# Health Impacts of the Aspirational Districts Program in India: Evidence from district level NFHS-5 data

Sandip K. Agarwal[a], Shubham Mishra[a]

[a]*Department of Economic Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India*

**Abstract**

**Background** Aspirational Districts (ADs) initiative was launched by Government of India in 2018 with the objective of reducing inter-district economic and social inequalities with health and nutrition, education, agriculture and water resources, financial inclusion and skill development and infrastructure as the focus areas for development. 117 most backward districts across the country were identified as aspirational districts (ADs) which received priority in funding and scheme implementation so that these districts can catch up with the rest of the districts. We conduct an impact evaluation of the AD initiative on the health and nutrition outcomes.
**Methods** The research employed a quasi-experimental approach, utilizing the difference-in-differences (DID) method and another method that combined propensity score matching with DID.
**Findings** The research found a positive impact of the AD program on maternal health through an increase in the percentage of home births attended by Skilled Birth Attendants (SBA) in the Aspirational Districts (ADs) by on an average 1.26% in the ADs. In addition, with respect to family planning an increase of 0.44% was found in percent of male sterilization. Additionally, weak evidence suggests a 3% improvement in ADs for immunization against the first dose of measles vaccine and three doses of penta or hepatitis B vaccine was observed. No strong evidence of adverse impacts of the AD initiative exist.
**Interpretation** The Aspirational District (AD) initiative, a flagship program of the Indian government, aims to address inter-district economic and social inequalities. Our research evaluated the impact of AD on health and nutrition outcomes. Using PSM-DID, we found significant improvements in home births attended by skilled birth attendants and an increase in percentage of male sterilization in ADs. No strong evidence of any adverse impact of AD was observed. Covid-19 pandemic and inter-sector competition for resources within a district might have undermined the performance of ADs on health and nutrition outcomes. Future research efforts should be put for a holistic impact evaluation of all the targeted sectors and outcomes of the AD initiative.
**Funding** None

*Keywords:* Aspirational Districts Programme, Inequality, Difference-in-differences (DID), Propensity score matching (PSM) PSM-DID, Full matching method, Average Treatment Effect in Treated (ATT), National Family Health Survey

## 1. Introduction

Regional inequalities in India both at the state as well as the districts have been of concern for the central and the state governments for a long time. These inequalities are multi-dimensional in nature with income inequalities and disparities in human development indicators being most prominent [1],[2],[3]. Evidence exists that while the country has witnessed high levels of economic growth, income inequalities, particularly economic disparity has widened in recent decades post-liberalization [4]. There have been targeted interventions in the form of several social welfare and poverty alleviation schemes in the past that primarily focus on deprivations but we are not familiar with any concerted effort that have been put together to address regional inequalities in India. In order to address inter-district and inter-state multi-dimensional inequalities, for the first time the central government launched 'Transformation of Aspirational Districts' or Aspirational Districts (ADs henceforth) initiative in 2018 [5]. AD programme identified the most backward districts in the country, and developed a framework to prioritise development in these districts so that they can catch

up with the other districts in the state, and subsequently at the national level.

One of the key focus areas of the AD programme is health and nutrition. Researchers have presented evidence of inequalities that exist in areas of health and nutrition sector in India (Joe et al., (2008); Subramanian et al., (2020))[6],[7]. Evidence of inequities in health and nutrition sector have surfaced that relates to maternal and reproductive health [8, 9], child health and nutrition [10, 11, 7, 12], child immunization [13] and contraceptive usage for family planning [14]. With the AD programme, a trend of convergence by narrowing of the existing inequalities in the AD is expected. Our research is an attempt in that direction to evaluate the impact of the AD programme on the health and nutrition indicators of the AD beneficiary districts. While few research studies have discussed the AD programme by highlighting the potential or evident differences in health outcomes between AD and non-AD districts in terms of maternal and reproductive health [9, 15], child nutrition [16, 17], child low birthweight and small birth size [18], covid vaccination [19], for most of the above studies evaluation of the AD programme is not the primary research objective. Sharma and Sharma (2020) is an exception among the above studies as the central objective of their research is to assess the efficiency of AD with regards to maternal health services using data envelopment analysis, in which they found that more than 80% of the ADs are operating below their optimal level. Our research is one of the first study that evaluates the AD program using observational data, and therefore makes a significant contribution to the literature. Our paper is structured as below. Section 2 provides a brief description of the AD programme. Section 3 discusses the data and the methodology. Section 4 presents results of our analysis followed by discussion in section 5. Section 6 concludes.

## 2. Background

'Transformation of Aspirational Districts' or Aspirational Districts (ADs) initiative was launched by the Government of India in January 2018 with the objective of achieving inclusive growth that aims to reduce multi-dimensional regional disparities in India. The key focus areas of ADs programme are health and nutrition, education, agriculture and water resources, financial inclusion and skill development and basic infrastructure, which spans 49 key performance indicators for the ADs. ADs are eligible for enhanced funding and priority allocation of various initiatives undertaken the central and the state government. Three key underlying mechanisms that are expected to make ADs initiative a success are convergence (of Central and state schemes), secondly collaboration (of Central, state level officers and district Collectors) and thirdly the competition among districts driven by a mass movement. The competition among the ADs is fostered through overall and indicator specific monthly incremental rankings of the ADs, which are publicly available on the website Champions of Change dashboard of the ADs programme[1].

117 most backward districts[2] were identified as ADs based on the ranking of a composite index formed out of 11 core measurable indicators as summarized in the table 1 below. Health and nutrition holds a 30% weightage through several indicators for the identification of the ADs as well as 30% weightage in impact outcomes. While health and nutrition outcomes are reviewed monthly and validated periodically through quarterly surveys, it relies mostly on the data entered at the level of individual districts. Our research evaluated the effectiveness of the health and nutrition outcome for the ADs using the district level data of the fourth and the fifth round of the National Family and Health Survey (NFHS) that was collected between 2015-16 and 2019-21 respectively.

[1] http://championsofchange.gov.in/site/coc-home/
[2] Each state had at least 1 district as AD

Table 1: Indicator used to identify ADs

| S No | Indicator | Source | Sector | Weight |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Landless household dependent on Manual Labour | SECC D7 | Deprivation | 25% |
| 2 | Ante Natal Care | NFHS-IV | Health | 7.50% |
| 3 | Institutional Deliveries | NFHS-IV | Health | 7.50% |
| 4 | Stunting of children below 5 years | NFHS-IV | Health | 7.50% |
| 5 | Wasting of children below 5 years | NFHS-IV | Health | 7.50% |
| 6 | Elementary Drop-out Rate | U-DISE 2015-16 | Education | 7.50% |
| 7 | Adverse pupil teacher ratio | U-DISE 2015-16 | Education | 7.50% |
| 8 | Unelectrified household | Ministry data | Infrastructure | 7.50% |
| 9 | Household without individual toilet | Ministry data | Infrastructure | 7.50% |
| 10 | Un-connected PMGSY village | Ministry data | Infrastructure | 7.50% |
| 11 | Rural Household without access to water | Ministry data | Infrastructure | 7.50% |

# 3. Data and Methods

We used the fourth and the fifth rounds of district level NFHS data collected in 2015-16 and 2019-21 respectively in order to find the causal impact of AD programme on health outcomes. One of the biggest advantages of using NFHS data for evaluation of the ADs initiative is that the health and nutrition outcomes are comparable to the baseline data (i.e. NFHS-4), which was one of the data sets used for identifying the ADs initially. NFHS data is a nationally representative survey that has been collected since 1992-93 every 4-5 years with an aim to keep track of changes in the status of health related variables and guide appropriate policy to that end. Therefore, NFHS data is comparable across different geographic and administrative units unlike the data collected by the district administration for monitoring their district's progress, which could potentially be biased due to several reasons.

We used NFHS-4 and NFHS-5 data as the pre and the post-intervention phase data respectively since the AD programme was initiated in 2018, between the two rounds of NFHS data collection. Therefore, using a Difference-in-differences (DID) framework to estimate the casual impact of the AD programme seems to be natural choice. A DID framework is suitable for impact evaluation of a policy or an intervention in observational studies, when the data for both the control and the treatment group are available before and after the policy implementation. DID estimates can be computed using a linear regression model as the following:

$$y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Policy_i + \beta_2 Post_t + \beta_3 (Policy_i \times Post_t) + u_{it} \tag{1}$$

where $Policy_i$ is a dummy variable with value 1, if district $i$ had received the intervention, else zero and $Post_t$ is a dummy variable with value 1, if the time period is after the intervention (else 0). Our DID estimate is given by the coefficient of interaction term between the two dummy variables denoted by $\beta_3$. DID design overcomes the challenge of random treatment assignment by comparing the temporal changes in the counterfactual group with those that experienced the policy change i.e., the treatment group [20, 21]. However, the DID model rests on a crucial assumption that the pre-treatment trend of the outcome variables between the control and the treatment group are parallel. This requires researchers to have more than one period of pre-intervention data so that the parallel trend assumption can be checked.

In the context of our study, our treatment group comprise of ADs, which were the most backward districts in the country, and hence were identified for the AD intervention. Several development indicators of AD were significantly lower than that of non-AD districts, and it is not unlikely that their growth trends might have been different too. Therefore, it would not be plausible to assume that growth rates of these variables were same prior to the AD initiative unless tested. There is a large literature in social sciences and development studies surrounding debates on convergences and divergences, which suggest a reduction or further widening of existing social and economic inequalities [2],[3],[4],[13],[12],[14]. Therefore, without testing for parallel pre-treatment growth trends between the control and the treatment group, validity of the

DID estimates are questionable.

In order to test for pre-treatment parallel trends between the control and the treatment group, one would require data for two or more periods before the policy intervention. However, due to the unavailability of the required data for two periods before the intervention, we were unable to test for parallel growth trends between the control and the treatment group for our variables of interest. Though, NFHS data from earlier rounds were available, we could not make use of them as they were not available for districts but only at the state and the national level [22]. Moreover, while the interval between NFHS-4 and NFHS-5 was for 5 years, the interval betwen NFHS-3 and NFHS4 was 10 years since NFHS-3 data was collected in 2005-06. This further makes it unlikely that pre-policy growth trends would have been parallel, even if we had the district level data from NFHS-3 rounds. Therefore instead of relying on our DID estimates, we used the combined Propensity Score Matching and DID (PSM-DID) to estimate the causal impact of the AD program.

Propensity Score Matching (PSM) has been widely used in observational studies to estimate the causal impact of a policy intervention [23],[24],[25],[26]. Using PSM, the probability of assignment (or the propensity score) of the treatment based on the observable is estimated, which is matched for treatment units and the control group so that based on the propensity scores, a treatment unit has a comparable counterfactual. PSM enables the design and analysis of observational studies to mimic certain aspects of randomized controlled trials. Essentially, the propensity score acts as a balancing score by ensuring that the distribution of observed baseline covariates is similar between treated and untreated subjects, given their propensity score values [26]. It allows us to estimate the Average Treatment Effect in Treated (ATT)[27].

A growing literature has employed a combination of PSM and DID (PSM-DID) method for impact evaluation of health policies using observational data. [28, 29, 30, 31, 32]. The use of PSM before the DID enables comparison between the groups and strengthens the plausibility of the parallel trends assumption, thus reducing the selection bias and the dependence upon the unobservables and observables consistent over time or having similar trend between the treatment and counterfactual [28, 32]. In line with Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd (1997) [33], the PSM-DID method allows for estimation of temporally invariant unobserved outcome differences between individuals in the treatment and control groups, akin to fixed effects in panel data analysis. Therefore, we used the PSM-DID method for impact evaluation of the AD initiative on selected health and nutrition outcomes that were present in the NFHS-5 data.

In order to estimate the casual impact of the AD initiative, we would like to to get the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT). Following Cheng et al. (2015) [34], the ATT is given by

$$ATT = E(Y^P_{i,post} - Y^P_{i,pre}|X^P_i, Z^P_i, D_i = 1) - E(Y^{NP}_{i,post} - Y^{NP}_{i,pre}|X^P_i, Z^P_i, D_i = 1) \tag{2}$$

where $Y^P_i$ and $Y^{NP}_i$ denote the outcomes for the treatment and the control group for the $i^{th}$ district with an additional subscript *pre* and *post* indicating pre or the post intervention time period. The outcomes are conditional upon treatment status indicated by $D_i = 1$ for treatment (else 0), observable and unobservable characteristics of the district denoted by $X_i$ and $Z_i$ respectively. While, $E(Y^{NP}_{i,post} - Y^{NP}_{i,pre}|X^P_i, Z^P_i, D_i = 1)$ is unobserved, a fundamental assumption in the matching literature is that the intervention assignment can be assumed to be random if the treatment and the control groups are matched on the observables, i.e. $X^P = X^{NP} = X$, which implies that $E(Y^{NP}_{i,post} - Y^{NP}_{i,pre}|X_i, Z^P_i, D_i = 1) = E(Y^{NP}_{i,post} - Y^{NP}_{i,pre}|X_i, Z^P_i, D_i = 0)$. Therefore, the ATT can be rewritten as

$$ATT = E(Y^P_{i,post} - Y^P_{i,pre}|X^P_i, Z^P_i, D_i = 1) - E(Y^{NP}_{i,post} - Y^{NP}_{i,pre}|X^P_i, Z^P_i, D_i = 0) \tag{3}$$

In the above equation, $Z_i$ can be eliminated using double differences since it is assumed to be time invariant. Moreover, given the assumption of conditional Independence, the potential outcomes are independent of the treatment status when matched on the covariates. Subsequently, the ATT can be estimated conditional on the propensity scores instead of conditional upon observed covariates, which can be rewritten as

$$ATT = E(Y^P_{i,post} - Y^P_{i,pre}|P(D_i = 1, X_i), D_i = 1) - E(Y^{NP}_{i,post} - Y^{NP}_{i,pre}|P(D_i = 1, X_i), D_i = 0) \tag{4}$$

The propensity scores or the probability of treatment assignment is estimated using a logit regression as in equation 5. $D_i$ is the binary variable with value 1 if the $i^{th}$ district was an AD else 0. $X$ is the list of indicators described earlier in table 1 which were used in creating the composite index, which was used to rank and identify the most backward districts as the ADs.

$$P(D_i = 1) = \frac{e^{X\Gamma}}{1 + e^{X\Gamma}} \tag{5}$$

We used the full matching method of PSM to match treatment and control districts based on the propensity scores. In this method, each treated (untreated) subject is matched with one or more untreated (treated) subjects based on their propensity scores by minimizing the matched sample's total absolute within-subclass distances by the number of subclasses selected and the units assigned to each subclass. [26] [35]. Full matching method has been demonstrated to be an effective matching technique for reducing bias due to observed confounding variables [25].

# 4. Results

Results from the DID estimation are presented in table 2. All analysis was conducted using R software. Each row in table 2 is a separate regression estimated by the DID regression equation 1 with the listed variable as the dependent variable. The set of dependent variables are the potential health and nutrition outcomes that have been targeted for improvement by the AD initiative as outlined in the operational guidelines of the AD [5]. The coefficient of the interaction term between *Policy* and *Post*, i.e. $\beta_3$ is the coefficient of interest, which is the DID estimate.

Based on DID estimates, we found improvement in the indicators of maternal health, health of new born, child health and nutrition, child immunization, family planning and adolescent health as a result of the AD initiative. Under maternal health, an increase of more than 4% in percent of mothers who had antenatal check up in the first trimester and who had at least 4 antenatal care visits was observed. An increase of more than 4% was observed in institutional deliveries as well as institutional deliveries in public facility. Among the indicators for health of new born, around 11% increase was observed in percent of children under age 6 months exclusively breastfed. Improvement in child health and nutrition was observed by a modest reduction of around 1.5% in percent of underweight children and a significant increase of around 8% in children with symptoms of Acute Respiratory Infection (ARI) taken to a health facility. Child immunization against BCG and polio increased by 3.6% and 4.2% respectively in the ADs post policy. Family planning variables corresponding to any method of family planning also increased by 3.4% and and male sterilization increased by 0.34%. In addition to the above positive impacts, negative impacts were also observed with an increase in the percent of anaemic pregnant women and a reduction in percent of children under age 3 years breastfed within one hour of birth.

Table 2: DID Estimates

| Dependent Variable | *Policy* ($\beta_1$) | *Post* ($\beta_2$) | *Policy* $\times$ *Post* ($\beta_3$) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Maternal Health** | | | |
| First Trimester Checkups(%) | $-6.639^{***}$ | $10.202^{***}$ | $4.690^{***}$ |
| | (1.683) | (1.685) | (1.795) |
| 4 Antenatal Care Visits(%) | $-5.475^{***}$ | $6.980^{***}$ | $4.801^{***}$ |
| | (1.215) | (2.127) | (1.012) |

Continued on next page

Table 2: DID Estimates (Continued)

| Dependent Variable | *Policy* ($\beta_1$) | *Post* ($\beta_2$) | *Policy* × *Post* ($\beta_3$) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Institutional Births(%) | $-8.280^{***}$ | $9.214^{***}$ | $4.310^{***}$ |
| | (1.241) | (1.248) | (1.053) |
| Institutional Births (Public Facility)(%) | $-1.728$ | $9.505^{***}$ | $4.272^{***}$ |
| | (1.243) | (1.341) | (1.445) |
| Skilled Home Births(%) | $0.831^{*}$ | $-0.921^{***}$ | 0.268 |
| | (0.464) | (0.293) | (0.464) |
| Sex Ratio at Birth | 9.089 | 11.516 | $-6.730$ |
| | (11.466) | (7.507) | (16.690) |
| **Anemia** | | | |
| Anemic Children(6-59 months)(%) | $3.678^{**}$ | $10.127^{***}$ | 0.034 |
| | (1.645) | (1.965) | (2.368) |
| Anemic Non-Pregnant Women(15-49 years)(%) | $3.756^{***}$ | $5.072^{***}$ | $-0.215$ |
| | (1.338) | (1.479) | (1.272) |
| Anemic Pregnant Women(15-49 years)(%) | 2.821 | $-7.097^{***}$ | $5.999^{***}$ |
| | (1.808) | (2.120) | (2.288) |
| Anemic Women(15-49 years)(%) | $3.761^{***}$ | $4.960^{***}$ | $-0.214$ |
| | (1.314) | (1.454) | (1.263) |
| **New Born Health** | | | |
| Breastfed within an hour(%) | $3.787^{***}$ | 0.383 | $-4.026^{*}$ |
| | (1.332) | (1.893) | (2.294) |
| Exclusively Breastfed (Age<6 months)(%) | 1.489 | $-10.085^{*}$ | $11.168^{**}$ |
| | (3.426) | (5.863) | (5.239) |
| Receiving solid or semisolid food and | $-4.891$ | $-35.015^{**}$ | 5.870 |
| breastmilk (Age 6-8 months)(%) | (3.662) | (4.983) | (3.884) |
| Adequate Diet in Breastfeeding | $-0.037$ | $2.255^{**}$ | 0.210 |
| Children(6-23 months)(%) | (0.549) | (0.966) | (1.093) |
| Adequate Diet in Non-Breastfeeding | $-0.595$ | $-11.910^{**}$ | 1.469 |
| Children(6-23 months)(%) | (2.413) | (4.965) | (2.709) |
| Adequate Diet (Total, Age 6-23 months)(%) | $-0.392$ | $-1.955^{*}$ | 0.309 |
| | (0.511) | (1.124) | (1.118) |
| **Child Health and Nutrition** | | | |
| Stunted Children(<5 years)(%) | $5.861^{***}$ | $-2.109^{**}$ | $-1.091$ |

Continued on next page

Table 2: DID Estimates (Continued)

| Dependent Variable | *Policy* ($\beta_1$) | *Post* ($\beta_2$) | *Policy* × *Post* ($\beta_3$) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (0.769) | (0.841) | (0.697) |
| Wasted Children(<5 years)(%) | 2.157*** | −1.853** | −0.973 |
| | (1.040) | (0.881) | (1.261) |
| Severly Wasted Children(<5 years)(%) | 1.039* | −0.012 | −0.193 |
| | (0.625) | (0.487) | (0.800) |
| Underweight(Age< 5 years)(%)) | 5.463*** | −2.854*** | −1.664* |
| | (0.993) | (1.097) | (0.970) |
| ARI Symptoms taken to Health | −3.316 | −27.452*** | 8.335* |
| Facility/Provider(Age < 5 years)(%) | (2.276) | (4.558) | (4.844) |
| ORS Use in Children with Diarrhea(%) | −3.572 | −34.175*** | 7.345 |
| | (4.002) | (5.517) | (5.901) |
| **Immunization** | | | |
| Full Vaccination Coverage (12-23 months, | −3.943** | 13.456*** | 3.306 |
| Card or Recall)(%) | (1.946) | (1.969) | (2.074) |
| Full Vaccination Coverage(12-23 months, | −3.753** | 18.679*** | 3.181 |
| Card Only)(%) | (1.865) | (2.191) | (2.250) |
| BCG Vaccination(Age 12-23 months)(%) | −2.849* | 1.351 | 3.616** |
| | (1.494) | (1.187) | (1.726) |
| Polio Vaccination(3 Doses)(Age 12-23 months)(%) | −4.365** | 6.458*** | 4.241** |
| | (1.871) | (1.685) | (1.843) |
| Penta/DPT Vaccination(3 Doses) | −3.434* | 6.975*** | 2.656** |
| (Age 12-23 months)(%) | (1.843) | (1.560) | (2.055) |
| Measles Containing Vaccine (MCV)(First Dose) | −3.410** | 5.632*** | 3.279** |
| (Age 12-23 months)(%) | (1.699) | (1.531) | (2.069) |
| Penta/Hepatitis B Vaccination(3 Doses) | −4.254** | 14.236*** | 3.358* |
| (Age 12-23 months)(%) | (2.094) | (1.781) | (1.966) |
| **Family Planning** | | | |
| Unmet Need for Family Planning(%) | 1.017 | −4.065*** | −1.117 |
| | (0.916) | (0.638) | (0.737) |
| Unmet Need for spacing (Family Planning)(%) | 0.786* | −1.935*** | −0.592 |
| | (0.413) | (0.279) | (0.468) |
| Any method(family planning)(%) | −4.254** | 14.236*** | 3.358* |

Continued on next page

Table 2: DID Estimates (Continued)

| Dependent Variable | *Policy* ($\beta_1$) | *Post* ($\beta_2$) | *Policy* × *Post* ($\beta_3$) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (2.094) | (1.781) | (1.966) |
| Any modern method(family planning)(%) | −2.651 | 9.457*** | 2.175 |
| | (1.640) | (1.547) | (1.535) |
| Female sterilization(%) | −1.923 | 2.560* | 1.044 |
| | (1.528) | (1.336) | (1.196) |
| Male sterilization(%) | 0.176 | 0.008 | 0.368** |
| | (0.127) | (0.032) | (0.176) |
| IUD/PPIUD(family planning)(%) | −0.159 | 0.875** | 0.054 |
| | (0.206) | (0.373) | (0.346) |
| Pill(family planning)(%) | 0.361 | 1.081*** | 0.530 |
| | (0.447) | (0.310) | (0.392) |
| Condom(family planning)(%) | −0.935 | 3.614*** | −0.414 |
| | (0.581) | (0.651) | (0.415) |
| **Adolescent Health** | | | |
| Early Marriage(Women 20-24 years)(%) | 4.572*** | −3.918*** | 0.520 |
| | (1.435) | (0.643) | (0.747) |
| Adolescent Motherhood(Women 15-19 years)(%) | 1.450*** | −1.363*** | −0.198 |
| | (0.484) | (0.311) | (0.457) |

*Note:* *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

The DID estimates would be unbiased only if the pre-policy growth trends of the outcome variables are parallel between ADs and non-ADs. However, due to unavailability of the district level NFHS data prior to NFHS-4 round, we were unable to test for parallel trends. Instead we used the PSM-DID method to measure the impact of AD intervention on the targeted health and nutrition variables.

We used 10 out of 11 indicators listed in table 1 as our observables for estimating propensity scores for treatment assignment using a logit regression. We could not include 'Unconnected PMGSY village' in the propensity score estimation due to unavailability of data. Moreover, for variables 'Household without individual toilet' and 'Rural Household Without Access to Water', we used 'Percent of Population living in households that use an improved sanitation facility' and 'Percent of Population living in households with an improved drinking water source' respectively from NFHS-4 data set instead of ministry data due to the unavailability of the latter. In addition, few variables from NFHS data had more than one indicators, which often measured the intensity of that particular variable. For example, with respect to antenatal care, there were three variables, one for percent of mothers who had an antenatal checkup in the first trimester, second percent of mothers who had at least 4 antenatal care visits and third percent of mothers who had full antenatal care. Similarly, for measure of children wasted we had two variables, one for percent of children being wasted and the other being severely wasted. For institutional deliveries too, we had an additional measure of institutional deliveries in public facilities. We included all of the above variables as independent variables in the logit regression for the propensity score estimation. Subsequently, the estimated propensity scores

were matched using full matching method to find valid counterfactual for the treated districts.

We had data for total 601 districts of which 109 were ADs before PSM. After PSM, we were left with 91 treated districts and 355 control districts that had the common support, which is a crucial assumption of PSM. PSM was condcuted using the 'matchit' algorithm in R [35]. Table 3 and 4 presents the balance statistics before and after the PSM. Thec summary statistics indicate that the PSM does a good job of balancing the observables data between the control and the treatment group. Figure 1 in the appendix provides a visual depiction of the density plots on the observable variables before and after matching. Plots comparing the propensity scores between the AD and the non-AD have been provided in the appendix in figures 2a to 2e.

Table 3: Summary of Balance for All Data

| | Means Treated | Means Control | Std. Mean Dif. | Var. Ratio | eCDF Mean | eCDF Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stunted Children(<5 years)(%) | 42.5450 | 34.8736 | 0.9223 | 0.7374 | 0.1998 | 0.3765 |
| Wasted Children(<5 years)(%) | 23.6220 | 20.1285 | 0.4167 | 1.2690 | 0.1042 | 0.1806 |
| Severly Wasted Children(<5 years)(%) | 8.8229 | 7.4669 | 0.2918 | 1.3188 | 0.0714 | 0.1508 |
| Institutional Births(%) | 69.1936 | 80.3744 | -0.6710 | 0.9860 | 0.2005 | 0.3364 |
| Institutional Births (Public Facility)(%) | 54.6330 | 56.1809 | -0.0992 | 0.8571 | 0.0418 | 0.1068 |
| First Trimester Checkups(%) | 52.5780 | 61.0445 | -0.4788 | 0.9876 | 0.1285 | 0.2460 |
| 4 Antenatal Care Visits(%) | 41.4780 | 52.5012 | -0.4490 | 0.9401 | 0.1234 | 0.1931 |
| Full Antenatal Care(%) | 14.9220 | 21.7037 | -0.5081 | 0.6264 | 0.1203 | 0.2025 |
| Household_without_individual_toilet | 67.2927 | 49.2331 | 0.9412 | 0.7654 | 0.2325 | 0.3996 |
| Landless_household_dependent_on_Manual_Labour | 31.1598 | 24.2816 | 0.4533 | 1.2006 | 0.1308 | 0.2210 |
| DR | 7.2768 | 4.6999 | 0.4693 | 1.5050 | 0.1688 | 0.2835 |
| Adverse_Pupil_Teacher_Ratio | 28.6730 | 22.8523 | 0.4232 | 1.5993 | 0.1383 | 0.2459 |
| Unelectrified_household | 22.2423 | 12.9268 | 0.6789 | 1.1483 | 0.2098 | 0.3215 |
| without_access_to_water | 14.9018 | 10.9738 | 0.2840 | 1.2989 | 0.0948 | 0.1887 |

Table 4: Summary of Balance for Matched Data

| | Means Treated | Means Control | Std. Mean Dif. | Var. Ratio | eCDF Mean | eCDF Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stunted Children(<5 years)(%) | 42.4923 | 41.2928 | 0.1442 | 0.9899 | 0.0310 | 0.1055 |
| Wasted Children(<5 years)(%) | 23.8066 | 23.7361 | 0.0084 | 1.3252 | 0.0281 | 0.0780 |
| Severly Wasted Children(<5 years)(%) | 8.9934 | 8.4718 | 0.1122 | 1.8469 | 0.0388 | 0.1081 |
| Institutional Births(%) | 70.7813 | 71.1675 | -0.0232 | 0.8944 | 0.0360 | 0.1130 |
| Institutional Births (Public Facility)(%) | 55.4736 | 56.9544 | -0.0949 | 0.9430 | 0.0407 | 0.1175 |
| First Trimester Checkups(%) | 53.9154 | 54.0856 | -0.0096 | 1.1734 | 0.0240 | 0.0657 |
| 4 Antenatal Care Visits(%) | 40.8890 | 42.1077 | -0.0496 | 1.0635 | 0.0285 | 0.0901 |
| Full Antenatal Care(%) | 14.9615 | 15.3982 | -0.0327 | 1.0073 | 0.0200 | 0.0906 |
| Household_without_individual_toilet | 67.1132 | 65.8405 | 0.0663 | 1.1033 | 0.0344 | 0.1440 |
| Landless_household_dependent_on_Manual_Labour | 29.6541 | 32.8453 | -0.2103 | 1.3721 | 0.0754 | 0.1885 |
| DR | 7.0426 | 7.1048 | -0.0113 | 0.8169 | 0.0384 | 0.1317 |
| Adverse_Pupil_Teacher_Ratio | 28.4395 | 27.3703 | 0.0777 | 1.1548 | 0.0313 | 0.0904 |
| Unelectrified_household | 22.2538 | 18.8137 | 0.2507 | 1.3595 | 0.0598 | 0.2123 |
| without_access_to_water | 15.0813 | 17.2088 | -0.1538 | 0.7805 | 0.0519 | 0.1371 |

It is important to note that several health and nutrition variables that were targeted outcomes for potential improvement as a result of AD programme, also influenced the treatment assignment, conditional upon which we have estimated the propensity scores or the probability of treatment assignment. While it is possible that improvements in these variables were more likely relative to others as these have received priority over others in identifying the ADs, PSM methodology does not allow us to use the observable as an outcome conditional upon which the propensity scores were estimated. Therefore, we restricted our PSM-DID estimates only to variables that have not been used as observables for estimating the propensity score.

The results of the ATT from the PSM-DID are presented in table 5. We removed the variables that had null result, and included only variables, whose PSM-DID estimate were significant at the level of 10% or higher. We find strong evidence of an increase in the percentage of home births attended by Skilled Birth Attendants (SBA) in the ADs by an average of 1.26%. In addition, there exists a weak evidence of 3% improvement in the ADs in immunization against first dose of measles vaccine and three doses of penta or hepatitis B vaccine. With respect to family planning indicators, there is an increase in the male sterilization

percent in the ADs with an increase in 0.44%, but a decrease in use of condoms by 1.16%, both at the 10% level of significance. A negative impact of the programme was observed in the indicator for anemia with a 2.43% increase in the percent of anemic children aged 6 to 59 months, though the evidence is weak.

Table 5: Impact estimates of AD using PSM-DID

| Dependent Variable | Estimate | p-values | CI (95%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Maternal Health** | | | |
| Skilled Home Births(%) | 1.26*** (0.362) | <0.001 | (0.551, 1.97) |
| **Anemia** | | | |
| Anemic Children(6-59 months)(%) | 2.43* (1.41) | 0.0847 | (-0.332, 5.18) |
| **Immunization** | | | |
| Measles Containing Vaccine (MCV)(First Dose) (Age 12-23 months)(%) | 3.2* (1.81) | 0.0763 | (-0.339, 6.75) |
| Penta/Hepatitis B Vaccination(3 Doses) (Age 12-23 months)(%) | 2.92* (1.77) | 0.099 | (-0.55, 6.4) |
| **Family Planning** | | | |
| Male sterilization(%) | 0.441* (0.244) | 0.0712 | (-0.038, 0.92) |
| Condom (%) | -1.16* (0.666) | 0.0806 | (-2.47, 0.142) |

*Note*: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

# 5. Discussion

The AD initiative is among one of the flagship programme of the government of India under the guidance of NITI Aayog, and first of its kind that had been exclusively designed to address inter-district economic and social inequalities in the country. Among the broad focus areas of the AD initiative, health and nutrition is one of the high priority areas, the other areas being education, agriculture and water resources, financial inclusion and skill development and infrastructure [5]. ADs are eligible for enhanced funding and priority allocation of various initiatives undertaken the central and the state government, which is a high opportunity cost if the ADs fail to meet their targets. Therefore, after 5 years of implementation the AD initiative demands an evaluation. We evaluated the health and nutrition outcomes of the AD initiative that had been considered for potential improvement targets in the operational guidelines [5].

DID estimates suggested significant improvement in several indicators as a result of the AD initiative. Notable among them were improvements in maternal health indicated by increased coverage of antenatal care and institutional deliveries, health of newborn through an increase in children under age 6 months exclusively breastfed, immunization outcomes through increased coverage of BGC and polio vaccines and an increase in male sterilization with respect to family planning. In addition, there was also some weak evidence on reduction in the percentage of underweight children, and an increase in the percentage of children taken to a health facility suffering from ARI and an increase in adoption of family planning methods. There also exist indicators that have worsened, which included strong evidence on increase in anemia among pregnant women aged 15-49 years and a decrease in percentage of children under age 3 years breastfed within one hour of birth, although the evidence for the latter was weak.

DID may not yield unbiased estimates, if the growth trend of the outcome variables between ADs and non-ADs are not parallel, which is a fundamental assumption of the DID methodology. Since, we were unable to test for parallel growth trends between the control and the treatment group, we would refrain from calling our DID estimates unbiased. Instead, we rather rely upon PSM-DID for finding unbiased estimates of the impact of the AD programme on health and nutrition outcomes.

PSM-DID estimates indicated a significant improvement in percentage of home births attended by skilled birth attendant. Results from DID estimates which indicated significant improvements in several other health and nutrition indicators except for increase in male sterilization percentage did not hold any longer under

PSM-DID method. Some weak evidence emerged surrounding immunization outcomes with increased coverage of measles and hepatitis B vaccines. Similarly, weak evidence was also found for a couple of unfavourable outcomes including an increase in anemia among children aged 6-59 months and a decrease in use of condoms for family planning, though it is not known if a part of the latter is driven by increase in male sterilization.

The AD program had built high hopes and made promises for transformation of the ADs. However, our casual estimates from PSM-DID (which are likely to be unbiased) of the AD initiative on targeted health and nutrition outcomes do not speak of exceptional performance of the ADs, though it indicated some improvements or no change. While the results might seem discouraging in the first place, we would argue that there could be several reasons that might be driving our results.

The AD initiative had several component that included health and nutrition, education, agriculture and water resources, financial inclusion and skill development and infrastructure. Within each of this broad category, there were several outcomes that were measured for monitoring the progress of the AD. One of the key mechanism that is expected to drive the working of AD initiative is the convergence of state and central schemes that target specific outcome variables. It is not unlikely that there are inter-linkages between schemes and targeted variables across different sectors. The inter-linkages between two outcome variables may enhance each other or may work in opposite direction giving rise to a trade-off between two outcome variables. With competition across ADs as one of the drivers of growth, it is not unlikely that an unintended competition within a district between the targeted sectors or outcome variables might have emerged such that sector that had higher potential for positive change or higher outcome visibility received priority over others. If the targeted outcomes of health and nutrition sector were likely to grow slowly over other sectors, they might not have received the same priority as other sectors for resource allocation during the initial years of the AD programme, and hence improvement in their performance might be less visible.

A second, and an important reason for observed results could be the Covid-19 pandemic. Pandemic had brought unprecedented challenges to health systems globally in all countries with situation being even more severe for low and middle income countries (LMICs). With inadequate health infrastructure and health workers, pandemic necessitated reallocation of resources towards meeting emergency by drawing them away from routine health services, which could be partly driving our results. However, the fact that there was no adverse impact even after the pandemic might be worth appreciating.

We make an honest attempt to evaluate the impact of AD initiative on health and nutrition outcomes. While we believe that results measured the intended impact, in spite of all our efforts there are few limitations of our study that we would like to point out. In employing the PSM, a standard assumption is that unobservables do not influence the treatment assignment. In the context of ADs, we knew the variables that influenced assignment, of which we had all but one variable, i.e. Unconnected PMGSY village. Therefore, data limitations could have impacted our result. Another data limitation was from the NFHS-5 data collection process. NFHS-5 data collection was disrupted due to the pandemic, and hence had to be collected in two phases. While the first phase was pre-pandemic, the second phase of NFHS-5 data collection was during the pandemic, which might have introduced some bias in our estimates. Similarly, if ADs were more or less badly hit due to the pandemic compared to non-ADs, this too might have introduced some bias in our causal estimates. In addition, if there were any other policy that were not a part of AD initiative but targeted health and nutrition outcomes in the backward districts, it might have biased our impact evaluation estimates of AD initiative.

In spite of all the limitations, we believe that our research provides evidence surrounding a novel initiative to address multi-dimensional regional inequities, which is unique in its way of operation as it increases accountability by fostering a sense of competition among the aspirational districts. Our research is one of the first studies that evaluated the ADs from the lens of health and nutrition outcomes. We make an important contribution by providing direction for a more holistic evaluation of the ADs, and similar initiatives in other LMICs. Future research efforts should be put for a holistic impact evaluation of all the targeted sectors and outcomes of the AD initiative.

## 6. Conclusion

Regional inequality is multi-dimensional including economic and social development that require conscious effort towards addressing them with policies targeted towards reduction of such inequities . In a unique initiative, Government of India designed the AD programme with the objective of bringing the most backwards districts at the level of other districts in several dimensions including health and nutrition, education, agriculture and water resources, financial inclusion and skill development and infrastructure. We estimated the causal impact of the AD initiative on health and nutrition outcomes using the DID and PSM-DID method. Our PSM-DID results provide unbiased causal estimates of the AD initiative suggesting a strong evidence of increase in percentage of home deliveries in presence of skilled birth attendant, and also an increase in percentage of male sterilization in the ADs. We do not find any strong evidence of a negative impact of ADs on any targeted health and nutrition outcomes. Future research efforts should be put for a holistic impact evaluation of all the targeted sectors and outcomes of the AD initiative.

## 7. Data sharing statement

This research used data available publicly. The data set will be provided by the authors upon request.

## 8. Declaration of interests

None of the authors have competing interests

## 9. Acknowledgments

We are thankful to J V Meenakshi, Ram Singh, Sangeeta Bansal and participants at the Annual Economics Conference 2022 organized at IISER Bhopal for their useful comments and feedback.

## References

[1] M. Suryanarayana, A. Agrawal, K. S. Prabhu, Inequality-adjusted human development index: States in india, Indian Journal of Human Development 10 (2) (2016) 157–175.

[2] N. Kumar, R. Rani, Regional disparities in social development: evidence from states and union territories of india, South Asian Survey 26 (1) (2019) 1–27.

[3] A. Singhal, S. Sahu, S. Chattopadhyay, A. Mukherjee, S. N. Bhanja, Using night time lights to find regional inequality in india and its relationship with economic development, PloS one 15 (11) (2020) e0241907.

[4] A. Lolayekar, P. Mukhopadhyay, Growth convergence and regional inequality in india (1981–2012), Journal of Quantitative Economics 15 (2017) 307–328.

[5] N. Aayog, Aspirational districts (2018).
URL https://nhm.gov.in/New_Updates_2018/NHM_Components/RMNCHA/ADP/Operational_Guidelines_for_Aspirational_Districts_Print_Ready_File_18th_October.pdf

[6] W. Joe, U. S. Mishra, K. Navaneetham, Health inequality in india: evidence from nfhs 3, Economic and Political Weekly (2008) 41–47.

[7] S. Subramanian, R. Sarwal, W. Joe, R. Kim, Geo-visualising diet, anthroprometric and clinical indicators for children in india: Enabling district prioritisation for interventions (2020).

[8] L. Sanneving, N. Trygg, D. Saxena, D. Mavalankar, S. Thomsen, Inequity in india: the case of maternal and reproductive health, Global health action 6 (1) (2013) 19145.

[9] G. Taneja, V. S.-R. Sridhar, J. S. Mohanty, A. Joshi, P. Bhushan, M. Jain, S. Gupta, A. Khera, R. Kumar, R. Gera, India's rmnch+ a strategy: approach, learnings and limitations, BMJ global health 4 (3) (2019) e001162.

[10] D. V. Patel, S. C. Bansal, A. S. Nimbalkar, A. G. Phatak, S. M. Nimbalkar, R. G. Desai, Breastfeeding practices, demographic variables, and their association with morbidities in children, Advances in preventive medicine 2015 (2015).

[11] J. P. Beckerman-Hsu, P. Chatterjee, R. Kim, S. Sharma, S. Subramanian, A typology of dietary and anthropometric measures of nutritional need among children across districts and parliamentary constituencies in india, 2016, Journal of Global Health 10 (2) (2020).

[12] P. H. Nguyen, R. Avula, L. M. Tran, V. Sethi, A. Kumar, D. Baswal, N. Hajeebhoy, A. Ranjan, P. Menon, Missed opportunities for delivering nutrition interventions in first 1000 days of life in india: insights from the national family health survey, 2006 and 2016, BMJ Global Health 6 (2) (2021) e003717.

[13] D. Bettampadi, J. M. Lepkowski, A. Sen, L. E. Power, M. L. Boulton, Vaccination inequality in india, 2002–2013, American Journal of Preventive Medicine 60 (1) (2021) S65–S76.

[14] U. Srivastava, K. K. Singh, P. K. Yadav, Disaggregated analysis of birth averted due to family planning use in india: An evidence from nfhs-4 (2015–16), Plos one 15 (9) (2020) e0239376.

[15] S. Sharma, V. Sharma, Efficiency Assessment of Maternal Health Services in the Aspirational Districts of EAG States in India: A Data Envelopment Analysis Approach, Institute of Economic Growth, University Enclave, University of Delhi, 2020.

[16] V. K. Paul, A. Singh, S. Palit, Poshan abhiyaan: Making nutrition a jan andolan, Proceedings of the Indian National Science Academy 84 (4) (2018) 835–841.

[17] S. Rajpal, J. Kim, W. Joe, R. Kim, S. Subramanian, Small area variation in child undernutrition across 640 districts and 543 parliamentary constituencies in india, Scientific Reports 11 (1) (2021) 1–9.

[18] M. J. Rana, R. Kim, S. Ko, L. K. Dwivedi, K. James, R. Sarwal, S. Subramanian, Small area variations in low birth weight and small size of births in india, Maternal & Child Nutrition 18 (3) (2022) e13369.

[19] S. K. Agarwal, M. Naha, Covid-19 vaccine coverage in india: A district-level analysis, Vaccines 11 (5) (2023) 948.

[20] J. B. Dimick, A. M. Ryan, Methods for evaluating changes in health care policy: the difference-in-differences approach, Jama 312 (22) (2014) 2401–2402.

[21] A. Abadie, M. D. Cattaneo, Econometric methods for program evaluation, Annual Review of Economics 10 (2018) 465–503.

[22] P. Delhi, Conducting the nfhs/annual health surveys (2019).
URL https://pib.gov.in/PressReleaseIframePage.aspx?PRID=1576629

[23] P. C. Austin, A critical appraisal of propensity-score matching in the medical literature between 1996 and 2003, Statistics in medicine 27 (12) (2008) 2037–2049.

[24] M. Caliendo, S. Kopeinig, Some practical guidance for the implementation of propensity score matching, Journal of economic surveys 22 (1) (2008) 31–72.

[25] E. A. Stuart, K. M. Green, Using full matching to estimate causal effects in nonexperimental studies: examining the relationship between adolescent marijuana use and adult outcomes., Developmental psychology 44 (2) (2008) 395.

[26] P. C. Austin, An introduction to propensity score methods for reducing the effects of confounding in observational studies, Multivariate behavioral research 46 (3) (2011) 399–424.

[27] G. W. Imbens, Nonparametric estimation of average treatment effects under exogeneity: A review, Review of Economics and statistics 86 (1) (2004) 4–29.

[28] H. Wang, W. Yip, L. Zhang, W. C. Hsiao, The impact of rural mutual health care on health status: evaluation of a social experiment in rural china, Health Economics 18 (S2) (2009) S65–S82.

[29] Y. Chen, G. Z. Jin, Does health insurance coverage lead to better health and educational outcomes? evidence from rural china, Journal of health economics 31 (1) (2012) 1–14.

[30] B. Su, G. H. Thierry, Q. Chen, Q. Zhao, The new cooperative medical scheme and self-employment in rural china, Sustainability 9 (2) (2017) 304.

[31] W. Dong, J. Gao, Z. Zhou, R. Bai, Y. Wu, M. Su, C. Shen, X. Lan, X. Wang, Effects of china's urban basic health insurance on preventive care service utilization and health behaviors: Evidence from the china health and nutrition survey, PLoS one 13 (12) (2018) e0209890.

[32] Q. Zhou, Q. He, K. Eggleston, G. G. Liu, Urban-rural health insurance integration in china: impact on health care utilization, financial risk protection, and health status, Applied Economics 54 (22) (2022) 2491–2509.

[33] J. J. Heckman, H. Ichimura, P. E. Todd, Matching as an econometric evaluation estimator: Evidence from evaluating a job training programme, The review of economic studies 64 (4) (1997) 605–654.

[34] L. Cheng, H. Liu, Y. Zhang, K. Shen, Y. Zeng, The impact of health insurance on health outcomes and spending of the elderly: evidence from china's new cooperative medical scheme, Health economics 24 (6) (2015) 672–691.

[35] N. Greifer, Matching methods (2018).
URL https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MatchIt/vignettes/matching-methods.html#optimal-full-matching-method-full

# 10. Appendix

## 10.1. Variables

Table 6: List of Abbreviations

| Abbreviation | Meaning |
|---|---|
| php_1 | Female population age 6 years and above who ever attended school (%) |
| php_2 | Population below age 15 years (%) |
| php_3 | Sex ratio of the total population (females per 1,000 males) |
| php_4 | Sex ratio at birth for children born in the last five years (females per 1,000 males) |
| php_5 | Children under age 5 years whose birth was registered with the civil authority (%) |
| php_6 | Deaths in the last 3 years registered with the civil authority (%) |
| php_7 | Population living in households with electricity (%) |
| php_8 | Population living in households with an improved drinking water source (%) |
| php_9 | Population living in households that use an improved sanitation facility (%) |
| php_10 | Households using clean fuel for cooking (%) |
| php_11 | Households using iodized salt (%) |
| php_12 | Households with any usual member covered under a health insurance/financing scheme (%) |
| php_13 | Children age 5 years who attended preprimary school during the school year 2019-20 (%) |
| cow_1 | Women who are literate (%) |
| com_1 | Men who are literate (%) |
| cow_2 | Women with 10 or more years of schooling (%) |
| maf_1 | Women age 20-24 years married before age 18 years (%) |
| mam_1 | Men age 25-29 years married before age 21 years (%) |
| maf_2 | Births in the 5 years preceding the survey that are third or higher order (%) |
| maf_3 | Women age 15-19 years who were already mothers or pregnant at the time of the survey (%) |
| maf_4 | Women age 15-24 years who use hygienic methods of protection during their menstrual period (%) |
| cfp_1 | Any method (%) |
| cfp_2 | Any modern method (%) |
| cfp_3 | Female sterilization (%) |
| cfp_4 | Male sterilization (%) |
| cfp_5 | IUD/PPIUD (%) |
| cfp_6 | Pill (%) |
| cfp_7 | Condom (%) |
| cfp_8 | Injectables (%) |
| ufm_1 | Total unmet need (%) |

Continued on next page

Table 6: List of Abbreviations (Continued)

| **Abbreviation** | **Meaning** |
|---|---|
| ufm_2 | Unmet need for spacing (%) |
| qfp_1 | Health worker ever talked to female non-users about family planning (%) |
| qfp_2 | Current users ever told about side effects of current method (%) |
| mch_1 | Mothers who had an antenatal checkup in the first trimester (%) |
| mch_2 | Mothers who had at least 4 antenatal care visits (%) |
| mch_3 | Mothers whose last birth was protected against neonatal tetanus (%) |
| mch_4 | Mothers who consumed iron folic acid for 100 days or more when they were pregnant (%) |
| mch_5 | Mothers who consumed iron folic acid for 180 days or more when they were pregnant (%) |
| mch_11 | Mothers who had full antenatal care8 (%) |
| mch_6 | Registered pregnancies for which the mother received a Mother and Child Protection (MCP) card (%) |
| mch_7 | Mothers who received postnatal care from a doctor/nurse/LHV/ANM/midwife/other health personnel within 2 days of delivery (%) |
| jsy_1 | Mothers who received financial assistance under Janani Suraksha Yojana (JSY) for births delivered in an institution (%) |
| mch_8 | Average out-of-pocket expenditure per delivery in a public health facility (Rs) |
| mch_9 | Children born at home who were taken to a health facility for a checkup within 24 hours of birth (%) |
| mch_10 | Children who received postnatal care from a doctor/nurse/LHV/ANM/midwife/other health personnel within 2 days of delivery (%) |
| dlc_1 | Institutional births (%) |
| dlc_2 | Institutional births in public facility (%) |
| dlc_3 | Home births that were conducted by skilled health personnel (%) |
| dlc_4 | Births attended by skilled health personnel (%) |
| dlc_5 | Births delivered by caesarean section (%) |
| dlc_6 | Births in a private health facility that were delivered by caesarean section (%) |
| dlc_7 | Births in a public health facility that were delivered by caesarean section (%) |
| cvv_1 | Children age 12-23 months fully vaccinated based on information from either vaccination card or mother's recall (%) |
| cvv_2 | Children age 12-23 months fully vaccinated based on information from vaccination card only (%) |
| cvv_3 | Children age 12-23 months who have received BCG (%) |
| cvv_4 | Children age 12-23 months who have received 3 doses of polio vaccine (%) |
| cvv_5 | Children age 12-23 months who have received 3 doses of penta or DPT vaccine (%) |

Continued on next page

Table 6: List of Abbreviations (Continued)

| **Abbreviation** | **Meaning** |
|---|---|
| cvv_6 | Children age 12-23 months who have received the first dose of measlescontaining vaccine (MCV) (%) |
| cvv_7 | Children age 24-35 months who have received a second dose of measlescontaining vaccine (MCV) (%) |
| cvv_8 | Children age 12-23 months who have received 3 doses of rotavirus vaccine (%) |
| cvv_9 | Children age 12-23 months who have received 3 doses of penta or hepatitis B vaccine (%) |
| cvv_10 | Children age 9-35 months who received a vitamin A dose in the last 6 months (%) |
| cvv_11 | Children age 12-23 months who received most of their vaccinations in a public health facility (%) |
| cvv_12 | Children age 12-23 months who received most of their vaccinations in a private health facility (%) |
| tcd_1 | Prevalence of diarrhoea in the 2 weeks preceding the survey (%) |
| tcd_2 | Children with diarrhoea in the 2 weeks preceding the survey who received oral rehydration salts (ORS) (%) |
| tcd_3 | Children with diarrhoea in the 2 weeks preceding the survey who received zinc (%) |
| tcd_4 | Children with diarrhoea in the 2 weeks preceding the survey taken to a health facility or health provider (%) |
| tcd_5 | Prevalence of symptoms of acute respiratory infection (ARI) in the 2 weeks preceding the survey (%) |
| tcd_6 | Children with fever or symptoms of ARI in the 2 weeks preceding the survey taken to a health facility or health provider (%) |
| cfn_1 | Children under age 3 years breastfed within one hour of birth (%) |
| cfn_2 | Children under age 6 months exclusively breastfed (%) |
| cfn_3 | Children age 6-8 months receiving solid or semisolid food and breastmilk (%) |
| cfn_4 | Breastfeeding children age 6-23 months receiving an adequate diet (%) |
| cfn_5 | Non-breastfeeding children age 6-23 months receiving an adequate diet (%) |
| cfn_6 | Total children age 6-23 months receiving an adequate diet (%) |
| cfn_7 | Children under 5 years who are stunted (height for age) (%) |
| cfn_8 | Children under 5 years who are wasted (weight for height) (%) |
| cfn_9 | Children under 5 years who are severely wasted (weight for height) (%) |
| cfn_10 | Children under 5 years who are underweight (weight for age) (%) |
| cfn_11 | Children under 5 years who are overweight (weight for height) (%) |
| nsw_1 | Women whose Body Mass Index (BMI) is below normal (BMI $<<$ 18.5 kg/$m^2$) |
| nsm_1 | Men whose Body Mass Index (BMI) is below normal (BMI $<$ 18.5 kg/$m^2$) (%) |
| nsw_2 | Women who are overweight or obese (BMI $\geq 25.0 kg/\mathrm{m}^2$) |
| nsm_2 | Men who are overweight or obese (BMI $\geq 25.0 kg/\mathrm{m}^2$) (%) |
| nsw_3 | Women who have high risk waist-to-hip ratio ($\geq$ 0.85) |

Continued on next page

Table 6: List of Abbreviations (Continued)

| **Abbreviation** | **Meaning** |
|---|---|
| acw_1 | Children age 6-59 months who are anaemic (< 11.0 g/dl) |
| acw_2 | Non-pregnant women age 15-49 years who are anaemic (< 12.0 g/dl) |
| acw_3 | Pregnant women age 15-49 years who are anaemic (< 11.0 g/dl) |
| acw_4 | All women age 15-49 years who are anaemic (%) |
| acw_5 | All women age 15-19 years who are anaemic (%) |
| acm_4 | Men age 15-49 years who are anaemic (<13.0 g/dl) (%) |
| bsw_1 | Female Blood sugar level high (141-160 mg/dl) (%) |
| bsw_2 | Female Blood sugar level very high (> 160 mg/dl) (%) |
| bsw_3 | Female Blood sugar level high or very high (> 140 mg/dl) or taking medicine to control blood sugar level (%) |
| bsm_1 | MaleBlood sugar level high (141-160 mg/dl) (%) |
| bsm_2 | Male Blood sugar level very high (> 160 mg/dl) (%) |
| bsm_3 | Male Blood sugar level high or very high (> 140 mg/dl) or taking medicine to control blood sugar level (%) |
| htw_1 | Female Mildly elevated blood pressure (Systolic 140-159 mm of Hg and/or Diastolic 90-99 mm of Hg) (%) |
| htw_2 | Female Moderately or severely elevated blood pressure (Systolic $\geq$ 160mm of Hg and/or Diastolic $\geq$ 100mm of Hg) (%) |
| htw_4 | Women Very high (Systolic $\geq$ 180 mm of Hg and/or Diastolic $\geq$ 110 mm of Hg) (%) |
| htw_3 | Female Elevated blood pressure or taking medicine to control blood pressure (Systolic $\geq$ 140 mm of Hg and/or Diastolic $\geq$ 90 mm of Hg) or taking medicine to control blood pressure (%) |
| htm_1 | Male Mildly elevated blood pressure (Systolic 140-159 mm of Hg and/or Diastolic 90-99 mm of Hg) (%) |
| htm_2 | Moderately or severely elevated blood pressure (Systolic $\geq$ 160mm of Hg and/or Diastolic $\geq$ 100mm of Hg) (%) |
| htm_4 | Men Very high (Systolic $\geq$ 180 mm of Hg and/or Diastolic $\geq$ 110 mm of Hg) (%) |
| htm_3 | Elevated blood pressure (Systolic $\geq$ 140 mm of Hg and/or Diastolic $\geq$ 90 mm of Hg) or taking medicine to control blood pressure (%) |
| scw_1 | Ever undergone a screening test for cervical cancer (%) |
| scw_2 | Ever undergone a breast examination for breast cancer (%) |
| scw_3 | Ever undergone an oral cavity examination for oral cancer (%) |
| tac_1 | Women age 15 years and above who use any kind of tobacco (%) |
| tac_2 | Men age 15 years and above who use any kind of tobacco (%) |
| tac_3 | Women age 15 years and above who consume alcohol (%) |
| tac_4 | Men age 15 years and above who consume alcohol (%) |

## 10.2. Propensity Score Matching




Figure 1: Balance plots for Propensity Score matched samples


cfn_7_4
cfn_8_4
adistrict
0
1
Propensity score

(a)


cfn_9_4
dlc_1_4
adistrict
0
1
Propensity score

(b)


dlc_2_4
mch_1_4
adistrict
0
1
Propensity score

(c)


mch_2_4
Household_without_individual_toilet
adistrict
0
1
Propensity score

(d)




(e)




(f)




(g)

Figure 2: Propensity Scores Matched for Samples

## 10.3. PSM-DID

Table 7: ATT Results from Matching

| Dependent Variable | Estimate | p values | CI (95%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Maternal Health** | | | |
| Institutional Births(%) | -1.06 | 0.24 | (-2.82, 0.706) |
| | (0.899) | | |
| Institutional Births (Public Facility)(%) | -0.756 | 0.527 | (-3.1, 1.59) |
| | (1.19) | | |
| Skilled Home Births(%) | 1.26*** | <0.001 | (0.551, 1.97) |
| | (0.362) | | |
| Sex Ratio at Birth(%) | -7.73 | 0.626 | (-38.8, 23.4) |
| | (16.4) | | |
| **Anemia** | | | |
| Anemic Children(6-59 months)(%) | 2.43* | 0.0847 | (-0.332, 5.18) |
| | (1.41) | | |
| Anemic Non-Pregnant Women(15-49 years)(%) | 2.09 | 0.137 | (-0.664, 4.85) |
| | (1.48) | | |
| Anemic Pregnant Women(15-49 years)(%) | 1.33 | 0.59 | (-3.5, 6.16) |
| | (2.46) | | |
| Anemic Women(15-49 years)(%) | 2.06 | 0.135 | (-0.645, 4.77) |
| | (1.38) | | |
| **New Born Health** | | | |
| Breastfed within an hour(%) | -2.51 | 0.116 | (-5.64, 0.62) |
| | (1.6) | | |
| Exclusively breastfed(%) | 4.49 | 0.172 | (-1.96, 10.9) |
| | (3.29) | | |
| Receiving solid or semisolid food and | -0.895 | 0.669 | (-5, 3.21) |
| breastmilk (Age 6-8 months)(%) | (2.09) | | |

Continued on next page

Table 7: ATT Results from Matching (Continued)

| Dependent Variable | Estimate | p values | CI (95%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adequate Diet in Breastfeeding Children(6-23 months)(%) | 0.881<br>(0.918) | 0.337 | (-0.919, 2.68) |
| Adequate Diet in Non-Breastfeeding Children(6-23 months)(%) | -0.356<br>(0.677) | 0.599 | (-1.68, 0.971) |
| Adequate Diet (Total, Age 6-23 months)(%) | 0.0589<br>(0.975) | 0.952 | (-1.85, 1.97) |
| **Child Health and Nutrition** | | | |
| Underweight(Age< 5 years)(%)) | -0.123<br>(0.859) | 0.886 | (-1.81, 1.56) |
| Acute Respiratory Infection (ARI) Symptoms(%) | 0.415*<br>(0.24) | 0.084 | (-0.0556, 0.885) |
| ARI Symptoms taken to Health Facility/Provider(Age < 5 years)(%) | 4.35<br>(3.53) | 0.218 | (-2.57, 11.3) |
| ORS Use in Children with Diarrhea(%) | -4.82<br>(3.99) | 0.227 | (-12.6, 3.01) |
| **Immunization** | | | |
| Full Vaccination Coverage(12-23 months, Card or Recall)(%) | 2.06<br>(1.79) | 0.25 | (-1.45, 5.58) |
| Full Vaccination Coverage(12-23 months, Card Only)(%) | -0.196<br>(1.84) | 0.915 | (-3.81, 3.42) |
| BCG Vaccination(Age 12-23 months)(%) | 2.05<br>(1.74) | 0.24 | (-1.37, 5.46) |
| Polio Vaccination(3 Doses)(Age 12-23 months)(%) | 1.73<br>(1.73) | 0.316 | (-1.65, 5.12) |
| Penta/DPT Vaccination(3 Doses) | 2.56 | 0.138 | (-0.818, 5.93) |

Continued on next page

Table 7: ATT Results from Matching (Continued)

| Dependent Variable | Estimate | p values | CI (95%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| (Age 12-23 months)(%) | (1.72) | | |
| Measles Containing Vaccine (MCV)(First Dose) | 3.2* | 0.0763 | (-0.339, 6.75) |
| (Age 12-23 months)(%) | (1.81) | | |
| Penta/Hepatitis B Vaccination(3 Doses) | 2.92* | 0.099 | (-0.55, 6.4) |
| (Age 12-23 months)(%) | (1.77) | | |
| **Family Planning** | | | |
| Unmet Need for Family Planning(%) | 0.117 | 0.821 | (-0.892, 1.13) |
| | (0.515) | | |
| Unmet Need for spacing (Family Planning)(%) | -0.0536 | 0.861 | (-0.652, 0.545) |
| | (0.305) | | |
| Any method(family planning)(%) | 0.194 | 0.886 | (-2.45, 2.84) |
| | (1.35) | | |
| Any modern method(family planning)(%) | -0.434 | 0.756 | (-3.17, 2.3) |
| | (1.39) | | |
| Female sterilization(%) | -0.482 | 0.78 | (-3.86, 2.89) |
| | (1.72) | | |
| Male sterilization(%) | 0.441* | 0.0712 | (-0.038, 0.92) |
| | (0.244) | | |
| IUD/PPIUD(family planning)(%) | 0.12 | 0.641 | (-0.385, 0.626) |
| | (0.258) | | |
| Pill(family planning)(%) | 0.118 | 1.06 | (-1.96, 2.2) |
| | (1.04) | | |
| Condom(family planning)(%) | -1.16* | 0.0806 | (-2.47, 0.142) |
| | (0.666) | | |
| Injectables(family planning)(%) | -0.0999 | 0.316 | (-0.295, 0.0953) |

Continued on next page

Table 7: ATT Results from Matching (Continued)

| Dependent Variable | Estimate | p values | CI (95%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (0.0996) | | |
| **Adolescent Health** | | | |
| Early Marriage(Women 20-24 years)(%) | 0.901 | 0.514 | (-1.8, 3.61) |
| | (1.38) | | |
| Adolescent Motherhood(Women 15-19 years(%) | 0.393 | 0.58 | (-0.997, 1.78) |
| | (0.709) | | |

*Note*: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01