

Co-coverage of social protection programs and maternal and child nutrition interventions in Bangladesh, India and Nepal

Samuel Scott^{1*}, Sumanta Neupane¹, Hana Tasic², Nadia Akseer³, Sunny S. Kim⁴, Harold Alderman¹, Bianca Carducci³, Rebecca Heidkamp³

¹International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, DC, USA

²Modern Scientists Global, Ontario, Canada

³Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

*Corresponding author

E-mail: samuel.scott@cgiar.org

1201 I Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005

Short title: social protection and nutrition co-coverage

Acknowledgements: We appreciate comments from Swetha Manohar, a Research Fellow at the International Food Policy Research Institute, on a draft of this manuscript.

Financial support: This work was supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation through the DataDENT initiative (grant number INV-040665). The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation had no role in the design, analysis or writing of this article.

Authorship: S.S., S.N., and S.S.K. designed the study, conducted the analysis, and drafted the initial manuscript. H.T., N.A., H.A., and R.H. provided substantial contributions to the interpretation of data and reviewed and provided comments on the drafts. B.C. conducted literature review and contributed to drafting the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

Abbreviations:

ANC, antenatal care

BMICS, Bangladesh Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey

CCT, conditional cash transfer

DHS, Demographic and Health Survey

HIES, Household Income and Expenditure Survey

ICDS, Integrated Child Development Services

IFA, iron folic acid

NDHS, Nepal Demographic and Health Survey

NFHS, National Family Health Survey

NMICS, Nepal Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey

NSS, National Sample Survey

SPP, social protection program

UCT, unconditional cash transfer

VGD/VGF, vulnerable group development/vulnerable group feeding

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 Social protection programs (SPPs) are common in South Asia, a global malnutrition hotspot. Provision of
3 SPP benefits as well as essential health/nutrition interventions to mothers and children are goals for
4 optimal health and development outcomes, but the degree of co-coverage of SPPs and health/nutrition
5 interventions among beneficiary households is poorly described. Using six population-based surveys from
6 2012 to 2019 in Bangladesh, India, and Nepal (n=253,703 women with children under five years of age),
7 we examined data availability for SPPs (food and cash transfers) and health/nutrition interventions, and
8 estimated their coverage and co-coverage during a woman's last pregnancy (interventions: take-home
9 food rations plus at least four antenatal care visits, receipt of at least 100 iron-folic acid tablets,
10 deworming, and tetanus injections), after delivery (cash benefit plus the interventions above), and in
11 children (take-home ration for the child plus vitamin A supplementation, deworming, iron syrup, growth
12 monitoring, and nutrition counseling). In India, 52% and 51% of women and children, respectively,
13 received food transfers, but only 3% and 8% received food plus all health/nutrition interventions. In India
14 and Nepal, respectively, cash after delivery was received by 41% and 86% of women, but only 2% and
15 21% received cash after delivery plus all health/nutrition interventions. There was insufficient data to
16 estimate coverage of both SPPs and health/nutrition interventions in Bangladesh. Our findings highlight
17 the need for data on both SPP and health/nutrition intervention coverage in household surveys. There are
18 missed opportunities to reach women and children with interventions across multiple sectors.

19

20 Keywords: nutrition, social protection, co-coverage, health system, women, children

21 INTRODUCTION

22 Forty percent of households (809 million individuals) in South Asia experienced moderate or severe food
23 insecurity in 2022, and 30% of children under five years old in the region are stunted (1). It is well-known
24 that nutrition interventions alone will not eradicate poor nutrition outcomes; solutions from multiple sectors
25 that target underlying and immediate determinants of these outcomes are needed (2,3). Cash or in-kind
26 transfers offered through social protection programs (SPPs), while not necessarily designed with nutrition
27 outcomes in mind, can address underlying determinants missed by nutrition interventions and, in some
28 cases, have been effective at reducing undernutrition in South Asian contexts (4). Making SPPs more
29 “nutrition-sensitive” by adding features that may enhance program impacts on nutrition outcomes has
30 been recommended (5,6). For example, a cash transfer may provide relief to a household’s budget but,
31 without an additional intervention such as information on the importance of consuming nutritious foods,
32 the transfer may not lead to impacts on diet and nutrition, as was observed in a trial in Bangladesh (7). A
33 recent review of SPPs in South Asia suggests that there is ample scope for making existing programs
34 more nutrition-sensitive through targeting vulnerable households, including nutrition behavior change,
35 linking the program to health services, empowering women, providing or ensuring access to foods with a
36 high nutritional value, or including other measures to promote healthy diets (8).

37 While it is important to track the reach of SPPs over time, large-scale scale household surveys have
38 limited data on exposure to SPPs and their potentially nutrition-sensitive features (9). Thus, assessing
39 coverage of nutrition-sensitive SPPs is currently hindered by poor data availability and measurement
40 challenges. To understand if households are reached simultaneously by multiple interventions, estimated
41 indicators of co-coverage (i.e., the percentage of households receiving more than one intervention of
42 interest) are an alternative method of analysis. Co-coverage has been used to understand simultaneous
43 coverage of multiple health/nutrition interventions within the same household (10–12). A recent non-
44 representative phone survey in India found low co-coverage of food and cash transfers with
45 health/nutrition interventions among mothers (13). In the current study, using data from representative
46 population-based surveys that measure household exposure to SPPs, we estimate co-coverage of SPPs
47 with health/nutrition interventions during pregnancy and childhood in Bangladesh, India, and Nepal.

48

49 **METHODS**

50 **Data sources and classification of SPPs**

51 The following publicly available, nationally representative surveys with data on SPPs were included: 1)
52 Bangladesh Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES) 2016; 2) Bangladesh Multiple Indicator
53 Cluster Survey (BMICS) 2019; 3) India National Family Health Survey (NFHS) 2016; 4) India National
54 Sample Survey (NSS) 2012; 5) Nepal Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) 2016; 6) Nepal Multiple
55 Indicator Cluster Survey (NMICS) 2019. While population-based surveys in other South Asian countries
56 exist, they were not included in this study due to being older than 10 years, limited accessibility, or not
57 having data on SPPs. The World Bank ASPIRE framework (14) was used to organize the SPPs by five
58 categories of cash for work, unconditional cash transfers (poverty-targeted cash, allowances, and public
59 charity), conditional cash transfers, food transfers, and school feeding. In these six surveys, data from
60 women with children under five years old were used. All women provided consent for participation in the
61 surveys. This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki
62 and all procedures involving research study participants were approved by Institutional Review Boards in
63 the respective countries.

64

65 **Estimating coverage of SPPs**

66 Coverage for each SPP was defined as the percentage of households with individuals that reported
67 receipt of government cash or food transfers in the past 12 months. For three SPPs targeting pregnant
68 women (the Janani Surakshya Yojana cash transfer in India, food supplements under India's Integrated
69 Child Development Services (ICDS), and the Aama Karyakram cash transfer in Nepal), coverage was
70 calculated among women with a pregnancy within the past five years. After reporting coverage of each
71 SPP, we summarized the percentage of households covered by any SPP that provided cash and/or food
72 (four aggregate indicators: any cash, any food, any cash or any food, any cash and any food). For
73 example, if there were four SPPs with cash transfers measured in a given survey, the "any cash"
74 coverage indicator was the percentage of households that received transfers from at least one of those
75 SPPs. If there were four cash SPPs and one food SPP measured in a survey, the "any cash and any
76 food" indicator was the percentage of households covered by at least one cash SPP and the food SPP.

77

78 **Estimating co-coverage of SPPs and health/nutrition interventions**

79 Co-coverage was defined as receiving both a SPP transfer and key health/nutrition interventions at three
80 different life stages typically noted as being nutritionally vulnerable periods: during the last pregnancy,
81 after delivery, and during childhood under five years of age. The four health/nutrition interventions
82 considered during pregnancy included 1) at least four antenatal care (ANC) visits, 2) at least 100 iron and
83 folic acid (IFA) tablets consumed, 3) maternal deworming, and 4) two or more tetanus injections. These
84 same four interventions were used for co-coverage of interventions with cash after delivery. For early
85 childhood, the five health/nutrition interventions considered, based on data availability, were: 1) vitamin A
86 supplementation in the past 6 months, 2) deworming in the past 6 months, 3) iron syrup in the past 7
87 days, 4) growth monitoring, and 5) counseling on nutritional status after growth monitoring. Co-coverage
88 of the SPP and each health/nutrition intervention was estimated, followed by the target scenario of co-
89 coverage of the SPP and all health/nutrition interventions combined. For example, the first co-coverage
90 indicator was the percentage of women with children under five years who received any food transfer
91 during pregnancy and at least four ANC visits during last pregnancy. The second co-coverage indicator
92 was the percentage of women with children under five who received any food transfer during pregnancy
93 plus at least 100 IFA tablets during last pregnancy, and so forth. Similar co-coverage indicators were
94 estimated for food plus deworming and food plus tetanus injections. The fifth and final co-coverage
95 indicator was for an optimal scenario: the percentage of women who received the food transfer plus all
96 four health/nutrition interventions during their pregnancy. The same approach was taken for cash
97 transfers after delivery and food transfers during childhood. Data were not available for cash transfers
98 during pregnancy, food transfers after delivery, or cash transfers during early childhood.

99

100 **RESULTS**

101

102 **Description of survey data on SPPs and sample characteristics**

103 In Bangladesh, coverage data were available for 11 and 6 SPPs, respectively in HIES 2016 and BMICS
104 2019 (**Table 1**). In India, data were available for 2 SPPs in both NSS 2012 and NFHS 2016. In Nepal,

105 data were available only for a maternal conditional cash transfer program in NDHS 2016 and for 5 types
106 of SPPs in NMICS 2016. No surveys had data on public charity programs. Included programs are listed in
107 Table 1, with additional details for each program provided in **Supplementary Table 1**. The total number
108 of households included in the surveys ranged from 11,040 in NDHS 2016 to 601,509 in NFHS 2016, and
109 20-40% of households had children under 5 years of age (**Supplementary Table 2**). Supplementary
110 Table 2 also provides additional household characteristics. **Coverage of SPPs and health/nutrition**
111 **interventions**
112 Coverage of SPPs in Bangladesh and Nepal was less than 20% in nearly all cases and less than 5% in
113 many cases, while about half of households were covered in India (**Table 2**). Between 12% (Bangladesh)
114 and 41% (India) of households received at least one cash transfer program. Coverage of at least one
115 food transfer program was highest in India, where 60% of households received take home rations through
116 the ICDS program. In Bangladesh, only 3% of households received a food transfer through the
117 Vulnerable Group Development program or a school feeding program per HIES 2016 data. In
118 Bangladesh, 18% of households received either cash or food but less than 2% received both cash and
119 food. In India, due to moderate coverage of Janani Surakshya Yojana and of take home rations through
120 ICDS, 16% of households received both cash and food.
121 Data on health/nutrition interventions were available for India (NFHS 2016) and Nepal (NDHS 2016) but
122 not for Bangladesh surveys. Coverage of interventions during pregnancy was lower in India compared to
123 Nepal, except for tetanus injections. There was large variation in coverage of interventions during early
124 childhood, ranging from 26% (IFA syrup) to 58% (vitamin A supplementation) in India and from 8% (IFA
125 syrup) to 86% (vitamin A supplementation) in Nepal.


126

127 **Co-coverage of SPPs and health/nutrition interventions**


128 Among the six surveys, only NFHS 2016 and NDHS 2016 had data on both SPPs and health/nutrition
129 interventions. Although half (52%) of women in India with a birth in the past 5 years received a food
130 transfer during their pregnancy, a take home ration through the ICDS scheme, only 3% received a food
131 transfer plus four health/nutrition interventions: having at least four ANC visits, consuming at least 100
132 IFA tablets, receiving deworming tablets, and receiving two tetanus toxoid injections (**Figure 1A**).

133 Similarly, in India and Nepal, respectively, while 41% and 86% of women received cash through perinatal
 134 cash transfer programs, only 2% and 21% of women received cash plus all four health/nutrition
 135 interventions (**Figure 1B**). Co-coverage of India's ICDS food transfer and health/nutrition interventions
 136 during early childhood followed the same pattern, with 51% of children getting the transfer but only 8% of
 137 children getting the transfer plus all five health/nutrition interventions (**Figure 1C**).


A. Food during pregnancy, India NFHS 2016¹



B. Cash after delivery, India NFHS 2016 and Nepal NDHS 2016^{2,4}



C. Food during early childhood, India NFHS 2016¹



139 **Figure 1. Co-coverage of transfers with other health/nutrition interventions during pregnancy (A),**
140 **after delivery (B) or in early childhood (C) in India and Nepal**

141 ¹Food in India's NFHS 2016 refers to food supplementation during pregnancy and during early childhood
142 under the Integrated Child Development Services program; the denominator for this analysis was women
143 who gave birth in the past 5 years for women and denominators varied by interventions for children
144 according to age group.

145 ²Among women who gave birth in a public health facility in the past 5 years.

146 ³Cash in India's NFHS 2016 refers to cash received through Janani Surakshya Yojana.

147 ⁴Cash in Nepal's NDHS 2016 refers to cash received through Aama Karyakram.

148 Abbreviations: ANC=antenatal care; IFA=iron folic acid; NDHS=Nepal Demographic and Health Survey;
149 NFHS=National Family Health Survey

150

151 **DISCUSSION**

152 While many SPPs exist in South Asia, measurement of whether households and/or target populations
153 receive benefits and related program features in population-based surveys remains poor (15). While
154 coverage on health/nutrition interventions exist, few surveys measure coverage of both SPPs and
155 health/nutrition interventions simultaneously or if SPP benefits include linked health/nutrition
156 interventions. Using available data from South Asia, our study found low coverage of most SPPs and a
157 missed opportunity to reach households with both SPP and health/nutrition interventions.

158 Many examples of large scale SPPs exist in South Asia, but they are infrequently measured. Although
159 social protection systems and, thus, SPPs differ across countries, certain SPPs that address underlying
160 determinants of malnutrition, such as school feeding programs or perinatal cash transfers, exist across
161 contexts in South Asia. Therefore, measuring both common SPP elements and generic features proven
162 to improve nutrition outcomes through a standard set of questions in household surveys would enable
163 cross-country comparisons of SPP coverage. Questions that ask about additional details on the transfers,
164 (e.g. quantity of cash received or school meal quality), would allow for further program refinement and
165 explorations of how program quality relates to measured nutrition outcomes. In the absence of such data
166 on the potentially nutrition-sensitive features of SPPs, co-coverage is a useful approach to understand if

167 households are receiving multiple interventions, but the scope of co-coverage estimation remains limited
168 due to few surveys measuring receipt of both SPPs and health/nutrition interventions.

169 While these six surveys are not an exhaustive list of surveys with SPP measurement in South Asia, we
170 used readily accessible datasets that allowed us to explore the concept of SPP and health/nutrition
171 intervention co-coverage. Our findings are generally in agreement with those from a phone survey in India
172 conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic that included detailed questions on receipt of SPPs and
173 health/nutrition interventions by women (13). Co-coverage estimates in the phone survey were higher
174 than what we found in the current study, likely because the phone survey was more recent (2022
175 compared to 2016 for NFHS), thus existing programs had wider reach and there were new programs; and
176 the phone survey included a broader set of SPPs and health/nutrition interventions compared to NFHS.
177 SPP coverage estimates from nationally representative surveys such as DHS and MICS may not account
178 for all existing SPPs within a country. Notably, Living Standards Measurement Study surveys typically
179 measure SPP coverage but do not measure receipt of health/nutrition interventions. Many non-
180 governmental organizations may provide social protection services in focused geographies, which are
181 often not tracked in large scale surveys. In any given survey, there is a limitation to the amount of
182 information that can be collected, thus multiple data sources should be utilized when possible. Some
183 countries have administrative data systems that track social assistance disbursed to beneficiaries. The
184 quality and frequency of administrative data varies, and this data source is often not available to the
185 public. Future research should triangulate information from multiple data sources to more closely examine
186 SPP coverage and co-coverage of multisectoral interventions.

187 SPPs or health/nutrition interventions in isolation have limited scope to respond to the broad range of
188 shocks and challenges that households face during critical periods of growth and development. Ensuring
189 that vulnerable households are reached by complementary interventions that provide both social
190 protection transfers and health/nutrition interventions to address underlying and intermediate needs is
191 critical for optimal maternal, infant and young child wellbeing. Measurement of SPPs and health/nutrition
192 interventions in population-based surveys requires further investment.

193

194 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

195 The authors declared that they have no conflict of interest.

196

197 REFERENCES

- 198 1. FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP, WHO. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2023. The
199 State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2023. FAO; IFAD; UNICEF; WFP; WHO; 2023 Jul.
- 200 2. Keats EC, Das JK, Salam RA, Lassi ZS, Imdad A, Black RE, et al. Effective interventions to address
201 maternal and child malnutrition : an update of the evidence. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*
202 [Internet]. 2021;4642(20):1–18. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2352-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30274-1)
203 4642(20)30274-1
- 204 3. Bhutta ZA, Das JK, Rizvi A, Gaffey MF, Walker N, Horton S, et al. Evidence-based interventions for
205 improvement of maternal and child nutrition: What can be done and at what cost? *The Lancet*.
206 2013;382(9890):452–77.
- 207 4. Gentilini U. *Social Protection, Food Security and Nutrition An Update of Concepts, Evidence and*
208 *Select Practices in South Asia and Beyond*. 2022.
- 209 5. Ruel MT, Alderman H. Nutrition-sensitive interventions and programmes: How can they help to
210 accelerate progress in improving maternal and child nutrition? *The Lancet*. 2013;382(9891):536–
211 51.
- 212 6. Ruel MT, Quisumbing AR, Balagamwala M. *Nutrition-sensitive agriculture: What have we learned*
213 *so far? Vol. 17, Global Food Security*. Elsevier B.V.; 2018. p. 128–53.
- 214 7. Ahmed A, Hoddinott J, Roy S. *Food transfers, cash transfers, behavior change communication and*
215 *child nutrition. Evidence from Bangladesh*. 2019. Report No.: 01868.
- 216 8. Scott S, Neupane S, Alderman H, Kim S, Parvin A, Rasheed S, et al. *Do social protection programs*
217 *in South Asia have the potential to be nutrition-sensitive? Insights from Bangladesh, India, Nepal,*
218 *and Pakistan*. 2023.

- 219 9. Neupane S, Scott S, Jangid M, Shapleigh S, Kim S, Akseer N, et al. Data Availability on Nutrition
220 Sensitive Social Protection Programs (NSSPPs) Across Population-based Surveys in South Asia.
221 2022.
- 222 10. Menon P, Avula R, Pandey S, Scott S, Kumar A. Rethinking Effective Nutrition Convergence An
223 Analysis of Intervention Co-coverage Data. *Econ Polit Wkly*. 2019;54(24).
- 224 11. Nguyen PH, Singh N, Scott S, Neupane S, Jangid M, Walia M, et al. Unequal coverage of nutrition
225 and health interventions for women and children in seven countries. *Bull World Health Organ*
226 [Internet]. 2022 Jan 1 [cited 2023 Oct 17];100(1):20. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC8722629/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/398722629/)
- 227 12. Victora CG, Fenn B, Bryce J, Kirkwood BR. Co-coverage of preventive interventions and
228 implications for child-survival strategies: Evidence from national surveys. *Lancet* [Internet]. 2005
229 Oct 22 [cited 2023 Nov 9];366(9495):1460–6. Available from:
230 <http://www.thelancet.com/article/S014067360567599X/fulltext>
- 231 13. Nguyen PH, Avula R, Neupane S, Akseer N, Heidkamp R. Identifying measures for coverage of
232 nutrition-sensitive social protection programs: Learnings from India. *Matern Child Nutr*. 2024 Jun
233 12;
- 234 14. World Bank. ASPIRE program classification [Internet]. [cited 2023 Nov 9]. Available from:
235 [https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/05c7cffd57ec07f5a3fc8d598ca4941d-](https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/05c7cffd57ec07f5a3fc8d598ca4941d-0380052021/original/ASPIRE-program-classification.pdf)
236 [0380052021/original/ASPIRE-program-classification.pdf](https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/05c7cffd57ec07f5a3fc8d598ca4941d-0380052021/original/ASPIRE-program-classification.pdf)
- 237 15. Gillespie S, Menon P, Heidkamp R, Piwoz E, Rawat R, Munos M, et al. Measuring the coverage of
238 nutrition interventions along the continuum of care: time to act at scale. *BMJ Glob Health*
239 [Internet]. 2019 May 1 [cited 2024 Sep 3];4(Suppl 4):e001290. Available from:
240 https://gh.bmj.com/content/4/Suppl_4/e001290
- 241

Table 1. Data availability on social protection programs in population-based surveys in Bangladesh, India, and Nepal¹

Program subcategory	Bangladesh			India			Nepal		
	Data availability		Program name(s)	Data availability		Program name(s)	Data availability		Program name(s)
	HIES 2016	BMICS 2019		NSS 2012	NFHS 2016		NDHS 2016	NMICS 2019	
Cash for work	P	P	Work for Money; Test relief; Employment generation program for the poorest	O	O	The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee	O	O	Prime Minister Employment program
UCT									
Poverty-targeted cash	P	O	Targeted ultra-poor program	NA	NA	-	O	P	Endangered Indigenous Peoples Allowance or Endangered Ethnicity Grant
Allowances									
Old age	P	P	Old-age Allowance program	O	O	Indira Gandhi National Old Age Pension Scheme	O	P	Old Age Allowance or Senior Citizen's Allowance
Widow/Single women	P	P	Husband-Deserted; Widowed and Destitute Women Allowance	O	O	Indira Gandhi National Widow Pension Scheme	O	P	Single Women's Allowance
Disabled	P	O	Allowance for Financially Insolvent Persons with Disabilities	O	O	Indira Gandhi National Disability Pension Scheme	O	P	Disability Grant
Martyr's ²	P	P	Allowance for freedom fighters/Shahed family	NA	NA	-	-	-	-
Public charity	NA	NA	-	NA	NA	-	NA	NA	-
CCT									
Women/Pregnant women	P	P	Maternity allowance program for the poor lactating mothers	O	P	Janani Suraksha Yojana	P	O	Aama program
Students	P	O	Primary Education Stipend program; Secondary Education Sector Investment program; Anand School program	NA	NA	-	O	O	Scholarships program
Food transfer	P	P	Vulnerable Group Development/ Vulnerable Group Feeding	P	P	Food supplements to pregnant and lactating women and children under Integrated Child Delivery Services program	O	O	Supplementary food for lactating women and children in food insecure areas

Table 1. Data availability on social protection programs in population-based surveys in Bangladesh, India, and Nepal¹

Program subcategory	Bangladesh			India			Nepal		
	Data availability		Program name(s)	Data availability		Program name(s)	Data availability		Program name(s)
	HIES 2016	BMICS 2019		NSS 2012	NFHS 2016		NDHS 2016	NMICS 2019	
Nutrition program ³	P	O	Improving Maternal and Child Nutrition; Community Nutrition program	NA	NA	-	O	P	Child (0-5 years) grant
School feeding	P	O	School feeding program in the poverty-prone areas	P	O	Mid-Day Meal	O	O	National School Meals program; Food for Education

¹For a more detailed description of each program, refer to Supplementary Table 1

²Family of a person who died in a war

³Any transfer (cash or food) that may be linked to the fulfillment of nutrition practices such as completing growth monitoring

P= Program and data available; O= Program available but data not available; NA=Program does not exist, thus data availability assessment was not applicable

Abbreviations: CCT=conditional cash transfer; HIES=Household Income and Expenditure Survey; MICS=Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey; NDHS=Nepal Demographic and Health Survey; NFHS=National Family Health Survey; NSS=National Sample Survey; UCT=unconditional cash transfer

Table 2. Coverage of individual social protection programs in the past 12 months in Bangladesh, India, and Nepal¹

	Bangladesh		India		Nepal	
	HIES	BMICS	NSS	NFHS	NDHS	NMICS
	2016	2019	2012 ⁴	2016	2016	2019
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Social protection programs						
Cash for work						
Employment generation	-	1.2	-	-	-	-
Gratuitous relief	1.4	-	-	-	-	-
Test relief	0.6					
Unconditional cash transfer						
Old age allowance	4.1	-	-	-	-	12.9
Widow allowance	1.3	-	-	-	-	6.8
Disabled allowance	0.4	-	-	-	-	1.3
Any unconditional allowances ²	-	10.2	-	-	-	-
Conditional cash transfer						
Anand school program	0.4					
Stipend for primary school students	6.9	-	-	-	-	-
Stipend for secondary school students	2.7	-	-	-	-	-
Maternity allowance	-	0.8				
Janani Surakshya Yojana ³	-	-	-	41.1	-	-
Aama Karyakram ³	-	-	-	-	86.4	-
Nutrition program						
Child support grant	-	-	-	-	-	2.9
Food support						
VGD/VGF	2.5	7.4	-	-	-	-
Public distribution system	-	-	44.1	-	-	-
Food supplement for pregnant women under ICDS ³	-	-	-	51.9	-	-
Food supplement for children under ICDS ³				51.3		
School feeding	0.9	-	37.9	-	-	-
Transfer type received (aggregate indicators)						
Any cash	15.9	11.6	-	41.1	86.4	22.1
Any food	3.3	7.4	51.8	59.8	-	-
Any cash or any food	18.3	17.7	-	65.9	-	-
Any cash and any food	1.0	1.6	-	15.7	-	-
Nutrition/health interventions						
Pregnancy						
≥ 4 ANC visits, %	-	-	-	49.3	69.4	-
≥ 100 IFA, %	-	-	-	30.3	65.4	-
Deworming, %	-	-	-	18.0	70.2	-
Two tetanus injections, %	-	-	-	83.5	66.1	-
Early childhood						
Vitamin A in past 6m (6-59m), %	-	-	-	57.8	86.0	-
Deworming in past 6m (12-59m), %	-	-	-	33.0	75.8	-
Iron syrup in past 7 days (6-59m), %	-	-	-	26.0	7.7	-

Growth monitored (0-59m), %	-	-	-	43.3	25.3	-
Counseling after growth monitoring (0-59m), %	-	-	-	27.8	12.2	-

¹For a more detailed description of each program, refer to Supplementary Table 1

²BMICS 2019 asked about all allowances combined (old age/disabled/widow/freedom fighters/shared families, etc.)

³The recall period for these programs was the previous pregnancy (not necessarily the last 12 months).

⁴In India, NSS data is shown for the percentage of households that received rice or wheat in the past 30 days or with children 6-14 years old who received a free school meal in the past 30 days.

Abbreviations: HIES=Household Income and Expenditure Survey; ICDS=Integrated Child Development Service; BMICS= Bangladesh Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey; NDHS=Nepal Demographic and Health Survey; NFHS=National Family Health Survey; NMICS= Nepal Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey; NSS=National Sample Survey; VGD=Vulnerable Group Development; VGF=Vulnerable Group Feeding.