of all agency indicators (54%) as compared to previous reviews, nonetheless suffer from measurement limitations, including lack of specificity, ambiguity regarding jointness in decisions and variability across indicator construction, among others (Ambler et al., 2021; Peterman et al., 2021; Seymour & Peterman, 2018). There are also few estimates for combined (aggregate) measures of agency and majority, signaling the relatively weak measurement of agency within experimental studies of SSNs.

Our second research objective was to examine variation in impacts by SSN type, as well as by design and contextual factors. We show heterogeneity in pooled effects by SSN modality, with the most striking differences emerging for CCTs and food, voucher or in-kind transfers—for which pooled effects are smaller in magnitude and largely insignificant. The differences for CCTs carry through to the meta-regression, including in models which control for other intervention-level factors which might explain this difference (i.e., value of benefits, gender targeting, scale of intervention). It is still possible that CCTs on average have fewer objectives and implement fewer complementary or operational components that are gender-informed more generally that are not explicitly captured, thus leading to lack of impacts by virtue of unexplored factors. However, a competing hypothesis is that CCTs (like in-kind transfers) restrict household and individual women's choices regarding use of benefits, thus giving her less autonomy over spending—including on her own priorities. In addition, due to conditionalities, there may be some disempowering aspects of programs,

leading to reinforcement of gender roles and excess time burden on women (Cookson, 2018; Molyneux, 2006).¹⁹ For example, if women are responsible for attending regular required trainings or ensuring children attend health care visits, this may both reduce her time to engage in productive work (particularly if meetings are far away or at inconvenient times), as well as reinforce her role as a primary caretaker of children. For these reasons, there have been increasing calls to drop conditionalities, in order to ensure the most marginalized women can maintain eligibility and to avoid overburdening them with program compliance requirements (Gavrilovic et al., 2022). Our evidence supports these recommendations. Among the remaining SSN typologies with significant pooled effects, effects on asset transfers and UCTs are consistently the largest and strongest, however it is also promising to see impacts on public works programs and social care services (the latter two driven by economic achievement outcomes). Impacts on social care services corroborate findings from a recent review on impacts of childcare services in LMICs on women's employment, which finds all but one of 22 studies showed positive impacts on either the intensive or extensive margin (Halim et al., 2023). We also find suggestive evidence that pilot interventions are correlated with lower impacts and that interventions with economic plus components are correlated with higher impacts, however find few other notable robust variations by program design or context.

A key limitation of the current analysis is this lack of concrete program design and contextual factors which appear to meaningfully predict effectiveness. Thus, we are unable to provide more specific recommendations regarding how interventions may work (or not) for women: for example, if they are designed to target her specifically, more specific information on complementary components, how long they last or how large of an economic benefit they transfer. This is in part due to power issues in the meta-regression, as well as generalized high heterogeneity of included studies. High heterogeneity is likely in part due to the lack of standardization of indicators used to measure each outcome domain-unlike a single health or disease-related outcome, there is no standardized way of reporting on many indicator domains included in this review. A related issue is that, although we find little evidence of publication bias, we are not able to fully investigate researchers' decisions to measure women's outcomes or analyze outcomes disaggregated by gender in the first place. It could be, for example, that the studies that produce impacts on women, are those most likely to have objectives related to and design considerations appropriate for benefiting women. It this is the case, we may be both underestimating the importance of design factors-for example the contribution of gender-informed design, as well as overestimating the potential for gender equality impacts when considering the full scope of programming currently being implemented. While the magnitude of this issue is unclear, a scoping of 1,052 pandemic-response projects implemented by four multilateral development banks found that among those with results frameworks, approximately 66% included gender indicators, yet only 7% included gender equality as a core project objective

¹⁹ Unfortunately, we do not have enough power to test impacts on unpaid care for CCTs alone, however it is reassuring to see no overall adverse effects on these outcomes from SSNs in general.

(Bourgault et al., 2023).²⁰ While results frameworks do not necessarily align with impact evaluation outcome indicators, these figures suggest that researchers and program implementers are interested in tracking and reporting on gender indicators in development projects, even when gender is not a core objective.

Our final research objectives were to assess the cost-benefit evidence associated with included studies and assess key research gaps to strengthen understanding of SSN impacts on women's economic achievements and agency. A minority of studies included costing estimates, and among those that did, few considered women's impacts as part of benefit calculations-instead relying on household-level impacts. Thus, while our summary confirms that interventions largely appear to be smart investments, additional shifts are needed for cost-benefit analysis to incorporate a gender lens. We also document clear research gaps in the geographic distribution of SSN evidence, with additional studies needed in East Asia and the Pacific, and the Middle East and North Africa regions-both regions with diverse contextual factors that might drive women's outcomes examined here. Likewise, few studies take places in fragile settings, or measure outcomes among youth or elderly women. More evidence is needed on certain types of SSNs, paired with outcome domainsfor example, public works and social care evaluations rarely measure agency outcomes—and few studies overall measure intensity or participation in care work, leadership, or aspirations and goals. Finally, mixed-method and qualitative work would provide a better understanding of mechanisms of impacts, how these are triggered by diverse program design and implementation, as well as how contextual factors interact with change pathways to create (or reduce) impact synergies.

A few broader limitations of this review are worth mentioning. A limitation on the scope of evidence is that only experimental evaluations are included, thus leaving out evidence from quasi-experimental evaluations. We made this decision as we understood the depth of the qualifying literature to be sufficient to select studies with highest internal validity to allow aggregation of common effects. Further, despite including searches in French and Spanish, we did not identify any qualifying paper, thus our review is only representative of the literature published in English. An additional limitation is the lack of sufficient estimates for some SSNs and outcomes to be able to generate pooled effect sizes or to run meta-regressions for by type of SSNs. Finally, we originally aimed to provide estimates of spillover effects, or impacts on non-participant women within the same clusters, including spillovers on economic achievements and agency. Unfortunately, an insufficient number of studies reported on spillovers, thus we were unable to provide these estimates. Nonetheless, recent studies suggest some positive impacts on non-treated women, thus future work may be able to more confidently aggregate this evidence (Leight & Mvukiyehe, 2023; Papineni et al., 2023).

²⁰ These same figures for social protection projects specifically are 75% with gender indicators in results frameworks and 21% with gender specific objectives (among 117 projects). The development banks surveyed include the World Bank, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.

We contend there is strong evidence that SSNs improve women's economic achievements and agency in LMICs-a conclusion which holds for most intervention types. There is significant momentum at the global and international level to invest in systems and programs which ensure women benefit equally and to ensure gender gaps do not widen (Aliga et al., 2023; Cookson et al., 2023; Gavrilovic et al., 2022). Nonetheless, at the national-level, implementation of gender-sensitive designs remains a challenge. Our results indicate SSNs have the greatest potential to benefit women if they are designed using unconditional modalities with cash, asset or care-based benefits, with some suggestion that complementary programming can boost impacts. In addition, we encourage policymakers and practitioners to adopt practical recommendations, including eliminating barriers that may limit women's access to SSNs, extending coverage to previously excluded groups, investing in linkages with complementary services and prioritizing women's leadership and political voice in decision-making structures (Gavrilovic et al., 2022). We encourage researchers to continue to close evidence gaps, with respect to understudied geographies, SSN typologies and outcomes. Future research should rigorously test design and operational components, unpack the role of contextual factors, including gender norms in delivering benefits for women and expand cost-benefit analysis to incorporate a gender lens.

References

- Aliga, A., Delbiso, T. D., Kitsao-Wekulo, P., Lambon-Quayefio, M., Moussié, R., Peterman, A., & Tilahun, N.
 (2023). Smart investment in global childcare requires local solutions and a coordinated research agenda. *BMJ Global Health*, 8(9), e012827. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2023-012827
- Ambler, K., Doss, C., Kieran, C., & Passarelli, S. (2021). He Says, She Says: Spousal Disagreement in Survey Measures of Bargaining Power. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 69(2), 765–788. https://doi.org/10.1086/703082
- Aromataris, E., & Munn, Z. (2020). *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. Joanna Briggs Institute. https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-01
- Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., Goldberg, N., Karlan, D., Osei, R., Parienté, W., Shapiro, J., Thuysbaert, B.,
 & Udry, C. (2015). A multifaceted program causes lasting progress for the very poor: Evidence from six countries. *Science*, 348(6236), 1260799. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1260799
- Banerjee, A., Hanna, R., Kreindler, G. E., & Olken, B. A. (2017). Debunking the Stereotype of the Lazy
 Welfare Recipient: Evidence from Cash Transfer Programs. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 32(2), 155–184. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkx002
- Banerjee, A., Karlan, D., Osei, R., Trachtman, H., & Udry, C. (2022). Unpacking a multi-faceted program to build sustainable income for the very poor. *Journal of Development Economics*, 155, 102781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2021.102781
- Bastagli, F., Hagen-Zanker, J., Harman, L., Barca, V., Sturge, G., & Schmidt, T. (2019). The Impact of Cash Transfers: A Review of the Evidence from Low- and Middle-income Countries. *Journal of Social Policy*, 48(3), 569–594. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279418000715
- Bedoya, G., Belyakova, Y., Coville, A., Escande, T., Isaqzadeh, M., & Ndiaye, A. (2023). The Enduring Impacts of a Big Push during Multiple Crises: Experimental Evidence from Afghanistan. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-10596
- Bedoya, G., Coville, A., Haushofer, J., Isaqzadeh, M., & Shapiro, J. P. (2019). *No Household Left Behind: Afghanistan Targeting the Ultra Poor Impact Evaluation*. https://doi.org/10.3386/w25981
- Bernard, T., Doss, C., Hidrobo, M., Hoel, J., & Kieran, C. (2020). Ask me why: Patterns of intrahousehold decision-making. *World Development*, *125*, 104671. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104671
- Bonilla, J., Zarzur, R. C., Handa, S., Nowlin, C., Peterman, A., Ring, H., & Seidenfeld, D. (2017). Cash for Women's Empowerment? A Mixed-Methods Evaluation of the Government of Zambia's Child Grant Program. World Development, 95, 55–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.02.017
- Bossuroy, T., Goldstein, M., Karimou, B., Karlan, D., Kazianga, H., Parienté, W., Premand, P., Thomas, C. C., Udry, C., Vaillant, J., & Wright, K. A. (2022). Tackling psychosocial and capital constraints to alleviate poverty. *Nature*, *605*, 291–297. https://doi.org/10.1038/ s41586-022-04647-8

- Botea, I., Brudevold-Newman, A., Goldstein, M., Low, C., & Roberts, G. (2023). *Supporting Women's Livelihoods at Scale: Evidence from a Nationwide Multi-Faceted Program* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 4560552). https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=4560552
- Bourgault, S., O'Donnell, M., & Griffin, M. (2023). *Gender Integration in Multilateral Development Banks' COVID-19 Response Efforts* (Policy Papers). Center for Global Development. https://www.cgdev.org/ publication/gender-integration-multilateral-development-banks-covid-19-response-efforts
- Brody, C., de Hoop, T., Vojtkova, M., Warnock, R., Dunbar, M., Murthy, P., & Dworkin, S. L. (2015).
 Economic Self-Help Group Programs for Improving Women's Empowerment: A Systematic Review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, *11*(1), 1–182. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2015.19
- Brudevold-Newman, A., Honorati, M., Jakiela, P., & Ozier, O. (2017). A firm of one's own: Experimental evidence on credit constraints and occupational choice. World Bank Publications. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdet ail/428361487270218330/A-firm-of-ones-own-experimental-evidence-on-credit-constraintsand-occupational-choice
- Buvinić, M., & Furst-Nichols, R. (2016). Promoting Women's Economic Empowerment: What Works? *The World Bank Research Observer*, *31*(1), 59–101. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lku013
- Buvinić, M., & O'Donnell, M. (2019). Gender Matters in Economic Empowerment Interventions: A Research Review. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 34(2), 309–346. https://doi.org/10.1093/ wbro/lky004
- Buvinić, M., O'Donnell, M., Knowles, J. C., & Bourgault, S. (2020). Measuring Women's Economic Empowerment: A Compendium of Selected Tools. https://www.cgdev.org/publication/measuringwomens-economic-empowerment-compendium-selected-tools
- Chang, W., Diaz-Martin, L., Gopalan, A., Guarnieri, E., Jayachandran, S., & Walsh, C. (2020). What works to enhance women's agency: Cross-cutting lessons from experimental and quasi-experimental studies (JPAL Working Paper). https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/researchpaper/gender_womens-agency-review_2020-march-05.pdf

Cookson, T. P. (2018). Unjust Conditions: Women's Work and the Hidden Cost of Cash Transfer Programs.

- Cookson, T. P., Ebner, N., Amron, Y., & Kukreja, K. (2023). Social protection systems and gender: A review of the evidence. *Global Social Policy*, 14680181231180507. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 14680181231180507
- Duvendack, M., Leon, M. D. A., & Filopoulos, J. (2023). The impact of credit and savings interventions on women's economic empowerment and agency: A systematic review and meta-analysis (Working Paper).
- Eggers del Campo, I., & Steinert, J. I. (2022). The Effect of Female Economic Empowerment Interventions on the Risk of Intimate Partner Violence: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 23*(3), 810–826. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838020976088

- Furuya-Kanamori, L., Barendregt, J. J., & Doi, S. A. R. (2018). A new improved graphical and quantitative method for detecting bias in meta-analysis. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare*, 16(4), 195–203. https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.00000000000141
- Gavrilovic, M., Rubio, M., Bastagli, F., Hinton, R., Staab, S., Goulder, R. G., Bilo, C., Khan, R.,
 Peterman, A., Diallo, B., Alfers, L., Santiago, A., Rizvi, Z., Holmes, R., Mejia, J. G. J., & Tabbush, C.
 (2022). Gender-responsive social protection post-COVID-19. *Science*, 375(6585), 1111–1113. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abm5922
- Gazeaud, J., Khan, N., Mvukiyehe, E., & Sterck, O. (2022). With or without him? Experimental Evidence on Gender-Sensitive Cash Grants and Trainings in Tunisia. *Policy Research Working Papers*. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-10132
- Halim, D., Perova, E., & Reynolds, S. (2023). Childcare and Mothers' Labor Market Outcomes in Lower- and Middle-Income Countries. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 38(1), 73–114. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkac003
- Handa, S., Daidone, S., Peterman, A., Davis, B., Pereira, A., Palermo, T., & Yablonski, J. (2018). Myth-Busting? Confronting Six Common Perceptions about Unconditional Cash Transfers as a Poverty Reduction Strategy in Africa. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 33(2), 259–298. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lky003
- Handa, S., Natali, L., Seidenfeld, D., Tembo, G., & Davis, B. (2018). Can unconditional cash transfers raise long-term living standards? Evidence from Zambia. *Journal of Development Economics*, 133, 42–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2018.01.008
- Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T. A., & Ebert, D. D. (2022). Chapter 9: Publication Bias: Vol. Doing Meta-Analysis with R: A Hands-On Guide. Chapman & Hall. https://bookdown.org/MathiasHarrer/ Doing_Meta_Analysis_in_R/pub-bias.html
- Hedges, L. V., Tipton, E., & Johnson, M. C. (2010). Robust variance estimation in meta-regression with dependent effect size estimates. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 1(1), 39–65. https://doi.org/10.1002/ jrsm.5
- Hidrobo, M., Hoddinott, J., Kumar, N., & Olivier, M. (2018). Social Protection, Food Security, and Asset Formation. *World Development*, *101*, 88–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.08.014
- Islam, M. A., Alam, S. S., Kundu, S., Hossan, T., Kamal, M. A., & Cavestro, C. (2020). Prevalence of Headache in Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of 14,275 Patients. Frontiers in Neurology, 11. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/ 10.3389/fneur.2020.562634
- Laszlo, S. (2019). The Gender Transformative Potential of Graduation Programs.
- Leight, J., & Mvukiyehe, E. (2023). Short-term and long-term effects of cash for work: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial in Tunisia. Intl Food Policy Res Inst.

Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). Practical meta-analysis (pp. ix, 247). Sage Publications, Inc.

- Lwamba, E., Shisler, S., Ridlehoover, W., Kupfer, M., Tshabalala, N., Nduku, P., Langer, L., Grant, S., Sonnenfeld, A., Anda, D., Eyers, J., & Snilstveit, B. (2022). Strengthening women's empowerment and gender equality in fragile contexts towards peaceful and inclusive societies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 18(1), e1214. https://doi.org/10.1002/ cl2.1214
- McGuire, J., Kaiser, C., & Bach-Mortensen, A. M. (2022). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the impact of cash transfers on subjective well-being and mental health in low- and middle-income countries. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 6(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01252-z
- Molyneux, M. (2006). Mothers at the Service of the New Poverty Agenda: Progresa/Oportunidades, Mexico's Conditional Transfer Programme. *Social Policy & Administration*, 40(4), 425–449. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2006.00497.x
- Orkin, K., Garlick, R., Mahmud, M., Sedlmayr, R., Haushofer, J., & Dercon, S. (2023). Aspiring to a Better Future: How a Simple Psychological Intervention Increases Investment. https://www.dropbox. com/s/u17dl4dbpx5bp4p/Aspiring_to_a_better_future_rev.pdf?dl=0
- Papineni, S., Gonzalez, P., Goldstein, M., & Friedman, J. (2023). Cash Is Queen: Local Economy Growth Effects of Cash Transfers to Women in West Africa.
- Perera, C., Bakrania, S., Ipince, A., Nesbitt-Ahmed, Z., Obasola, O., Richardson, D., Van de Scheur, J.,
 & Yu, R. (2022). Impact of social protection on gender equality in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review of reviews. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 18(2), e1240. https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1240
- Peterman, A., Kumar, N., Pereria, A., & Gilligan, D. (2020). *Towards gender equality: A review of evidence on social safety nets in Africa*. Intl Food Policy Res Inst.
- Peterman, A., Schwab, B., Roy, S., Hidrobo, M., & Gilligan, D. O. (2021). Measuring women's decisionmaking: Indicator choice and survey design experiments from cash and food transfer evaluations in Ecuador, Uganda and Yemen. World Development, 141, 105387. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105387
- Seymour, G., & Peterman, A. (2018). Context and measurement: An analysis of the relationship between intrahousehold decision making and autonomy. World Development, 111, 97–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.06.027
- Shamim, M. A., Dwivedi, P., & Padhi, B. K. (2023). Beyond the funnel plot: The advantages of Doi plots and prediction intervals in meta-analyses. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, *84*, 103550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2023.103550
- Stöterau, J., Kemper, J., & Ghisletta, A. (2022). The Impact of Vocational Training Interventions on Youth Labor Market Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis. *SSRN* Working paper series. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4217580

- Tipton, E. (2013). Robust variance estimation in meta-regression with binary dependent effects. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 4(2), 169–187. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1070
- Tipton, E. (2015). Small sample adjustments for robust variance estimation with meta-regression. *Psychological Methods*, *20*(3), 375–393. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000011
- UN Women. (2019). Social Protection Systems, Access to Public Services and Sustainable Infrastructure for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls; 2019 Commission on the Status of Women, Agreed Conclusions. https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/Headquarters/ Attachments/Sections/CSW/63/Conclusions63-EN-Letter-Final.pdf
- UNICEF Office of Research-Innocenti. (2020). *Gender-Responsive Age-Sensitive Social Protection: A conceptual framework*. https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/1116-gender-responsive-age-sensitive-social-protection-a-conceptual-framework.html
- Vaessen, J., Rivas, A., Duvendack, M., Jones, R. P., Leeuw, F., van Gils, G., Lukach, R., Holvoet, N., Bastiaensen, J., Hombrados, J. G., & Waddington, H. (2014). The Effects of Microcredit on Women's Control over Household Spending in Developing Countries: A Systematic Review and Metaanalysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 10(1), 1–205. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2014.8
- van Eerdewijk, A., Wong, F., Newton, J., & Vaast, C. (2017). A Conceptual Model of Women and Girls' Empowerment. https://www.kit.nl/project/empowerment-of-women-and-girls-conceptualmodel-and-measurement-guidance/
- World Bank. (2018). The State of Social Safety Nets 2018. Washington, DC: World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1254-5

Appendix A. Supplementary information and analysis

FIGURE A1. Conceptual framework linking social safety nets to women's agency and economic achievements



FIGURE A2. Number of publications over time











Notes: Violin boxplots of effect size by SSN intervention type. The width of each plot is proportional to the number of observed studies with a given Hedges' g magnitude. Each box represents the interquartile ranges, split by the median. Any estimate beyond 1.5 times the interquartile range is plotted separately outside the box.

TABLE A1. Summary of related meta-ana	yses on women's economic achievement	and agency outcomes (2013–2023)
---------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------

Study	Setting	Intervention(s)	Outcome(s)	Studies	Effects	Pooled Effect Size
Brody et al. (2015)ª	LMICs	Economic self-help groups	Empowerment	7	NR	0.18** [0.5, 0.31]
Duvendack et al. (2023)	LMICs	Microcredit and savings	Economic empowerment	17	173	0.027** [0.003, 0.051]
			Agency	12	49	0.019* [-0.003, 0.040]
Lwamba et al. (2022)	Fragile contexts	Asset transfers	Access to and ownership of assets, credit and incomes	11	NR	0.34*** [0.22, 0.46]
			Decent work	5	NR	0.10 [-0.00, 0.20]
			Decision-making	5	NR	0.07* [0.04, 0.11]
		Cash transfers Self-help groups	Access to and ownership of assets, credit and incomes	12	NR	0.22* [0.12, 0.31]
			Decent work	6	NR	0.18 [-0.01, 0.36]
			Decision-making	6	NR	0.03 [-0.31, 0.09]
			Access to and ownership of assets, credit and incomes	7	NR	0.31** [0.03, 0.60]
			Freedom of movement and association	7	NR	0.18 [0.05, 0.31]
			Decision-making	6	NR	0.04 [-0.04. 0.12]
			Community participation	5	NR	0.07 [-0.01, 0.16]
Stöterau et al. (2022)	LMICs	Vocational training	Employment and earnings	50	465	0.109** [0.042, 0.177]
Vaessen et al. (2014) ^b	LMICs	Microcredit	Control over household spending	14	NR	0.069 [0.003, 0.141]

Notes: Pooled effects are included for the figure which represents the greatest number of studies within each review; pooled effects are only if studies meta-analyze five or more studies; LMICs = lowand middle-income countries, NR = not reported. ^apooled effects are reported from experimental and quasi-experimental medium risk of bias, as these represent the effects for the largest pool of studies; ^bpooled effects are for quasi-experimental studies, as experimental studies are pooled from only four studies (effects are not significant); pooled effects for quasi-experimental studies without removing outliers (3 studies) results in positive effects: 0.129** [0.035, 0.222].

Domain	Inclusion Critoria	Exclusion Criteria
Domain Intervention	 Inclusion Criteria Social safety nets, or social assistance interventions, broadly aligned with the World Bank's Atlas of Social Protection Indicators of Resilience and Equity (ASPIRE) categorization for non-contributory programming as follows: Unconditional cash transfers (e.g., poverty-targeted cash transfers, family allowances, emergency cash support, non-contributory old-age social pensions, disability benefits) Conditional cash transfers (e.g., cash transfers including co-responsibilities or behavioral requirements which are monitored and enforced) Food, vouchers or consumable in-kind transfers (e.g., food stamps, take-home food rations, emergency food support, school feeding, in-kind supplies) Productive asset transfers (e.g., livestock, business equipment, materials or lumpy asset transfers, including graduation programs) Public works (e.g., cash-for-work, food-for-work, wage or job subsidies or direct job creation activities) Fee waivers and targeted subsides (e.g., health insurance exemptions, education waivers or scholarships, housing subsidies or allowances, utility or agricultural input subsides, transportation benefits) Social care services (e.g., childcare benefits, including childcare or daycare provision, subsidies etc., home-based care, family support services, child protection services) 	 Exclusion Criteria Evaluations of social protection or job market interventions beyond social safety nets, including micro-finance interventions, savings interventions, mentoring or skills training interventions Evaluations which evaluate a 'plus' component only, layered over a social safety net Evaluations which compare two equally valued social safety nets (e.g., cash vs. food transfers with no control group or cash transfers to men vs. women with no control group) Evaluations which compare a dosage effect of the same social safety net intervention without a clear exposure period for different groups
	with additional 'plus programming' of various forms (e.g., livelihood or nutrition trainings, parenting programs)	
Setting	Low- and middle-income countries	High-income countries
Population	Impacts reported for adult women (18 years or older), or mixed female ages which have an overall mean sample age of 18 or over, regardless of who reports on outcomes	Impacts reported exclusively for men, in populations younger than 18 years, in a mixed sample of men and women without disaggregation, or where the overall mean sample age is younger than 18 years
Outcomes	Economic achievement : Following the categories and terminology in the CGD measuring women's economic empowerment compendium:	 Measures labeled as economic achievement or agency which are unclear in terms of definition
	 Labor force participation (extensive margin, e.g., any formal or informal employment or work-for-pay, any own farm or self-employment non-farm work, any business operation) Productive work intensity or quality of work (intensive margin, e.g., number of hours worked, wage, profits, revenue, earnings and income, or quality of work, such as "receives benefits" or "flexible work hours" or "daytime shifts") Unpaid care work (extensive margin, e.g., use/uptake of formal or informal childcare arrangements or other care services or any unpaid care) 	 Measures of economic achievement or agency which are hypothetical or expected, rather than realized (e.g. expected wage, reservation wage or decision-making outcome respondent would accept)

TABLE A2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Domain	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
	• Unpaid care work intensity or quality of work (e.g., number of hours worked in care or domestic tasks, quality of activities)	 Aggregate indices which are composed of majority indicators
	 Savings (e.g., any or amount saved, use of financial services for savings) 	outside economic achievement or agency domains
	 Debt or loans (any or amount outstanding owed, use of financial services for credit, loans) 	
	 Assets (e.g., durable or productive asset ownership including livestock, business assets, information technology) 	
	 Expenditure (e.g., personal expenditure on durable goods or investment in productive activities) 	
	Agency : Following the conceptualization by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's Conceptual Model of Empowerment focused on "choice" "voice" and "leadership":	
	 Decision making (e.g., household and individual sole or joint decision-making and bargaining power) 	
	 Autonomy and self-efficacy (e.g., agency, self-efficacy, power, control, mobility, independence, self-worth and value, confidence) 	
	 Aspirations and goals (e.g. stated aspirations related to economic or agency outcomes) 	
	 Voice (e.g. collective agency, voting, membership and participation in groups) 	
	 Leadership (e.g. leadership positions, participation in local governance) 	
	Aggregates in either economic or agency domain that include multiple measures	
Methodology	Quantitative evaluations using experimental designs: individual or cluster-randomized control trials reporting intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates	 Evaluations reporting only treatment-on-the-treated (TOT) or per-protocol analyses
		 Quantitative evaluations using quasi- experimental or non-experimental methods
		Qualitative evaluations
Time frame	Studies published from 2003 to 2023	Studies published before 2003
Type of publication	Journal article, working or discussion paper, pre-print, technical report	Policy brief, presentation or other outputs with insufficient information to determine eligibility criteria and methodological details
Language	Studies in English, French or Spanish	Studies in all other languages

TABLE A3. Revised Joanna Briggs Institute quality assessment for experimental studies

ltem	Description	Question	Responses
1	Randomization	Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?	Yes, No, Unclear
2	Baseline balance	Were treatment and control groups similar at baseline?	Yes, No, Unclear, NA
3	Participants blinded at baseline	Were participants blind to treatment assignment at baseline?	Yes, No, Unclear, NA
4	Data collectors blinded at baseline	Were outcome assessors blind to treatment assignment at baseline?	Yes, No, Unclear, NA
5	Groups treated identically	Were treatment (and control) groups treated identically over time—except for the intervention of interest?	Yes, No, Unclear
6	Attrition	Was follow-up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow-up adequately described and analyzed?	Yes, No, Unclear, NA
7	ITT analysis	Were participants analyzed in the groups to which they were randomized?	Yes, No, Unclear
8	Outcome measure	Were outcomes measured the same way for treatment groups?	Yes, No, Unclear
9	Appropriate power	Was the study appropriately powered	Yes, No, Unclear
10	Statistical analysis	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	Yes, No, Unclear

Notes: ITT = intent-to-treat, NA = not applicable; Original items (2) and (5) were dropped ("if allocation to treatment groups was concealed" and "if those delivering the treatment were blinded to assignment") and existing items (3) and (4) were modified to specify applicability to baseline only, rather than over the course of the study. These modifications were made to accommodate norms and feasibility of concealment in social science experiments in which treatment cannot be fully hidden at later stages of the study. Original item (9) regarding conducting validity and reliability checks of outcome measures was also dropped, as psychometric testing and validation is rarely done for economic and agency outcomes. Finally existing item (9) was singled out as it's own item (originally part of item 10), as power to detect effects and sample size calculations were deemed to be an important component within social science experimental studies. All JBI tools are available online at: https://synthesismanual.jbi.global.

TABLE A4. Indicator definitions for characteristics at the publication, intervention and effect level

Level	Indicator(s)	Description
Study	Region	Five different regions following the World Bank classification (sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, Middle East and North Africa, Europe and Central Asia): https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/ articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups
Study	Income group	Three different income groups following the World Bank classification (low-income, lower-middle income, upper-middle income)—in rare cases, studies were included that took place in a high income country if they qualified as upper-middle income at the time of the implementation:https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/ articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups
Study	Fragility	Classified as: 1) post-conflict, war or disaster, 2) active conflict or humanitarian crisis or 3) COVID-19 or other pandemic / epidemic if mentioned explicitly in the publication. Otherwise, classified as stable or development setting.
Study	Urban setting	Classified as urban setting if part or all of the evaluation sample lived in an urban or peri-urban area. Missing observations for 5% of impacts—meta-regression results are robust to analysis of only non- missing sample.
Intervention	Type of SSN	See inclusion and exclusion criteria for details (Table A2)
Intervention	Implementer	Three different implementors: 1) Government, 2) Researchers, 3) NGOs, United Nations organizations or others (private sector). When more than one implementer was mentioned, the one primarily responsible for delivering the economic component (rather than plus components) was recorded.
Intervention	Scale	Categorized into three levels: 1) pilot or small scale (if self-described as a pilot or local implementation, often as part of a start-up phase of implementation), 2) mid-level (if described as covering several geographic areas or dozens of clusters, but not yet at large-scale), 3) at scale (an established program, covering many geographic areas or majority of a country or reaching hundreds of thousands of participants).
Intervention	Value of economic benefit	Reported monthly value (in USD) for economic benefit(s), including in purchasing power parity (PPP) if given, during the intervention period. Meta-regressions are robust to controlling for if value is in PPP. Averages for values are taken if there is variation in economic benefits within an intervention arm. Currency conversions use the midpoint of the intervention period using Oanda currency converter. Missing observations for 5% of impacts—meta-regression results are robust to analysis of only non-missing sample.
Intervention	Poverty targeted	Indicator = 1 if the intervention targeting was described to include poverty as a factor, either via a proxy means test, categorical or geographical targeting. Included mention of 'poor', 'ultra-poor', 'labor-constrained' etc.
Intervention	Gender targeted	Indicator = 1 if the intervention targeting was described to include gender as a factor, for example, mention of targeting mothers, female caregivers, adolescent girls, women entrepreneurs, primary adult female or female-headed household.

Level	Indicator(s)	Description
Intervention	Plus component	Indicators for if the intervention arm has at least one plus component, defined as any complementary layered or integrated additional programming, including the following: i) training and information, ii) livelihood or economic, iii) health, including mental health or psychological, social behavior change for health outcomes, child protection or violence component or iv) other. Interventions were classified first as (i) training and information regardless of if they incorporated training on a health or economic component and thereafter into additional categories. Interventions were coded as gender sensitive if they specifically targeted women or were designed around gender considerations, and gender neutral if otherwise.
Intervention	Female sample age	Mean age in years of the female sample for which impacts are estimated and splines are generated for the following ranges: 1) 24 years or younger, 2) 25-39 years, 3) 40 years or older. If no mean age is given for the full sample, control sample is recorded or age range (from which a mean figure is calculated). Recorded up to one decimal point. Missing observations for 29% of impacts—meta-regression results are robust to analysis of only non-missing sample.
Effect	Outcome category	See inclusion and exclusion criteria for details (Table A2)
Effect	Duration of intervention	Coded in months (rounding up to the whole month, thus a lump sum transfer with no other component was coded as one month) and indicator = 1 if the value was 12 months or higher. For intervention with multiple components, the intervention period representing the longest total duration was recorded.
Effect	Time post intervention at survey	Coded in months (rounding down to zero if the follow-up survey was completed while the intervention was ongoing) and indicator = 1 if the value was 12 months or higher. For surveys covering two or more months, averages were taken and the mean post-intervention time was recorded.

ID	Authors	Туре	Year	Country	Intervention	Type(s) of SSN	Included Impacts		Quality	
							Total	Economic	Agency	Assessment
58	Bedoya et al.	t	2019	Afghanistan	Targeting the Ultra Poor program	Asset transfer; UCT; Fee waiver or subsidy	13	5	8	90%
58	Bedoya et al.	†	2023	Afghanistan	Targeting the Ultra Poor program	argeting the Ultra Poor Asset transfer; UCT; program Fee waiver or subsidy		4	4	90%
70	Gibbs et al.	*	2020	Afghanistan	Women for Women International	Vomen for Women UCT nternational		2	2	90%
17	Roy et al.	*	2015	Bangladesh	BRAC's Targeting the Ultra Poor (TUP) Program	Asset transfer; UCT	66	19	47	80%
17	Bandiera et al.	*	2017	Bangladesh	BRAC's Targeting the Ultra Poor (TUP) Program	Asset transfer; UCT	6	6	0	80%
57	Roy et al.	*	2019	Bangladesh	The Transfer Modality Research Initiative	UCT; Food, voucher or in-kind transfer	20	6	14	90%
57	Roy et al.	*	2023	Bangladesh	The Transfer Modality Research Initiative	UCT; Food, voucher or in-kind transfer	12	4	8	90%
57	Ahmed et al.	*	2023	Bangladesh	The Transfer Modality Research Initiative	UCT; Food, voucher or in-kind transfer	8	8	0	90%
71	Hussam et al.	*	2022	Bangladesh	NR	Public works; UCT	10	4	6	80%
72	Hossain et al.	*	2022	Bangladesh	NR	UCT	2	0	2	90%
73	Karasz et al.	*	2021	Bangladesh	ASHA (Hope) project	UCT	5	0	5	90%
36	Attanasio et al.	t	2022	Brazil	Rio de Janeiro's public daycare program	Social care services	8	8	0	88%
18	Karimli et al.	*	2020	Burkina Faso	Trickle Up and Trickle Up plus	UCT	46	46	0	90%
18	lsmayilova et al.	*	2018	Burkina Faso	Trickle Up and Trickle Up plus	UCT	4	0	2	90%
31	Ajayi et al.	t	2022	Burkina Faso	Youth Employment and Skills Project + Mobile Creches	Social care services	12	9	3	80%
75	Olney et al.	*	2016	Burkina Faso	3-y enhanced-homestead food production program	Asset transfer	5	0	5	70%
75	van den Bold et al.	*	2015	Burkina Faso	3-y enhanced-homestead food production program	Asset transfer	9	9	0	70%

TABLE A5. Publication details ordered by country of study and year of publication

ID	Authors	Туре	Year	Country	Intervention	Type(s) of SSN		ncluded Impo	icts	Quality
							Total	Economic	Agency	Assessment
15	Martizez & Perticara	*	2017	Chile	Chile's 4–7 Program	Social care services	10	10	0	90%
43	Attanasio et al.	*	2011	Colombia	Jóvenes en Acción	Jóvenes en Acción CCT		9	0	80%
33	Gazeaud et al.	S	2022	Comoros	The Social Safety Net Project	Public works	3	2	1	90%
30	Angelucci et al.	†	2022	DRC	Stronger Nations Stronger Women	Stronger Nations Stronger UCT Nomen		18	5	100%
38	Donald & Vaillant	t	2023	DRC	NR	R Social care services		28	3	70%
63	Hidrobo & Fernald	*	2012	Ecuador	Bono de Desarrollo Humano	UCT	2	0	2	90%
77	Peterman et al.	*	2021	Ecuador	World Food Programme's food, cash & voucher program	Food, voucher or in-kind transfer; CCT	9	0	9	90%
77	Buller et al.	*	2016	Ecuador	World Food Programme's food, cash & voucher program	Food, voucher or in-kind transfer; CCT	8	0	8	90%
77	Hidrobo et al.	*	2016	Ecuador	World Food Programme's food, cash & voucher program	Food, voucher or in-kind transfer; CCT	5	3	2	90%
6	Caria et al.	S	2022	Egypt	NR	Social care services	2	2	0	80%
65	Crépon et al.	*	2023	Egypt	NR	Food, voucher or in-kind transfer; UCT	26	24	2	70%
19	Alderman et al.	S	2021	Ethiopia	Strengthen PSNP4 Institutions and Resilience (SPIR) Development Food Security Activity (DFSA)	UCT; Asset transfer	20	20	0	90%
19	Ranganathan et al.	*	2022	Ethiopia	Strengthen PSNP4 Institutions and Resilience (SPIR) Development Food Security Activity (DFSA)	UCT; Asset transfer	10	0	10	90%
44	Banerjee et al.	*	2015	Ethiopia	Graduation Program	Asset transfer	2	0	2	90%

ID	Authors	Туре	Year	Country	Intervention	Type(s) of SSN	Included Impacts		Quality	
							Total	Economic	Agency	Assessment
11	Fafchamps et al.	*	2014	Ghana	NR	UCT; Asset transfer	4	4	0	90%
45	Banerjee et al.	*	2015	Ghana	Graduation Program	Asset transfer; UCT	4	2	2	90%
45	Banerjee et al.	*	2022	Ghana	Graduating from Ultra Poverty ("GUP")	Asset transfer	11	7	4	90%
46	Banerjee et al.	*	2015	Honduras	Graduation Program	Graduation Program Asset transfer; Food, voucher or in-kind transfer		0	2	90%
82	Alzua et al.	*	2013	Honduras	Programa de Asignación Familiar ("Family Allowance Program") (PRAF)	ССТ	3	3	0	70%
82	Molina Millán et al.	*	2019	Honduras	Programa de Asignación Familiar ("Family Allowance Program") (PRAF)	Programa de Asignación CCT Familiar ("Family Allowance Program") (PRAF)		11	0	70%
83	Benedetti et al.	*	2016	Honduras	Bono 10,000	ССТ	2	2	0	80%
29	Nandi et al.	*	2020	India	Uttam Unnati ('great progress')	Social care services	7	7	0	80%
47	Banerjee et al.	*	2015	India	Graduation Program	Asset transfer; UCT	1	0	1	90%
56	Banerjee et al.	*	2017	Indonesia	Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH)	ССТ	1	1	0	60%
8	Groh et al.	t	2012	Jordan	Jordan New Opportunities for Women (Jordan NOW) pilot	Public works	38	32	6	90%
2	Clark et al.	*	2019	Kenya	NR	Social care services	6	5	1	70%
3	Brooks et al.	*	2022	Kenya	NR	UCT	5	5	0	80%
7	Haushofer & Shapiro	*	2016	Kenya	GiveDirectly	UCT	4	0	4	90%
7	Haushofer et al.	†	2019	Kenya	GiveDirectly	UCT	2	2	0	90%
21	Gobin et al.	*	2017	Kenya	Rural Entrepreneur Access Program	UCT	3	3	0	70%

ID	Authors	Туре	Year	Country	Intervention	Type(s) of SSN	Included Impacts		Quality	
							Total	Economic	Agency	Assessment
26	Brudevold- Newman et al.	t	2017	Kenya	NR	UCT; Asset transfer	46	36	10	90%
28	Asfaw et al.	*	2014	Kenya	The Kenya Cash Transfer Programme for Orphans and Vulnerable Children	UCT	4	4	0	80%
37	Orkin et al.	†	2023	Kenya	NR	UCT	2	0	2	90%
59	Gallardo et al.	S	2022	Kenya	Development Impact Bond	ССТ	1	1	0	70%
41	Perova et al.	t	2021	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Road Management Group Program	Public works	1	0	1	70%
12	Pace et al.	*	2019	Lesotho	Child Grants Program	UCT	1	1	0	80%
12	Daidone et al.	*	2019	Lesotho	Lesotho Child Grant Program	UCT	9	9	0	80%
1	Baird et al.	*	2019	Malawi	Zomba Cash Transfer Program	UCT; CCT	24	15	9	70%
67	Ambler et al.	t	2019	Malawi	NR	UCT; Food, voucher or in-kind transfer	61	0	61	70%
76	Angeles et al.	*	2019	Malawi	Malawi Social Cash Transfer	UCT	2	2	0	90%
76	Lambon- Quayefio et al.	*	2023	Malawi	Malawi Social Cash Transfer	UCT	4	4	0	90%
24	Heath et al.	*	2020	Mali	Programme de Filets Sociaux (Jigisemejiri)	UCT	5	2	3	70%
42	Aguila & Smith	*	2020	Mexico	Reconocer Urbano	UCT	6	6	0	80%
54	Banerjee et al.	*	2017	Mexico	Programa de Apoyo Alimentario (PAL)	UCT	4	4	0	60%
81	Alzua et al.	*	2013	Mexico	Programa de Educacion, Salud y Alimentacion	ССТ	12	12	0	70%
81	Urbina	*	2020	Mexico	Programa de Educacion, Salud y Alimentacion	ССТ	3	0	3	70%
53	Banerjee et al.	*	2017	Morocco	Tayssir Program	ССТ	4	4	0	60%

ID	Authors	Туре	Year	Country	Intervention	Type(s) of SSN	Included Impacts		Quality	
							Total	Economic	Agency	Assessment
69	Field & Maffioli	t	2021	Myanmar	National maternal cash transfer pilot	National maternal cash UCT transfer pilot		0	10	88%
13	Janzen et al.	t	2023	Nepal	Heifer International's livestock transfer program	Heifer International's Asset transfer; UCT livestock transfer program		8	12	80%
16	Gram et al.	*	2019	Nepal	The Low Birth Weight South Asia Trial (LBW–SAT)	The Low Birth Weight SouthUCT; Food, voucherAsia Trial (LBW-SAT)or in-kind transfer		0	32	70%
16	Harris-Fry et al.	*	2022	Nepal	The Low Birth Weight South Asia Trial (LBW-SAT)	ne Low Birth Weight South UCT; Food, voucher sia Trial (LBW-SAT) or in-kind transfer		0	2	70%
32	Hojman & Boo	*	2022	Nicaragua	Programa Urbano	Social care services	1	1	0	60%
52	Alzua et al.	*	2013	Nicaragua	Red de Protección Social ("Social Protection Network")	ССТ	6	6	0	80%
64	Macours & Vakis	*	2014	Nicaragua	Atención a Crisis	CCT; UCT	15	0	15	90%
39	Bossuroy el al.	*	2022	Niger	Niger national cash transfer program	UCT	44	28	16	90%
34	Carneiro et al.	S	2019	Nigeria	Child Development Grant Programme	UCT	10	10	0	100%
50	Armand et al.	†	2023	North Macedonia	the Subsidized Employment Program	Public works	2	2	0	90%
48	Banerjee et al.	*	2015	Pakistan	Graduation Program	Asset transfer; UCT	2	0	2	90%
49	Banerjee et al.	*	2015	Peru	Graduation Program	Asset transfer; UCT	2	0	2	90%
55	Banerjee et al.	*	2017	Philippines	Pantawid Pamilya Program	ССТ	4	4	0	60%
66	Edmonds & Theoharides	*	2020	Philippines	Kabuhayan Para sa Magulang ng Batang Manggagawa (KASAMA)	Asset transfer	5	5	0	100%
68	Ambler et al.	t	2019	Senegal	NR UCT		18	0	18	70%
74	Rosas & Sabarwal	t	2016	Sierra Leone	Cash for Work Program	Public works	2	2	0	60%

ID	Authors	Туре	Year	Country	Intervention	Type(s) of SSN	Included Impa		icts	Quality
							Total	Economic	Agency	Assessment
23	Abdullahi et al.	*	2022	Somalia	Humanitarian Support and Re-Integration of IDP and Returnees in Mogadishu & Building Resilient Communities in Somalia	UCT	12	12	0	80%
5	Kilburn et al.	*	2018	South Africa	HIV Prevention Trial Network 068	IV Prevention Trial Network CCT 68		0	2	80%
5	Kilburn et al.	*	2019	South Africa	HIV Prevention Trial Network 068	IV Prevention Trial Network CCT 168		4	0	80%
40	de Mel et al.	*	2012	Sri Lanka	NR	UCT; Asset transfer	16	16	0	90%
51	de Mel et al.	*	2009	Sri Lanka	NR	UCT; Asset transfer	4	4	0	90%
84	de Mel et al.	*	2014	Sri Lanka	Start-and-Improve Your Business program	Start-and-Improve Your CCT Business program		16	0	90%
9	Calderone et al.	t	2022	Tanzania	STRYDE 2.0	ССТ	20	15	5	90%
22	Kuringe et al.	*	2022	Tanzania	Determined, Resilient, Empowered, AIDS-free, Mentored and Safe (DREAMS) initiative	UCT	1	1	0	60%
25	Tanzania cash plus evaluation team	9	2018	Tanzania	Productive Social Safety Net	CCT; UCT	5	3	2	70%
27	Palermo et al.	*	2021	Tanzania	Productive Social Safety Net	CCT	4	2	2	90%
20	Briaux et al.	*	2020	Togo	Pilot Cash Transfer Program	UCT	2	0	2	100%
14	Gazeaud et al.	†	2022	Tunisia	Cash Grant Study	UCT	12	10	2	90%
86	Leight & Mvukiyehe	t	2023	Tunisia	Community Works and Local Participation Project	Public works	8	4	4	71%
10	Blattman et al.	*	2014	Uganda	Youth Opportunities Program	UCT	6	4	2	90%
10	Blattman et al.	*	2020	Uganda	Youth Opportunities Program	UCT	7	7	0	90%

ID	Authors	Туре	Year	Country	Intervention	Type(s) of SSN	Included Impacts		Quality	
							Total	Economic	Agency	Assessment
10	Fiala et al.	t	2022	Uganda	Youth Opportunities Program	UCT	6	6	0	90%
35	Bjorvatn et al.	t	2022	Uganda	NR	R Social care services; UCT		22	0	90%
60	Gallardo et al.	S	2022	Uganda	Development Impact Bond	ССТ	1	1	0	70%
61	Blattman et al.	*	2016	Uganda	Women's Income Generating Support	ССТ	4	0	4	90%
78	Peterman et al.	*	2021	Uganda	World Food Programme	Food, voucher or in-kind transfer; UCT	4	0	4	90%
85	Gupta et al.	*	2023	Uganda	GiveDirectly	UCT	1	1	0	70%
4	Bonilla et al.	*	2017	Zambia	Zambia's Child Grant Program	UCT	2	0	2	90%
4	Handa et al.	*	2018	Zambia	Zambia's Child Grant Program	UCT	4	4	0	90%
79	Botea et al.	t	2023	Zambia	Supporting Women's Livelihoods Prorgram	UCT	32	28	4	80%
80	Handa et al.	*	2018	Zambia	Multiple Category Targeting Grant	UCT	4	4	0	100%
80	AIR	S	2014	Zambia	Multiple Category Targeting Grant	UCT	2	0	2	100%

Notes: * = journal article, † = working paper or pre-print, § = technical report. CCT = conditional cash transfer, NR = not reported, UCT = unconditional cash transfer; Quality assessment is the percentage of 'yes' answers among those applicable by study using a modified version of the Joanna Briggs Institute assessment tool for experimental studies (see Table A3).

TABLE A6. Pooled effect sizes for all social safety net interventions

	All Outcomes	Economic Achievement	Agency
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Hedges' g (SE)	0.103 *** (0.01)	0.105 *** (0.01)	0.103*** (0.02)
95% CI	[0.08, 0.13]	[0.08, 0.13]	[0.06, 0.15]
I ² (consistency)	91.99%	91.66%	94.34%
$ au^2$ (heterogeneity)	0.025	0.022	0.047
N of studies	85	67	52
N of effect sizes	1067	660	405

Notes: CI = confidence interval; SE = standard error. *p<0.10, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

TABLE A7. Pooled effect sizes across all outcomes by different social safety net interventions

	UCT	сст	Asset Transfers	In-kind Transfers	Public Works	Social Care
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Hedges' g (SE)	0.133 *** (0.02)	0.041 ⁺ (0.02)	0.124 *** (0.02)	0.074 (0.04)	0.133 ⁺ (0.06)	0.122 *** (0.02)
95% CI	[0.10, 0.17]	[-0.00, 0.08]	[0.08, 0.17]	[-0.02, 0.17]	[-0.03, 0.29]	[0.07, 0.18]
I ² (consistency)	92.69%	86.48%	91.65%	82.25%	94.24%	93.20%
$ au^2$ (heterogeneity)	0.037	0.008	0.039	0.019	0.058	0.035
N of studies	51	19	16	7	7	10
N of effect sizes	632	159	216	112	59	105

Notes: CCT = conditional cash transfer; CI = confidence interval; SE = standard error; UCT = unconditional cash transfer. ^{+}p <0.10, $^{*}p$ <0.05, $^{*}p$ <0.001, $^{**}p$ <0.001.

TABLE A8. Pooled effect sizes for social safety	v net interventions by	different outcome cate	aories of economic ach	nievements and agency
			J	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

	Labor Force Participation	Productive Work Intensity	Care Work Participation	Care Work Intensity	Savings	Debt or Loans	Assets	Expenditures
Panel A: Economic achievements	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Hedges' G (SE)	0.089 *** (0.02)	0.061 *** (0.02)	Insufficient power	-0.016 (0.02)	0.225 *** (0.04)	0.145 (0.12)	0.220 *** (0.05)	0.158 ** (0.04)
95% CI	[0.05, 0.13]	[0.03, 0.09]		[-0.07, 0.04]	[0.13, 0.32]	[-0.17, 0.46]	[0.12, 0.32]	[0.07, 0.24]
I² (consistency)	89.39%	83.87%		67.08%	94.01%	95.57%	90.58%	85.99%
τ² (heterogeneity)	0.012	0.012		0.004	0.037	0.084	0.042	0.015
N of studies	40	45	5	12	18	6	12	15
N of effect sizes	132	309	12	34	54	12	57	42
	Decision	n-Making	Autonomy and	Self-Efficacy	Aspiration	s and Goals	Voice	Leadership
Panel B: Agency	(1)		(2)	(2)		(3)	(4)	(5)
Hedges' G (SE)	0.095**		0.114**		Insufficient power		0.172*	Insufficient power
	(0	.03)	(0.04)				(0.06)	
95% CI	[0.04, 0.15]		[0.04, 0.19]			[0.05, 0.30]		
I ² (consistency)	94.30%		93.80%				95.57%	
$ au^2$ (heterogeneity)	0.044		0.037				0.076	
N of studies	:	36	30			1	12	0
N of effect sizes	220		125			4	49	0

Notes: CI = confidence interval; SE = standard error. *p<0.10, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

	ист	сст	Asset Transfers	In-kind Transfers	Social Care	Public Works				
Panel A: Economic achievement outcomes										
Hedges' g (SE)	0.125***	0.027	0.128***	Insufficient	0.132***	0.201*				
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	power	(0.03)	(0.08)				
95% CI	[0.10, 0.21]	[-0.01, 0.06]	[0.07, 0.19]		[0.07, 0.19]	[-0.00, 0.40]				
I ² (consistency)	95.75%	78.43%	91.57%		93.24%	95.26%				
$ au^2$ (heterogeneity)	0.069	0.004	0.045		0.035	0.071				
N of studies	37	17	11	3	10	6				
N of effect sizes	371	107	115	28	86	44				
Panel B: Agency o	utcomes									
Hedges' g (SE)	0.157***	0.065	0.128***	0.049***	Insufficient	Insufficient				
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.01)	power	power				
95% CI	[0.09, 0.21]	[-0.04, 0.17]	[0.07, 0.18]	[0.02, 0.08]						
I ² (consistency)	95.74%	89.84%	94.24%	61.21%						
τ^{2} (heterogeneity)	0.071	0.023	0.048	0.006						
N of studies	36	9	12	7	4	5				
N of effect sizes	259	52	101	84	19	15				

TABLE A9. Pooled effect sizes for economic achievement and agency domains by social safety net intervention types

Notes: CCT = conditional cash transfer; CI = confidence interval; SE = standard error; UCT = unconditional cash transfer. p<0.10, p<0.05, p<0.01, p<0.01, p<0.001

Authors	Year	Country	Type(s) of SSN	Cost Estimate	Gender- Specific Estimates?	Interpretation
Gazeaud et al.	2022	Tunisia	UCT	BCR: 16.9	No	Considering household consumption and assets at two years, the BCR is 16.9 (using a social discount rate of 5%); the benefits fully exceed the costs after 1.2 years of intervention.
Hojman & Boo	2022	Nicaragua	Social care services	BCR: 6.2	Partially	Considering mother's income and child noncognitive skill gains (on future earnings), the BCR is 6.2 (using a 3% interest rate); the marginal value of public funds is 70, putting it in the top 20% of those recently reviewed.
Banerjee et al.	2015	India	Asset transfer; UCT	BCR: 4.3; IRR: 23%	No	Considering household consumption (each year) and assets (at three years), the BCR is 4.33 and an IRR of 23.4% (using a social discount rate of 5%).
Angelucci et al.	2022	DRC	UCT	BCR: 3.7; IRR: 20%; NPV: \$1,306	No	Considering household non-durable consumption at 12-months and post intervention follow-up the BCR is 3.68, the IRR is 19.9% and the NPV is \$1,306 (using a social discount rate of 5%).
Bandiera et al.	2017	Bangladesh	Asset transfer; UCT	BCR: 3.2; IRR: 16–23%	Partially	Assuming household consumption and asset benefits at year four are repeated over 20 years, the program has a BCR of 3.2 (using a social discount rate of 5%); the IRR is between 16% and 23%, depending on assumptions around opportunity cost of time.
Banerjee et al.	2015	Ethiopia	Asset transfer	BCR: 2.6; IRR: 13%	No	Considering household consumption (each year) and assets (at three years), the BCR is 2.6 and an IRR of 13.3% (using a social discount rate of 5%).
Bedoya et al.	2019	Afghanistan	Asset transfer; UCT; Fee waiver or subsidy	BCR: 2.3; IRR: 26%	No	Considering impacts on household non-durable consumption and assuming a continuation over a 10-year period, the BCR is 2.3, the IRR is 26% and the break-even point is 4 years after program start (using a social discount rate of 5%).
Janzen et al.	2023	Nepal	Asset transfer; UCT	BCR: 1.8; NPV: \$108	No	Considering the value of goat herds at year four and goat sales over time, the BCR is 1.83 and the NPV of benefits is \$108 (using a social discount rate of 10%).
Banerjee et al.	2015	Pakistan	Asset transfer; UCT	BCR: 1.8; IRR: 10%	No	Considering household consumption (each year) and assets (at three years), the BCR is 1.79 and an IRR of 9.5% (using a social discount rate of 5%).
Banerjee et al.	2015	Peru	Asset transfer; UCT	BCR: 1.5; IRR: 8%	No	Considering household consumption (each year) and assets (at three years), the BCR is 1.46 and an IRR of 7.5% (using a social discount rate of 5%).
Banerjee et al.	2015	Ghana	Asset transfer; UCT	BCR: 1.3; IRR: 7%	No	Considering household consumption (each year) and assets (at three years), the BCR is 1.33 and an IRR of 6.90% (using a social discount rate of 5%).
Bedoya et al.	2023	Afghanistan	Asset transfer; UCT; Fee waiver or subsidy	BCR: 1.1	No	Considering household non-durable consumption with post-intervention impacts up to five years (impacts are expected to dissipate by year 9), the BCR is 1.1 with the break-even point at 6 years after the asset transfer (using a social discount rate of 5%).

TABLE A10. Summary of cost-benefit analysis in included studies

Authors	Year	Country	Type(s) of SSN	Cost Estimate	Gender- Specific Estimates?	Interpretation
Bossuroy el al.	2022	Niger	UCT	BCR: 0.8–18.0; IRR: –9–73%; CE: various	No	Considering household consumption, if all impacts dissipate after two years, the BCR is 0.80 (capital) and 1.27 (full package) with IRRs of -9% (capital) and 21% (full package); If all impacts are sustained into perpetuity, the BCR is 10.38 (capital) and 18.04 (full package) with IRRs of 48% (capital) and 73% (full package) (using a social discount rate of 5%); Full package is 1.6–1.7x higher BCR as compared to capital only arm.
Crépon et al.	2023	Egypt	UCT; Food, voucher or in-kind	BCR: 1.0–2.0; CE: various	Yes	Considering impacts on women's labor income are sustained for 30 (40) months, the BCR for in-kind grants is 1.58 (1.99) and for cash grants is 0.97 (1.22); Based on women's labor income, in-kind grants would cover the cost of the intervention after 17.8 months, while cash grants would cover the cost of the intervention after 31.28 months; On cost-effectiveness, for women's employment: Grants (both cash and in-kind) create jobs for women at a cost of 5.9x cost of the grant, while loans create the same of 2.42x cost of the grant; For subjective wellbeing: Loans increase 1 "util" for a cost of 1.03x cost of the grant, while in-kind would cost 2.76 for the same increase (no significant impacts for cash grants).
Orkin et al.	2023	Kenya	UCT	BCR: 0.5–1.0; CE: various	No	Considering household non-durable consumption, education, housing and land expenditures, and non-land asset stocks at endline (17-months after the intervention, thereafter dissipating), the BCR for the psychological only intervention is 0.96, the cash is 0.56 and the combined is 0.46, making the psychological only of higher cost effectiveness (2-6x) as compared to the cash only arm.
Botea et al.	2023	Zambia	UCT	BCR: 0.4– 8.5; IRR: -64-42%	No	Considering household consumption at one-year post-intervention, the BCR ranges from 0.36–7.27 and IRR ranges from –64%–36% for the full package (considering complete dissipation vs. perpetuity, BCR is >1 assumption 25% dissipation); BCR ranges from 0.42–8.42 and IRR ranges from –58%–42% for the financial capital arm (considering the same scenarios).
Banerjee et al.	2022	Ghana	Asset transfer; UCT	BCR: 0-1.2	No	Considering household consumption (each year) and assets (at three years), the BCR of the full package is 1.2, while the asset transfer only arm has a BCR of effectively zero (using a social discount rate of 5%).
Banerjee et al.	2015	Honduras	Asset transfer; Food, voucher or in-kind transfer	BCR: -1.98	No	Considering household consumption (each year) and assets (at three years), the BCR is –1.98 (using a social discount rate of 5%).

Authors	Year	Country	Type(s) of SSN	Cost Estimate	Gender- Specific Estimates?	Interpretation
Blattman et al.	2016	Uganda	ССТ	IRR: 23–24%; NPV: \$9,309– \$10,302	No	Considering household non-durable consumption, BCRs are 23–24% and NPV is \$9,309-\$10,302 (with and without group training), indicating the present value of consumption is nearly 5x the cost of the program (using a social discount rate of 5%).
Attanasio et al.	2011	Colombia	ССТ	IRR: 22–35%	Yes	Considering employment and earnings impacts, gains are \$3,805 (if permanent) and \$1,478 (if depreciation occurs 10% annually), leading to IRR of 35% and 21.6%, respectively.
Rosas & Sabarwal	2016	Sierra Leone	Public works	CE: various	Partially	Cost per temporary job created (for men and women) is \$198, while the cost per additional \$1 income generated from these jobs is \$7.
Brudevold- Newman et al.	2017	Kenya	UCT; Asset transfer	CE: various	Yes	At 7–10 months and 14–22 months post-treatment, the cash grant impacts on income are generally larger than micro franchising (but only statistically significantly different at the 10% level in the 7–10-month follow-up) and less expensive (\$286 vs. \$376–494); Cash grants are more cost-effective as compared to micro franchising in increasing income.
Handa et al.	2018	Zambia	UCT	Multiplier: 1.6	Partially	Pooled estimates across 24- and 36-month follow-ups indicate a multiplier of 1.61 (households spend or save 61% more than what they receive).
Handa et al.	2018	Zambia	UCT	Multiplier: 1.7	Partially	Estimates pooled across 24- and 36-month follow-ups indicate a multiplier of 1.72 (households spend or save 72% more than what they receive).

Notes: BCR = benefit cost ratio; CCT = conditional cash transfer; CE = cost-effectiveness; IRR = internal rate of return; NPV = net present value; UCT = unconditional cash transfer.

Works cited for primary papers

- Abdullahi, A., Ali, M., Kipchumba, E., & Sulaiman, M. (2022). Supporting Micro-enterprise in Humanitarian Programming: Impact Evaluation of Business Grants versus Unconditional Cash Transfer. *Journal of African Economies*, ejac012. https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejac012
- Aguila, E., & Smith, J. P. (2020). Supplemental income program design: A cluster-randomized controlled trial to examine the health and wellbeing effects on older adults by gender, duration, and payment frequency. *Social Science & Medicine*, *259*, 113139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113139
- Ahmed, A. U., Hoddinott, J., Roy, S., & Sraboni, E. (2023). Transfers, nutrition programming, and economic well-being: Experimental evidence from Bangladesh. World Development, 173, 106414. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2023.106414
- Ajayi, K. F., Dao, A., & Koussoubé, E. (2022). *The Effects of Childcare on Women and Children: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation in Burkina Faso*. Center for Global Development. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-10239
- Alderman, H., Billings, L., Gilligan, D. O., Hidrobo, M., Leight, J., Taffesse, A. S., & Tambet, H. (2021).
 Impact Evaluation of the Strengthen PSNP4 Institutions and Resilience (SPIR) Development Food
 Security Activity (DFSA) Endline Report. International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Alzúa, M. L., Cruces, G., & Ripani, L. (2013). Welfare programs and labor supply in developing countries: Experimental evidence from Latin America. *Journal of Population Economics*, 26(4), 1255–1284. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-012-0458-0
- Ambler, K., Brauw, A. de, & Godlonton, S. (2019). Lump-sum Transfers for Agriculture and Household Decision Making. Department of Economics Working Papers, Article 2019–19. https://ideas.repec. org//p/wil/wileco/2019-19.html
- American Institutes for Research (AIR). (2014). Zambia's Multiple Category Targeting Grant: 24-Month Impact Report. https://www.air.org/resource/report/zambias-multiple-category-targetinggrant-24-month-impact-report
- Angeles, G., de Hoop, J., Handa, S., Kilburn, K., Milazzo, A., & Peterman, A. (2019). Government of Malawi's unconditional cash transfer improves youth mental health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 225, 108–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.01.037
- Angelucci, M., Heath, R., & Noble, E. (2022). Graduation Programs Targeting Women: Evidence from the Democratic Republic of Congo.
- Armand, A., Carneiro, P., Tagliati, F., & Xia, Y. (2023). Can Subsidized Employment Tackle Long-Term Unemployment? Experimental Evidence from North Macedonia. IZA Discussion Papers. https://www.iza.org/publications/dp/13478/can-subsidized-employment-tackle-long-termunemployment-experimental-evidence-from-north-macedonia

- Asfaw, S., Davis, B., Dewbre, J., Handa, S., & Winters, P. (2014). Cash Transfer Programme, Productive Activities and Labour Supply: Evidence from a Randomised Experiment in Kenya. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 50(8), 1172–1196. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2014.919383
- Attanasio, O., Kugler, A., & Meghir, C. (2011). Subsidizing Vocational Training for Disadvantaged Youth in Colombia: Evidence from a Randomized Trial. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 3, 188–220. https://doi.org/10.1257/APP.3.3.188
- Attanasio, O., Paes de Barros, R., Carneiro, P., Evans, D. K., Lima, L., Olinto, P., & Schady, N. (2022). Public Childcare, Labor Market Outcomes of Caregivers, and Child Development: Experimental Evidence from Brazil (Working Paper 30653). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w30653
- Baird, S., McIntosh, C., & Özler, B. (2019). When the money runs out: Do cash transfers have sustained effects on human capital accumulation? *Journal of Development Economics*, 140, 169–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2019.04.004
- Bakhtiar, M. M., Fafchamps, M., Goldstein, M., Leonard, K. L., & Papineni, S. (2022). Women's Empowerment and the Intrinsic Demand for Agency: Experimental Evidence from Nigeria (Working Paper 30789). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w30789
- Bandiera, O., Burgess, R., Das, N., Gulesci, S., Rasul, I., & Sulaiman, M. (2017). Labor Markets and Poverty in Village Economies. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(2), 811–870. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjx003
- Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., Goldberg, N., Karlan, D., Osei, R., Parienté, W., Shapiro, J., Thuysbaert, B.,
 & Udry, C. (2015). A multifaceted program causes lasting progress for the very poor: Evidence from six countries. *Science*, 348(6236), 1260799. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1260799
- Banerjee, A., Hanna, R., Kreindler, G. E., & Olken, B. A. (2017). Debunking the Stereotype of the Lazy
 Welfare Recipient: Evidence from Cash Transfer Programs. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 32(2), 155–184. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkx002
- Banerjee, A., Karlan, D., Osei, R., Trachtman, H., & Udry, C. (2022). Unpacking a multi-faceted program to build sustainable income for the very poor. *Journal of Development Economics*, 155, 102781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2021.102781
- Bedoya, G., Belyakova, Y., Coville, A., Escande, T., Isaqzadeh, M., & Ndiaye, A. (2023). The Enduring Impacts of a Big Push during Multiple Crises: Experimental Evidence from Afghanistan. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-10596
- Bedoya, G., Coville, A., Haushofer, J., Isaqzadeh, M., & Shapiro, J. P. (2019). No Household Left Behind: Afghanistan Targeting the Ultra Poor Impact Evaluation. https://doi.org/10.3386/w25981
- Behrman, J. R., Parker, S. W., & Todd, P. E. (2011). Do Conditional Cash Transfers for Schooling Generate Lasting Benefits? A Five-Year Followup of PROGRESA/Oportunidades. *Journal of Human Resources*, 46(1), 93–122.

- Benedetti, F., Ibarrarán, P., & McEwan, P. J. (2016). Do Education and Health Conditions Matter in a Large Cash Transfer? Evidence from a Honduran Experiment. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 64(4), 759–793. https://doi.org/10.1086/686583
- Bjorvatn, K., Ferris, D., Gulesci, S., Nasgowitz, A., Somville, V., & Vandewalle, L. (2022). Childcare, Labor Supply, and Business Development: Experimental Evidence from Uganda (SSRN Scholarly Paper 4121426). https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=4121426
- Blattman, C., Fiala, N., & Martinez, S. (2014). Generating Skilled Self-Employment in Developing Countries: Experimental Evidence from Uganda*. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129, 697–752. https://doi.org/10.1093/QJE/QJT057
- Blattman, C., Fiala, N., & Martinez, S. (2020). The Long-Term Impacts of Grants on Poverty: Nine-Year Evidence from Uganda's Youth Opportunities Program. *American Economic Review: Insights*, 2(3), 287–304. https://doi.org/10.1257/aeri.20190224
- Blattman, C., Green, E. P., Jamison, J., Lehmann, M. C., & Annan, J. (2016). The Returns to Microenterprise Support among the Ultrapoor: A Field Experiment in Postwar Uganda. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 8(2), 35–64. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20150023
- Bonilla, J., Zarzur, R. C., Handa, S., Nowlin, C., Peterman, A., Ring, H., & Seidenfeld, D. (2017). Cash for Women's Empowerment? A Mixed-Methods Evaluation of the Government of Zambia's Child Grant Program. World Development, 95, 55–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.02.017
- Bossuroy, T., Goldstein, M., Karimou, B., Karlan, D., Kazianga, H., Parienté, W., Premand, P., Thomas, C. C., Udry, C., Vaillant, J., & Wright, K. A. (2022). Tackling psychosocial and capital constraints to alleviate poverty. *Nature*, 605, 291–297. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04647-8
- Botea, I., Brudevold-Newman, A., Goldstein, M., Low, C., & Roberts, G. (2023). Supporting Women's Livelihoods at Scale: Evidence from a Nationwide Multi-Faceted Program (SSRN Scholarly Paper 4560552). https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=4560552
- Briaux, J., Martin-Prevel, Y., Carles, S., Fortin, S., Kameli, Y., Adubra, L., Renk, A., Agboka, Y.,
 Romedenne, M., Mukantambara, F., Dyck, J. V., Boko, J., Becquet, R., & Savy, M. (2020). Evaluation of an unconditional cash transfer program targeting children's first-1,000–days linear growth in rural Togo: A cluster-randomized controlled trial. *PLOS Medicine*, *17*(11), e1003388. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003388
- Brooks, W., Donovan, K., Johnson, T. R., & Oluoch-Aridi, J. (2022). Cash transfers as a response to COVID-19: Experimental evidence from Kenya. *Journal of Development Economics*, 158, 102929. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2022.102929
- Brudevold-Newman, A., Honorati, M., Jakiela, P., & Ozier, O. (2017). *A firm of one's own: Experimental evidence on credit constraints and occupational choice*. World Bank Publications. https://documents. worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/428361487270218330/A-firm-of-ones-own-experimental-evidence-on-credit-constraints-and-occupational-choice

- Buller, A. M., Hidrobo, M., Peterman, A., & Heise, L. (2016). The way to a man's heart is through his stomach?: A mixed methods study on causal mechanisms through which cash and in-kind food transfers decreased intimate partner violence. *BMC Public Health*, 16(1), 488. https://doi. org/10.1186/s12889-016-3129-3
- Calderone, M., Fiala, N., Melyoki, L. L., Schoofs, A., & Steinacher, R. (2022). Making intense skills training work at scale: Evidence on business and labor market outcomes in Tanzania (Working Paper 950). Ruhr Economic Papers. https://doi.org/10.4419/96973113
- Caria, S., Crepon, B., ElBehairy, H., Fadlalmawla, N., Krafft, C., Nagy, A., Mottaghi, L., Zeitoun, N.,
 & El Assiouty, S. (2022). Child Care Subsidies, Employment Services and Women's Labor Market
 Outcomes in Egypt: First Midline Results [Working Paper]. World Bank. https://openknowledge.
 worldbank.org/handle/10986/37825
- Carneiro, P., Rasul, I., Mason, G., & Kraftman, L. (2019). *Child Development Grant Programme Evaluation*. Oxford Policy Management & ITAD.
- Clark, S., Kabiru, C. W., Laszlo, S., & Muthuri, S. (2019). The Impact of Childcare on Poor Urban Women's Economic Empowerment in Africa. *Demography*, 56(4), 1247–1272. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-019-00793-3
- Crépon, B., El Komi, M., & Osman, A. (2023). Is It Who You Are or What You Get? Comparing the Impacts of Loans and Grants for Microenterprise Development. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20210683
- Daidone, S., Davis, B., Dewbre, J., & Covarrubias, K. (2014). *Lesotho's Child Grant Programme:* 24-month impact report on productive activities and labour allocation—Lesotho country case study report. FAO. https://www.fao.org/reduce-rural-poverty/resources/resources-detail/en/c/468329/
- Daidone, S., Davis, B., Handa, S., & Winters, P. (2019). The Household and Individual-Level Productive Impacts of Cash Transfer Programs in Sub-Saharan Africa. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 101(5), 1401–1431. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajae/aay113
- de Mel, S., McKenzie, D., & Woodruff, C. (2009). Are Women More Credit Constrained? Experimental Evidence on Gender and Microenterprise Returns. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 1(3), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.1.3.1
- de Mel, S., McKenzie, D., & Woodruff, C. (2012). One-Time Transfers of Cash or Capital Have Long-Lasting Effects on Microenterprises in Sri Lanka. *Science*, *335*, 962–966. https://doi.org/10.1126/ science.1212973
- de Mel, S., McKenzie, D., & Woodruff, C. (2014). Business training and female enterprise start-up, growth, and dynamics: Experimental evidence from Sri Lanka. *Journal of Development Economics*, 106, 199–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2013.09.005

Donald, A., & Vaillant, J. (2023). Experimental Evidence on Rural Childcare Provision [Working Paper].

- Edmonds, E., & Theoharides, C. (2020). The short term impact of a productive asset transfer in families with child labor: Experimental evidence from the Philippines. *Journal of Development Economics*, 146, 102486. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2020.102486
- Fafchamps, M., McKenzie, D., Quinn, S., & Woodruff, C. (2014). Microenterprise growth and the flypaper effect: Evidence from a randomized experiment in Ghana. *Journal of Development Economics*, 106, 211–226. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JDEVECO.2013.09.010
- Fiala, N., Rose, J., Aryemo, F., & Peters, J. (2022). *The (Very) Long-Run Impacts of Cash Grants during a Crisis*. https://g2lm-lic.iza.org/publications/wp/the-very-long-run-impacts-of-cash-grants-during-a-crisis/
- Field, E. M., & Maffioli, E. M. (2021). Are Behavioral Change Interventions Needed to Make Cash Transfer Programs Work for Children? Experimental Evidence from Myanmar (Working Paper 28443). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w28443
- Gallardo, M. A. J., Kananu, W., Lazicky, C., McManus, J., & Njogu-Ndongwe, F. (2022). *Village Enterprise Development Impact Bond Evaluation Findings*. https://www.idinsight.org/publication/villageenterprise-development-impact-bond-evaluation-findings/
- Gazeaud, J., Khan, N., Mvukiyehe, E., & Sterck, O. (2022). With or without him? Experimental Evidence on Gender-Sensitive Cash Grants and Trainings in Tunisia. *Policy Research Working Papers, null,* null. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-10132
- Gazeaud, J., Mvukiyehe, E., & Sterck, O. (2022). Public Works and Welfare: A Randomized Control Trial of the Comoros Social Safety Net Project–Endline Report. https://documents.worldbank.org/pt/ publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/753341575624212242/Public-Works-and-Welfare-A-Randomized-Control-Trial-of-the-Comoros-Social-Safety-Net-Project-Endline-Report
- Gibbs, A., Corboz, J., Chirwa, E., Mann, C., Karim, F., Shafiq, M., Mecagni, A., Maxwell-Jones, C.,
 Noble, E., & Jewkes, R. (2020). The impacts of combined social and economic empowerment
 training on intimate partner violence, depression, gender norms and livelihoods among women:
 An individually randomised controlled trial and qualitative study in Afghanistan. *BMJ Global Health*, 5(3), e001946. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001946
- Gobin, V. J., Santos, P., & Toth, R. (2017). No Longer Trapped? Promoting Entrepreneurship Through Cash Transfers to Ultra-Poor Women in Northern Kenya. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 99(5), 1362–1383. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajae/aax037
- Gram, L., Morrison, J., Saville, N., Yadav, S. S., Shrestha, B., Manandhar, D., Costello, A.,
 & Skordis-Worrall, J. (2019). Do Participatory Learning and Action Women's Groups Alone or
 Combined with Cash or Food Transfers Expand Women's Agency in Rural Nepal? *The Journal of Development Studies*, 55(8), 1670–1686. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2018.1448069

- Groh, M., Krishnan, N., McKenzie, D., & Vishwanath, T. (2012). Soft Skills or Hard Cash? The Impact of Training and Wage Subsidy Programs on Female Youth Employment in Jordan. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-6141
- Gupta, P., Stein, D., Longman, K., Lanthorn, H., Bergmann, R., Nshakira-Rukundo, E., Rutto, N.,
 Kahura, C., Kananu, W., Posner, G., Zhao, K. J., & Davis, P. (2024). Cash transfers amid shocks:
 A large, one-time, unconditional cash transfer to refugees in Uganda has multidimensional
 benefits after 19 months. *World Development*, 173, 106339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.
 2023.106339
- Handa, S., Natali, L., Seidenfeld, D., Tembo, G., & Davis, B. (2018). Can unconditional cash transfers raise long-term living standards? Evidence from Zambia. *Journal of Development Economics*, 133, 42–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2018.01.008
- Harris-Fry, H., Saville, N. M., Paudel, P., Manandhar, D. S., Cortina-Borja, M., & Skordis, J. (2022).
 Relative power: Explaining the effects of food and cash transfers on allocative behaviour in rural Nepalese households. *Journal of Development Economics*, 154, 102784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jdeveco.2021.102784
- Haushofer, J., Ringdal, C., Shapiro, J. P., & Wang, X. Y. (2019). Income Changes and Intimate Partner
 Violence: Evidence from Unconditional Cash Transfers in Kenya (Working Paper 25627). National
 Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w25627
- Haushofer, J., & Shapiro, J. (2016). The short-term impact of unconditional cash transfers to the poor: Experimental evidence from Kenya. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1314, 1973–2042. https://doi.org/10.1093/QJE/QJW025
- Heath, R., Hidrobo, M., & Roy, S. (2020). Cash transfers, polygamy, and intimate partner violence: Experimental evidence from Mali. *Journal of Development Economics*, 143, 102410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2019.102410
- Hidrobo, M., & Fernald, L. (2013). Cash transfers and domestic violence. *Journal of Health Economics*, 32(1), 304–319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2012.11.002
- Hidrobo, M., Peterman, A., & Heise, L. (2016). The Effect of Cash, Vouchers, and Food Transfers on Intimate Partner Violence: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in Northern Ecuador. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 8(3), 284–303. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20150048
- Hojman, A., & Lopez Boo, F. (2022). Public childcare benefits children and mothers: Evidence from a nationwide experiment in a developing country. *Journal of Public Economics*, *212*, 104686. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2022.104686
- Hossain, S. J., Roy, B. R., Sujon, H. M., Tran, T., Fisher, J., Tofail, F., El Arifeen, S., & Hamadani, J. D. (2022).
 Effects of integrated psychosocial stimulation (PS) and Unconditional Cash Transfer (UCT)
 on Children's development in rural Bangladesh: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *Social Science & Medicine*, 293, 114657. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114657

- Hussam, R., Kelley, E. M., Lane, G., & Zahra, F. (2022). The Psychosocial Value of Employment: Evidence from a Refugee Camp. *American Economic Review*, *112*(11), 3694–3724. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20211616
- Janzen, S., Magnan, N., Sharma, S., & Thompson, W. (2023). Pay it Forward: A Mechanism for Achieving Scale in Anti-Poverty Programs (Working Paper).
- Karasz, A., Anne, S., Hamadani, J. D., & Tofail, F. (2021). The ASHA (Hope) Project: Testing an Integrated Depression Treatment and Economic Strengthening Intervention in Rural Bangladesh: A Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18010279
- Kilburn, K., Hughes, J. P., MacPhail, C., Wagner, R. G., Gómez-Olivé, F. X., Kahn, K., & Pettifor, A. (2019).
 Cash Transfers, Young Women's Economic Well-Being, and HIV Risk: Evidence from HPTN 068.
 AIDS and Behavior, 23(5), 1178–1194. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-018-2329-5
- Kilburn, K., Pettifor, A., Edwards, J. K., Selin, A., Twine, R., MacPhail, C., Wagner, R., Hughes, J. P.,
 Wang, J., & Kahn, K. (2018). Conditional cash transfers and the reduction in partner violence
 for young women: An investigation of causal pathways using evidence from a randomized
 experiment in South Africa (HPTN 068). *Journal of the International AIDS Society*, 21(S1), e25043.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/jia2.25043
- Kuringe, E., Christensen, A., Materu, J., Drake, M., Majani, E., Casalini, C., Mjungu, D., Mbita, G.,
 Kalage, E., Komba, A., Nyato, D., Nnko, S., Shao, A., Changalucha, J., & Wambura, M. (2022).
 Effectiveness of Cash Transfer Delivered Along With Combination HIV Prevention
 Interventions in Reducing the Risky Sexual Behavior of Adolescent Girls and Young Women
 in Tanzania: Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance*, 8, null.
 https://doi.org/10.2196/30372
- Lambon-Quayefio, M., Peterman, A., Handa, S., Molotsky, A., Otchere, F., Mvula, P., Tsoka, M., de Hoop, J., Angeles, G., Kilburn, K., & Milazzo, A. (2024). Unconditional cash transfers and safe transitions to adulthood in Malawi. *World Development*, 175, 106483. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.worlddev.2023.106483
- Leight, J., & Mvukiyehe, E. (2023). Short-term and long-term effects of cash for work: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial in Tunisia. Intl Food Policy Res Inst.
- Macours, K., & Vakis, R. (2014). Changing Households' Investment Behaviour through Social Interactions with Local Leaders: Evidence from a Randomised Transfer Programme. *The Economic Journal*, 124(576), 607–633. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecoj.12145
- Martínez, C., & Perticará, M. (2017). Childcare effects on maternal employment: Evidence from Chile. Journal of Development Economics, 126, 127–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2017.01.001

- Molina Millán, T., Macours, K., John A., M., & Tejerina, L. (2019). *The Long-Term Impacts of Honduras' CCT Program: Higher Education and International Migration*. Inter-American Development Bank. https://doi.org/10.18235/0001670
- Nandi, A., Agarwal, P., Chandrashekar, A., & Harper, S. (2020). Access to affordable daycare and women's economic opportunities: Evidence from a cluster-randomised intervention in India. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 12(3), 219–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/19439342.2020. 1773898
- Olney, D. K., Bliznashka, L., Pedehombga, A., Dillon, A., Ruel, M. T., & Heckert, J. (2016). A 2-Year Integrated Agriculture and Nutrition Program Targeted to Mothers of Young Children in Burkina Faso Reduces Underweight among Mothers and Increases Their Empowerment: A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial123. *The Journal of Nutrition*, *146*(5), 1109–1117. https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.115.224261
- Orkin, K., Garlick, R., Mahmud, M., Sedlmayr, R., Haushofer, J., & Dercon, S. (2023). Aspiring to a Better Future: How a Simple Psychological Intervention Increases Investment. https://www.dropbox. com/s/u17dl4dbpx5bp4p/Aspiring_to_a_better_future_rev.pdf?dl=0
- Pace, N., Daidone, S., Davis, B., & Pellerano, L. (2019). Shaping Cash Transfer Impacts Through 'Soft-Conditions': Evidence from Lesotho. *Journal of African Economies*, 28(1), 39–69. https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejy009
- Palermo, T., Prencipe, L., & Kajula, L. (2021). Effects of Government-Implemented Cash Plus Model on Violence Experiences and Perpetration Among Adolescents in Tanzania, 2018–2019. American Journal of Public Health, 111(12), 2227–2238. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2021.306509
- Perova, E., Johnson, E., Mannava, A., Reynolds, S., & Teman, A. (2021). Public Work Programs and Gender-Based Violence: Evidence from Lao PDR [Working Paper]. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-9691
- Peterman, A., Schwab, B., Roy, S., Hidrobo, M., & Gilligan, D. O. (2021). Measuring women's decisionmaking: Indicator choice and survey design experiments from cash and food transfer evaluations in Ecuador, Uganda and Yemen. World Development, 141, 105387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105387
- Ranganathan, M., Pichon, M., Hidrobo, M., Tambet, H., Sintayehu, W., Tadesse, S., & Buller, A. M. (2022). Government of Ethiopia's public works and complementary programmes: A mixed-methods study on pathways to reduce intimate partner violence. *Social Science & Medicine*, 294, 114708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.114708
- Rosas, N., & Sabarwal, S. (2016). Can You Work it? Evidence on the Productive Potential of Public Works from a Youth Employment Program in Sierra Leone. World Bank. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/ papers.cfm?abstract_id=2849107

- Roy, S., Ara, J., Das, N., & Quisumbing, A. R. (2015). "Flypaper effects" in transfers targeted to women: Evidence from BRAC's "Targeting the Ultra Poor" program in Bangladesh. *Journal of Development Economics*, 117, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2015.06.004
- Roy, S., Hidrobo, M., Hoddinott, J., & Ahmed, A. (2019). Transfers, Behavior Change Communication, and Intimate Partner Violence: Postprogram Evidence from Rural Bangladesh. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 101(5), 865–877. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_00791
- Roy, S., Hidrobo, M., Hoddinott, J., Koch, B., & Ahmed, A. (2022). Can transfers and complementary nutrition programming reduce intimate partner violence four years post-program? Experimental evidence from Bangladesh. *Journal of Human Resources*. https://doi.org/10.3368/ jhr.0720-11014R2
- Tanzania Social Action Fund, UNICEF Office of Research, Innocenti, & Policy Research for Development (REPOA). (2018). Tanzania Youth Study of the Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) Evaluation: Endline Report. https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/942-.html
- Urbina, D. R. (2020). In the Hands of Women: Conditional Cash Transfers and Household Dynamics. Journal of Marriage and Family, 82(5), 1571–1586. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12684
- van den Bold, M., Dillon, A., Olney, D., Ouedraogo, M., Pedehombga, A., & Quisumbing, A. (2015). Can Integrated Agriculture-Nutrition Programmes Change Gender Norms on Land and Asset Ownership? Evidence from Burkina Faso. *The Journal of Development Studies*, *51*(9), 1155–1174. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2015.1036036

Appendix B. Scopus search strings in eligible languages

English

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("social safety net*" OR "social assistance" OR "social security" OR "cash transfer*" OR "family allowance*" OR welfare OR (allowance W/3 financial) OR (allowance W/3 economic) OR (assistance W/3 financial) OR (assistance W/3 economic) OR "social security" OR "child grant*" OR "cash grant*" OR "child benefit*" OR "maternity benefit*" OR "paternity benefit*" OR "child subsid*" OR "cash support" OR "pension*" OR "death benefit*" OR "survivor* benefit*" OR "burial fund" OR "disability benefit*" OR "UCT" OR "CCT" OR "basic income" OR "income guarantee" OR "UBI" OR "unemployment benefit*" OR "cash plus" OR "food transfer*" OR "voucher*" OR "In-kind transfer*" OR "food stamp*" OR "food ration*" OR "food parcel" OR "school feeding" OR "school supplies" OR "therapeutic feeding" OR "food support" OR "asset transfer*" OR "livestock transfer*" OR "graduation program*" OR "graduation model" OR "business start-up grant*" OR "business grant*" OR "public work*" OR "cashfor-work" OR "cash for work" OR "food-for-work" OR "food for work" OR "fee waiver*" OR "subsid*" OR "tax credit*" OR "tax break*" OR "financial incentive*" OR incentive* OR "insurance exception" OR "insurance waiver*" OR "education waiver*" OR "housing subsid*" OR "housing allowance*" OR "rental subsid*" OR "input subsidy" OR "transportation benefit*" OR "utility subsid*" OR "child care" OR "day care" OR "home-based care" OR "family support services" OR "child protection" OR "disaster relief" OR "humanitarian aid" OR "emergency relief")) AND

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("woman*" OR "women*" OR "girl*" OR "gender" OR "female" OR "mother*" OR "grandmother*" OR "sister" OR "sex")) AND Spanish

French

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("red de seguridad social*" OR "asistencia social" OR "seguridad social" OR "transferencia de efectivo*" OR "subsidio familiar*" OR bienestar OR (subsidio W/3 financiero) OR (subsidio W/3 económico) OR (ayuda W/3 financiera) OR (ayuda W/3 económica) OR "seguridad social" OR "subsidio para niños*" OR "subsidio en efectivo*" OR "subsidio familiar*" OR "beneficio de maternidad*" OR "beneficio de paternidad*" OR "subsidio infantil*" OR "ayuda en efectivo" OR "pensión*" OR "beneficio por fallecimiento*" OR "beneficio* de supervivencia*" OR "fondo para gastos de entierro" OR "beneficio por incapacidad*" OR "transferencia de efectivo sin condiciones" OR "transferencia de efectivo condicionada" OR "renta básica" OR "garantía de ingresos" OR "renta básica universal" OR "subsidio de desempleo*" OR "efectivo plus" OR "transferencia de alimentos*" OR "voucher*" OR "transferencia en especie*" OR "cupón de alimentos*" OR "ración de alimentos*" OR "paquete de alimentos" OR "alimentación escolar" OR "útiles escolares" OR "alimentación terapéutica" OR "avuda alimentaria" OR "transferencia de activos*" OR "transferencia de ganado*" OR "programa de graduación*" OR "modelo de graduación" OR "subvención para la creación de empresas*" OR "subvención empresarial*" OR "trabajo público*" OR "efectivo-portrabajo" OR "efectivo por trabajo" OR "alimentos-portrabajo" OR "alimentos por trabajo" OR "exención de tarifas*" OR "subsidio*" OR "crédito fiscal*" OR "exención fiscal*" OR "incentivo financiero*" OR incentivo* OR "excepción del seguro" OR "exención del seguro*" OR "exención educativa*" OR "subsid* de vivienda" OR "subsidio de alojamiento*" OR "subsid* de alquiler" OR "subvención de insumos" OR "beneficio* de transporte" OR "subsid* de servicios públicos" OR "cuidado de niños" OR "guardería" OR "atención domiciliaria" OR "servicios de apoyo familiar" OR "protección de la infancia" OR "ayuda en desastres" OR "ayuda humanitaria" OR "ayuda de emergencia"))AND

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("filet* de sécurité sociale" OR "assistance sociale" OR "sécurité sociale" OR "transfert* d'argent" OR "allocation* familiale*" OR bien-être OR (allocation W/3 financière) OR (allocation W/3 économique) OR (assistance W/3 financière) OR (assistance W/3 économique) OR "sécurité sociale" OR "subvention* pour enfant*" OR "subvention* financière*" OR "prestation* pour enfant*" OR "prestation* de maternité" OR "prestation* de paternité" OR "subvention* pour enfant*" OR "soutien financier" OR "pension*" OR "prestation* de décès" OR "prestation* de survivant*" OR "fonds funéraires" OR "prestation* d'invalidité" OR "transfert monétaire inconditionnel" OR TMI OR "transfert monétaire conditionnel" OR TMC OR "revenu de base" OR "revenu* garanti*" OR "revenu de base universel" OR RBU OR "prestation* de chômage" OR "prestation* d'assurance-emploi" OR "troc plus" OR "transfert* de nourriture" OR "bon* d'achat*" OR "transfert* en nature" OR "coupon* alimentaire*" OR "ration* alimentaire*" OR "colis de nourriture" OR "alimentation scolaire" OR "fournitures scolaires" OR "alimentation thérapeutique" OR "soutien alimentaire" OR "transfert* d'actif*" OR "transfert* de bétail" OR "programme* de graduation" OR "modèle de graduation" OR "subvention* au démarrage d'entreprise*" OR "subvention* aux entreprises*" OR "trava* publi*" OR "travail rémunéré" OR "travail contre nourriture" OR "dispense* de frais" OR "subvention*" OR "crédit* d'impôt*" OR "allégement* fisca*" OR "incitatif* financier*" OR incitatif* OR "exclusion* d'assurance*" OR "renonciation* à l'assurance*" OR "renonciation* aux assurances" OR "dérogation" à l'éducation" OR "subvention" au* logement*" OR "allocation* pour logement*" OR "subvention* de location" OR "subvention aux intrants" OR "prestation" de transport" OR "subvention" aux services" OR "services de garde" OR "garderie" OR

English

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("empowerment" OR "economic standing" OR "economic security" OR "financial wellbeing" OR "economic wellbeing" OR "financial welfare" OR "financial wellbeing" OR "financial security" OR "financial health" OR "financial resilience" OR "economic achievement" OR "labo*r force" OR "labo*r market" OR "employ*" OR "work" or "self-employ*" OR "business" OR "time use" OR "wage" OR "earning*" OR "income" OR "investment*" OR "profit*" OR "expenditure*" OR "childcare" OR "care" OR "unpaid labo*r" OR "care burden" OR "care responsibility" OR "domestic tasks" OR "domestic work" OR "domestic chore*" OR "savings" OR "save" OR "debt" OR "credit" OR "loan*" OR "asset*" OR "livestock" OR "land" OR (agriculture W/3 fertilizer) OR (agricultural W/3 productivity) OR (agriculture W/3 seed) OR (agriculture W/3 harvest) OR "housing" OR "house" OR "agency" OR "choice" OR "voice" OR "leadership" OR "decision-making" OR "decision making" OR "bargaining power" OR "self-efficacy" OR "self efficacy" OR "independence" OR "agency" OR "power" OR "aspiration*" OR "goal*" OR "vote" OR "voting" OR "participation in group*" OR "group participation" OR "social capital" OR "civic engagement" OR "political engagement" OR "political participation" OR "rights" OR "discriminat*")) AND

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("random* control* trial*" OR "random* trial*" OR "control* random* trial*" OR "RCT" OR "lottery" OR "impact evaluation" OR "causal effect" OR "causal impact" or "clinical trial"))

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("global south" OR "deprived countries" OR "deprived country" OR "deprived nation" OR "deprived nations" OR "deprived population" OR "deprived populations" OR "deprived world" OR "developing countries" OR "developing country" OR "developing economies" OR "developing economy" OR "developing nation" OR "developing nations" OR

Spanish

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("mujer*" OR "mujeres*" OR "chica*" OR "género" OR "femenino" OR "madre*" OR "abuela*" OR "hermana" OR "sexo")) AND

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("empoderamiento" OR "situación económica" OR "seguridad económica" OR "bienestar financiero" OR "bienestar económico" OR "asistencia financiera" OR "prosperidad financiera" OR "seguridad financiera" OR "salud financiera" OR "resiliencia financiera" OR "logro económico" OR "fuerza labo*ral" OR "mercado labo*ral" OR "emplead*" OR "trabajo" or "autónomo" OR "independiente" OR "empresa" OR "uso del tiempo" OR "salario" OR "ingreso*" OR "sueldo" OR "inversi*" OR "ganancia*" OR "gasto*" OR "cuidado de niños" OR "asistencia" OR "trabajo no remunerado" OR "sobrecarga del cuidado" OR "responsabilidad del cuidado" OR "tareas domésticas" OR "trabajo doméstico" OR "labor*es domésticas" OR "ahorros" OR "ahorrar" OR "deuda" OR "crédito" OR "préstamo*" OR "activo*" OR "ganado" OR "tierra" OR (agricultura W/3 fertilizante) OR (productividad W/3 agrícola) OR (semillas W/3 agricultura) OR (cosecha W/3 agrícola) OR "alojamiento" OR "vivienda" OR "agencia" OR "elección" OR "voz" OR "liderazgo" OR "toma-dedecisiones" OR "toma de decisiones" OR "poder de negociación" OR "autoeficacia" OR "auto eficacia" OR "independencia" OR "organismo" OR "poder" OR "aspiración*" OR "objetivo*" OR "voto" OR "votación" OR "participación en grupo*" OR "participación grupal" OR "capital social" OR "compromiso cívico" OR "compromiso político" OR "participación política" OR "derechos" OR "discrimina*")) AND

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("ensayo* de control* aleatorio*" OR "ensayo* aleatorio*" OR "ensayo* controlado* aleatorio*" OR "ECA" OR "sorteo" OR "evaluación de impacto" OR "efecto causal" OR "impacto causal" or "ensayo clínico"))

"soins à domicile" OR "services de soutien aux familles" OR "protection de l'enfance" OR "secours aux sinistrés" OR "aide humanitaire" OR "secours d'urgence")) AND

French

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("femme" OR "femmes" OR "fille*" OR "genre" OR "féminin" OR "mère*" OR "grand*mère*" OR "sœur" OR "sexe")) AND

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("autonomisation" OR "situation économique" OR "sécurité économique" OR "bienêtre financier" OR "bien-être économique" OR "prospérité financière" OR "bien-être financier" OR "sécurité financière" OR "santé financière" OR "résilience financière" OR "réussite économique" OR "population* active*" OR "marché* du travail" OR "emplo*" OR "travail" or "travail indépendant" OR "entreprise" OR "temps d'utilisation" OR "salaire" OR "gain*" OR "revenu" OR "investissement*" OR "profit*" OR "dépense*" OR "service* de garde d'enfant*" OR "soin" OR "travail non rémunéré" OR "charge des soins" OR "responsabilité* des soins" OR "tâche* domestique*" OR "travail domestique" OR "tâche domestique*" OR "épargne" OR "économiser" OR "dette" OR "crédit" OR "prêt*" OR "actif*" OR "bétail" OR "terrain" OR (agriculture W/3 engrais) OR (productivité W/3 agricole) OR (agriculture W/3 semence) OR (agriculture W/3 récolte) OR "logement" OR "maison" OR "agence" OR "choix" OR "voix" OR "leadership" OR "prise de décision" OR "prise de décision" OR "pouvoir de négociation" OR "autoefficacité" OR "auto-efficacité" OR "indépendance" OR "agence*" OR "pouvoir" OR "aspiration*" OR "but*" OR "vote*" OR "voter" OR "participation en groupe*" OR "participation de groupe*" OR "capital social" OR "engagement citoyen" OR "engagement politique" OR "participation politique" OR "droits" OR "discrimin*")) AND

English

"developing population" OR "developing populations" OR "developing world" OR "less developed countries" OR "less developed country" OR "less developed economies" OR "less developed economy" OR "less developed nation" OR "less developed nations" OR "less developed population" OR "less developed populations" OR "less developed world" OR "lesser developed countries" OR "lesser developed country" OR "lesser developed economies" OR "lesser developed economy" OR "lesser developed nation" OR "lesser developed nations" OR "lesser developed population" OR "lesser developed populations" OR "lesser developed world" OR "LMIC" OR "LMICS" OR "low gdp" OR "low gnp" OR "low gross domestic" OR "low gross national" OR "low income countries" OR "low income country" OR "low income economies" OR "low income economy" OR "low income nation" OR "low income nations" OR "low income population" OR "low income populations" OR "lower gdp" OR "lower gnp" OR "lower gross domestic" OR "lower gross national" OR "lower income countries" OR "lower income country" OR "lower income economies" OR "lower income economy" OR "lower income nation" OR "lower income nations" OR "lower income population" OR "lower income populations" OR "middle income countries" OR "middle income country" OR "middle income economies" OR "middle income economy" OR "middle income nation" OR "middle income nations" OR "middle income population" OR "middle income populations" OR "poor countries" OR "poor country" OR "Poor Economies" OR "Poor Economy" OR "poor nation" OR "poor nations" OR "poor population" OR "poor populations" OR "poor world" OR "poorer countries" OR "poorer country" OR "Poorer Economies" OR "Poorer Economy" OR "poorer nation" OR "poorer nations" OR "poorer population" OR "poorer populations" OR "poorer world" OR "third world" OR "transitional countries" OR "transitional country" OR "Transitional Economies"

Spanish

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("sur global" OR "países desfavorecidos" OR "país desfavorecido" OR "nación desfavorecida" OR "naciones desfavorecidas" OR "población desfavorecida" OR "poblaciones desfavorecidas" OR "mundo desfavorecido" OR "países en desarrollo" OR "país en desarrollo" OR "economías en desarrollo" OR "economía en desarrollo" OR "nación en desarrollo" OR "naciones en desarrollo" OR "población en desarrollo" OR "poblaciones en desarrollo" OR "mundo en desarrollo" OR "países menos desarrollados" OR "país menos desarrollado" OR "economías menos desarrolladas" OR "economía menos desarrollada" OR "nación menos desarrollada" OR "naciones menos desarrolladas" OR "población menos desarrollada" OR "poblaciones menos desarrolladas" OR "mundo menos desarrollado" OR "países subdesarrollados" OR "país subdesarrollado" OR "economías subdesarrolladas" OR "economía subdesarrollada" OR "nación subdesarrollada" OR "naciones subdesarrolladas" OR "población subdesarrollada" OR "poblaciones subdesarrolladas" OR "mundo subdesarrollado" OR "países con ingresos bajos y medios" OR "países de renta baja y media" OR "PIB bajo" OR "PNB bajo" OR "bajo producto interno bruto" OR "bajo ingreso nacional bruto" OR "países de bajos ingresos" OR "país de bajos ingresos" OR "economías de bajos ingresos" OR "economía de bajos ingresos" OR "nación de bajos ingresos" OR "naciones de bajos ingresos" OR "población de bajos ingresos" OR "poblaciones de bajos ingresos" OR "menor PIB" OR "menor PNB" OR "menor producto interno bruto" OR "menor producto nacional bruto" OR "países de menores ingresos" OR "país de menores ingresos" OR "economías de menores ingresos" OR "economía de menores ingresos" OR "nación de menores ingresos" OR "naciones de menores ingresos" OR "población de menores ingresos" OR "poblaciones de menores

French

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("aléatoire* contrôle* essai*" OR "aléatoire* essai*" OR "contrôle* aléatoire* essai*" OR "essai* contrôlé* randomisé*" OR "ECR" OR " loterie" OR " évaluation d'impact*" OR "effet* de causalité" OR "impact causal" or "essai* clinique*"))

((TITLE-ABS-KEY ("pays du sud" OR "pays défavorisés" OR "pays défavorisé" OR "nation défavorisée" OR "nations défavorisées" OR "population défavorisée" OR "populations défavorisées" OR "pays en développement" OR "pays en développement" OR "économies en développement" OR "économie en développement" OR "nation en développement" OR "nations en développement" OR "population en développement" OR "populations en développement" OR "pays moins développés" OR "pays moins développé" OR "économies moins développées" OR "économie moins développée" OR "nation moins développée" OR "nations moins développées" OR "population moins développée" OR "populations moins développées" OR "pays les moins développés" OR "pays le moins développé" OR "économies les moins développées" OR "économie la moins développée" OR "nation la moins développée" OR "nations les moins développées" OR "population la moins développée" OR "nations les moins développées" OR "pays à faible et moyen revenue" OR "PFMR" OR "pays à faible et moyen revenue" OR PFMRs OR "faible produit intérieur brut" OR "faible produit national brut" OR "faible produit intérieur" OR "faible produit national" OR "pays à faible revenu" OR "pays à faible revenu" OR "économies à faible revenu" OR "économie à faible revenu" OR "nation à faible revenu" OR "nations à faible revenu" OR "population à faible revenu" OR "populations à faible revenu" OR "plus faible produit intérieur brut" OR "PIB" OR "plus faible produit national brut" OR "PNB" OR "plus faible produit intérieur" OR "plus faible produit national" OR "pays à

English

OR "Transitional Economy" OR "under developed countries" OR "under developed country" OR "under developed economies" OR "under developed economy" OR "under developed nation" OR "under developed nations" OR "under developed population" OR "under developed populations" OR "under developed world" OR "under served countries" OR "under served country" OR "under served nation" OR "under served nations" OR "under served population" OR "under served populations" OR "under served world" OR "underdeveloped countries" OR "underdeveloped country" OR "underdeveloped economies" OR "underdeveloped economy" OR "underdeveloped nation" OR "underdeveloped nations" OR "underdeveloped population" OR "underdeveloped populations" OR "underdeveloped world" OR "underserved countries" OR "underserved country" OR "underserved nation" OR "underserved nations" OR "underserved population" OR "underserved populations" OR "underserved world" OR Afghanistan OR Albania OR Algeria OR "American Samoa" OR Angola OR Argentina OR "Argentine Republic" OR Armenia OR Azerbaijan OR Bangladesh OR Belarus OR Byelarus OR Belorussia OR Belize OR Benin OR Bhutan OR Bolivia OR Bosnia OR Botswana OR Brazil OR Bulgaria OR Burma OR "Burkina Faso" OR Burundi OR "Cabo Verde" OR "Cape Verde" OR Cambodia OR Cameroon OR "Central African Republic" OR Chad OR Chile OR China OR Colombia OR Comoros OR Comoros OR Comoro OR Congo OR "Costa Rica" OR "Côte d'Ivoire" OR Cuba OR Djibouti OR Dominica OR "Dominican Republic" OR Ecuador OR Egypt OR "El Salvador" OR Eritrea OR Ethiopia OR Fiji OR Gabon OR Gambia OR Gaza OR "Georgia Republic" OR Georgian OR Ghana OR Grenada OR Grenadines OR Guatemala OR Guinea OR "Guinea Bissau" OR Guyana OR Haiti OR Herzegovina OR Hercegovina OR Honduras OR India OR

Spanish

French

ingresos" OR "países de ingresos medios" OR "país de ingresos medios" OR "economías de ingresos medios" OR "economía de ingresos medios" OR "nación de ingresos medios" OR "naciones de ingresos medios" OR "población de ingresos medios" OR "poblaciones de ingresos medios" OR "países pobres" OR "país pobre" OR "economías pobres" OR "economía pobre" OR "nación pobre" OR "naciones pobres" OR "población pobre" OR "poblaciones pobres" OR "mundo pobre" OR "países más pobres" OR "país más pobre" OR "economías más pobres" OR "economía más pobre" OR "nación más pobre" OR "naciones más pobres" OR "población más pobre" OR "poblaciones más pobres" OR "mundo más pobre" OR "tercer mundo" OR "países en transición" OR "país en transición" OR "economías en transición" OR "economía en transición" OR "países en vías de desarrollo" OR "país en vías de desarrollo" OR "economías en vías de desarrollo" OR "economía en vías de desarrollo" OR "nación en vías de desarrollo" OR "naciones en vías de desarrollo" OR "población en vías de desarrollo" OR "poblaciones en vías de desarrollo" OR "mundo en vías de desarrollo" OR "países con servicios insuficientes" OR "país con servicios insuficientes" OR "nación con servicios insuficientes" OR "naciones con servicios insuficientes" OR "población con servicios insuficientes" OR "poblaciones con servicios insuficientes" OR "mundo con servicios insuficientes" OR "países en subdesarrollo" OR "país en subdesarrollo" OR "economías en subdesarrollo" OR "economía en subdesarrollo" OR "nación en subdesarrollo" OR "naciones en subdesarrollo" OR "población en subdesarrollo" OR "poblaciones en subdesarrollo" OR "mundo en subdesarrollo" OR "países marginados" OR "país marginado" OR "nación marginada" OR "naciones marginadas" OR "población marginada" OR "poblaciones marginadas" OR "mundo marginado"

plus faible revenu" OR "pays à plus faible revenu" OR "économies à plus faible revenu" OR "économie à plus faible revenu" OR "nation à plus faible revenu" OR "nations à plus faible revenu" OR "population à faible revenu" OR "populations à plus faible revenu" OR "pays à revenu moyen" OR "pays à revenu moyen" OR "économies à revenu moyen" OR "économie à revenu moyen" OR "nation à revenu moyen" OR "nations à revenu moyen" OR "population à revenu moyen" OR "populations à revenu moyen" OR "pays pauvres" OR "pays pauvre" OR "économies pauvres" OR "économie pauvre" OR "nation pauvre" OR "nations pauvres" OR "population pauvre" OR "populations pauvres" OR "pays les plus pauvres" OR "pays le plus pauvre" OR "économies les plus pauvres" OR "économie la plus pauvre" OR "nation la plus pauvre" OR "nations les plus pauvres" OR "population la plus pauvre" OR "populations les plus pauvres" OR "tiers-monde" OR "pays en transition" OR "pays en transition" OR "économies en transition" OR "économie en transition" OR "pays sous-développés" OR "pays sous-développé" OR "économies sous-développées" OR "économie sous-développée" OR "nation sousdéveloppée" OR "nations sous-développées" OR "population sous-développée" OR "populations sous-développées" OR "pays sous-desservis" OR "pays sous-desservi" OR "nation sous-desservie" OR "nations sous-desservies" OR "population sousdesservie" OR "populations sous-desservies" OR "pays sous-développés" OR "pays sous-développé" OR "économies sous-développées" OR "économie sous-développée" OR "nation sous-développée" OR "nations sous-développées" OR "population sousdéveloppée" OR "populations sous-développées" OR "pays sous desservis" OR "pays sous desservi" OR "nation sous desservie" OR "nations sous desservies" OR "population sous desservie" OR "populations sous desservies" OR Afghanistan OR Albanie OR Algérie

English

Indonesia OR Iran OR Iraq OR Jamaica OR Jordan OR Kazakhstan OR Kenya OR Kiribati OR Korea OR Kosovo OR Kyrgyz OR Kirghizia OR Kirghiz OR Kirgizstan OR Kyrgyzstan OR "Lao PDR" OR Laos OR Lebanon OR Lesotho OR Liberia OR Libya OR Macedonia OR Madagascar OR Malawi OR Malay OR Malaya OR Malaysia OR Maldives OR Mali OR "Marshall Islands" OR Mauritania OR Mauritius OR Mexico OR Micronesia OR Moldova OR Mongolia OR Montenegro OR Morocco OR Mozambique OR Myanmar OR Namibia OR Nauru OR Nepal OR Nicaragua OR Niger OR Nigeria OR Pakistan OR Palau OR Panama OR "Papua New Guinea" OR Paraguay **OR Peru OR Philippines OR Philippines OR Philippines** OR Philippines OR Principe OR Romania OR Rwanda OR Ruanda OR Samoa OR "Sao Tome" OR Senegal OR Serbia OR "Sierra Leone" OR "Solomon Islands" OR Somalia OR "South Africa" OR "South Sudan" OR "Sri Lanka" OR "St Lucia" OR "St Vincent" OR Sudan OR Surinam OR Suriname OR Swaziland OR Syria OR "Syrian Arab Republic" OR Tajikistan OR Tadzhikistan OR Tajikistan OR Tadzhik OR Tanzania OR Thailand OR Timor OR Togo OR Tonga OR Tunisia OR Turkey OR Turkmen OR Turkmenistan OR Tuvalu OR Uganda OR Ukraine OR Uruguay OR Uzbek OR Uzbekistan OR Vanuatu OR Venezuela OR Vietnam OR "West Bank" OR Yemen OR Zambia OR Zimbabwe OR "Sub-Sahara* Africa*" OR "Sub-Saharan Africa*" OR "middle east" OR "north Africa" OR "west Africa" OR "Southern Africa" OR "east Africa" or "Arab region" OR "South Asia" OR "Asia Pacific" OR "Pacific Islands" OR "East Asia" OR "Latin America" OR "South America" OR "Caribbean"))

AND PUBYEAR > 2003 AND PUBYEAR < 2023

Spanish

French

OR Afganistán OR Albania OR Argelia OR "Samoa Americana" OR Angola OR Argentina OR "República Argentina" OR Armenia OR Azerbaiyán OR Bangladesh OR Bielorrusia OR Bielorrusia OR Belice OR Benín OR Bután OR Bolivia OR Bosnia OR Botsuana OR Brasil OR Bulgaria OR Birmania OR "Burkina Faso" OR Burundi OR "Cabo Verde" OR "Cabo Verde" OR Camboya OR Camerún OR "República Centroafricana" OR Chad OR Chile OR China OR Colombia OR Comoras OR Comores OR Comoro OR Congo OR "Costa Rica". OR "Costa de Marfil" OR Cuba OR Djibouti OR Dominica OR "República Dominicana" OR Ecuador OR Egipto OR "El Salvador" OR Eritrea OR Etiopía OR Fiji OR Gabón OR Gambia OR Gaza OR "República de Georgia" OR georgiano OR Ghana OR Granada OR Granadinas OR Guatemala OR Guinea OR "Guinea Bisáu" OR Guyana OR Haití OR Herzegovina OR Hercegovina OR Honduras OR India OR Indonesia OR Irán OR Irag OR Jamaica OR Jordán OR Kazajstán OR Kenia OR Kiribati OR Corea OR Kosovo OR Kyrgyz OR Kirghizia OR Kirguistán OR Kirguizistán OR "Lao PDR" OR Laos OR Líbano OR Lesoto OR Liberia OR Libia OR Macedonia OR Madagascar OR Malawi OR Malayo OR Malaya OR Malasia OR Maldivas OR Malí OR "Islas Marshall" OR Mauritania OR Mauricio OR México OR Micronesia OR Moldavia OR Mongolia OR Montenegro OR Marruecos OR Mozambique OR Myanmar OR Namibia OR Nauru OR Nepal OR Nicaragua OR Níger OR Nigeria OR Pakistán OR Palau OR Panamá OR "Papúa Nueva Guinea" OR Paraguay OR Perú OR Filipinas OR "Filipinas" OR "Príncipe" OR Rumanía OR Ruanda OR Ruanda OR Samoa OR "Santo Tomé" OR Senegal OR Serbia OR "Sierra Leona" OR "Islas Salomón" OR Somalia OR "Sudáfrica" OR "Sudán del Sur" OR "Sri Lanka" OR "Santa Lucía" OR "San Vicente" OR Sudán OR Surinam OR Suriname OR Swazilandia

OR "Samoa américaines" OR Angola OR Argentine OR "République d'Argentine" OR Arménie OR Azerbaïdjan OR Bangladesh OR Bélarus OR Biélorussie OR Bélize OR Belize OR Bénin OR Bhoutan OR Bolivie OR Bosnie OR Botswana OR Brésil OR Bulgarie OR Birmanie OR "Burkina Faso" OR Burundi OR "Cap-Vert" OR Cambodge OR Cameroun OR "République centrafricaine" OR Tchad OR Chili OR Chine OR Colombie OR Comores OR Congo OR "Costa Rica" OR "Côte d'Ivoire" OR Cuba OR Djibouti OR Dominique OR "République dominicaine" OR Équateur OR Égypte OR "El Salvador" OR Salvador OR Érythrée OR Éthiopie OR Fidji OR Gabon OR Gambie OR Gaza OR "République de Géorgie" OR Géorgie OR Ghana OR Grenade OR Grenadines OR Guatemala OR Guinée OR "Guinée-Bissau" OR Guyane OR Haïti OR Herzégovine OR Honduras OR Inde OR Indonésie OR Iran OR Irak OR Jamaïque OR Jordanie OR Kazakhstan OR Kenya OR Kiribati OR Corée OR Kosovo OR Kirghize OR Kirghizie OR Kirghizstan OR Kirghizistan OR "République démocratique populaire (RDP) lao" OR Laos OR Liban OR Lesotho OR Liberia OR Libye OR Macédoine OR Madagascar OR Malawi OR Malaisie OR Maldives OR Mali OR "Îles Marshall" OR Mauritanie OR Île Maurice OR Mexique OR Micronésie OR Moldavie OR Mongolie OR Monténégro OR Maroc OR Mozambique OR Myanmar OR Namibie OR Nauru OR Népal OR Nicaragua OR Niger OR Nigéria OR Pakistan OR Palaos OR Panama OR "Papouasie-Nouvelle-Guinée" OR Paraguay OR Pérou OR Philippines OR Principe OR Roumanie OR Rwanda OR Samoa OR "Sao Tomé" OR Sénégal OR Serbie OR "Sierra Leone" OR "Îles Salomon" OR Somalie OR "Afrique du Sud" OR "Soudan du Sud" OR "Sri Lanka" OR "Sainte-Lucie" OR "Saint-Vincent" OR Soudan OR Suriname OR Swaziland OR Eswatini OR Syrie OR "République arabe syrienne" OR Tadjikistan OR Tadjik OR

English	Spanish	French
	OR Esuatini OR Siria OR "República Árabe Siria" OR	Tanzanie OR Thaïlande OR Timor OR Togo OR Tonga
	Tajikistán OR Tadzhikistán OR Tayikistán OR Tadzhik	OR Tunisie OR Turquie OR Turkmène OR Turkménistan
	OR Tanzania OR Tailandia OR Timor OR Togo OR	OR Tuvalu OR Ouganda OR Ukraine OR Uruguay OR
	Tonga OR Túnez OR Turquía OR Turkmenistán OR	Ouzbek OR Ouzbékistan OR Vanuatu OR Venezuela
	Tuvalu OR Uganda OR Ucrania OR Uruguay OR	OR Vietnam OR "Cisjordanie" OR Yémen OR Zambie
	Uzbekistán OR Vanuatu OR Venezuela OR Vietnam OR	OR Zimbabwe OR "Afrique sub-sahara*" OR "Afrique
	"Cisjordania" OR Yemen OR Zambia OR Zimbabue	subsaharien*" OR "Moyen-Orient" OR "Afrique du
	OR "África Subsahariana*" OR "África subsahariana*"	Nord" OR "Afrique de l'Ouest" OR "Afrique australe"
	OR "Oriente Medio" OR "África del Norte" OR "África	OR "Afrique de l'Est" or "Région arabe" OR "Asie du
	Occidental" OR "África Austral" OR "África Oriental"	Sud" OR "Asie-Pacifique" OR "Îles du Pacifique" OR
	OR "Región Árabe" OR "Asia Meridional" OR "Asia	"Asie de l'Est" OR "Amérique Latine" OR "Amérique du
	Pacífico" OR "Islas del Pacífico" OR "Asia Oriental" OR	Sud" OR "Caraïbes"))
	"América Latina" OR "América del Sur" OR "Caribe"))	AND PUBYEAR > 2003 AND PUBYEAR < 2023
	AND PUBYEAR > 2003 AND PUBYEAR < 2023	