

1 Missing the vulnerable – Inequalities in social protection
2 among the general population, people living with HIV,
3 and adolescent girls and young women in 13 sub-
4 Saharan African countries: Analysis of population-based
5 surveys

6

7 Short title:

8 Missing the vulnerable – Inequalities in social protection

9

10 Author names:

11 David Chipanta^{1 *}, Silas Amo-Agyei^{2, #a, #b}, Lucas Hertzog³, Ahmad Reza Hosseinpoor⁴,
12 Michael Smith^{5, c}, Caitlin Mahoney^{5, d}, Juan Gonzalo Jaramillo Mejia^{5, d}, Olivia Keiser⁶, Janne
13 Estill⁶

14

15 Affiliation

16 ¹ United Nations Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), Windhoek, Namibia.

17 ^{2 #a}The University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom.

18 ^{#b}United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Switzerland.

19 ³WHO Collaborating Centre for Climate Change and Health Impact Assessment, Faculty of
20 Health Sciences, School of Population Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia.

21 ⁴ Department of Data and Analytics, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

22 ⁵ Nutrition Division ^c, Social Protection Unit ^d, World Food Programme, Rome, Italy.

23 ⁶ Institute of Global Health, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland.

24

25 Corresponding author

26 *David Chipanta

27 Email: chipantad@unaids.org

28

29 Abstract

30 Inequality in access to services is a global problem mainly impacting the poorest
31 populations. The role of social protection in reducing inequalities is recognized, but few
32 studies have investigated whether social protection benefits people facing considerable
33 socioeconomic inequalities. We assessed inequalities in receiving social protection among
34 the public, men and women living with human immunodeficiency virus (PLHIV), and
35 adolescent girls and young women (AGYW), using population-based data from 13 African
36 countries. We constructed concentration curves and computed concentration indices (CIX)
37 for each country and population group. We also conducted a desk review of social protection
38 in the studied countries where information was available on the characteristics of social
39 protection programs and their access by the general population, PLHIV, and AGYW. The
40 sample size ranged from 10,197 in Eswatini to 29,577 in Tanzania. Women comprised 60%
41 or more of PLHIV in the surveyed countries. 50%–70% of the respondents were
42 unemployed, except in Cameroon, Kenya, and Uganda, where less than 50% were
43 unemployed. Generally, the proportion of respondents from wealth quintile one (Q1), the
44 poorest 20% of households, was like that from Q2–Q5. The proportion of the general
45 population receiving social protection varied from 5.2% (95% Confidence Interval 4.5%–
46 6.0%) in Ethiopia to 39.9% (37.0%–42.8%) in Eswatini. Among PLHIV, the proportion
47 receiving social protection varied from 6.9% (5.7%–8.4%) among men living with HIV in
48 Zambia to 45.0% (41.2–49.0) among women living with HIV in Namibia. Among AGYW, the
49 proportion varied from 4.4% (3.6–5.3) in Ethiopia to 44.6% (40.8–48.5) in Eswatini. In
50 general, 15% or less of the respondents from Q1 reported receiving social protection in eight
51 countries (i.e., Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania, Uganda, and
52 Zambia), with 10% or less in three countries (Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, and Ethiopia); 15%–
53 20% in Rwanda, 30% in Zimbabwe, 40% in Lesotho, and more than 50% in Eswatini and
54 Namibia. Among the wealthiest quintiles (Q5), the proportion receiving social protection
55 ranged from 3.6% (2.6%–5.0%) in Ethiopia to 19.7% (16.25–23.8%) in Namibia. Only in
56 countries with higher social protection coverage did the proportion of the poorest wealth
57 quintile households reached also high. Socioeconomic inequalities in receiving social
58 protection favored the poor in 11 out of 13 countries and the rich in Cameroon and were
59 undefined in Côte d'Ivoire. The CIX values for socioeconomic inequalities in receiving social
60 protection in these 11 countries ranged from –0.080 ($p=0.002$) among the general
61 population in Malawi to –0.372 ($p<0.001$) among WLHIV in Zimbabwe. However, in 8
62 countries (Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania, Uganda, and
63 Zambia) of these 11 countries, 15% or less of the population from the poorest wealth quintile
64 received social protection. In the countries surveyed, access to social protection for the
65 general population, MLHIV and WLHIV, and AGYW was generally low but favored people
66 from poor households. However, pro-poor social protection, although necessary, is not
67 sufficient to ensure that people from the poorest households receive social protection.
68 Further research is required to identify and reach people from the poorest households with
69 social protection in sub-Saharan Africa.

70

71

72

73

74 **1 Introduction**

75 Inequality in access to services is an urgent global concern, with the alarming gap between extreme
76 wealth and poverty reaching unprecedented levels and thrusting billions of people into hardship,
77 including hunger [1, 2]. Inequality is multifaceted, spanning race, ethnicity, income, wealth, and
78 gender. Gender inequalities are deeply entrenched and intersect with other forms of inequality [3, 4].
79 Generally, equitable communities enjoy robust social cohesion, low crime rates, high levels of trust,
80 life satisfaction, durable peace, political stability, and economic growth, in contrast to their inequitable
81 counterparts [3, 5, 6, 7]. Conversely, high inequalities can undermine a nation's capacity to prevent,
82 respond, and adapt to emergencies, including infectious diseases [3, 7]. Therefore, addressing
83 inequalities is an imperative objective of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). SDG 10—
84 Reducing Inequalities—committed member states to reducing inequalities by promoting the inclusion
85 of all population groups in socioeconomic and political spheres by 2030 [8]. Despite the increasing
86 global focus on inequalities, current trajectories show that the world is unlikely to meet even 10% of
87 the full targets under SDG 10 by 2030 [9]. People residing in the Global South, particularly in sub-
88 Saharan Africa, bear the impact of the failure to achieve SDG10 [9].

89 Social protection programs can accelerate progress toward achieving SDG 10. Social protection is
90 defined as policies and programs that help individuals and societies manage risk and uncertainty,
91 protect them from poverty and inequality, and allow them to access economic opportunity [10]. They
92 reduce poverty, inequality, and the prevalence of ill health; foster gender equality; and stimulate
93 economic growth [11, 12, 13, 14]. Social protection programs that cater to the poorest populations can
94 alleviate inequality [15]. Such programs are pro-poor. They prioritize the most impoverished and
95 vulnerable people, including children, women, persons with disabilities, and the elderly [11, 16, 17,
96 18]. However, research investigating socioeconomic inequalities in receiving social protection in sub-
97 Saharan Africa is limited. We assessed socioeconomic inequalities in receiving social protection
98 among the general population, people (women and men) living with HIV (PLHIV), and adolescent girls
99 and young women (AGYW) using population-based impact assessment survey data from 13 sub-
100 Saharan African countries. Our hypothesis was that social protection was pro-poor, focused on
101 people from poor households who are considered most vulnerable and deserving of access to it.

102 **2 Materials and Methods**

103 We analyzed SDG Indicator 1.3.1, defined as the proportion of the population receiving at least one
104 social protection benefit from any source, as the main outcome indicator. UNAIDS earmarked this
105 indicator as a target to measure the coverage of social protection for people living with, at risk of, or
106 affected by HIV [19]. The target states ensure that by 2025, 45% of people living with, at risk of or
107 affected by HIV have access to social protection benefits [19]. We examined inequalities in receiving
108 social protection within the preceding 12 months of the survey interview by the general population,
109 men and women living with HIV (MLHIV and WLHIV), and AGYW. We also assessed whether social
110 protection programs in the participating countries reached the poorest households measured based
111 on living standards including household assets.

112 We analyzed the PHIA survey data for countries with data on social protection receipt by the general
113 population, MLHIV and WLHIV, and AGYW. The PHIA surveys collected a range of health and
114 sociodemographic data to evaluate the impact of HIV programs in the countries supported by the
115 United States President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. We used the Household, Adult Interview,
116 and Adult HIV Biomarker datasets. In participating households, a household questionnaire was
117 administered to the household head, who indicated all individuals living in the household and provided
118 information on the household, such as assets, living standards, and access to social protection
119 benefits. Individual questionnaires were then administered to eligible and consenting adults aged 15
120 or older in the household. The Adult HIV Biomarker data set contained the HIV test results of all
121 adults and adolescents aged 15 or older who completed an individual interview and consented or
122 agreed to provide blood samples for HIV testing. The interviews assessed wealth, education level,
123 and other sociodemographic characteristics at the individual and household levels. They also included
124 questions about external economic support. In addition, the questions identified AGYWs aged 15–24
125 years. We obtained the PHIA data sets from the PHIA Project website at [https://phia-](https://phia-data.icap.columbia.edu/)
126 [data.icap.columbia.edu/](https://phia-data.icap.columbia.edu/). We also conducted a desk review of social protection in the studied
127 countries where information was available on the characteristics of social programs and their access
128 by the general population, PLHIV, and AGYW.

129 **2.1 Variables and outcome descriptions**

130

131 Our primary outcome was the receipt of any form of external economic support. This support was
132 defined as any external economic assistance provided to the household within the previous 12
133 months of the survey. This was derived from the PHIA household survey question “Has your
134 household received any of the following forms of economic support in the last 12 months?” The
135 acknowledgment of any economic support, including assistance for school fees, material support for
136 education, food assistance, support for income generation, social pensions, and cash transfers,
137 including pensions, disability, and child grants, was recorded as receiving social protection benefits.
138 We classified a respondent as HIV-positive if the respondent self-reported an HIV-positive test result
139 and the result of their HIV biomarker test was positive. AGYW were defined as females aged 15–24
140 years, men as males 15 years and older and women as females 15 years and older. Other
141 explanatory variables included HIV prevalence, age, sex, marital status, household size, residence,
142 employment, education, wealth, and region defined in Supplementary Table 1.

143 The study sample included women and men aged 15–59 years who were interviewed. Any individual
144 with a missing sex was excluded from the analysis. Household wealth was evaluated via a composite
145 measure reflecting living standards, based on asset ownership, which included items such as
146 television sets, refrigerators, water access, and roofing. Region reflected the subregion of a country
147 and was included in the analyses to account for subregional variation in access to social protection.

148 **2.2 Analysis**

149 ***2.2.1 Measuring the level of social protection coverage***

150 We used the *surveymeans* procedure to determine the weighted proportion of persons who reported
151 receiving any social protection benefit for each country and population group – the public aged 15 to
152 59, MLHIV, WLHIV and AGYW. Survey weights accounting for nonresponse using Chi-squared
153 automatic interaction detector analysis, noncoverage, and the probability of selection were applied.
154 We used individual interview weights in the analysis of the data. Variances and 95% confidence
155 intervals (CIs) were estimated using the corresponding jackknife replicate weights [20] .

156 ***2.2.2 Measuring inequality in social protection coverage***

157 We used two methodologies to examine income-related inequality in receiving social protection. First,
158 we constructed concentration curves for receiving social protection for each subpopulation within
159 each country. A concentration curve represents the cumulative percentage of a variable of interest

160 (social protection coverage in the context of this study) plotted on the y-axis against the cumulative
161 proportion of the population—ranked by socioeconomic status from the poorest to the richest—on the
162 x-axis [21]. The concentration curve coincides with the 45° line, known as the line of equality, when
163 every individual receives the same value of the variable of interest. A concentration curve lying above
164 (below) the line of equality signifies that the variable of interest is concentrated among the poor (rich).
165 The degree of pro-poor (pro-rich) inequality increases as the curve diverges further above (below) the
166 line of equality. In this study, we defined pro-poor social protection by the concentration curve of
167 receiving social protection above the line of equality.

168 In the second approach, we computed the Concentration Index (CIX). The CIX encapsulates the
169 information conveyed by the concentration curve, quantifying the socioeconomic inequalities
170 associated with the variable of interest. The CIX is twice the area between the concentration curve
171 and the line of equality, equating to zero in the absence of economic-related inequality [21]. A
172 negative (positive) CIX value signifies that the curve lies above (below) the line of equality, indicating
173 a disproportionate concentration of the variable of interest among the poor (rich). A zero CIX value
174 can also occur if the curve intersects the line of equality and the areas above and below the equality
175 line offset each other. In standard practice, CIX is interpreted in conjunction with the concentration
176 curve. We conducted all analyses using Stata version 18.

177 **2.2.3 Ethics Statement**

178 PHIA survey administration follows international scientific research standards in human subjects,
179 including protecting respondents' privacy and confidentiality of information. Each country's PHIA
180 survey report provides details of the survey design, sampling procedure, protection of the privacy and
181 confidentiality of information, and obtaining informed consent.

182 Ethics and regulatory bodies, including ministries of health and institutional review boards, approved
183 the PHIA survey protocols, consent forms, questionnaires, and other survey documents in each
184 country. The institutional review boards of Columbia University Medical Center, Westat, and the
185 Centers for Disease Control also reviewed and approved the survey documents.

186 This study did not require ethical clearance because the data were de-identified. It can be accessed
187 by registering at the PHIA Project website at <https://phia-data.icap.columbia.edu/>

188 **3. Results**

189 The 13 countries and the years of the surveys were Cameroon (2017–2018), Côte d'Ivoire (2017–
190 2018), Ethiopia (2017–2018), Eswatini (2016–2017), Kenya (2018–2019), Lesotho (2016–2017),
191 Malawi (2015–2016), Namibia (2017), Rwanda (2018), Tanzania (2016–2017), Uganda (2016–2017),
192 Zambia (2016), and Zimbabwe (2015–2016). The sample size ranged from 10,197 in Eswatini to
193 29,577 in Tanzania, with median ages ranging between 27 years (interquartile range, IQR, 20–37 in
194 Uganda) to 32 years (IQR 25–41 in Kenya) (Table 1). HIV prevalence was lowest in Côte d'Ivoire
195 (2.7%, 95% CI (2.4%–3.1%)) and highest in Eswatini (27.9%, 26.5%–29.3%). Women comprised 60%
196 or more of people living with HIV in the surveyed countries (Supplementary Table 2).

197 More than 60% of the respondents lived in rural areas in eight countries (i.e., Eswatini, Kenya,
198 Lesotho, Malawi, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zimbabwe). In all countries surveyed, 80% or
199 more of respondents were married or cohabiting, and 60% or more had at least four members. Of the
200 respondents, 50%–70% were unemployed, except in Cameroon, Kenya, and Uganda, where less
201 than 50% were unemployed. Up to 13% of the respondents had no formal education, except in Côte
202 d'Ivoire, where 42% had no formal education. In general, the proportion of respondents from wealth
203 quintile one (Q1), that is, the bottom 20% of households, was similar to those from Q2–Q5 (Table 1).

Table 1: Survey weighted sample descriptive statistics by country (PHIA 2015-2019). The results are reported as (percentages with, sample size, 95% confidence intervals and absolute numbers unless otherwise indicated)

	Cameroon (N=26039)	Côte d'Ivoire (N=18339)	Eswatini (N=10197)	Ethiopia (N=18466)	Kenya (N=23536)	Lesotho (N=12842)	Malawi (N=19092)
Sex							
Male	49.1 (49.0 - 49.2) 11827	51.3 (51.2 - 51.4) 9145	45.5 (45.5 - 45.6) 4377	50.0 (49.9 - 50.1) 7735	47.5 (47.1 - 47.9) 9468	50.1 (50.0 - 50.1) 5339	48.5 (48.5 - 48.5) 8002
Female	50.9 (50.8 - 51.0) 14212	48.7 (48.6 - 48.8) 9194	54.5 (54.4 - 54.5) 5820	50.0 (49.9 - 50.1) 11731	52.5 (52.1 - 52.9) 14068	49.9 (49.9 - 50.0) 7503	51.5 (51.5 - 51.5) 11090
Age [Years] (IQR)	29 (21 - 39)	29 (22 - 39)	28 (21 - 38)	28 (21 - 38)	32 (25 - 41)	30 (22 - 40)	28 (20 - 38)
15-24	36.6 (36.6 - 36.7) 9333	34.3 (34.2 - 34.4) 6199	37.2 (37.2 - 37.3) 3785	35.7 (35.6 - 35.8) 7882	21.9 (21.4 - 22.5) 4513	34.1 (34.0 - 34.2) 4403	39.8 (39.8 - 39.9) 7166
25-34	28.1 (28.0 - 28.2) 7474	31.2 (31.2 - 31.3) 5387	29.0 (29.0 - 29.1) 2843	31.3 (31.2 - 31.3) 5982	35.0 (34.7 - 35.2) 7857	29.9 (29.8 - 29.9) 3640	27.6 (27.6 - 27.6) 5489
35-44	19.4 (19.4 - 19.5) 4928	19.2 (19.2 - 19.3) 3818	18.7 (18.6 - 18.7) 1820	19.4 (19.3 - 19.4) 3288	23.8 (23.5 - 24.0) 5770	19.0 (18.9 - 19.0) 2387	18.2 (18.2 - 18.2) 3690
45-54	11.8 (11.7 - 11.8) 3084	11.6 (11.6 - 11.6) 2221	11.3 (11.3 - 11.3) 1256	10.4 (10.3 - 10.4) 1730	14.5 (14.4 - 14.7) 3911	12.1 (12.0 - 12.1) 1593	10.8 (10.8 - 10.8) 2050
55+	4.0 (4.0 - 4.1) 1220	3.6 (3.6 - 3.6) 714	3.8 (3.8 - 3.9) 493	3.3 (3.3 - 3.4) 584	4.8 (4.8 - 4.9) 1485	5.0 (4.9 - 5.0) 819	3.6 (3.6 - 3.6) 697
Residence type							
Rural	47.4 (43.4 - 51.4) 14731	37.4 (33.8 - 41.2) 8762	72.0 (69.7 - 74.2) 7835		60.5 (58.5 - 62.5) 14548	58.8 (56.4 - 61.2) 7774	79.9 (77.0 - 82.5) 11827
Urban	52.6 (48.6 - 56.6) 11308	62.6 (58.8 - 66.2) 9577	28.0 (25.8 - 30.3) 2362	100.0(89.9 -100.1)18466	39.5 (37.5 - 41.5) 8988	41.2 (38.8 - 43.6) 5068	20.1 (17.5 - 23.0) 7265
Marital status							
Single	17.1 (16.4 - 17.7) 4402	8.8 (8.0 - 9.6) 1482	12.2 (11.5 - 13.0) 1290	14.8 (14.1 - 15.5) 3124	14.7 (14.0 - 15.3) 3670	17.0 (16.3 - 17.7) 2371	12.0 (11.3 - 12.7) 2441
Married	82.9 (82.3 - 83.6) 21637	91.2 (90.4 - 92.0) 16857	87.8 (87.0 - 88.5) 8907	85.2 (84.5 - 85.9) 16342	85.3 (84.7 - 86.0) 19866	83.0 (82.3 - 83.7) 10471	88.0 (87.3 - 88.7) 16651
Household size (n)							
1 to 3	23.2 (21.9 - 24.6) 5823	25.7 (24.2 - 27.2) 4752	31.2 (29.2 - 33.3) 3146	39.5 (38.0 - 41.1) 8075	32.0 (30.5 - 33.5) 6774	40.5 (39.1 - 42.0) 5259	25.2 (23.9 - 26.5) 5075
4 to 6	35.8 (34.4 - 37.3) 9022	34.8 (32.6 - 37.0) 6308	37.4 (35.7 - 39.1) 3795	45.0 (43.7 - 46.3) 8361	44.8 (43.5 - 46.0) 10649	43.3 (41.8 - 44.8) 5543	50.8 (49.3 - 52.2) 9597
>7	40.9 (38.9 - 43.1) 11194	39.6 (37.0 - 42.2) 7279	31.4 (29.2 - 33.7) 3256	15.5 (14.0 - 17.0) 3030	23.2 (22.0 - 24.6) 6113	16.1 (14.8 - 17.6) 2040	24.0 (22.6 - 25.5) 4420
Employment status							
Not employed	45.1 (43.8 - 46.5) 12218	52.7 (51.1 - 54.3) 9962	56.7 (55.2 - 58.2) 5975	52.2 (50.8 - 53.7) 10996	42.4 (41.1 - 43.8) 11382	60.9 (59.6 - 62.1) 8156	70.4 (69.3 - 71.5) 13156
Employed	54.9 (53.5 - 56.2) 13821	47.3 (45.7 - 48.9) 8377	43.3 (41.8 - 44.8) 4222	47.8 (46.3 - 49.2) 8470	57.6 (56.2 - 58.9) 12154	39.1 (37.9 - 40.4) 4686	29.6 (28.5 - 30.7) 5936
Education level							
Not educated	13.0 (11.9 - 14.3) 4695	40.8 (38.5 - 43.1) 7984	3.5 (3.0 - 4.0) 384	11.3 (10.3 - 12.4) 2318	7.5 (6.7 - 8.3) 2650	5.0 (4.5 - 5.5) 620	8.6 (8.0 - 9.3) 1521
Primary	26.2 (24.9 - 27.5) 7358	25.6 (24.3 - 26.9) 4904	25.9 (24.7 - 27.3) 2795	35.1 (33.7 - 36.6) 6821	49.5 (48.2 - 50.8) 12002	39.8 (38.2 - 41.4) 5247	63.2 (61.7 - 64.7) 10894
Secondary	33.5 (32.5 - 34.6) 8146	26.9 (25.4 - 28.5) 4539	59.9 (58.4 - 61.3) 6032	29.1 (28.0 - 30.2) 5706	30.9 (29.7 - 32.1) 6341	44.6 (43.2 - 46) 5719	25.3 (23.9 - 26.7) 5689
Higher	27.3 (25.4 - 29.3) 5840	6.7 (5.5 - 8.2) 912	10.7 (9.4 - 12.2) 986	24.5 (22.7 - 26.3) 4621	12.1 (11.2 - 13.1) 2543	10.6 (9.6 - 11.7) 1256	2.9 (2.6 - 3.3) 988
Wealth quintiles:							
Q1: Poorest	19.9 (17.7 - 22.4) 7529	25.4 (22.0 - 29.1) 2867	20.2 (18.5 - 22.1) 2224	16.5 (14.4 - 18.9) 3379	19.9 (18.4 - 21.5) 6151	17.3 (15.5 - 19.3) 2485	15.2 (14.0 - 16.5) 2228
Q2	20.1 (17.8 - 22.7) 5776	19.1 (16.5 - 22.0) 3304	19.9 (18.2 - 21.7) 2139	17.6 (16.3 - 19.0) 3495	20.5 (19.3 - 21.8) 4937	18.9 (17.6 - 20.4) 2530	18.2 (16.9 - 19.5) 2725
Q3	21.3 (19.6 - 23.0) 4864	18.4 (16.4 - 20.6) 4169	22.9 (20.8 - 25.1) 2374	19.8 (18.4 - 21.3) 3895	20.7 (19.5 - 21.8) 4867	20.1 (18.6 - 21.7) 2539	20.1 (18.9 - 21.4) 3040
Q4	18.9 (17.2 - 20.7) 4065	19.7 (17.8 - 21.7) 4508	18.0 (16.1 - 20.1) 1697	22.1 (20.2 - 24.0) 4212	20.2 (18.6 - 21.9) 4441	21.0 (19.6 - 22.5) 2592	22.1 (20.7 - 23.7) 3902
Q5: Wealthiest	19.8 (17.2 - 22.6) 3805	17.3 (14.5 - 20.6) 3491	19.0 (16.2 - 22.2) 1763	24.1 (21.8 - 26.5) 4485	18.8 (17.1 - 20.6) 3140	22.6 (20.7 - 24.8) 2696	24.4 (22.3 - 26.5) 7197

Q1 Quintiles 1: Poorest, Q5: Wealthiest. IQR Interquartile range ____ data set had no variable. Lesotho, we combined the population living in peri-urban areas with rural areas. Ethiopia data set only had an urban variable.

Table 1: Survey weighted sample descriptive statistics by country (PHIA 2015-2019). The results are reported as percentages with 95% confidence intervals and absolute numbers unless otherwise indicated).

	Namibia (N=18009)	Rwanda (N=29510)	Tanzania (N=29577)	Uganda (N=28212)	Zambia (N=21138)	Zimbabwe (N=21424)
Sex						
Male	48.3 (48.2 - 48.3) 7967	48.1 (48.1 - 48.1) 13299	49.1 (49.1 - 49.1) 12867	47.4 (47.3 - 47.4) 12004	48.9 (48.9 - 49.0) 9104	47.7 (47.6 - 47.7) 8831
Female	51.7 (51.7 - 51.8) 10042	51.9 (51.9 - 51.9) 16211	50.9 (50.9 - 50.9) 16710	52.6 (52.6 - 52.7) 16208	51.1 (51.0 - 51.1) 12034	52.3 (52.3 - 52.4) 12593
Age [Years] (IQR)	29 (21 - 40)	29 (21 - 39)	28 (20 - 39)	27 (20 - 37)	27 (20 - 38)	29 (21 - 38)
15-24	35.2 (35.1 - 35.2) 6081	35.7 (35.7 - 35.7) 11365	38.4 (38.4 - 38.5) 10704	43.4 (43.3 - 43.4) 11321	41.1 (41.0 - 41.2) 8043	37.8 (37.8 - 37.8) 7730
25-34	28.7 (28.6 - 28.7) 4871	28.9 (28.8 - 28.9) 8181	27.3 (27.3 - 27.4) 8127	26.8 (26.8 - 26.9) 7643	27.3 (27.2 - 27.3) 5736	28.4 (28.4 - 28.4) 5570
35-44	19.4 (19.3 - 19.4) 3657	19.5 (19.5 - 19.5) 5636	18.8 (18.8 - 18.8) 5875	16.5 (16.4 - 16.5) 4923	18.1 (18.1 - 18.2) 4146	19.6 (19.6 - 19.6) 4360
45-54	12.5 (12.5 - 12.6) 2450	11.1 (11.1 - 11.1) 3086	11.5 (11.5 - 11.5) 3671	10.1 (10.1 - 10.1) 3315	10.1 (10.1 - 10.2) 2418	10.1 (10.1 - 10.1) 2596
55+	4.3 (4.3 - 4.3) 950	4.8 (4.8 - 4.8) 1242	3.9 (3.9 - 4.0) 1200	3.3 (3.2 - 3.3) 1010	3.4 (3.3 - 3.4) 795	4.1 (4.1 - 4.2) 1168
Residence						
Rural	41.7 (39.4 - 44.0) 10146	79.3 (75.2 - 82.9) 21969	62.5 (58.7 - 66.2) 19601	71.3 (67.3 - 74.9) 20515	54.3 (50.8 - 57.6) 11911	64.0 (62.3 - 65.6) 14924
Urban	58.3 (56.0 - 60.6) 7863	20.7 (17.1 - 24.8) 7541	37.5 (33.8 - 41.3) 9976	28.7 (25.1 - 32.7) 7697	45.7 (42.4 - 49.2) 9227	36.0 (34.4 - 37.7) 6500
Marital status						
Single	18.7 (17.8 - 19.6) 3467	11.0 (10.6 - 11.5) 3250	13.4 (12.8 - 14.0) 4085	16.9 (16.3 - 17.5) 4866	11.4 (10.9 - 11.9) 2612	13.0 (12.4 - 13.6) 3111
Married	81.3 (80.4 - 82.2) 14542	89.0 (88.5 - 89.4) 26260	86.6 (86.0 - 87.2) 25492	83.1 (82.5 - 83.7) 23346	88.6 (88.1 - 89.1) 18526	87.0 (86.4 - 87.6) 18313
Household size (n)						
1 to 3	30.9 (29.5 - 32.4) 5294	15.2 (14.3 - 16.2) 4595	24.0 (22.7 - 25.4) 6749	19.5 (18.6 - 20.5) 5018	18.1 (17.1 - 19.2) 3836	27.8 (26.6 - 29.1) 6035
4 to 6	33.7 (32.1 - 35.4) 5783	44.3 (42.8 - 45.8) 12971	41.1 (39.8 - 42.4) 11799	35.7 (34.5 - 37.0) 9730	42.9 (41.8 - 44.1) 9176	49.4 (48.0 - 50.8) 10403
>7	35.4 (33.5 - 37.2) 6932	40.5 (38.6 - 42.4) 11944	34.9 (33.1 - 36.7) 11029	44.8 (43.2 - 46.3) 3464	38.9 (37.5 - 40.4) 8126	22.8 (21.4 - 24.2) 4986
Employment status						
Not employed	54 (52.8 - 55.3) 10329	59.5 (58.3 - 60.6) 17441	55.3 (54.2 - 56.4) 16829	47.0 (45.9 - 48.0) 13776	66.2 (65.0 - 67.4) 14295	59.8 (58.6 - 60.9) 13423
Employed	46.0 (44.7 - 47.2) 7680	40.5 (39.4 - 41.7) 12069	44.7 (43.6 - 45.8) 12748	53.0 (52.0 - 54.1) 14436	33.8 (32.6 - 35.0) 6843	40.2 (39.1 - 41.4) 8001
Education level						
Not educated	6.7 (6.0 - 7.4) 1579	9.1 (8.6 - 9.6) 2502	12.9 (11.9 - 14.0) 4403	7.1 (6.6 - 7.6) 2486	4.9 (4.3 - 5.7) 1121	1.9 (1.7 - 2.1) 518
Primary	23.3 (22.2 - 24.5) 4994	61.6 (60.3 - 62.8) 17643	61.5 (60.4 - 62.6) 18231	55.7 (54.3 - 57.0) 16061	41.9 (40.2 - 43.6) 9164	25.1 (24.1 - 26.2) 6143
Secondary	58.0 (56.4 - 59.5) 9972	25.3 (24.2 - 26.3) 7921	20.3 (19.3 - 21.4) 5593	26.2 (25.3 - 27.2) 6819	44.8 (43.2 - 46.3) 9170	64.8 (63.6 - 66.0) 13314
Higher	12.0 (10.5 - 13.6) 1464	4.1 (3.6 - 4.7) 1444	5.3 (4.7 - 5.9) 1350	11.1 (10.2 - 12.0) 2846	8.4 (7.4 - 9.6) 1683	8.2 (7.2 - 9.3) 1449
Wealth quintiles						
Q1: Poorest	19.2 (17.8 - 20.7) 4610	18.7 (16.8 - 20.7) 5054	18.6 (16.4 - 21.1) 6155	20.5 (19.2 - 22.0) 7631	15.0 (13.6 - 16.5) 3357	19.2 (17.7 - 20.9) 4965
Q2	19.8 (18.0 - 21.8) 4122	19.0 (17.5 - 20.6) 5275	20.3 (18.7 - 21.9) 6154	19.6 (18.1 - 21.2) 5618	18.0 (16.6 - 19.5) 3931	19.6 (18.5 - 20.8) 4487
Q3	21.4 (19.4 - 23.5) 3827	19.9 (18.6 - 21.2) 5543	20.8 (19.3 - 22.4) 6583	19.7 (18.3 - 21.2) 5240	20.0 (18.3 - 21.8) 4274	19.2 (17.8 - 20.7) 4122
Q4	20.3 (18.2 - 22.6) 3077	20.8 (19.3 - 22.3) 5856	19.6 (17.8 - 21.6) 5510	19.8 (18.4 - 21.3) 4611	21.7 (19.6 - 24.0) 4526	19.7 (17.8 - 21.9) 3637
Q5: Wealthiest	19.3 (16.7 - 22.1) 2373	21.7 (19.3 - 24.4) 7782	20.7 (18.7 - 22.8) 5175	20.3 (18.1 - 22.7) 5112	25.2 (22.7 - 28.0) 5050	22.2 (20.1 - 24.4) 4213

Q1 Quintiles 1: Poorest, Q5: Wealthiest. IQR Interquartile range

204 The proportion of the general population receiving social protection varied from 5.2% (95% CI 4.5%–
205 6.0%) in Ethiopia to 39.9% (37.0%–42.8%) in Eswatini. Among PLHIV households, the proportion
206 receiving social protection varied from 6.9% (5.7%–8.4%) among MLHIV in Zambia to 45.0% (41.2–
207 49.0) among WLHIV in Namibia. Among AGYW, the proportion varied from 4.4% (3.6–5.3) in Ethiopia
208 to 44.6% (40.8–48.5) in Eswatini.

209 The proportion of the general population reporting receiving social protection from the poorest wealth
210 quintile (Q1) ranged from 8.1% (6.4%–10.2%) in Cameroon to 56.2% (51.5%–60.7%) in Eswatini.
211 Among the wealthiest quintiles (Q5), the proportion ranged from 3.6% (2.6%–5.0%) in Ethiopia to
212 19.7% (16.25–23.8%) in Namibia (Table 2). In general, 15% or less of the respondents from Q1
213 reported receiving social protection in eight countries (i.e., Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Kenya,
214 Malawi, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia), with 10% or less in three countries (Cameroon, Côte
215 d'Ivoire, and Ethiopia); 15%–20% in Rwanda, 30% in Zimbabwe, 40% in Lesotho, and more than 50%
216 in Eswatini and Namibia.

Table 2: Survey weighted household social protection coverage for the general population, among people living with HIV (male and female), and adolescent girls and adolescent girls and young women by country (PHIA 2015-2019) (percent, 95% confidence interval)

	Cameroon			Côte d'Ivoire§			Eswatini				
	Gen pop	MLHIV	WLHIV	AGYW	Gen pop	WLHIV	AGYW	Gen pop	MLHIV	WLHIV	AGYW
Coverage	16.3 (14.7 - 18.0)	13.3 (8.9 - 19.5)‡	18.3 (14.9 - 22.4)	17.4 (15.4 - 19.7)	11.7 (10.3 - 13.2)	11.9 (7.9 - 17.4)‡	12.8 (10.8 - 15.1)	39.9 (37.0 - 42.8)	37.0 (32.6 - 41.5)	39.2 (35.6 - 43.0)	44.6 (40.8 - 48.5)
Residence Rural	15.0 (12.7 - 17.7)	---	21.3 (15.3 - 28.9)	15.3 (12.5 - 18.5)	11.7 (9.7 - 14.0)	---	9.8 (7.4 - 12.9)	46.1 (43.1 - 49.2)	44.8 (39.7 - 50.1)	46.1 (41.9 - 50.4)	50.7 (46.6 - 54.7)
Urban	17.5 (15.4 - 19.7)	---	16.0 (12.1 - 20.9)	19.4 (16.4 - 22.9)	11.7 (9.9 - 13.7)	9.6 (5.6 - 16.0)‡	14.1 (11.5 - 17.1)	23.7 (17.5 - 31.3)	20.4 (14.6 - 27.8)	22.9 (17.4 - 29.5)	26.9 (18.3 - 37.8)
Employment status											
Not employed	13.2 (11.8 - 14.9)	---	11.6 (7.9 - 16.8)‡	16.2 (14.2 - 18.3)	12.2 (10.6 - 13.9)	14.6 (8.8 - 23.3)‡	13.3 (10.9 - 16.0)	43.9 (40.9 - 46.9)	43.0 (36.7 - 49.6)	42.2 (38.3 - 46.2)	45.9 (41.8 - 50.2)
Employed	18.8 (16.9 - 20.9)	15.2 (10.0 - 22.3)‡	24.1 (18.7 - 30.4)	20.9 (17.5 - 24.7)	11.1 (9.6 - 12.8)	---	11.2 (8.5 - 14.7)	34.6 (31.4 - 38.0)	33.4 (28.5 - 38.7)	35.4 (30.4 - 40.7)	38.9 (32.6 - 45.6)
Education level											
Not educated	8.5 (7.0 - 10.2)	---	---	7.4 (5.2 - 10.5)‡	10.5 (8.9 - 12.4)	---	10.3 (8.0 - 13.3)	40.6 (34.0 - 47.6)	---	44.3 (33.6 - 55.5)	---
Primary	16.1 (14.1 - 18.3)	---	19.1 (13.3 - 26.5)	12.6 (10.1 - 15.7)	11.5 (9.9 - 13.3)	---	10.6 (8.1 - 13.7)	46.6 (42.7 - 50.5)	43.1 (36.4 - 50.1)	47.2 (41.8 - 52.6)	52.2 (45.3 - 59.0)
Secondary	16.8 (14.8 - 19.1)	---	16.6 (12.0 - 22.6)‡	17.6 (14.9 - 20.7)	13.9 (11.8 - 16.3)	---	17.3 (14.1 - 21.1)	39.3 (36.4 - 42.2)	34.1 (29.3 - 39.3)	35.9 (31.9 - 40.1)	43.3 (39.3 - 47.4)
Higher	19.6 (17.3 - 22)	---	---	24.0 (20.1 - 28.5)	10.7 (7.4 - 15.2)	---	---	26.5 (21.7 - 32.0)	---	26.2 (16.8 - 8.5)‡	34.0 (22.0 - 48.5)‡
Wealth quintiles											
Q 1: Poorest	8.1 (6.4 - 10.2)	---	---	8.0 (5.9 - 10.7)	9.1 (6.5 - 12.5)	---	9.7 (6.0 - 15.5)	56.2 (51.6 - 60.7)	49.2 (40.9 - 57.6)	52.6 (47.4 - 57.8)	60.0 (53.2 - 66.4)
Q 2	18.8 (15.5 - 22.5)	---	24.2 (17.4 - 32.6)‡	16.4 (12.9 - 20.5)	11.6 (9.5 - 14.1)	---	14.9 (11.2 - 19.5)	51.7 (46.6 - 56.7)	45.5 (37.2 - 54.2)	53.8 (46.5 - 60.9)	56.0 (49.4 - 62.4)
Q 3	17.1 (14.0 - 20.6)	---	16.7 (11.1 - 24.3)‡	20.0 (16.0 - 24.7)	14.9 (12.4 - 17.8)	---	20.5 (15.7 - 26.4)	41.6 (36.9 - 46.4)	41.4 (32.8 - 50.5)	42.5 (35.7 - 49.5)	45.7 (39.1 - 52.5)
Q 4	19.7 (17.1 - 22.8)	---	---	22.6 (18.5 - 27.3)	13.6 (11.1 - 16.6)	---	9.7 (7.3 - 12.8)	28.1 (23.9 - 32.7)	25.9 (18.5 - 35.0)‡	23.0 (17.3 - 29.9)	29.5 (23.7 - 36.2)
Q5 Wealthiest	17.9 (14.9 - 21.3)	---	---	20.0 (15.5 - 25.5)	9.9 (7.2 - 13.3)	---	9.5 (5.8 - 15.3)	19.2 (14.2 - 25.4)	18.6 (11.7 - 28.3)‡	17.2 (13.4 - 21.8)‡	20.3 (13.3 - 29.8)
	Ethiopia§			Kenya			Lesotho				
	Gen pop	WLHIV	AGYW	Gen pop	MLHIV	WLHIV	AGYW	Gen pop	MLHIV	WLHIV	AGYW
Coverage	5.2 (4.5 - 6.0)	11.4 (8.3 - 15.3)	4.4 (3.6 - 5.3)	14.1 (13.1 - 15.1)	14.8 (10.4 - 20.7)	17.4 (14.5 - 20.7)	11.7 (10.1 - 13.6)	24.0 (22.3 - 25.9)	22.7 (19.8 - 25.9)	23.6 (21.3 - 26.0)	26.7 (24.2 - 29.3)
Residence Rural	5.6 (4.5 - 6.9)	---	5.0 (3.9 - 6.5)	16.2 (15.0 - 17.6)	13.7 (9.8 - 18.9)‡	19.2 (15.5 - 23.5)	14.6 (12.3 - 17.3)	32.6 (30.3 - 35.0)	30.7 (26.8 - 34.8)	33.7 (30.5 - 37.1)	34.7 (31.3 - 38.2)
Urban	4.8 (3.9 - 5.8)	11.4 (8.3 - 15.3)	3.7 (2.8 - 5.0)	10.8 (9.3 - 12.5)	---	14.4 (10.1 - 19.9)	7.9 (6.0 - 10.3)	11.9 (9.4 - 14.9)	11.3 (7.8 - 16.0)‡	11.0 (8.3 - 14.6)	15.6 (12.3 - 19.4)
Employment status											
Not employed	5.2 (4.3 - 6.1)	11.6 (7.8 - 17.0)‡	4.6 (3.7 - 5.7)	13.8 (12.6 - 15.0)	---	16.5 (12.8 - 20.9)	11.8 (9.9 - 13.8)	28.0 (26.1 - 30.1)	30.3 (26.3 - 34.6)	27.8 (24.7 - 31.1)	28.4 (25.6 - 31.3)
Employed	5.2 (4.4 - 6.1)	11.1 (6.9 - 17.2)	3.8 (2.8 - 5.2)‡	14.3 (13.1 - 15.6)	15.0 (10.4 - 21.3)‡	18.3 (14.2 - 23.3)	11.7 (9.1 - 14.9)	17.8 (15.9 - 19.9)	15.7 (12.3 - 19.9)	17.4 (14.7 - 20.5)	17.7 (13.6 - 22.8)
Education level											
Not educated	8.1 (6.5 - 10.1)	---	---	14.0 (11.7 - 16.7)	---	---	9.0 (5.1 - 15.5)‡	28.5 (24.1 - 33.4)	20.8 (15.2 - 27.7)‡	---	---
Primary	6.3 (5.3 - 7.5)	14.1 (9.3 - 20.7)‡	4.0 (2.9 - 5.4)	15.3 (14.1 - 16.5)	17.3 (10.9 - 26.2)‡	15.4 (12.4 - 18.9)	13.0 (10.4 - 16.0)	29.0 (26.8 - 31.4)	25.5 (21.4 - 30.1)	28.9 (25.7 - 32.3)	36.2 (31.3 - 41.4)
Secondary	4.3 (3.5 - 5.2)	---	4.3 (3.3 - 5.5)	13.3 (12.1 - 14.7)	---	20.3 (14.5 - 27.6)‡	11.3 (9.0 - 14.1)	21.1 (19.1 - 23.3)	20.1 (15.3 - 26.0)	18.3 (15.3 - 21.6)	23.6 (21.1 - 26.2)
Higher	3.2 (2.6 - 4.0)	---	4.8 (3.3 - 7.1)‡	11.4 (9.2 - 13.9)	---	---	10.6 (6.7 - 16.3)‡	15.7 (11.7 - 20.6)	---	---	26.4 (18.5 - 36.1)‡
Wealth quintiles											
Q 1: Poorest	8.2 (6.7 - 10.1)	---	8.1 (5.8 - 11.2)	17.0 (15.2 - 19.1)	---	17.9 (12.9 - 24.2)‡	14.6 (11.2 - 18.7)	40.0 (36.1 - 44.0)	38.7 (32.2 - 45.7)	44.5 (38.6 - 50.5)	44.4 (38.7 - 50.2)
Q 2	4.2 (3.2 - 5.5)	---	---	17.3 (15.3 - 19.5)	---	19.6 (14.5 - 26.0)‡	15.2 (11.5 - 19.9)	37.8 (34.2 - 41.4)	31.5 (25.7 - 38.0)	34.5 (29.8 - 39.6)	37.4 (32.3 - 42.9)
Q 3	5.7 (4.5 - 7.0)	---	5.1 (3.6 - 7.0)	17.4 (15.6 - 19.4)	---	18.7 (13.1 - 26.0)‡	20.1 (15.2 - 26.1)	22.6 (19.5 - 26.0)	18.4 (13.6 - 24.4)‡	19.6 (15.5 - 24.5)	26.0 (21.9 - 30.6)
Q 4	5.0 (3.6 - 6.8)	---	---	11.9 (10.1 - 13.8)	---	16.7 (10.8 - 25.1)‡	6.9 (4.4 - 10.5)‡	13.5 (11.1 - 16.3)	---	12.9 (9.6 - 17.3)	13.6 (10.3 - 17.7)
Q5 Wealthiest	3.6 (2.6 - 5.0)	---	3.4 (2.3 - 5.2)‡	6.2 (4.6 - 8.3)	---	---	---	11.5 (8.4 - 15.6)	---	11.6 (7.9 - 16.7)‡	16.4 (11.5 - 22.9)

Gen pop is General population; MLHIV is Men living with HIV; WLHIV is women living with HIV; AGYW is adolescent girls and young women --- Results had fewer than 25 observations and are not shown. § results for MLHIV were less than 25 observations and are not shown. ___ data set had no variable. ‡ Estimate based on 25-49 observations and should be interpreted with caution. Ethiopia data set had data from urban settings

Table 2: Survey weighted household social protection coverage of general population, people living with HIV (male and female), adolescent girls and young women by country (PHIA 2015-2019) (percent, 95% confidence interval) continued

	Malawi				Namibia				Rwanda§		
	Gen pop	MLHIV	WLHIV	AGYW	Gen pop	MLHIV	WLHIV	AGYW	Gen pop	WLHIV	AGYW
General coverage	14.8 (13.6 - 16.2)	14.7 (11.8 - 18.3)	14.5 (12.4 - 16.9)	15.1 (13.3 - 17.1)	36.1 (34.3 - 38.0)	38.4 (33.2 - 43.8)	45.0 (41.2 - 49.0)	40.5 (37.6 - 43.5)	10.4 (9.3 - 11.5)	11.6 (8.6 - 15.5)	11.0 (9.7 - 12.5)
Residence:											
Rural	16.6 (15.1 - 18.2)	17.7 (14.0 - 22.1)	17.0 (14.3 - 20.1)	16.8 (14.7 - 19.1)	51.6 (48.7 - 54.4)	52.5 (46.3 - 58.7)	57.3 (53.2 - 61.3)	55.8 (51.8 - 59.7)	11.7 (10.5 - 13.1)	14.4 (10.5 - 19.3)	12.3 (10.8 - 14.1)
Urban	7.8 (6.0 - 10.0)	---	7.9 (5.8 - 10.6)‡	8.5 (5.3 - 13.3)	25.1 (22.7 - 27.6)	25.2 (18.7 - 33.0)	32.5 (26.7 - 38.9)	28.4 (24.4 - 32.8)	5.1 (3.8 - 6.8)	---	6.0 (4.2 - 8.4)
Employment status											
Not employed	14.9 (13.5 - 16.4)	17.9 (13.4 - 23.5)	14.8 (12.2 - 17.8)	15.1 (13.1 - 17.2)	45.0 (42.8 - 47.2)	50.0 (43.1 - 56.9)	50.7 (46.5 - 54.8)	43.4 (40.1 - 46.9)	10.6 (9.4 - 11.8)	10.0 (6.9 - 14.3)‡	10.9 (9.5 - 12.4)
Employed	14.7 (13.1 - 16.4)	11.5 (8.2 - 16.0)‡	13.8 (9.9 - 18.9)‡	15.2 (11.7 - 19.3)	25.7 (23.8 - 27.6)	27.3 (21.3 - 34.2)	33.9 (28.1 - 40.3)	28.3 (23.5 - 33.6)	10.1 (8.9 - 11.4)	14.2 (9.6 - 20.6)‡	11.2 (9.2 - 13.6)
Education level											
Not educated	15.7 (13.2 - 18.7)	---	19.4 (13.9 - 6.4)‡	---	36.5 (32.7 - 40.4)	36.2 (24.4 - 50.0)‡	44.5 (33.9 - 55.7)	41.4 (30.7 - 52.9)	13.9 (12.2 - 5.8)	---	---
Primary	15.3 (13.9 - 16.9)	15.2 (11.5 - 19.9)	14.9 (12.2 - 18.1)	15.4 (13.2 - 17.8)	45.1 (42.2 - 48.0)	40.2 (33.0 - 47.8)	47.9 (42.0 - 53.8)	50.3 (45.0 - 55.6)	11.1 (9.9 - 12.4)	12.1 (8.6 - 16.8)‡	12.9 (11.1 - 14.8)
Secondary	14.1 (12.5 - 15.9)	---	9.9 (6.4 - 14.9)‡	15.6 (13.0 - 18.7)	35.8 (33.8 - 37.8)	36.0 (29.4 - 43.1)	44.0 (39.7 - 48.5)	40.2 (37.4 - 43.1)	8.5 (7.3 - 9.8)	---	9.2 (7.7 - 10.9)
Higher	7.8 (5.6 - 10.7)	---	---	---	20.1 (16.4 - 24.3)	---	---	23.0 (13.5 - 36.2)‡	3.5 (2.2 - 5.4)	---	---
Wealth quintiles											
Q 1: Poorest	14.8 (12.5 - 17.4)	---	14.5 (9.2 - 22.1)‡	12.8 (9.3 - 17.5)	51.1 (47.6 - 54.7)	48.7 (40.5 - 56.9)	55.8 (50.1 - 61.4)	54.1 (49.4 - 58.6)	17.1 (14.9 - 19.5)	---	18.7 (15.1 - 22.8)
Q 2	16.5 (14.0 - 19.3)	---	19.9 (14.1 - 27.3)‡	16.4 (13.0 - 20.5)	48.7 (45.1 - 52.4)	51.3 (42.3 - 60.1)	57.5 (50.7 - 64.1)	56.3 (50.7 - 61.7)	14.2 (12.2 - 16.6)	---	14.0 (11.1 - 17.5)
Q 3	17.0 (14.5 - 19.8)	---	16.8 (11.6 - 23.6)‡	16.4 (13.2 - 20.3)	37.2 (33.5 - 41.1)	37.5 (28.7 - 47.1)	41.9 (35.0 - 49.1)	41.1 (34.9 - 47.6)	10.6 (8.7 - 12.9)	---	13.5 (10.6 - 17.2)
Q 4	17.2 (14.6 - 20.1)	---	15.8 (11.2 - 21.9)‡	17.3 (13.9 - 21.4)	24.1 (20.7 - 27.8)	---	23.8 (15.9 - 34.1)	25.6 (20.7 - 31.1)	8.7 (7.2 - 10.6)	---	8.2 (6.1 - 10.9)
Q5 Wealthiest	9.7 (8.0 - 11.7)	---	9.1 (6.2 - 13.0)‡	12.4 (8.9 - 17)	19.7 (16.2 - 23.8)	---	---	22.5 (17.2 - 28.8)	2.6 (1.9 - 3.6)	---	2.5 (1.5 - 4.0)‡
	Tanzania				Uganda§				Zambia		
	Gen pop	MLHIV	WLHIV	AGYW	Gen pop	WLHIV	AGYW	Gen pop	MLHIV	WLHIV	AGYW
General coverage	8.8 (8.0 - 9.7)	10.7 (7.6 - 15.0)	13.8 (11.2 - 17.0)	8.8 (7.6 - 10.1)	10.4 (9.5 - 11.3)	10.5 (8.5 - 12.8)	10.9 (9.7 - 12.2)	7.8 (6.8 - 8.9)	6.3 (4.7 - 8.6)	7.3 (5.9 - 8.9)	8.1 (6.8 - 9.7)
Residence:											
Rural	9.7 (8.6 - 10.9)	11.6 (7.7 - 17.3)‡	13.6 (10.0 - 18.3)	10.0 (8.5 - 11.8)	11.0 (10.0 - 12.2)	11.0 (8.6 - 13.9)	11.9 (10.4 - 13.5)	9.2 (7.7 - 11.0)	8.5 (5.9 - 12.0)‡	8.9 (6.6 - 11.7)	9.3 (7.3 - 11.7)
Urban	7.4 (6.2 - 8.9)	---	14.1 (10.5 - 18.5)	7.0 (5.4 - 9.1)	8.8 (7.1 - 10.7)	9.7 (6.6 - 14.0)‡	8.7 (6.8 - 11.2)	6.1 (5.1 - 7.4)	---	6.2 (4.5 - 8.6)	6.9 (5.4 - 8.8)
Employment status											
Not employed	8.9 (8.0 - 9.9)	---	15.4 (11.9 - 19.8)	8.5 (7.4 - 9.9)	10.7 (9.7 - 11.9)	11.5 (8.8 - 14.9)	12.0 (10.5 - 13.6)	8.0 (6.8 - 9.3)	---	7.0 (5.5 - 8.7)	8.1 (6.7 - 9.7)
Employed	8.8 (7.8 - 9.9)	11.8 (7.8 - 17.6)‡	11.6 (8.3 - 15.9)	9.5 (7.4 - 12.2)	10.1 (9.2 - 11.1)	9.6 (7.1 - 12.9)	8.7 (7.2 - 10.6)	7.5 (6.5 - 8.6)	6.4 (4.3 - 9.3)‡	8.1 (5.6 - 11.5)‡	8.4 (6.2 - 11.3)
Education level											
Not educated	11.0 (9.1 - 13.1)	---	12.3 (7.2 - 20.3)‡	10.5 (7.4 - 14.7)‡	11.1 (9.0 - 13.5)	---	12.3 (7.7 - 19.2)‡	10.1 (6.8 - 14.6)	---	---	---
Primary	9.1 (8.1 - 10.1)	10.7 (7.3 - 15.5)‡	15.3 (12.1 - 19.0)	9.3 (7.7 - 11.1)	10.2 (9.3 - 11.1)	9.7 (7.4 - 12.6)	10.9 (9.5 - 12.4)	8.7 (7.3 - 10.2)	---	6.7 (5.1 - 8.9)	7.4 (5.6 - 9.7)
Secondary	7.8 (6.7 - 9.0)	---	---	8.2 (6.7 - 10.0)	10.9 (9.6 - 12.4)	---	11.1 (9.2 - 13.4)	7.0 (6.1 - 8.1)	6.0 (3.8 - 9.4)‡	7.1 (5.3 - 9.4)‡	8.2 (6.8 - 9.8)
Higher	4.7 (3.2 - 6.8)	---	---	---	9.8 (8.4 - 11.5)	---	9.7 (7.1 - 13.1)	6.6 (4.7 - 9.0)	---	---	---
Wealth quintiles											
Q 1: Poorest	14.0 (11.9 - 16.4)	---	19.6 (13.5 - 27.6)‡	13.8 (10.8 - 17.5)	13.4 (11.9 - 15.0)	13.6 (9.0 - 19.9)‡	13.9 (12.0 - 16.0)	9.6 (7.3 - 12.7)	---	---	8.8 (5.8 - 13.2)
Q 2	11.0 (9.2 - 13.0)	---	16.5 (10.9 - 24.1)‡	10.9 (8.1 - 14.4)	11.3 (9.4 - 13.5)	---	12.3 (9.9 - 15.2)	7.5 (6.1 - 9.3)	---	---	8.3 (6.0 - 11.5)
Q 3	8.3 (7.0 - 9.9)	---	14.7 (10.5 - 20.3)‡	10.5 (7.8 - 14.0)	9.5 (7.6 - 11.7)	---	10.2 (7.5 - 13.8)	10.6 (8.3 - 13.4)	---	7.5 (4.8 - 11.8)‡	9.0 (6.4 - 12.5)
Q 4	6.9 (5.3 - 8.9)	---	---	7.0 (5.0 - 9.8)	10.7 (8.7 - 13.1)	11.8 (8.3 - 16.6)‡	10.8 (8.3 - 14.0)	6.1 (4.9 - 7.5)	---	6.0 (4.1 - 8.7)‡	7.8 (5.6 - 10.9)
Q5 Wealthiest	4.4 (3.3 - 5.9)	---	---	3.5 (2.1 - 5.8)‡	7.1 (5.6 - 8.9)	---	7.5 (5.5 - 10.3)	6.3 (4.8 - 8.1)	---	6.6 (4.4 - 9.9)‡	7.3 (5.3 - 9.9)

Gen pop General population; MLHIV Men living with HIV; WLHIV women living with HIV; AGYW adolescent girls and young women --- Results had fewer than 25 observations and are not shown. § Results had fewer than 25 observations and are not shown for MLHIV including in Uganda where general coverage was 11.5 (8.8 - 14.8), for rural 11.5 (8.4 - 15.6) employed 12.2 (8.9 - 16.4) and primary education). --- data set had no variable. ‡ Estimate based on 25-49 observations and should be interpreted with caution.

Table 2: Survey weighted household social protection coverage of the general population, people living with HIV (male and female), and adolescent girls and young women by country (PHIA 2015-2019) (percent, 95% confidence interval)

Zimbabwe				
	Gen pop	MLHIV	WLHIV	AGYW
General coverage	19.9 (18.6 - 21.2)	18.6 (16.1 - 21.3)	18.4 (16.4 - 20.5)	20.0 (18.3 - 21.8)
Residence: Rural	26.8 (24.9 - 28.7)	25.2 (21.8 - 28.9)	25.4 (22.6 - 28.4)	27.1 (24.6 - 29.8)
Urban	7.6 (6.2 - 9.2)	---	7.1 (5.0 - 10.0)	8.9 (7.1 - 11.1)
Employment status				
Not employed	21.7 (20.3 - 23.1)	20.8 (17.1 - 25.1)	18.5 (16.3 - 21.0)	20.7 (18.8 - 22.7)
Employed	17.2 (15.7 - 18.7)	16.4 (13.5 - 19.8)	18.1 (14.8 - 21.9)	17.6 (14.7 - 20.8)
Education level				
Not educated	23.0 (19.1 - 27.4)	---	---	---
Primary	22.3 (21.1 - 24.8)	16.8 (12.9 - 21.6)	20.4 (17.6 - 23.5)	20.9 (17.5 - 24.8)
Secondary	19.7 (18.3 - 21.2)	19.6 (16.5 - 23.1)	17.6 (15.0 - 20.6)	20.2 (18.3 - 22.3)
Higher	10.9 (8.7 - 13.4)	---	---	12.9 (7.8 - 20.6)‡
Wealth quintiles				
Q 1: Poorest	30.7 (27.9 - 33.7)	27.8 (22.0 - 34.5)	30.9 (26.2 - 36.0)	30.7 (26.4 - 35.3)
Q 2	32.1 (29.4 - 34.9)	32.5 (26.2 - 39.5)	28.4 (23.3 - 34.2)	32.5 (28.4 - 36.8)
Q 3	22.8 (20.0 - 25.9)	18.8 (13.0 - 26.4)‡	22.6 (17.2 - 29.0)	23.4 (19.5 - 27.8)
Q 4	7.5 (5.8 - 9.5)	---	5.6 (4.0 - 8.8)‡	8.3 (5.9 - 11.5)
Q5 Wealthiest	8.1 (6.4 - 10.2)	---	7.8 (5.2 - 11.3)‡	9.9 (7.6 - 12.7)

Gen pop General population; MLHIV Men living with HIV; WLHIV women living with HIV; AGYW adolescent girls and young women --- Results had fewer than 25 observations and were suppressed. ___ data set had no variable. ‡ Estimate based on 25–49 observations and should be interpreted with caution.

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230 Figure 1 presents the concentration curves of access to social protection by country for the general
231 population, MLHIV and WLHIV, and AGYW. Table 3 reports the associated concentration indices.
232 The results show that socioeconomic inequalities in access to social protection were pro-rich only in
233 Cameroon, among the general population, and AGYW—evident as the concentration curves lie below
234 the line of equality—with a CIX value of 0.122 ($p < 0.001$) among the general population and a CIX
235 value of 0.169 (<0.001) among AGYW. This result shows that more people from wealthier than poor
236 households reported receiving social protection. In Côte d'Ivoire, socioeconomic inequalities in
237 receiving social protection were pro-rich, but the associated CIX estimates were not significantly
238 different from zero. In the remaining 11 countries, social protection was pro-poor. The CIX values for
239 socioeconomic inequalities in receiving social protection in these countries ranged from -0.080 ($p =$
240 0.002) among the general population in Malawi to -0.372 ($p < 0.001$) among WLHIV in Zimbabwe
241 (Table 3).

242 In Eswatini, Lesotho, Rwanda, Namibia, and Zimbabwe, socioeconomic inequalities in receiving
243 social protection were pro-poor, below -0.300 , among all population groups. Socioeconomic
244 inequalities in receiving social protection access were pro-poor and moderate, with CIX values
245 ranging from -0.100 to -0.300 among the general population and AGYW in Ethiopia, Kenya, and
246 Uganda and among the general population, WLHIV, and AGYW in Tanzania. Social protection was
247 pro-poor and of low inequality, that is, between CIX -0.010 and CIX $= -0.100$ among the general
248 population and MLHIV and WLHIV in Malawi, and the general population and MLHIV in Zambia
249 (Figure 1 and Table 3).

250

251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274

Figure 1: Concentration curves of receiving social protection among the general population, people living with HIV (women and men), and adolescent girls and young women in sub-Saharan African Countries (PHIA 2015-2019).

Table 3: Survey weighted concentration index of socioeconomic inequalities in receiving social protection for the general population, people living with HIV (male and female) and adolescent girls and young women (CIX, p-value, sample size) PHIA 2015-2019

	Cameroon			Cote D'Ivoire			Eswatini			Ethiopia			Kenya			Lesotho			Malawi		
	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size
Gen population	0.122	<0.001	24850	0.046	0.234	17268	-0.320	<0.001	9523	-0.133	0.001	18449	-0.175	<0.001	21409	-0.351	<0.001	11640	-0.080	0.002	16685
WLHIV	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.326	<0.001	1909	---	---	---	-0.072	0.173	1016	-0.369	<0.001	2176	-0.128	0.012	1475
MLHIV	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.271	<0.001	867	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.335	<0.001	1016	---	---	---
AGYW	0.169	<0.001	4936	0.010	0.848	3163	-0.324	<0.001	1922	-0.196	0.001	4773	-0.249	<0.001	2587	-0.315	<0.001	2350	-0.017	0.658	3578

	Namibia			Rwanda			Tanzania			Uganda			Zambia			Zimbabwe		
	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size	CIX	p-value	sample size
Gen population	-0.301	<0.001	16220	-0.299	<0.001	29435	-0.229	<0.001	28289	-0.115	<0.001	27868	-0.095	0.008	18991	-0.353	<0.001	19612
WLHIV	-0.291	<0.001	1622	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.372	<0.001	2151
MLHIV	-0.275	<0.001	713	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.347	<0.001	1084
AGYW	-0.306	<0.001	3007	-0.320	<0.001	6063	-0.249	<0.001	5824	-0.121	0.001	6315	-0.043	0.340	4144	-0.331	<0.001	3927

---The results for the following countries and subpopulations were not shown because their observations for the wealth variables were fewer than 25: Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia for MLHIV and WLHIV; Kenya and Malawi for MLHIV.

276 **4 Discussion**

277 This study examined economic-related inequality in receiving social protection among the general
278 population, MLHIV and WLHIV, and AGYW in 13 sub-Saharan African countries. The study also
279 evaluated whether people in the poorest households received social protection. Our findings showed
280 that the proportion of the general population receiving social protection varied from 5.2% (95% CI
281 4.5%–6.0%) in Ethiopia to 39.9% (37.0%–42.8%) in Eswatini. Social protection was pro-poor in 11 out
282 of the 13 countries studied, implying that more people from poor households received social
283 protection than those from wealthier households in these 11 countries. However, in eight of these 11
284 countries, less than 15% of people from the poorest quintile households reported receiving social
285 protection. Cameroon was the only country where social protection was pro-rich. These results bear
286 considerable policy implications for the targeting, scale up, and equalization of access to social
287 protection among the general population, MLHIV and WLHIV, and AGYW.

288 Our study's first results showed that the proportion of respondents receiving social protection varied
289 widely, ranging from 4.4% among AGYW in Ethiopia to 44.6% among WLHIV in Namibia,
290 corroborating the evidence. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) report 2020–2022 indicated
291 that only 46.9% of the global population were covered by at least one social protection benefit in 2020
292 [22]. The ILO report further highlighted considerable regional disparities in access to social protection,
293 with the lowest coverage in Africa at 17.4% and the highest in Europe and Central Asia at 83.9% [22].
294 A study covering Eswatini, Malawi, Tanzania, and Zambia found that the proportion receiving social
295 protection varied from 7.7% in Zambia to 39.6% in Eswatini [23]. The paper found comparable social
296 protection coverage among the AGYW and PLHIV to the general population in Malawi and Zambia
297 [23].

298 Our second finding revealed that social protection was pro-poor in 11 of the 13 countries surveyed.
299 The pro-poor social protection found in our study was expected and aligns with our hypothesis. Social
300 protection programs are generally focused on the most impoverished households [11, 16, 17, 18]. In
301 this regard, our findings are consistent with the core objectives of social protection, which prioritize the
302 poorest households. However, in eight of the 11 countries, fewer than 15% of people from households
303 in the bottom wealth quintile reported receiving social protection. A review of evidence from 123
304 countries found that only 22% of the poorest 20% received social assistance in support of our finding

305 [24]. Cameroon stood out as an outlier, exhibiting pro-rich social protection, underscoring a significant
306 shortfall in reaching people from the poorest households. A contributing factor to this disparity in
307 Cameroon was the high access to social protection among employed individuals, indicating that the
308 benefits were linked to their employment. For example, civil service pensions, which benefited only
309 141,000 pensioners in 2016 in Cameroon, were allocated over 10 times more funding by the
310 government of Cameroon than all social assistance schemes combined [25]. Another potential reason
311 was the relatively nascent state of social protection in Cameroon [25]. Despite the development of a
312 comprehensive social protection policy in 2017, the program was not approved. Social protection
313 programs remained small-scale and uncoordinated [25]. This result shows a potential gap in reaching
314 people from the poorest households.

315 The limited coverage of individuals from the poorest quintile households identified in our study may be
316 due to difficulties faced by low-income countries in identifying the poorest population groups to target
317 their social protection services [24]. Another reason may be the dynamic mobility of people across
318 economic groups. For example, in the Occupied Palestine State, where 40% of individuals receiving
319 social protection were categorized as poor, they moved up and down income groups over time [26].
320 These findings underscore that pro-poor social protection alone is insufficient to reach people from
321 the poorest households. Although policymakers may contemplate redistributing social protection
322 benefits from wealthier to poor households, this approach may not be feasible or desirable. Wealthier
323 households can descend into poverty, requiring social protection [26]. Another potential explanation
324 could be the nontakeup of social protection benefits, a common phenomenon among marginalized
325 populations who need social protection the most [27]. Nontakeup pertains to eligible individuals not
326 accessing available benefits for a range of reasons, including lack of information, complex or costly
327 procedures, limited access to digital technology and know-how, stigma, discrimination, shame, and
328 fear of interacting with social services [27]. Moreover, people from the poorest households, eligible to
329 access social protection, may not take up available social protection benefits owing to inadequate
330 coverage and the narrow scope of programs [28]. According to our study, only in countries with an
331 overall higher social protection coverage, such as Eswatini, Lesotho, Namibia, and Zimbabwe, the
332 proportion of the poorest wealth quintile households reached were also high. A study examining
333 global inequalities in accessing reproductive, maternal, newborn, and child health services showed
334 that countries, with low inequality and high coverage in these services, effectively reached the poorest

335 women and children [29]. The coverage of social protection needs to be broadened and deepened to
336 reach the poorest households. Additionally, strategies to identify households that are thrust into
337 poverty owing to emerging risks, such as financial crises, conflicts, droughts, disasters, and
338 pandemics like COVID-19, and link them to social protection, should be developed.

339 This study has several limitations and strengths. Contrary to the ILO's strategy of presenting
340 summarized national responses to government-provided social protection [22], our study compiles
341 individual responses from various countries through household surveys. Notwithstanding, our
342 estimates correspond to the data from the ILO 2020–2022 report, indicating that our measurement
343 reflects the same information that governments use in their reporting. Another limitation of our study is
344 the absence of identification for marginalized people, such as gay men and other men who have sex
345 with men, sex workers and migrants. Marginalized population groups suffer a bulk of hardships owing
346 to inequalities [1, 2]. These population groups may be excluded from accessing social protection
347 benefits often because of stigma, discrimination, and punitive laws [30]. The potential barriers to
348 accessing social protection benefits of these subgroups were not addressed in this study. This gap
349 stems from either a lack of available information or an insufficient sample size to conduct meaningful
350 analysis. Furthermore, we did not disaggregate the specific social protection benefits received or their
351 monetary value. Neither did we account for the rapid scale up of social protection in response to the
352 COVID-19 pandemic, which would have provided more insights into our analysis.

353 **5. Conclusion**

354 In the countries surveyed, access to social protection for the general population, MLHIV and WLHIV,
355 and AGYW was low but favored people from poor households. However, pro-poor social protection,
356 although necessary, is not sufficient to ensure that people from the poorest households receive social
357 protection. Further research is required to identify and reach people from the poorest households with
358 social protection in sub-Saharan Africa.

359 **Competing interest**

360 Authors declare no competing interests.

361

362 **Author contributions**

363 DC designed the study. DC and SA-A collated the data. DC, SA-A, LH, ARH, MS, CM, JGJM, OK and
364 JE performed the data analysis. DC and SA-A conducted the data visualization. DC and SA-A drafted
365 and revised the manuscript. DC, SA-A, LH, ARH, MS, CM, JGJM, OK and JE critically reviewed the
366 drafts. All authors approved the final manuscript.

367

368 **Acknowledgment**

369 The authors acknowledge comments from UNAIDS.

370

371 **Funding:**

372 The Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) grant number 202660 funded Olivier Keiser.

373

374 **Disclaimer:** Where authors are identified as personnel of the World Health Organization or
375 UNAIDS, the authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this article and they do not
376 necessarily represent the decisions, policy, or views of the World Health Organization or UNAIDS.

377 **REFERENCES**

378

- 1 J. E. Stiglitz, "The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers our Future," in *Sustainable Humanity Sustainable Nature Our Responsibility*, D. P. S, R. Veerabhadran and M. S. Sorondo, Eds., Vatican, The Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, 2015, pp. 379 - 399.
- 2 Global leading economists, *Open Letter to the United Nations Secretary-General and President of the World Bank-Setting Serious Goals to Combat Inequality, 2023*.
- 3 International Labour Organization, "Inequalities and the world of work. Report IV," Geneva, 2021.
- 4 D. Perrons, "Gendering inequality: a note on Piketty's Capital in the twenty-first century," *Br J Sociol*, vol. 65(4), no. Doi: 10.1111/1468-4446.12114., pp. 667-77, Dec 2014.
- 5 S. M. S. Krammer, A. A. Lashitew, J. P. Doh and H. Bapuji, "Income inequality, social cohesion, and crime against businesses: Evidence from a global sample of firms," *J Int Bus Stud*, vol. 54 , no. 2: doi: 10.1057/s41267-022-00535-5, p. 385–400, June 2022.
- 6 S. G. Topuz, "The Relationship Between Income Inequality and Economic Growth: Are Transmission Channels Effective?," *Soc Indic Res*, vol. 162, no. Doi.org/10.1007/s11205-022-02882-0, p. 1177–1231, Jan 2022.
- 7 A. Deaton, "Health, Inequality, and Economic Development," *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. XLI, p. 113–158, March 2003.
- 8 U. N. Statistics, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/Global%20Indicator%20Framework%20after%202023%20refinement_Eng.pdf. [Accessed 18 July 2023].
- 9 U. Nations, "Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals: Towards a Rescue Plan for People and Planet," New York, 2023.
- 10 The World Bank Group, "Charting a Course Towards Universal Social Protection Resilience, Equity, and Opportunity for All," Washington DC, 2022.
- 11 S. Handa, F. Otchere and P. Sirma, "More evidence on the impact of government social protection in sub-Saharan Africa: Ghana, Malawi, and Zimbabwe," *Development Policy Review*, vol. 40, no. 3. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12576>, p. e12576, May 2022.
- 12 S. Handa, L. Natali, D. Seidenfeld, G. Tembo and B. Davis, "Can unconditional cash transfers raise long-term living standards? Evidence from Zambia," *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 133, no. doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2018.01.008., pp. 42-65, 2018.
- 13 L. Carraro and M. S. L. Marzi, "Chapter 34: Effects of social protection on poverty and inequality," in *Handbook on Social Protection Systems*, E. Schüring and M. Loewe, Eds., 2021, p. 582–595.
- 14 C. Perera, S. Bakrania, A. Ipince, Z. Nesbitt-Ahmed, O. Obasola, D. Richardson, J. V. d. Scheur and R. Yu, "Impact of social protection on gender equality in low- and middle-income countries:

- A systematic review of reviews," *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, vol. 18, no. Doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1240, May 2022.
- 15 United Nations Development Programm, Income Inequality Trends in sub-Saharan Africa Divergence, Determinants and Consequences., A. Odusola, G. A. Cornia, H. Bhorat and P. Conceição, Eds., New York, 2017.
 - 16 M. Garcia and C. M. T. Moore, The Cash Dividend: The Rise of Cash Transfer Programs in Sub-Saharan Africa, doi: 10.1596/978-0-8213-8897-6 ed., Washington DC: The World Bank, 2012.
 - 17 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), From Evidence to Action. The Story of Cash Transfers and Impact Evaluation in Sub-Saharan Africa, SBN 978-0-19-876944-6 ed., B. David, S. Handa, N. Hypher, N. W. Rossi, P. Winters and J. Yablonski, Eds., Oxford: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; The United Nations Children's Fund; Oxford Press, 2016.
 - 18 Z. Mokomane, N. Xaba, K. Roehm, M. Hambayi, M. Mumma, G. Giordana, S. Mabhele and C. Mouala, "HIV-sensitive social protection: an assessment of east and southern Africa's social protection policies and programmes," *African Journal of AIDS Research*, vol. 22:2, no. 113-122, p. DOI: 10.2989/16085906.2023.2203131, June 2023.
 - 19 Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), "End inequalities. End AIDS. Global AIDS Strategy 2021-2026," Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), Geneva, 2021.
 - 20 ICAP at Columbia University, "Population-based HIV Impact Assessment (PHIA) Data Use Manual," New York, 2021.
 - 21 A. Wagstaff, O. O'Donnell, E. v. Doorslaer and M. Lindelow, Analyzing Health Equity Using Household Survey Data: A Guide to Techniques and Their Implementation, Washington DC: The World Bank, 2008.
 - 22 International Labour Office (ILO), "World Social Protection Report 2020-22: Social protection at the crossroads – in pursuit of a better future," Geneva, 2021.
 - 23 D. Chipanta, A. Pettifor, J. Edwards, D. Giovenco, H. M. Topazian, R. M. Bray, M. C. Millington, J. Estill, O. Keiser and J. E. Justman, "Access to Social Protection by People Living with, at Risk of, or Affected by HIV in Eswatini, Malawi, Tanzania, and Zambia: Results from Population-Based HIV Impact Assessments," *AIDS and Behavior*, no. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-022-03645-1>, March 2022.
 - 24 N. Parekh and O. Bandiera, "Do social assistance programmes reach the poor? Micro-evidence from 123 countries," London, 2020.
 - 25 S. Levine, A. Socpa, N. Both, H. Salomon and F. Fomekong, "Integrating assistance to the displaced into a social protection system in Cameroon. An ideal, but in whose interests?," London, 2022.
 - 26 I. L. O. (ILO), "Income dynamics and their implications for social protection in the Occupied Palestinian Territory ILO Policy brief," Geneva, 2023.

- 27 U. N. G. Assembly, "Non-take-up of rights in the context of social protection Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Olivier De Schutter," 2022.
- 28 K. A. Abaya, N. Yonzanb, S. Kurdia and K. Tafere, "Revisiting Poverty Trends and the Role of Social Protection Systems in Africa during the COVID-19 Pandemic," *Journal of African Economies*, vol. 32, no. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejac041>, p. ii44–ii68, 2023.
- 29 A. J. D. Barros, F. C. Wehrmeister, L. Z. Ferreira, L. P. Vidaletti, A. R. Hosseinpoor and C. G. Victora, "Are the poorest poor being left behind? Estimating global inequalities in reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health," *BMJ Glob Health*, vol. 5, no. 1 Doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002229, p. e002229., 2020.
- 30 Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), "UNAIDS terminology guidelines," Geneva, 2015.

379

380

381 **Supporting information**


382 S1 Table. Variable descriptions.

383 S2 Table. Survey weighted proportions of men and women living with HIV by country (PHIA
384 2015-2019).

385

386

387



The concentration curves for the following countries and subpopulations were not shown because their observations for the wealth variables were fewer than 25: Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia for MLHIV and WLHIV; Kenya and Malawi for MLHIV.