

1 **Analysis of Economic and Educational Spillover Effects in PEPFAR Countries**

2

3

Short title: Economic and Educational Effects of PEPFAR

4

5

William Crown^{1*}, Dhvani Hariharan¹, Jennifer Kates², Gary Gaumer¹,

6

Monica Jordan¹, Clare L. Hurley¹, Yiqun Luan¹, A.K. Nandakumar¹

7

8

¹Institute for Global Health and Development,

9

Heller School for Social Policy and Management,

10

Brandeis University, Waltham, MA, USA

11

² KFF, Washington, DC, USA

12

13

*Corresponding Author: William Crown, PhD., Institute for Global Health and Development,

14

The Heller School for Social Policy and Management, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA USA.

15

Email: wcrown@brandeis.edu

16

17

18 **Abstract**

19 The United States President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) has been credited with
20 saving millions lives and helping to change the trajectory of the global human
21 immunodeficiency virus (HIV) epidemic. This study assesses whether PEPFAR has had impacts
22 beyond health by examining changes in five economic and educational outcomes in PEPFAR
23 countries: the gross domestic product (GDP) per capita growth rate; the share of girls and share
24 of boys, respectively, who are out of school; and female and male employment rates. We
25 constructed a panel data set for 157 low- and middle-income countries between 1990 and 2018
26 to estimate the macroeconomic impacts of PEPFAR. Our PEPFAR group included 90 countries
27 that had received PEPFAR support over the period. Our comparison group included 67 low- and
28 middle-income countries that had not received any PEPFAR support or had received minimal
29 PEPFAR support (<\$1M or <\$.05 per capita) between 2004 and 2018. We used differences in
30 differences (DID) methods to estimate the program impacts on the five economic and
31 educational outcome measures. This study finds that PEPFAR is associated with increases in the
32 GDP per capita growth rate and educational outcomes. In some models, we find that PEPFAR is
33 associated with reductions in male and female employment. However, these effects appear to
34 be due to trends in the comparison group countries rather than programmatic impacts of
35 PEPFAR. We show that these impacts are most pronounced in COP countries receiving the
36 highest levels of PEPFAR investment.

37

38

39 Introduction

40 A large literature has demonstrated that health investments are correlated with educational
41 attainment and economic growth [1-7]. However, analysis of the economic and educational
42 impacts of health investments made by specific programs is less common. The United States
43 President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) is the largest commitment by any country
44 addressing a single disease [8-11]. PEPFAR has been credited with saving 25 million lives and
45 helping to change the trajectory of the global human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) epidemic
46 [12]. In prior analyses, we found that PEPFAR has contributed to large, significant reductions in
47 all-cause mortality, suggesting a mortality effect beyond HIV [13], as well as significant, positive,
48 health spillover effects in the area of maternal and child health, including reductions in
49 maternal and child mortality and increases in childhood immunization rates [13].

50 In this analysis, we seek to assess whether PEPFAR has had impacts beyond health by examining
51 changes in five economic and educational outcomes in PEPFAR countries: the gross domestic
52 product (GDP) per capita growth rate; the share of girls and share of boys, respectively, who are
53 out of school; and female and male employment rates. Since its launch in 2003, PEPFAR has
54 provided approximately \$90 billion in bilateral assistance to address HIV in low- and middle-
55 income countries (LMICs) to provide services directly and to purchase supplies, local labor, real-
56 estate, utilities, and various contracted services. While PEPFAR, as an HIV-focused and targeted
57 effort, was not designed to be an economic or educational program, there are several reasons
58 to think that such spending could potentially have positive externalities for the economy and on
59 educational attainment. Barofsky and Nosair (2015) enumerate three basic economic benefits
60 of improved population health: "1) greater labor productivity and school attendance from less

61 absenteeism, 2) better cognition and school performance through less disease in utero and in
62 early life, and 3) greater incentives for education and savings with lengthened life expectancy”
63 [14]. Even more directly, program impacts on mortality and morbidity in the population would
64 be expected to have positive effects on labor supply.

65 In addition, over time, PEPFAR has incorporated interventions that include economic and
66 educational support, such as in its DREAMS program focused on adolescent girls and young
67 women that addresses the drivers of the HIV epidemic [15-17]. In addition, external aid may
68 also act as a direct economic stimulus in countries, impacting their GDP [18].

69 This analysis aims to add to the limited research and evidence on such effects. A study
70 published in 2015 showed that PEPFAR investments led to increases in male employment in ten
71 PEPFAR-focus countries but did not show similar results for female employment [18]. A paper
72 published in 2017 showed that PEPFAR investments contributed positively to GDP growth rates
73 [19]. Similarly, the Bipartisan Policy Center found that GDP per capita and productivity per
74 worker were positively correlated with the level of PEPFAR investments [20]. There are
75 however no studies that have looked at PEPFAR investments and educational attainment.

76 For the current analysis, we look at a larger set of countries and over a longer period of time
77 than the prior analyses identified. We use a difference-in-difference quasi-experimental design
78 to analyze the change in each of these outcomes in 90 PEPFAR countries between 2004, the
79 first year in which PEPFAR funding began, and 2018, compared to a comparison group of 67
80 low- and middle-income countries (See methodology for more detail). We tested several
81 different model specifications. Our final model controls for numerous baseline variables that

82 may also be expected to influence these outcomes and which help to make the PEPFAR and
83 non-PEPFAR country groups more comparable.

84 **Methods**

85 We constructed a panel data set for 157 low- and middle-income countries between 1990 and
86 2018 to estimate the macroeconomic impacts of PEPFAR. Our PEPFAR group included 90
87 countries that had received PEPFAR support over the period. Our comparison group included
88 67 low- and middle-income countries that had not received any PEPFAR support or had
89 received minimal PEPFAR support (<\$1M or <\$.05 per capita) between 2004 and 2018. Data
90 on PEPFAR spending by country were obtained from the U.S. government's
91 <https://foreignassistance.gov/> database [21] and represent U.S. fiscal year disbursements.

92 The baseline variables are reported in Table 1:

93

Table 1: Baseline Variables	
Variable	Data Source
1. GDP per capita (current USD)	World Bank Development Indicators, [22]
2. Recipient of U.S. HIV funding prior to 2004 (dummy variable)	USAID, [21]
3. Total population	United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, [23]

4. Life expectancy at birth (years)	World Bank Development Indicators, [22]
5. Total fertility rate (births per woman)	World Bank Development Indicators, [22]
6. Percent urban population (of total population)	World Bank Development Indicators, [22]
7. School enrollment, secondary (% gross)	World Bank Development Indicators, [22]
8. WB country income classification	World Bank, [24]
9. HIV prevalence (% of population ages 15-49)	World Bank Development Indicators, [22] To address missing values in some cases, additional data were obtained from the Global Burden of Disease Collaborative Network, [25]
10. Per capita donor spending on health (non-PEPFAR) (constant \$)	OECD Creditor Reporting System database, [26]

11. Per capita domestic health spending, government and private, PPP (current \$)	World Bank Development Indicators, [22]
---	---

94 Notes: GDP=gross domestic product; HIV=human immunodeficiency virus; OECD=Organization
95 for Economic Cooperation and Development; PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS
96 Relief; PPP=purchasing power parity; USAID= United States Agency for International
97 Development; WB=World Bank; WDI=world development indicators.

98
99 Impact estimates of PEPFAR are obtained with a difference-in-differences econometric model
100 that utilizes PEPFAR participation beginning in 2004. Impact estimates are made for all PEPFAR
101 recipient countries as a group, as well as for the 31 countries that submitted Country
102 Operational Plans (COPs) during the period. The largest Impacts of PEPFAR would be expected
103 in the COP countries because they received the largest funding amounts and country teams
104 were actively engaged in the planning process for the investment of program dollars. The
105 comparison group of LMICs includes 46 unfunded countries and 18 minimally funded countries.

106
107 We estimate impacts of PEPFAR on five economic and educational outcome measures including
108 the GDP per capita growth rate, percentage of female adults employed, percentage of male
109 adults employed, girl's educational disengagement (ratio of primary school age females out of
110 school to the population of primary school age females), and boy's educational disengagement
111 (ratio of primary school age males out of school to the population of primary school age males).

112

113 DID methods have been widely used in the program evaluation literature to estimate treatment
114 effects as a non-parametric alternative to parametric sample selection models [27]. DID can be
115 thought of as an extension of quasi-experimental design to account for unobserved variables
116 potentially correlated with both an intervention and the outcome that are assumed to remain
117 fixed over time. The method can be used when two periods of data are available for countries
118 that receive an intervention (in this case, PEPFAR funding) and those that do not (the
119 comparison group). In the baseline period, PEPFAR countries have not yet received any PEPFAR
120 program dollars (although they may have received external HIV funding, which we control for,
121 as described below). Characteristics of the comparison group countries are also measured in
122 the baseline period. The first group of PEPFAR countries began receiving funding in 2004 and
123 their outcomes are observed in the second (follow-up) period. We also measure the outcomes
124 for countries in the comparison group in the same follow-up period. If we assume that
125 countries may also have unobserved characteristics, λ_i , that are correlated with outcomes but
126 that these characteristics remain fixed over time (e.g., unobserved health endowment), DID
127 provides a method to control for these fixed, unobserved characteristics. The outcome
128 equations for periods 1 and 2 are shown in equations 1a and 1b, respectively:

129

130 (1a) $Y_{i1} = B_0 + B_1X_{i1} + B_2\lambda_i + \epsilon_{i1}$

131 (1b) $Y_{i2} = B_0 + B_1X_{i2} + B_2\lambda_i + B_3T_i + \epsilon_{i2}$

132

133 Calculating the change in outcomes and explanatory variables between time 1 and time 2, and
134 re-estimating the outcome equation, is equivalent to subtracting equation (1a) from (1b):

135

136 (2)
$$(Y_{i2} - Y_{i1}) = (B_0 - B_0) + B_1(X_{i2} - X_{i1}) + B_2(\lambda_i - \lambda_i) + B_3T_i + (\epsilon_{i2} - \epsilon_{i1})$$

137

138 Which simplifies to:

139

140 (3)
$$(Y_{i2} - Y_{i1}) = B_1(X_{i2} - X_{i1}) + B_3T_i + (\epsilon_{i2} - \epsilon_{i1})$$

141

142 In other words, the DID approach subtracts out unobserved fixed effects of countries that may
143 be correlated with both treatment selection and outcomes.

144

145 Operationally, the DID model is easy to implement and generates three key parameter values of
146 interest. A time dummy variable captures the overall differences in the mean value of the
147 dependent variable between the baseline period and the follow-up period for the comparison
148 group. A dummy variable=1 for PEPFAR countries and 0 for comparison group countries and
149 measures the differences between the two groups prior to the intervention. Finally, the
150 coefficient on the variable representing the interaction between PEPFAR and the time dummy
151 variables measures the program impact of PEPFAR.

152

153 The countries that received substantial PEPFAR support during 2004 to 2018 were not a
154 random sample of LMICs. As a result, we also estimate DID models controlling for several
155 covariates to achieve better balance with the comparison group. These covariates include the
156 urban population percentage, HIV prevalence rate, life expectancy, whether the US had

157 provided HIV aid prior to PEPFAR, and others (all measured in 2004 baseline values; see Table
 158 1).
 159
 160 Table 2 reports the descriptive statistics for all PEPFAR countries, the subset that are COP
 161 countries, and the comparison group countries. There are 90 PEPFAR countries in the database,
 162 of which 31 are COP countries. PEPFAR distributed aid to nearly half of the countries in the
 163 world over the period, comprising three-quarters of the global population. The average
 164 population size of PEPFAR countries is 62 million compared to 12.8 million for the comparison
 165 group countries.

166

167 **Table 2. Descriptive Statistics – All PEPFAR, COP, and Comparison Group Countries**

Variable	All PEPFAR Funded LMICs	COPs	Comparison Group (non-PEPFAR LMICs)
Number of countries	90	31	67
Total population 2018	5,609,546,475	2,680,309,948	860,246,053
Cumulative PEPFAR disbursements 2004-2018	\$40,920,244,737	\$39,783,701,262	\$8,025,017
Cumulative PEPFAR disbursements per capita, 2004-2018	\$3,094.20	\$2,974.10	\$0.40

Cumulative other donor health aid per capita (non-PEPFAR donor + non-HIV donor+US), 2004-2018	\$9,428.40	\$3,805.50	\$4,525.90
Cumulative health spending per capita (domestic) [2000-2016]	\$365,066	\$85,261	\$588,474
BL GDP/capita	\$1,761.90	\$1,092.60	\$4,654.60
BL HIV prevalence rate	3	7	0.2
BL life expectancy at birth	61.1	55.1	71.3
BL population urban	41.70%	33.80%	58.00%
BL % adult. pop > primary education --- secondary	55.80%	43.40%	82.00%
No. countries receiving U.S. HIV aid before 2004	54	25	2
BL fertility	4	4.4	2.6

168 **Source:** Authors' tabulations of panel dataset

169 Notes: BL=baseline; COP=Country Operational Plans; GDP=gross domestic product; HIV=human
170 immunodeficiency virus; LMICs=low- and middle-income countries; PEPFAR= US President's
171 Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

172

173 **GDP per Capita Growth Rate**

174 Fig 1 shows the 1990-2018 trends in the GDP per capita growth rate for all PEPFAR countries,
175 COP countries, and the comparison group countries. In general, the comparison group
176 countries exhibit significantly greater variability than the PEPFAR countries over the entire
177 period. From 2000 to 2004, the trends in GDP per capita are similar and vary within a narrow
178 band—although not strictly parallel as required by the DID methodology. For all countries,
179 growth rates peak in 2004 and then decline over most of 2004-2018, with a slight increase in
180 growth in the PEPFAR countries at the end of the period. Although all countries continue to
181 experience GDP growth per capita, the rate of growth slows more in the comparison group
182 countries than either the total PEPFAR group of countries or the COP countries. At around the
183 time of the 2009 global recession, GDP per capita growth rates for all PEPFAR countries and
184 COP countries began to exceed those of comparison group countries and remained higher
185 throughout the remainder of the follow-up period. Although the PEPFAR program was formally
186 introduced in most countries in 2004, it should be noted that efforts to address the HIV
187 pandemic were underway in many countries prior to 2004. There is a substantial increase in
188 GDP per capita in PEPFAR countries and comparison group countries over 2003-2004 but this is
189 unlikely to be a result of HIV programmatic spending as growth rates were highest in the
190 comparison group countries.

191

192 **Fig 1. Trends in GDP per Capita Growth Rate, 1990-2018 for PEPFAR, COP and Non-PEPFAR**

193 **Countries**

194

195 **Source:** Authors' tabulations

196 Notes: Vertical line indicates the formal year of initiation of the PEPFAR program; COP=Country Operational Plans;

197 GDP=gross domestic product; PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

198

199 Table 3 reports the key DID model results for GDP growth per capita growth rate for all PEPFAR

200 countries and COP countries relative to comparison group countries. Two sets of model results

201 are reported: DID models that do not include any baseline control variables and those that do.

202 In general, the unadjusted models closely mirror the descriptive trends in GDP among the

203 different comparison groups. The PEPFAR ALL and PEPFAR COP parameter estimates measure

204 the baseline differences in GDP per capita growth rate for these countries relative to the

205 comparison group at baseline. The unadjusted model results indicate that GDP per capita

206 growth rates were roughly 2 percentage points lower in both groups of PEPFAR countries than

207 comparison group countries at baseline and these differences were highly significant

208 statistically. The sign and significance of baseline differences were similar in the adjusted

209 models. The parameter estimates for the TIME variable measure the trend in the comparison

210 group relative to the baseline. Although the plot of GDP per capita growth rate shows

211 fluctuation in the comparison group over time, there is no discernible trend, and the variable is

212 statistically insignificant in both the adjusted and unadjusted models. Finally, the INTERACTION

213 variable measures the impact of PEPFAR on GDP per capita growth rate. For the PEPFAR ALL

214 group, the PEPFAR effect is positive and statistically significant. As expected, the magnitude of
 215 the PEPFAR impacts was highest for the PEPFAR COP countries (2.50 versus 2.07 for the broader
 216 group of PEPFAR countries in the adjusted models). It should be noted that the adjusted R-
 217 squares for all models are very low, indicating that PEPFAR explains a small amount of the
 218 variability in GDP per capita growth rate.

219

220 **Table 3. DID Models of GDP Per Capita Growth Rate**

GDP Growth	Unadjusted Model Total PEPFAR	Adjusted Model Total PEPFAR	Unadjusted Model COPs	Adjusted Model COPs
	Coefficient (t- statistic)	Coefficient (t- statistic)	Coefficient (t- statistic)	Coefficient (t- statistic)
Constant	2.875***	7.691**	2.875***	13.50***
	(0.247)	(2.515)	-0.268	-4.097
Time	-0.287	-0.112	-0.287	-0.125
	(0.333)	(0.343)	(0.360)	(0.373)
PEPFAR	-1.977***	-1.754***	n/a	n/a
	(0.317)	(0.389)	n/a	n/a
PEPFAR COPs	n/a	n/a	-1.950***	-2.100**
	n/a	n/a	(0.444)	(0.796)

Interaction - PEPFAR	2.276***	2.072***	n/a	n/a
	(0.429)	(0.434)	n/a	n/a
Interaction - COPs	n/a	n/a	2.623***	2.504***
	n/a	n/a	(0.610)	(0.615)
Adj. R-squared	0.015	0.035	0.01	0.025
N	4,192	3,865	2,558	2,283

221 **Source:** Authors' analyses.

222 **Notes:** ***p < 0.001 **p < 0.01. Adj=adjusted; COP=Country Operational Plans;

223 DID=difference-in-difference; n/a=not applicable; PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for

224 AIDS Relief.

225

226 **Female Primary School Disengagement**

227 Fig 2 reports the trends in female primary school disengagement for all PEPFAR countries, COP

228 countries, and comparison group countries from 1990-2018. Baseline levels of disengagement

229 are substantially higher in the PEPFAR countries relative to comparison group countries. There

230 is a gradual improvement in female primary school disengagement rates in the comparison

231 group countries over 1990-2004 but this appears to flatten out after 2004. Over the period

232 1997/98 to 2003, there is a steep improvement in female primary school disengagement rates

233 in PEPFAR countries. Following the introduction of PEPFAR in 2004, rates of female

234 disengagement for PEPFAR appear to converge toward the comparison group countries--

235 particularly for PEPFAR countries that prepare COPs.

236

237 **Fig 2. Female Primary School Disengagement, 1990-2018**

238

239

240 **Source:** Authors' tabulations

241 Notes: Vertical line indicates the formal year of initiation of the PEPFAR program; COP=Country Operational Plans;

242 PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

243

244 Table 4 reports the key unadjusted and adjusted DID model results for female primary school
245 disengagement for all PEPFAR countries and COP countries relative to comparison group
246 countries. The definitions of all key variables are the same as previously described for the GDP
247 per capita growth models. The PEPFAR ALL and PEPFAR COP coefficients indicate very large
248 differences in baseline levels of primary school disengagement for females relative to
249 comparison group countries. The unadjusted model results indicate that rates of female
250 primary school disengagement were more than 19 percent higher in all PEPFAR countries than
251 in comparison group countries at baseline; the baseline differences were about 18 percent
252 higher in COP countries. However, after controlling for baseline characteristics, these baseline
253 differences were no longer statistically significant for the COP countries. The parameter
254 estimates for the TIME variable show that, after controlling for other baseline variables, levels
255 of disengagement in the comparison group trended upward by approximately 4-5 percentage
256 points across the unadjusted and adjusted PEPFAR ALL and COP models from 2004-2018.
257 Controlling for the baseline differences and trends in the comparison group countries, the
258 INTERACTION variable measuring the impact of PEPFAR on female primary school

259 disengagement in the adjusted models is large and highly significant for both the PEPFAR ALL
 260 group (-9.18 percentage points) and the COP group (-12.58 percentage points). The magnitudes
 261 of these treatment effects were similar in the unadjusted models. Moreover, the adjusted R-
 262 squares for the models range from 0.67 to 0.61, indicating that these models explain a
 263 significant amount of the variation female primary school disengagement trends.

264

265 **Table 4. DID Models of Female Primary School Disengagement**

Female Education	Unadjusted model PEPFAR	Adjusted model PEPFAR	Unadjusted model COPs	Adjusted model COPs
	Coefficient (t-statistic)	Coefficient (t-statistic)	Coefficient (t-statistic)	Coefficient (t-statistic)
Constant	11.54***	68.15***	11.54***	67.94***
	(1.053)	(6.647)	-0.785	-9.077
Time	-4.915***	-4.551***	-4.915***	-4.113***
	(1.365)	(0.928)	(1.019)	(0.835)
PEPFAR	19.37***	5.895***	n/a	n/a
	(1.320)	(1.049)	n/a	n/a
PEPFAR COPs	n/a	n/a	18.31***	1.598
	n/a	n/a	(1.250)	(1.735)

Interaction - PEPFAR	-9.271***	-9.185***	n/a	n/a
	(1.713)	(1.143)	n/a	n/a
Interaction - COPs	n/a	n/a	-11.60***	-12.58***
	n/a	n/a	(1.658)	(1.304)
Adj. R-squared	0.220	0.669	0.291	0.609
N	1,669	1,577	969	901

266 **Source:** Authors' Analyses

267 Notes: ***p < 0.001 **p < 0.01; Adj=adjusted; COP=Country Operational Plans; DID=difference-in-difference;

268 n/a=not applicable; PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

269

270 **Male Primary School Disengagement, 1990-2018**

271 Fig 3 reports the trends in male primary school disengagement for all PEPFAR countries, COP
 272 countries, and comparison group countries from 1990-2018. As with females, baseline levels of
 273 male disengagement were substantially higher in the PEPFAR countries relative to comparison
 274 group countries and displayed similar trends in the baseline and follow-up periods to those of
 275 females. Following the introduction of PEPFAR, rates of male disengagement for PEPFAR
 276 appear to converge toward the comparison group countries--particularly for PEPFAR countries
 277 that prepared COPs.

278

279 **Fig 3. Trends in Male Primary School Disengagement**

280

281

282 Notes: Vertical line indicates the formal year of initiation of the PEPFAR program; COP=Country Operational Plans;
283 PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

284

285 Table 5 reports the key DID model results for male primary school disengagement for all
286 PEPFAR countries and COP countries relative to the comparison group countries. As with the
287 models for females, the PEPFAR ALL and PEPFAR COP variables indicate very large differences in
288 baseline levels of primary school disengagement for males relative to comparison group
289 countries. The results from the unadjusted models indicate that rates of male primary school
290 disengagement were roughly 17 percentage points higher in all PEPFAR countries and 18
291 percentage points higher in COP countries at baseline. Not surprisingly, these differences were
292 highly significant statistically. The parameter estimates for the TIME variable show that levels
293 of disengagement in the comparison group decreased by roughly 3 percentage points from
294 2004-2018. Controlling for the trend in the comparison group countries, the INTERACTION
295 variable measuring the impact of PEPFAR on male primary school disengagement was large and
296 highly significant for both the PEPFAR ALL group (-7.96 percentage points) and the COP group (-
297 12.51 percentage points). Moreover, the adjusted R-squares for the models range from 0.60 to
298 0.58, indicating that PEPFAR and the baseline control variables explain a significant amount of
299 the variation in these trends.

300

301 **Table 5. DID Models of Male Primary School Disengagement**

Male Education	Unadjusted model	Adjusted model	Unadjusted model COPs	Adjusted model COPs
-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------

	PEPFAR	PEPFAR		
	Coefficient (t-statistic)	Coefficient (t-statistic)	Coefficient (t-statistic)	Coefficient (t-statistic)
Constant	9.054***	34.46***	9.054***	48.40***
	(0.873)	(5.992)	-0.659	-8.146
Time	-3.010**	-2.863***	-3.010***	-2.577***
	(1.132)	(0.837)	(0.855)	(0.749)
PEPFAR	17.10***	7.023***	n/a	n/a
	(1.094)	(0.945)	n/a	n/a
PEPFAR COPs	n/a	n/a	18.12***	5.782***
	n/a	n/a	(1.049)	(1.557)
Interaction - PEPFAR	-8.382***	-7.962***	n/a	n/a
	(1.420)	(1.031)	n/a	n/a
Interaction - COPs	n/a	n/a	-12.34***	-12.51***
	n/a	n/a	(1.392)	(1.171)
Adj. R-squared	0.225	0.598	0.331	0.577
N	1,669	1,577	969	901

302

303 Source: Authors' analysis

304 Notes: ***p < 0.001 **p < 0.01 Adj=adjusted; COP=Country Operational Plans; DID=difference-in-difference;

305 n/a=not applicable; PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

306

307 **Trends in Female Employment Rates**

308 Fig 4 reports the trends in employment rates for females aged 15 and over. Although the
309 baseline trends appear to be parallel, there is only a hint of an upward trend in the comparison
310 group during the follow-up period while employment rates for women remained flat during this
311 period. Despite no evidence of trends, it is apparent that employment rates for women are
312 substantially higher in all PEPFAR countries and COP countries relative to comparison group
313 countries.

314

315 **Fig 4. Trends in Female Employment Rates, 1990-2018**

316

317

318 Notes: Vertical line indicates the formal year of initiation of the PEPFAR program; COP=Country
319 Operational Plans; PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

320

321 The DID models for females are reported in Table 6. As anticipated based on the trends in Fig 4,
322 the PEPFAR ALL and PEPFAR COP parameter estimates from the unadjusted models are 15.00
323 and 21.28, respectively, indicating large and statistically significant differences in female

324 employment rates between the PEPFAR and comparison group countries over the baseline
 325 period. The TIME coefficient estimates from the unadjusted models indicate that comparison
 326 group employment increased by about 2.5 percentage points in the follow-up period relative to
 327 baseline. After controlling for baseline differences in female employment rates between the
 328 PEPFAR and comparison groups, the INTERACTION variable measuring PEPFAR program impact
 329 is negative and statistically significant for both the PEPFAR ALL and COP groups. However, this
 330 does not seem to be due to a programmatic impact of PEPFAR but, rather, an upward trend in
 331 employment in the comparison group while employment rates remained unchanged in PEPFAR
 332 countries.

333

334 **Table 6. DID Model of Female Employment Rates**

Female Employment	Unadjusted model PEPFAR	Adjusted model PEPFAR	Unadjusted model COPs	Adjusted model COPs
	Coefficient (t- statistic)	Coefficient (t- statistic)	Coefficient (t- statistic)	Coefficient (t- statistic)
Constant	35.64***	156.7***	35.64***	93.83***
	(0.628)	(5.680)	-0.615	-7.539
Time	2.484**	2.869***	2.484**	2.869***
	(0.858)	(0.805)	(0.840)	(0.695)

PEPFAR	15.00***	2.084*	n/a	n/a
	(0.790)	(0.885)	n/a	n/a
PEPFAR COPs	n/a	n/a	21.28***	15.88***
	n/a	n/a	(1.006)	(1.416)
Interaction - PEPFAR	-1.94	-2.416*	n/a	n/a
	(1.080)	(0.991)	n/a	n/a
Interaction - COPs	n/a	n/a	-2.846*	-3.313**
	n/a	n/a	(1.374)	(1.102)
Adj. R-squared	0.147	0.334	0.265	0.543
N	3,948	3,612	2,324	2,044

335 Source: Authors' analysis.

336 Notes: ***p < 0.001 **p < 0.01 * p < 0.05. Adj=adjusted; COP=Country Operational Plans;

337 DID=difference-in-difference; n/a=not applicable; PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for

338 AIDS Relief.

339

340 Trends in Male Employment Rates, 1990-2018

341 Fig 5 reports the trends in employment rates for males aged 15 and over. As with female

342 employment the trends in the PEPFAR and comparison groups are basically horizontal lines

343 over both the baseline and follow-up periods. In the follow-up period there is evidence of an a

344 very modest trend in employment rates for males in the comparison group countries.

345

346 **Fig 5. Trends in Male Employment Rates, 1990-2018**

347

348

349 Notes: Vertical line indicates the formal year of initiation of the PEPFAR program; COP=Country Operational Plans;

350 PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief

351

352 The DID model for male employment is shown in Table 7. The PEPFAR ALL and PEPFAR COP

353 parameter estimates from the unadjusted models indicate that baseline employment levels

354 were about 4.5 percentage points higher in PEPFAR ALL countries and 5.6 percentage points

355 higher in COPs countries relative to the comparison group. There are no statistically significant

356 employment trends for males in the comparison group countries. Finally, in the models that

357 adjusted for baseline variables, the parameter estimates for the PEPFAR program INTERACTION

358 term were statistically significant and negative for the ALL PEPFAR and COP countries. As with

359 females, this appears to be due to a slight increase in employment in the comparison group

360 while employment in PEPFAR countries remained flat over time.

361

362 **Table 7. DID Models of Male Employment Rates**

Male Employment	Unadjusted model PEPFAR	Adjusted model PEPFAR	Unadjusted model COPs	Adjusted model COPs
	Coefficient (t-	Coefficient (t-	Coefficient (t-	Coefficient (t-

	statistic)	statistic)	statistic)	statistic)
Constant	66.72***	28.96***	66.72***	-8.904*
	(0.413)	(3.578)	-0.383	-4.405
Time	-0.444	-0.22	-0.444	-0.22
	(0.564)	(0.507)	(0.523)	(0.406)
PEPFAR	4.497***	-0.557	n/a	n/a
	(0.520)	(0.557)	n/a	n/a
PEPFAR COPs	n/a	n/a	5.645***	5.338***
	n/a	n/a	(0.627)	(0.827)
Interaction - PEPFAR	-1.389	-1.657**	n/a	n/a
	(0.710)	(0.625)	n/a	n/a
Interaction - COPs	n/a	n/a	-1.451	-1.650*
	n/a	n/a	(0.856)	(0.644)
Adj. R-squared	0.031	0.314	0.055	0.460
N	3,948	3,612	2,324	2,044

363 Source: Authors' analysis.

364 Notes: ***p < 0.001 **p < 0.01 * p < 0.05. Adj=adjusted; COP=Country Operational Plans; DID=difference-in-

365 difference; n/a=not applicable; PEPFAR= US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

366

367 **Sensitivity Analyses**

368 A large number of sensitivity analyses were conducted in addition to the main results reported
369 here. Separate sets of models were estimated for the different PEPFAR country groups
370 stratified by income classification (low and middle), as well as three five-year time periods. In
371 general, the largest program impacts were observed for COP countries or countries where
372 PEPFAR made the largest investments (which overlap significantly with COP countries). We also
373 ran all models with and without China and India, the two most populous countries in the world,
374 to assess whether they were influencing the results. In both cases, the results were similar.
375 Results for these sensitivity analyses are reported in the online S1 Appendix. We also
376 performed statistical tests for violations of the parallel trends assumption [28]. These tests
377 indicated that the parallel trends assumption was not supported in some cases. Further
378 research should be conducted to determine the sensitivity of the estimates in cases where the
379 parallel trends assumption is violated.

380

381 **Discussion**

382 This study confirms previous literature demonstrating that PEPFAR is associated with increases
383 in economic growth [19, 20], measured here by the GDP per capita growth rate. We show that
384 these impacts are most pronounced in COP countries.

385

386 In addition, we demonstrate the impacts of PEPFAR on two measures not previously reported
387 in the literature--girls' and boys' primary educational disengagement. PEPFAR was found to

388 have large and statistically significant impacts on improving primary school engagement for
389 both boys and girls. Again, the PEPFAR impacts were greatest in COP countries.

390
391 In contrast to a prior analysis [18] we do not find evidence for positive impacts of PEPFAR on
392 rates of employment for females and males. Rates of employment for both females and males
393 were essentially flat over the entire 1990-2018 period for the cohorts of all PEPFAR countries,
394 COP countries, and comparison group countries. In the long run, it would be anticipated that
395 reduced mortality as well as greater primary school educational engagement by both girls and
396 boys should be reflected in higher rates of labor force participation and economic growth.
397 However, such trends can take many years before they become evident. We consistently find
398 that the positive macroeconomic externalities of PEPFAR on GDP growth and school
399 engagement were the largest in COP countries, generally those that received the most money
400 and engaged in intensive program planning.

401
402 **Limitations**

403 Modeling the macroeconomic and educational spillover effects of PEPFAR is challenging due
404 the complexity of the mechanisms through which substantial spending from a program like
405 PEPFAR may work its way through a country's economy over time. For example, in addition to
406 the potential impacts of health investments on mortality and morbidity, and subsequent
407 impacts on labor supply and productivity, direct and indirect income effects of PEPFAR
408 investments may contribute to aggregate demand. Investments in health care infrastructure
409 generate income for health care workers which is then spent creating subsequent income for

410 people working in other sectors. This income is then respent and, via Keynesian
411 macroeconomic multipliers, generates potential benefits worth multiples of the original
412 expenditure. Together, the demand and supply side effects generated by PEPFAR would be
413 expected to have a positive impact on economic growth. In the long run, however, economic
414 growth enhances the ability of a society to invest in further educational and health care
415 infrastructure creating a positive feedback loop stemming from the original PEPFAR investment.
416 Many of these issues are discussed by Piabuo and Tieguhong (2017) in their review of the
417 literature on health expenditure and economic growth [4].

418 The differences-in-differences approach attempts to address these complexities by focusing
419 attention on the program intervention itself. This requires making a strong assumption that the
420 effects of factors not included in the model are fixed over time and are eliminated through the
421 differencing procedure. Still, it is important to note that even with strong statistical methods,
422 estimation is challenging in the presence of feedback effects (e.g., better health results in
423 greater economic growth and greater economic growth improves health).

424 Acknowledgments

425 The authors thank Adam Wexler and Stephanie Oum from KFF, Washington DC, for data
426 retrieval and dataset preparation.

427

428 References

- 429 1. Bloom D, Kuhn M, Prettnne K. Health and Economic Growth, IZA DP No. 11939. IZA
430 Institute of Labor Economics. 2018. [cited: 2023 Apr 10]. Available from:
431 2023<https://www.iza.org/publications/dp/11939/health-and-economic-growth>
- 432 2. Bloom DE, Khoury A, Kufenko V, Prettnner K. Spurring Economic Growth through Human
433 Development: Research Results and Guidance for Policymakers. IZA Discussion Papers,
434 No. 12964, Institute of Labor Economics: Bonn. 2020. [cited: 10 Apr 10]. Available from:
435 <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/215360/1/dp12964.pdf>
- 436 3. Collin M, Weil D. The Effect of Increasing Human Capital Investment on Economic
437 Growth and Poverty: A Simulation Exercise, World Bank, WPS8590. 2018. [cited: 2023
438 Apr 10]. Available from:
439 [https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/786861537902769850/pdf/WPS8590.p](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/786861537902769850/pdf/WPS8590.pdf)
440 [df](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/786861537902769850/pdf/WPS8590.pdf)
- 441 4. Piabuo S, Tieguhong J. Health expenditure and economic growth - A review of the
442 literature and an analysis between the economic community for central African states
443 (CEMAC) and selected African countries. Health Econ Rev. 2017;7:23.
444 [https://healthconomicsreview.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13561-017-0159-](https://healthconomicsreview.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13561-017-0159-1)
445 1.


- 446 5. Remes J, Wilson M, Ramdoral A. How Investing in Health Has a Significant Economic
447 Payoff for Developing Countries. Brookings Institute. 2020. [cited: 2023 Apr 10].
448 Available from: [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2020/07/21/how-investing-in-health-has-a-significant-economic-payoff-for-developing-economies/)
449 [development/2020/07/21/how-investing-in-health-has-a-significant-economic-payoff-](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2020/07/21/how-investing-in-health-has-a-significant-economic-payoff-for-developing-economies/)
450 [for-developing-economies/](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2020/07/21/how-investing-in-health-has-a-significant-economic-payoff-for-developing-economies/)
- 451 6. Vogl TS. Education and Health in Developing Economies, Working Papers 1453,
452 Princeton University, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs,
453 Research Program in Development Studies. 2012. [cited: 2023 Apr 10]. Available from:
454 [https://rpds.princeton.edu/sites/g/files/toruqf1956/files/media/vogl_ed_health_review](https://rpds.princeton.edu/sites/g/files/toruqf1956/files/media/vogl_ed_health_review.pdf)
455 [.pdf](https://rpds.princeton.edu/sites/g/files/toruqf1956/files/media/vogl_ed_health_review.pdf)
- 456 7. World Bank. Human Capital Project. 2020. [cited: 2023 Apr 10]. Available from:
457 <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/human-capital>
- 458 8. Bor J, Tanser F, Newell ML, Bärnighausen T. In a study of a population cohort in South
459 Africa, HIV patients on antiretrovirals had nearly full recovery of employment. *Health Aff*
460 *(Millwood)*. 2012;31(7):459–469.
- 461 9. Guo Y, Li X, Sherr L. The impact of HIV/AIDs on children’s educational outcome: A critical
462 review of the global literature. *AIDs Care*. 2012;24(8):993-1012.
- 463 10. Resch S, Korenromp E, Stover J, Blakley M, Krubiner C, Thorien K, et al. Economic returns
464 to investment in AIDS treatment in low and middle income countries. *PloS One*.
465 2011;6(10):e25310.

- 466 11. Thirumurthy H, Galárraga O, Larson B, Rosen S. HIV treatment produces economic
467 returns through increased work and education, and warrants continued US support.
468 Health Aff (Millwood). 2012;31(7):1470–1477.
- 469 12. US Department of State. About Us - PEPFAR. 2022. [cited: 2023 May 17]. Available
470 from: [https://www.state.gov/about-us-](https://www.state.gov/about-us-pepfar/#:~:text=Since%20its%20inception%20in%202003,significantly%20strengthening%20global%20health%20security)
471 [pepfar/#:~:text=Since%20its%20inception%20in%202003,significantly%20strengthening](https://www.state.gov/about-us-pepfar/#:~:text=Since%20its%20inception%20in%202003,significantly%20strengthening%20global%20health%20security)
472 [%20global%20health%20security](https://www.state.gov/about-us-pepfar/#:~:text=Since%20its%20inception%20in%202003,significantly%20strengthening%20global%20health%20security)
- 473 13. Kates J, Nandakumar A, Gaumer G, Hariharan D, Crown W, Wexler A, et al. Assessing
474 PEPFAR’s Impact: Analysis of Mortality in PEPFAR Countries. KFF; 2021. [cited: 2023 May
475 30]. Available from: [https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/issue-brief/assessing-](https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/issue-brief/assessing-pepfars-impact-analysis-of-mortality-in-pepfar-countries/)
476 [pepfars-impact-analysis-of-mortality-in-pepfar-countries/](https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/issue-brief/assessing-pepfars-impact-analysis-of-mortality-in-pepfar-countries/)
- 477 14. Barofsky J, Nosair W. Investments in Health For Poverty Reduction: New Evidence and
478 Data Challenges. Brookings Institute; 2013. [cited: 2023 Jun 2]. Available from:
479 [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/africa-in-focus/2015/10/08/investment-in-health-for-](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/africa-in-focus/2015/10/08/investment-in-health-for-poverty-reduction-new-evidence-and-data-challenges/)
480 [poverty-reduction-new-evidence-and-data-challenges/](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/africa-in-focus/2015/10/08/investment-in-health-for-poverty-reduction-new-evidence-and-data-challenges/)
- 481 15. Crown W, Kates J, Nandakumar A, Gaumer G, Hariharan D. Assessing PEPFAR’s Impact:
482 Analysis of Economic and Educational Spillover Effects in PEPFAR Countries. 2022. [cited:
483 2023 May 30]. Available from: [kff.org/global-health-policy/issue-brief/assessing-](https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/issue-brief/assessing-pepfars-impact-analysis-of-economic-and-educational-spillover-effects-in-pepfar-countries/)
484 [pepfars-impact-analysis-of-economic-and-educational-spillover-effects-in-pepfar-](https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/issue-brief/assessing-pepfars-impact-analysis-of-economic-and-educational-spillover-effects-in-pepfar-countries/)
485 [countries/](https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/issue-brief/assessing-pepfars-impact-analysis-of-economic-and-educational-spillover-effects-in-pepfar-countries/)
- 486 16. US Department of State. PEPFAR DREAMS Guidance. 2021. [cited: 2023 May 31].
487 Available from:

- 488 <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a29b53af9a61e9d04a1cb10/t/611ed11ed7ee4f>
489 [73abf24803/16294_09569489/2021-08-17+DREAMS+Guidance+Final+March+2018+Update_PEPFAR+Solutions.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a29b53af9a61e9d04a1cb10/t/611ed11ed7ee4f/73abf24803/16294_09569489/2021-08-17+DREAMS+Guidance+Final+March+2018+Update_PEPFAR+Solutions.pdf)
- 491 17. US Department of State. PEPFAR 2022 Country and Regional Operational Plan
492 (COP/ROP) Guidance for all PEPFAR-Supported Countries. 2022. [cited: 2023 May 31].
493 Available from: [https://www.state.gov/wpcontent/uploads/2022/02/COP22-Guidance-](https://www.state.gov/wpcontent/uploads/2022/02/COP22-Guidance-Final_508-Compliant-3.pdf)
494 [Final_508-Compliant-3.pdf](https://www.state.gov/wpcontent/uploads/2022/02/COP22-Guidance-Final_508-Compliant-3.pdf)
- 495 18. Wagner Z, Borofsky J, Sood N. PEPFAR funding associated with an increase in
496 employment among males in ten sub-Saharan African countries. *Health Affairs*.
497 2015;34(6). <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.1006>.
- 498 19. Kim Y, Whang T. The effects of the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief on the
499 economies and domestic politics of focus countries. *Global Economic Review*.
500 2017;46(4):441–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1226508X.2017.1367316>.
- 501 20. Daschle T, Frist W. Building Prosperity, Stability, and Security Through Strategic Health
502 Diplomacy: A Study of 15 Years of PEPFAR, BiPartisan Policy Center. Washington DC; July
503 2018
- 504 21. US Department of State, USAID. [Foreignassistance.gov](https://foreignassistance.gov). 2023. [cited: 2023 May 17].
505 Available from: <https://foreignassistance.gov/>
- 506 22. World Bank. World Development Indicators. [cited: 2023 May 17]. Available from:
507 <https://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators/>

- 508 23. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World
509 Population Prospects 2019, Online Edition. Rev. 2019. Available from:
510 <https://population.un.org/wpp/>
- 511 24. World Bank. Data: World Bank Country and Lending Groups. [cited: 2023 May 30].
512 Available from: <https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519->
- 513 25. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). Global Burden of Disease Study 2019
514 (GBD 2019) Data Resources. 2020. [cited: 2023 May 30]. Available from:
515 <https://ghdx.healthdata.org/gbd-2019>, <http://ghdx.healthdata.org/gbd-results-tool>
- 516 26. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Creditor Reporting
517 System (CRS). [cited: 2023 May 30]. Available from:
518 <https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=crs1>
- 519 27. Wooldridge J. Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data, 2nd Edition.
520 Cambridge, MA/London: Penguin Random House/MIT Press; 2011.
- 521 28. Rambachan A, Roth J. A more credible approach to parallel trends. Review of Economic
522 Studies. 2023;15:1-37.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.19.23293360>; this version posted August 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.



1

1

Figure 1






Figure 2



1


Figure 3



1

1

Figure 4



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.29.23293360>; this version posted August 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

1

1

Figure 5