

## Author's Proof

Carefully read the entire proof and mark all corrections in the appropriate place, using the Adobe Reader commenting tools ([Adobe Help](#)). We do not accept corrections in the form of edited manuscripts.

Before you submit your corrections, please make sure that you have checked your proof carefully as once you approve it, you won't be able to make any further corrections.

In order to ensure the timely publication of your article, please submit the corrections within 48 hours. If you have any questions, contact [publichealth.production.office@frontiersin.org](mailto:publichealth.production.office@frontiersin.org).

### Quick Check-List

- **Author names** - Complete, accurate and consistent with your previous publications.
- **Affiliations** - Complete and accurate. Follow this style when applicable: Department, Institute, University, City, Country.
- **Tables** - Make sure our formatting style did not change the meaning/alignment of your Tables.
- **Figures** - Make sure we are using the latest versions.
- **Funding and Acknowledgments** - List all relevant funders and acknowledgments.
- **Conflict of Interest** - Ensure any relevant conflicts are declared.
- **Supplementary files** - Ensure the latest files are published and that no line numbers and tracked changes are visible. Also, the supplementary files should be cited in the article body text.
- **Queries** - Reply to all typesetters queries below.
- **Content** - Read all content carefully and ensure any necessary corrections are made.

## Author Queries Form

Query No.	Details Required	Author's Response
<b>Q1</b>	The citation and surnames of all of the authors have been highlighted. Check that they are correct and consistent with the authors' previous publications, and correct if need be. Please note that this may affect the indexing of your article in repositories such as PubMed.	
<b>Q2</b>	We have used [Stéphane Verguet, Donald A. P. Bundy] instead of [Stephane Verguet, Donald Bundy]. Please confirm that it is correct.	
<b>Q3</b>	Please ask the following authors to <a href="https://www.frontiersin.org/Registration/Register.aspx">register</a> with Frontiers (at <a href="https://www.frontiersin.org/Registration/Register.aspx">https://www.frontiersin.org/Registration/Register.aspx</a> ) if they would like their names on the article abstract page and PDF to be linked to a Frontiers profile. Please ensure to provide us with the profile link(s) when submitting the proof corrections. Non-registered authors will have the default profile image displayed. "Averi Chakrabarti" "Arif Husain" "Carmen Burbano."	
<b>Q4</b>	Confirm if all author affiliations are fine as listed.	

Query No.	Details Required	Author's Response
<b>Q5</b>	Confirm that the email address in your correspondence section is accurate.	
<b>Q6</b>	Ensure that all the figures, tables and captions are correct, and that all figures are of the highest quality/resolution.	
<b>Q7</b>	Verify that all the equations and special characters are displayed correctly.	
<b>Q8</b>	Confirm that the Data Availability statement is accurate.	
<b>Q9</b>	Confirm that the details in the "Author Contributions" section are correct.	
<b>Q10</b>	Ensure to add all grant numbers and funding information, as after publication this will no longer be possible. All funders should be credited and all grant numbers should be correctly included in this section.	
<b>Q11</b>	<p>Ensure that any supplementary material is correctly published at this link: <a href="https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2020.587046/full#supplementary-material">https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2020.587046/full#supplementary-material</a></p> <p>Provide new files if you have any corrections and make sure all Supplementary files are cited. Please also provide captions for these files, if relevant. Note that ALL supplementary files will be deposited to FigShare and receive a DOI. Notify us of any previously deposited material.</p>	
<b>Q12</b>	Provide the page range for the following references. “(8, 9, 13, 27, 30, 31).”	
<b>Q13</b>	Confirm whether the insertion of the article title is correct.	
<b>Q14</b>	Confirm that the short running title is correct, making sure to keep it to a maximum of five words.	
<b>Q15</b>	Confirm that the keywords are correct and keep them to a maximum of eight and a minimum of five. (Note: a keyword can be comprised of one or more words). Note that we have used the keywords provided at Submission. If this is not the latest version, please let us know.	
<b>Q16</b>	Check if the section headers (i.e., section leveling) were correctly captured.	
<b>Q17</b>	Confirm if the text included in the Conflict of Interest statement is correct.	
<b>Q18</b>	Provide the doi for “(14).”	
<b>Q19</b>	Check that the amendments to the title are fine.	

Query No.	Details Required	Author's Response
<b>Q20</b>	Please confirm if this should be moved to a Funding section: "These multi-sectoral and multi-partner studies are devised and implemented by a global consortium of researchers, with primary funding from the United Nations' World Food Programme and from the UAE-based global philanthropic organization Dubai Cares. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript."	
<b>Q21</b>	We received the Supplementary information section inside the manuscript, please provide the Appendix as a separate supplementary file.	
<b>Q22</b>	Provide the city name for the following references. "(5, 18, 44)."	
<b>Q23</b>	Please confirm the deletion of first occurrence of "(20)" in the reference list as it is appearing twice in the list.	
<b>Q24</b>	Please cite the reference "(58)" inside the text.	
<b>Q25</b>	Please confirm whether the formatting of the "Tables 1-4" are fine.	



# The Broader Economic Value of School Feeding Programs in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Estimating the Multi-Sectoral Returns to Public Health, Human Capital, Social Protection, and the Local Economy

## OPEN ACCESS

### Edited by:

Will R. Ross,  
Washington University School of  
Medicine in St. Louis, United States

### Reviewed by:

Irene Pittman Aiken,  
University of North Carolina at  
Pembroke, United States  
Neil Garrod,  
Independent Researcher, South Africa

### \*Correspondence:

Stéphane Verguet  
verguet@hsph.harvard.edu

### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to  
Public Health Education and  
Promotion,  
a section of the journal  
Frontiers in Public Health

Received: 24 July 2020

Accepted: 05 October 2020

Published: xx October 2020

### Citation:

Verguet S, Limasalle P, Chakrabarti A,  
Husain A, Burbano C, Drake L and  
Bundy DAP (2020) The Broader  
Economic Value of School Feeding  
Programs in Low- and Middle-Income  
Countries: Estimating the  
Multi-Sectoral Returns to Public  
Health, Human Capital, Social  
Protection, and the Local Economy.  
*Front. Public Health* 8:587046.  
doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2020.587046

Stéphane Verguet<sup>1\*</sup>, Paulina Limasalle<sup>1</sup>, Averi Chakrabarti<sup>1</sup>, Arif Husain<sup>2</sup>,  
Carmen Burbano<sup>2</sup>, Lesley Drake<sup>3</sup> and Donald A. P. Bundy<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, United States,

<sup>2</sup> World Food Programme, Rome, Italy, <sup>3</sup> Partnership for Child Development, Imperial College, London, United Kingdom,

<sup>4</sup> Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

**Introduction:** Globally, there are 370 million children receiving school meals every day. Coverage is least in low-income countries, where the need is greatest and where program costs are viewed as high in comparison with the benefits to public health alone. Here we explore the policy implications of including the returns of school feeding to other sectors in an economic analysis.

**Methods:** We develop an economic evaluation methodology to estimate the costs and benefits of school feeding programs across four sectors: health and nutrition; education; social protection; and the local agricultural economy. We then apply this multi-sectoral benefit-cost analytical framework to school feeding programs in 14 countries (Botswana, Brazil, Cape Verde, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ghana, India, Kenya, Mali, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, and South Africa) for which input data are readily available.

**Results:** Across the 14 countries, we estimate that 190 million schoolchildren benefit from school feeding programs, with total program budgets reaching USD11 billion per year. Estimated annual human capital returns are USD180 billion: USD24 billion from health and nutrition gains, and USD156 billion from education. In addition, school feeding programs offer annual social protection benefits of USD7 billion and gains to local agricultural economies worth USD23 billion.

**Conclusions:** This multi-sectoral analysis suggests that the overall benefits of school feeding are several times greater than the returns to public health alone, and that the overall benefit-cost ratio of school feeding programs could vary between 7 and 35, with particular sensitivity to the value of local wages. The scale of the findings suggests

Q5

Q19  
Q13

Q1  
Q2  
Q3

Q4

115 that school feeding programs are potentially much more cost-beneficial when viewed 172  
 116 from the perspective of their multi-sectoral returns, and that it would be worthwhile 173  
 117 following up with more detailed analyses at the national level to enhance the precision of 174  
 118 these estimates. 175  
 119 176

120 **Keywords: school feeding, benefit—cost analysis, economic evaluation, social protection, education** 177 **Q15**  
 121 178  
 122 179

## 123 INTRODUCTION

124 **Q16**  
 125 **Q7** Across the world, school feeding (SF) programs are implemented 180  
 126 with the primary aims of addressing child hunger and nutritional 181  
 127 deficits, and boosting school participation and learning. As 182  
 128 of 2018, 117 countries report operating such schemes and 183  
 129 as many as 370 million children receive school meals every 184  
 130 day (1, 2). SF can take the form of hot meals or snacks 185  
 131 prepared in schools or centralized community kitchens (3), or 186  
 132 are incorporated into humanitarian assistance programs (4). 187  
 133 The coverage of these programs can vary substantially: for 188  
 134 instance, Ghana targets SF to government schools in deprived 189  
 135 communities (5), whereas Brazil and India mandate the provision 190  
 136 of meals in all public schools (6, 7). SF is also targeted to 191  
 137 other vulnerable populations such as orphans, children with 192  
 138 disabilities or former child soldiers (3). SF is often implemented 193  
 139 as part of broader school health and nutrition programs, and 194  
 140 is typically the most expensive component of these programs, 195  
 141 requiring the daily provision of food throughout the school 196  
 142 year (8). 197

143 Traditionally, the costs of SF have been compared with 198  
 144 benefits in health and nutrition, or in education. However, SF 199  
 145 programs have potential benefits spanning at least four major 200  
 146 sectors: health, education, social protection, and agriculture. 201  
 147 A recent review (9) suggests that a more realistic assessment 202  
 148 of the returns to effective SF programs would include returns 203  
 149 to outcomes in multiple domains. SF programs increase 204  
 150 enrollment and reduce absenteeism which in turn enhance 205  
 151 learning and support higher educational attainment. These 206  
 152 effects are particularly strong for girls and young women since 207  
 153 retaining girls in secondary education can increase educational 208  
 154 achievement, reduce the risk of early marriage or inappropriate 209  
 155 work, and limit exposure to major health risks, including 210  
 156 HIV (9). School meal delivery platforms can also be used to 211  
 157 provide other critical services such as deworming medication 212  
 158 (3). Furthermore, SF can serve as a non-cash transfer equivalent 213  
 159 to 10–15% of household income in low-income communities, 214  
 160 and can thus serve as a strong incentive for parents to send 215  
 161 children to school. In terms of economic effects, SF can generate 216  
 162 sustainable and predictable demand for locally grown food 217  
 163 and thereby positively impact the agricultural system and food 218  
 164 supply, including the operations of small holder farmers. SF 219  
 165 programs can incorporate bio-fortified foods, such as orange- 220  
 166 flesh sweet potato and iron-fortified beans, in place of other 221  
 167 vegetables, thereby boosting health benefits while simultaneously 222  
 168 developing and maintaining local agricultural production (9). SF 223  
 169 benefits are greater for the most vulnerable and marginalized, 224  
 170 and so these programs are likely to be pro-poor and pro- 225  
 171 woman (9). 226

180 Initially, motivations for social change, social protection, and 181  
 182 poverty reduction were instrumental to the development and 183  
 184 maintenance of national SF in a majority of countries (7, 10), and 185  
 186 the programs were most often enacted and implemented by the 187  
 188 education sector (11). More recently, the agricultural sector has 189  
 190 taken a greater role in sustaining SF given the large potential of SF 191  
 192 programs to support local food supply systems and agricultural 193  
 194 production in developing countries, particularly in sub-Saharan 194  
 195 Africa. With ~400 million schoolchildren receiving a school meal 195  
 196 every day, inputs to SF programs represent a global market to the 196  
 197 order of USD80 billion per annum (12). 197

198 Assessing the benefits and costs of SF programs in 199  
 199 a comprehensive manner will demand accounting for all 200  
 200 intersectoral benefits and costs. Hence, in this paper, building 201  
 201 on recently published evidence (13, 14), we first develop an 202  
 202 economic evaluation methodology to estimate the potential costs 203  
 203 and benefits of SF programs across the health, education, social 204  
 204 protection, and local agricultural sectors. Next, we apply a 205  
 205 benefit-cost analysis framework and provide preliminary benefit- 206  
 206 cost ratios for SF programs in select low- and middle-income 207  
 207 countries (LMICs) spanning three world regions where input 208  
 208 data are readily available. Our sample includes the country with 209  
 209 the largest global SF program—India (7). 210

## 211 METHODS

212 We develop a benefit-cost analysis framework to conduct an 213  
 213 economic evaluation of SF programs by tentatively accounting 214  
 214 for effects across the four sectors of health and nutrition, 215  
 215 education, social protection, and the local agricultural economy. 216

217 We select countries that have data sources and key input 218  
 218 parameters readily available to illustrate our methodology. 219  
 219 Fourteen countries, whose SF programs have previously been 220  
 220 studied in depth (15), were chosen: Botswana, Brazil, Cape Verde, 221  
 221 Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ghana, India, Kenya, Mali, Mexico, 222  
 222 Namibia, Nigeria, and South Africa<sup>1</sup>. The target population of 223  
 223 the combined SF programs was the reported number of school 224  
 224 students fed annually in each country (**Table 1**) (15). 225

226 Our benefit-cost analysis framework has five components: 227  
 227 four components cover benefits (one component per sector) and 228  
 228 one component captures the costs of SF programs. The benefit 229  
 229 components include gains in health and nutrition, education, 230  
 230 social protection, and local agricultural economies. The cost 231  
 231 component encompasses the running costs of SF programs. 232

233 <sup>1</sup>All countries in the sample were LMICs per World Bank income group 234  
 234 classification (16) (except Chile) in 2012, the year for which country data were 235  
 235 readily available. 236

**TABLE 1** | Estimated number of beneficiaries of school feeding programs in 14 countries, along with illustrative country-specific indicators (gross national income (GNI) per capita, under-five mortality rate).

Country	Reported number of schoolchildren fed per year	GNI per capita (2018 USD)	Under-five mortality (per 1,000 live births)
Botswana	333,000	7,985	37
Brazil	42,433,000	8,785	14
Cape Verde	85,000	3,550	20
Chile	1,850,000	15,270	7
Côte d'Ivoire	265,000	1,639	81
Ecuador	1,788,000	6,174	14
Ghana	1,739,000	2,159	48
India	113,600,000	1,990	37
Kenya	826,000	1,696	41
Mali	109,000	876	98
Mexico	6,100,000	9425	13
Namibia	300,000	5,810	40
Nigeria	9,301,000	1,935	120
South Africa	8,850,000	6,173	34

Sources: Global School Feeding Sourcebook (2016) (15); World Bank (data pertain to the latest year for which data was available—2018) (17). Office of the Vice President of Nigeria (18).

## Health and Nutrition Gains

The health and nutrition benefits of SF programs can be estimated by capturing potential reductions in anemia and worm infections. Our objective here is not to be precise or comprehensive. Rather, we choose two of the most prevalent health conditions that affect poor children in LMICs [e.g., anemia and soil-transmitted helminth (STH) infections] and that have been demonstrated to have long-run consequences for health and education (19–26). We intend to convey the expected scale of effects that would emerge if SF programs were able to address just these two health conditions.

We first computed the number of cases of STH infections that would be averted by SF programs. We used the prevalence of any STH infection among 5–14 year-old (by world region (in 2015) for each country in our sample) (27) and the reported number of beneficiaries in schools (Table 1) to derive the likely number of beneficiaries with an STH infection (i.e., the avoidable STH burden) as in: Beneficiaries with STH = [Beneficiaries] \* [STH prevalence]. Subsequently, we computed the impact of SF on reducing STH cases by utilizing the efficacy of low-cost, single-dose oral therapies in reducing STH infections when administered as part of SF's essential packages. SF effectiveness in reducing STH was assumed to be 90% (20). Using a simple static formulation, the number of STH cases averted could be estimated as [Beneficiaries with STH] \* [SF effectiveness on STH]. Lastly, the STH cases averted were converted into disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) averted. For this, we used disability weights from the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) study (28), which were multiplied by the duration a child would have an STH infection (assuming a conservative duration of 5 years). We implemented a third of GBD's disability weight for intestinal nematode infections

(symptomatic) as our best estimate given available data<sup>2</sup>. In other words, the estimated DALY burden per STH case was derived as:  $DALY_{STH} \sim 0.027 / 3 * 5 \text{ years} \sim 0.045$ . Hence, DALYs averted by SF could be computed as:  $DALY_{STH,av} = [\text{STH cases averted}] * [DALY_{STH}]$ .

Similarly, for anemia-related benefits, we used the prevalence of anemia among 48–59 month-old across world regions (30) and the number of beneficiaries previously computed to derive: Beneficiaries with anemia = [Beneficiaries] \* [Anemia prevalence]. For the effectiveness of SF in reducing anemia, we used randomized controlled trial (RCT) evidence from Uganda that showed that school meals and take-home rations would bring about a 17–20% point reduction in anemia prevalence in girls aged 10–13 years (31–33). Another RCT from India studied the impact of delivering iron-fortified salt through SF and found similar scales of effect (reduction of prevalence of any type of anemia by 9% points or 20% reduction) (34). It is noteworthy that high-quality studies from two different settings (i.e., from populations in different continents, sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia) show similar effect sizes for the population of interest (i.e., 5–14 year-old). We thus proceed assuming a 20% reduction as we intend to get a sense of the scale of the effect in this paper.<sup>3</sup>

The number of anemia cases averted was computed as: Anemia cases averted = [Beneficiaries with anemia] \* [SF effectiveness on anemia]. We considered GBD disability weights of moderate cases of anemia (28), and also assumed a disease duration of 5 years (consistent with STH), in order to compute an average estimate. Thus, the estimated DALY burden per anemia case was derived as:  $DALY_A = 0.052 * 5 = 0.260$ . The anemia burden averted could then be estimated as:  $DALY_{A,av} = [\text{Anemia cases averted}] * [DALY_A]$ .

## Education Gains

Here, we considered the impact of SF on increasing school attendance (37). School meals could increase school attendance by 9% [drawing from a review of rigorously designed studies undertaken in LMICs over 1990–2015 (31, 38)], and this improvement can eventually increase future wages by 0.81% [one additional year of schooling leads to a 9% increase in future wages (39)].

We compute education gains per child as reflected by future wages (FW) earned in adult life; in doing so, we assumed an earning potential of 45 years of work (kicking in 5 years into the future, say from age 15 to age 60) discounted at 3% per year. Thus, we approximately derived:  $FW = W * A * \sum_{i=5}^{49} (1 + r)^i$ , where  $W$  is wage,  $A$  the impact of SF on wages (i.e., 0.81%), and  $r$  is the discount rate [3% per year, following economic evaluation standards (40)]. In the base case, we used countries' gross national

<sup>2</sup>The burden of STH infection (number of worms per individual) varies non-linearly and is overdispersed. The burden is associated with morbidity, so morbidity distribution too is overdispersed. The assumption that disability affects one third of infections is an approximation for this. Life expectancy varies across the most prevalent 3 STH species (roundworm, whipworm and hookworm), and 5 years is also an approximation (29).

<sup>3</sup>Note however that RCTs from Burkina Faso and Laos (35, 36) where rations did not have multi-fortified foods did not demonstrate impact on anemia prevalence reduction (31).



income (GNI) per capita for the computation of FW gains. However, alternatives can be used (and were tested in sensitivity analyses; see **Supplementary Appendix**).

### Potential Social Protection Impact

We attempted to derive a crude money-metric value for the meals delivered to schoolchildren as an approximation of the social protection value conferred by SF programs. In particular, we sought to estimate the value of the transfer conferred to families with children participating in SF programs. About two-thirds (around 64%) of the SF budget is spent on food purchase (15). Therefore, we multiplied the annual SF cost per beneficiary by 0.64 and the number of beneficiaries per year to obtain the potential social protection impact of SF.

### Potential Impact to the Local Agricultural Economy

SF programs represent an opportunity to grow the local agricultural economy of LMICs. Hence, we quantified the potential benefits to the local agricultural sector (i.e., smallholder farmers) from implementing SF programs. To estimate the food needed per child per year, we used the daily ration for a home-grown school meal menu with a standardized kilocalorie (kcal) allowance of 700 per day [converted to kilograms (kg) using the composition of SF menus in selected LMICs including Kenya (15, 41)]. The 700 kcal allowance is consistent with Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) normative standards (42, 43). Assuming 200 days of schooling over a year the amount of food to be produced is: [Beneficiaries] \* [Food per beneficiary] \* [200 days].

Subsequently, we sourced data on the total quantity of food that could be produced by a smallholder farmer in a year. We used data from farmers participating in the Purchase from Africans for Africa program (44)<sup>4</sup> to compute the number of smallholder farmers to be mobilized to sustain local SF programs. Assuming a daily income per farmer per world region (45), we derived a monetary value for the local farming impact: [Farmers needed] \* [Farmer income] \* [200 days].

### Program Costs

We identified SF program costs per child per year [in 2012 USD for the 14 study countries (15)] to derive total running costs: SF cost = [Beneficiaries] \* [SF cost per beneficiary]. No additional assumption was made regarding who would bear the cost of programs, whether it would be national authorities, regional governments, donor agencies, or non-governmental organizations. Furthermore, cost variations arising due to specific features of local settings could also not be considered due to lack of input data (15).

### Dashboard of Program Benefits and Costs

All four kinds of benefits of SF programs were either expressed or converted into money-metric values to enable comparison or aggregation. Education, social protection, and local farming

impact are already expressed in money-metric terms (USD). Health and nutrition gains (expressed in terms of DALYs averted) had to be converted into USD value. For that purpose, consistent with the education gains, we assigned a value corresponding to the GNI per capita (per DALY averted).

We also conducted sensitivity analyses with: USD1000 or USD5000 (per DALY averted), following previous benefit-cost analyses undertaken for low-income and lower middle-income countries (46); minimum wages (44, 45, 47–50); and gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (see **Supplementary Appendix**). Finally, we computed aggregate benefit-cost ratios (BCR, i.e., the ratio of benefits to costs) that compared the total benefits to the total costs of SF programs when feasible. Results were reported at the region level and included ranges across countries within each region: Latin America (Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico); South Asia (India); and sub-Saharan Africa (Botswana, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Namibia, Nigeria, and South Africa).

All computations were realized using Microsoft Excel 2016. All key input parameters used in the calculations are summarized in **Tables 1, 2**; and monetary terms are expressed in 2012 USD (as running costs of SF programs were measured in 2012 USD), unless otherwise stated.

## RESULTS

We first report the computed gains generated by SF programs on health and nutrition, and education, along with the program costs (**Table 3**). Next, we describe the potential impact in terms of social protection and local farming (**Table 4**).

For all outcomes examined, we found substantial heterogeneity based on variation in the underlying parameters. For example, the size of health and nutrition gains was contingent on the number of beneficiaries and the disease burdens alleviated. Meanwhile, the education gains, and the potential social protection and farming impacts depended on parameter values in local contexts such as the wage assumption, the annual cost of feeding a child, and the imputed income for smallholder farmers.

We summarize here the money-metric estimates identified. First, the total budgets of SF across the 14 countries examined would be about \$10,549 million (**Table 3**). These costs would greatly vary across regions, with per capita costs of about \$105 (\$41–332 range) in Latin America, \$33 in South Asia (India), and \$62 (\$10–104 range) in sub-Saharan Africa. Second, for health and nutrition, the gains would amount to roughly \$23,561 million. Again, these benefits would greatly vary across settings, with per capita gains of \$277 (\$126–335) in Latin America, \$54 in South Asia, and \$140 (\$32–200) in sub-Saharan Africa. Compared to SF costs (\$10,549 million), this would yield a partial BCR of about 2.2, with large variations across settings: 2.6 (1.0–3.1) in Latin America, 1.6 in South Asia, and 2.3 (1.1–4.6) in sub-Saharan Africa. Third, SF programs would yield substantial education-related benefits (about \$156,161 million), with varying per capita gains: \$2,096 (\$951–2,532) in Latin America, \$261 in South Asia, and \$795 (\$129–1,281) in sub-Saharan Africa.

<sup>4</sup>In the program (44), a total of 2,698 total tons of food was produced by 15,998 participating farmers over two years. Hence,  $0.1686 = 169$  kg were produced per farmer over 2 years or about 84 kg per farmer per year.

**TABLE 2 |** Key input parameters used in the comprehensive economic evaluation of school feeding programs.

Input parameter	Value	Source
Prevalence of STH infections (any type)	26.7, 26.4, and 25.5% in sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Latin America, respectively.	(27)
Prevalence of anemia (any type)	63, 39, and 30% in West, Eastern, and Southern Africa; 49% in South Asia; and 25% in Latin America	Based on anemia prevalence among 48–59 month-old (30)
SF effectiveness on reducing STH prevalence	90%	Authors' assumption based on (20)
SF effectiveness on reducing anemia	20%	Authors' assumption based on (31, 33, 34)
SF effectiveness on increasing school attendance	9%	Authors' assumption based on (8)
DALY per STH case (years)	0.045	Authors' calculations based on (28)
DALY per anemia case (years)	0.260	Authors' calculations based on (28)
Increase in future wages gained via school feeding programs	0.81%	Authors' calculations based on (37–39)
School feeding program cost* (per child per year)	\$10–\$332	(15)
Food production per smallholder farmer per year	84 kg	(44)
Farmer wage (per day)**	\$0.8 (sub-Saharan Africa); \$2.7 (South Asia); \$4.3 (Latin America)	(45)
Gross national income per capita*	\$730–\$14,350	(17)
Discount rate	3% per year	(40)

\*2012 USD; \*\*2009 International \$.

**TABLE 3 | (A)** Estimated number of soil-transmitted helminth (STH) cases averted, anemia (moderate) cases averted, and corresponding money-metric gains. **(B)** Estimated education gains in terms of future additional wages earned. **(C)** Costs.

Outcome/region	Latin America	South Asia	Sub-Saharan Africa	All
<b>(A) Health and nutrition</b>				
STH cases averted (millions)	12	27	5	44
Anemia cases averted (millions)	3	11	2	16
Money-metric value (\$ millions)	14,431	6,082	3,049	23,561
Per capita money-metric value (\$)	277 (126–335)	54 (N/A)	140 (32–200)	126 (32–335)
<b>(B) Education</b>				
Total future additional wages gained (\$ millions)	109,161	29,668	17,332	156,161
Per capita future additional wages gained (\$)	2,096 (951–2,532)	261 (N/A)	795 (129–1336)	833 (129–2,532)
<b>(C) Costs</b>				
Total costs (\$ millions)	5,450	3,754	1,345	10,549
Per capita costs (\$)	105 (41–332)	33 (N/A)	62 (10–104)	56 (10–332)

School feeding programs across three world regions (captured via 14 countries). Note: money-metric gains are expressed in 2012 USD.

The corresponding partial BCR for education gains would be of about 14.8, with the following variations: 20.0 (7.6–23.3) in Latin America, 7.9 in South Asia, and 12.8 (6.1–30.9) in sub-Saharan Africa. Fourth, with respect to social protection, the potential impact was estimated to be around \$6,752 million (Table 4), which corresponds to the direct income transfer aspect of SF programs. The estimate would greatly vary across settings: per child transfers of \$67 (\$26–212) in Latin America, \$21 in South Asia, and \$39 (\$6–67) in sub-Saharan Africa. Finally, for the local

farming, the potential impact could amount to about \$23,486 million—recall that this is roughly approximated as the income received by local smallholder farmers meeting the food demands of the SF programs. Again, the estimate would greatly vary across settings: per child impact of \$273 (\$207–280) in Latin America, \$75 in South Asia, and \$36 (\$31–50) in sub-Saharan Africa.

In summary, across all 14 countries, total benefits across four sectors (health and nutrition; education; social protection; and local farming impact) could amount to as much as \$210,710



**TABLE 4 | (A)** Estimated potential social protection (income transfer) impact. **(B)** Estimated potential impact on local farming.

Outcome/region	Latin America	South Asia	Sub-Saharan Africa	All
<b>(A) Social protection</b>				
Income transfer of SF program (\$)	3,488	2,403	861	6,752
SF food cost per child per year (\$)	67 (26–212)	21 (N/A)	39 (6–67)	36 (6–212)
<b>(B) Farming impact</b>				
Total farming impact (\$ millions)	14,190	8,512	784	23,486
Per capita farming impact (\$)	273 (207–280)	75 (N/A)	36 (32–50)	125

*School feeding programs across three world regions (captured by 14 countries). Note: monetary terms are expressed in 2012 USD.*

million, while the total costs of all SF programs would be about \$10,549 million. As a result, SF programs could yield returns on investment in the health and nutrition and education sectors of about 17–1 (yet with a wide range of 7–35 depending on the setting) while potentially providing social protection worth \$6,752 and enabling growth of local economies worth \$23,486 million. Importantly, our estimates are highly sensitive to the assumptions behind wage imputation: the BCR could decrease to as low as 3 to 1 with lower wages assigned (see **Supplementary Tables 2, 3**).

## DISCUSSION

We presented in this paper a methodology to assess the broad benefits and costs of SF programs in 14 selected countries (13 LMICs and Chile). Our approach intends to capture, in money-metric terms, the substantial SF-driven impact from four sectors: health and nutrition, education, social protection, and local farming.

Our preliminary findings show that SF could yield substantial benefits for the program costs invested, with at least \$7 of returns for every \$1 invested in SF programs. This represents a large return on investment, comparable in magnitude to several of the best-buy intersectoral interventions identified through the Copenhagen Consensus exercise (46). Below, we explore the limitations of the methodology we used and discuss the main drivers of the identified BCRs, before considering implications for policy.

### Limitations of the Methodology

Our methodology presents a number of major limitations. First, there were important limitations in the data and estimates used. We focused on a sub-set of countries for which data were readily available; this was a convenience sample, and although we recognize that this was a deliberately diverse group we do not know whether it is representative. Thus, there are uncertainties around the extent to which the findings are externally valid. Furthermore, a number of key inputs involved assumptions, including the extent of local farming production, the money-metric valuation of school meals, and the relevance of the

disability weights extracted from the GBD study. Second, we made a number of specific modeling choices in our estimation procedures. At the conceptual level, we relied on a static rather than dynamic model. In terms of more detailed choices: we made simplifying assumptions in the computation of future wages gained, specifically 45 years of future income and starting 5 years into the future; and we restricted our analysis to only four sectors, while there certainly are multiple other dimensions that could be considered on the benefit side (e.g., improvement of local political stability and conflict avoidance). Similarly, the impact on local farming production and the local economies did not account for pre-existing food production or the broader political economy landscape of food production. Likewise, we did not account for the amount of money local smallholder farmers could gain independently of SF programs purchasing their crop productions. Most importantly, we do not offer a summed total figure across the four sectors, and assume independent benefits across them. Rather, we speculate that an additive effect is a simpler (and perhaps probable) outcome to start with; and we argue that more research at the country level should be pursued (e.g., upper limits for the total benefits, possible cross correlations and independence across the sectors). This concept is indeed addressed in the FAO home-grown SF standards with reference to returns to education and agricultural economy (42) and in Alderman and Bundy (51) with reference to returns to human capital and social safety nets. To our knowledge, no other researchers have extended the argument to include all four sectors together [besides in (9)]. Also, we did not consider the geographical heterogeneity in health and education inputs, such as the distribution in disease burden or the distribution in educational attainment and quality of education received. The analysis assumes homogeneity and does not account for the distributional impact of SF programs across socioeconomic status, gender, and geographical settings within countries. As a result, our preliminary findings should be interpreted with caution, and further sensitivity analyses with additional countries should be conducted in the future.

### Identifying the Main Drivers and the Scale of Effect

Our analysis for all 14 countries suggests that the benefits are largely driven by the high rates of return on education. The estimated returns to health and nutrition, the impact on local economics by creating sustained and predictable demand for locally produced food, and the impact on social safety net gains from in-kind income transfers (i.e., the provision of school meals) are also important but much smaller than the returns to education.

Health and education during childhood and adolescence are key contributors to human capital. This is recognized in the analyses for the World Bank Human Capital Project (52), and can be conceptually measured by a single metric, especially Learning Adjusted Years of Schooling (LAYS) (53). SF appears to contribute directly to child human capital by improving health and more so indirectly by enhancing educational attainment.

Overall, these human capital effects could lead to a BCR that varies from 7 to 35.

School meals also bring about significant positive returns along two other dimensions: social protection and the local agricultural economy. We measured these effects as returns to an income transfer and to food costs vs. food production costs, respectively. Each of these can be thought of as a ratio: in the former of income transfers as a proportion of SF costs, with the return being around 0.6; and in the latter of food costs vs. food production costs, of around 2.2 (0.5–5.1).

In earlier discussions of these data, we summed across the multiple returns and found that the overall return to SF programs could be in double figures if these several different benefits were taken together (9). While we still consider that to be true conceptually (that is, that the multiple partial benefits for health, education, social protection, and the local agriculture economy can be combined additively to represent comprehensive benefits), we have concerns that simply summing the partial BCRs may not be a correct way to express the scale of the effects that are described by such different metrics. For now, therefore, we suggest that the more precise conclusion is that the return to human capital (i.e., from education and health improvements) represents a BCR varying between 7 and 35, and that SF programs also provide additional, substantial and independent returns to social protection, in the form of a transfer, and to the local agriculture economy, in the form of local purchasing equivalent to the value of the food provided. Future work should explore ways to express these very different types of returns in a combined metric.

The COVID-19 pandemic has brought new recognition of the role of SF programs in the health and development of schoolchildren. By March 2020, school closures across the world had resulted in some 1.5 billion children being excluded from education, and an estimated 390 million no longer receiving a meal at school. For many children this was the one guaranteed meal in the day, and the urgent efforts by governments and development agencies to replace the meal with cash transfers or take-home rations achieved at best partial success and at significantly higher cost. Even in rich countries the role of SF as a social safety net emerged strongly as a politically salient issue. With the growing back-to-school movement, SF and its role in incentivizing children to go to school, and parents to send them, has emerged as a near-universal element of the available international and national guidance frameworks (54).

## Conclusions and Next Steps

The intersectoral benefits of SF programs seem to promise an effective channel to promote socioeconomic development and to provide safety nets in LMICs. In this respect, further work should study additional dimensions in each of the four sectors examined in this report. For instance, in the health and nutrition sector, the effects of enhancing the nutrient contents of food provided to children and the intergenerational effects of SF programs warrant additional research. For the education sector, distributional issues regarding the location of schools and who benefits the most from SF programs (e.g., poor vs. rich), along with issues of female

empowerment should be scrutinized to fully account for the potential equity benefits of SF programs. As for social protection, it will be important to think of how SF programs are integrated within the broader safety nets and poverty reduction policies specific to each country, and how SF programs may or may not promote opportunities for the poorest. Lastly, an important question will be how SF programs may encourage local food production and act as a catalyst for facilitating the growth of local economies in a sustainable manner.

The scale of the findings from this desk review suggest that SF programs are potentially much more cost-beneficial when viewed from the perspective of their multi-sectoral returns, and that it would be worthwhile following up with more detailed analyses at the national level. Furthermore, given the social determinants of health and the increasingly intersectoral nature of development policies in LMICs, and the recognition that schoolchildren should be placed at the center of the Sustainable Development Goals (55), it is essential that novel economic evaluation methods, such as the one used here, be developed to more fully reflect the multifaceted benefits and costs that these interventions imply across socioeconomic groups and in terms of non-health benefits (56, 57).

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SV and DB conceptualized and initiated the study. LD, PL, and AC provided data. LD, CB, and AH provided advice. PL, AC, and SV did the research. PL and AC ran the analyses. SV wrote the first draft of the paper, which was reviewed by all authors.

## FUNDING

These multi-sectoral and multi-partner studies are devised and implemented by a global consortium of researchers, with primary funding from the United Nations' World Food Programme and from the UAE-based global philanthropic organization Dubai Cares. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is part of a planned series of research studies exploring the impact of School Health and Nutrition interventions in the creation of Human Capital in low- and lower-middle-income countries. The research consortium is led by DB, and the secretariat is based in the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. An earlier version of this paper was presented during seminars at the World Food Programme

(Rome, Italy), where we received valuable comments from participants, including Gianluca Guerrini, Ramin Gallenbacher, Lauren Landis, Sarah Laughton, Nail Lazrak, Edward Lloyd-Evans, Sarah Laughton, David Ryckembush, and Bing Zhao.

## REFERENCES

- World Bank. *The State of Social Safety Nets 2018*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- UNICEF, WFP. *Futures of 370 Million Children in Jeopardy as School Closures Deprive them of School Meals*. (2020). Available online at: <https://www.unicef.org/press-releases/futures-370-million-children-jeopardy-school-closures-deprive-them-school-meals>
- The United Nations World Food Programme. *Two Minutes on School Feeding*. (2018). Available online at: <https://www.wfp.org/publications/two-minutes-school-feeding> (accessed September 14, 2020).
- Aurino E, Tranchant JP, Sekou Diallo A, Gelli A. School feeding or general food distribution? Quasi-experimental evidence on the educational impacts of emergency food assistance during conflict in Mali. *J Dev Stud*. (2019) 55(sup1):7–28. doi: 10.1080/00220388.2019.1687874
- Dunaev A, Corona F. *School Feeding in Ghana*. Investment Case: Cost-Benefit Analysis Report (2018).
- Pye-Smith C. *Scaling Up the Brazilian School Feeding Model*. Rome: Food and Agricultural Organization (2014).
- Singh A, Park A, Dercon S. School meals as a safety net: an evaluation of the midday meal scheme in India. *Econ Dev Cult Change*. (2014) 62:275–306. doi: 10.1086/674097
- Fernandes M, Aurino E. Identifying an essential package for school-age child health: economic analysis. In: Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Jamison DT, Patton GC, editors. *Disease Control Priorities Third Edition, Volume 8: Child and Adolescent Health and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank (2018).
- Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Patton GC, Schultz L, Jamison DT, et al. Re-imagining school feeding: a high return investment in human capital and local economies. In: Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Jamison DT, Patton G, editors. *Disease Control Priorities Third Edition, Volume 8: Child and Adolescent Health and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank (2018).
- Afridi F. Child welfare programs and child nutrition: evidence from a mandated school meal program in India. *J Dev Econ*. (2010) 92:152–65. doi: 10.1016/j.jdeveco.2009.02.002
- World Education Forum. *The Dakar Framework for Action. Education for All: Our Collective Commitments*. World Education Forum, Dakar. Available online at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/0012.11/1211.47e.pdf>
- The United Nations World Food Programme. *The State of School Feeding Worldwide*. Rome: World Food Program (2013).
- Black RE, Walker N, Laxminarayan R, Temmerman M. Child and adolescent health and development: realizing neglected potential. In: Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Jamison DT, Patton G, editors. *Disease Control Priorities Third Edition, Volume 8: Child and Adolescent Health and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank (2018).
- Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Patton GC, Schultz L, Jamison DT, et al. Investment in child and adolescent health and development: key messages from disease control priorities, 3rd edition. *Lancet*. (2017) 391:687–99
- Drake L, Woolnough A, Burbano C, Bundy DAP. *Global School Feeding Sourcebook: Lessons From 14 Countries*. London: Partnership for Child Development, Imperial College (2016).
- World Bank. *World Bank Country and Lending Groups*. Available online at: <https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups> (accessed September 14, 2020).
- World Bank. *World Development Indicators*. Available online at: <https://databank.worldbank.org/data/source/world-development-indicators> (accessed March 3, 2019).
- Office of the Vice President of Nigeria. *Unequivocal Political Will Led to Success of Homegrown School Feeding in Nigeria Says Osinbajo*. (2018).

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2020.587046/full#supplementary-material>

- Baird S, Hicks JH, Kremer M, Miguel E. Worms at work: long-run impacts of a child health investment. *Quart J Econ*. (2016) 131:1637–80. doi: 10.3386/w21428
- Miguel E, Kremer M. Worms: identifying impacts on education and health in the presence of treatment externalities. *Econometrica*. (2004) 72:159–217. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0262.2004.00481.x
- Bundy DA, Kremer M, Bleakley H, Jukes MC, Miguel E. Deworming and development: asking the right questions, asking the questions right. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. (2009) 3:e362. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000362
- Amrita A, Baird S, Hicks JH, Kremer M, Miguel E. Economics of mass deworming programmes. In: Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Jamison DT, Patton GC, editor. *Disease Control Priorities, Third Edition, Volume 8, Child and Adolescent Health and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank (2018).
- Fernandes M, Aurino E. Identifying an essential package for school-age child health: economic analysis. In: Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Jamison DT, Patton GC, editors. *Disease Control Priorities Third Edition, Volume 8: Child and Adolescent Health and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank (2018).
- Hall A, Bobrow E, Brooker S, Jukes M, Nokes K, Lambo J, et al. Partnership for Child Development. Anaemia in schoolchildren in eight countries in Africa and Asia. *Public Health Nutr*. (2001) 4:749–56. doi: 10.1079/PHN.2000111
- Brooker S, Hotez PJ, Bundy DA. Hookworm-related anaemia among pregnant women: a systematic review. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. (2008) 2:e291. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000291
- Nokes C, van den Bosch C, Bundy DAP. *The Effects of Iron Deficiency and Anemia on Mental and Motor Performance, Educational Achievement, and Behaviour in Children: a Technical Review*. International Nutritional Anemia Consultative Group (INACG). Washington (INACG) Document. Washington, DC: ILSI Press (1998).
- Bundy DAP, Appleby LJ, Bradley M, Croke K, Hollingsworth TD, Pullan R, et al. Mass deworming programs in middle childhood and adolescence. In: Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Jamison DT, Patton GC, editors. *Disease Control Priorities Third Edition, Volume 8: Child and Adolescent Health and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank (2018).
- Salomon JA, Haagsma JA, Davis A, de Noordhout CM, Polinder S, Havelaar AH, et al. Disability weights for the global burden of disease 2013. *Study Lancet Global Health*. (2015) 3:e712–e23. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(15)00069-8
- Bundy DAP, Appleby LJ, Bradley M, Croke K, Hollingsworth TD, Pullan R, et al. 100 years of mass deworming programmes: a policy perspective from the World Bank's disease control priorities analyses. *Adv Parasitol*. (2018) 100:127–54. doi: 10.1016/bs.apar.2018.03.005
- Galloway R. Global nutrition outcomes at ages 5 to 19 25. In: Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Jamison DT, Patton GC, editors. *Re-Imagining School Feeding: A High-Return Investment in Human Capital and Local Economies, Third Edition*. Washington, DC: World Bank (2018).
- Drake L, Fernandes M, Aurino E, Kiamba J, Giyose B, Burbano C, et al. School feeding programs in middle childhood and adolescence. In: Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Jamison DT, Patton GC, editors. *Disease Control Priorities, Third Edition, Volume 8: Child and Adolescent Health and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank (2018).
- The United Nations World Food Programme. *The Impact of School Feeding Programmes*. Available online at: <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000.1023.38/download/>
- Adelman S, Gilligan DO, Konde-Lule J, Alderman H. School feeding reduces anemia prevalence in adolescent girls and other vulnerable household members in a cluster randomized controlled trial in Uganda. *J Nutr*. (2019) 149:659–66. doi: 10.1093/jn/nxy305



- 913 34. Chambers D, Simpson L, Hill-Briggs F, Neta G, Vinson C, Chambers D, 970  
 914 et al. Improving children health and cognition: evidence from school-based 971  
 915 nutrition intervention in India. In: *Georg-August- Universität Göttingen* 972  
 916 *Discussion Paper 247*. Available online at: [https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/](https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/1041.9/1797.94/1/CRC-PEG_DP_247neu.pdf) 973  
 917 35. Buttenheim A, Alderman H, Friedman J. Impact evaluation 974  
 918 of school feeding programs in Lao PDR. *J Dev Effect.* (2011) 975  
 919 3:520–42. doi: 10.1080/19439342.2011.634511 976  
 920 36. Kazianga H, de Walque D, Alderman H. School feeding programs, 977  
 921 intrahousehold allocation and the nutrition of siblings: evidence from 978  
 922 a randomized trial in rural Burkina Faso. *J Dev Econ.* (2014) 106:15– 979  
 923 34. doi: 10.1016/j.jdeveco.2013.08.007 980  
 924 37. Bundy DAP, de Silva N, Horton S, Jamison DT, Patton GC. *Re-Imagining* 981  
 925 *School Feeding: A High-Return Investment in Human Capital and Local* 982  
 926 *Economies, Third Edition*. Washington, DC: World Bank (2018). 983  
 927 38. Sniltveit B, Stevenson J, Menon R, Phillips D, Gallagher E, Geleen M, et al. *The* 984  
 928 *Impact of Education Programmes on Learning and School Participation in Low-* 985  
 929 *and Middle- Income Countries*. 3ie Systematic Review Summary 7. London: 986  
 930 International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) (2016). Available online 987  
 931 at: [http://www.3ieimpact.org/media/filer\\_public/2016/09/20/srs7-education-](http://www.3ieimpact.org/media/filer_public/2016/09/20/srs7-education-report.pdf) 988  
 932 [report.pdf](http://www.3ieimpact.org/media/filer_public/2016/09/20/srs7-education-report.pdf) 989  
 933 39. Psacharopoulos G, Patrinos HA. Returns to investment in education: a 990  
 934 decennial review of the global literature. In: *Policy Research Working Paper* 991  
 935 *WPS (8402)*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (2018). 992  
 936 40. Drummond ME, Sculpher MJ, Torrance GW, O'Brien BJ, Stoddart GL. 993  
 937 *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Healthcare Programmes, Third* 994  
 938 *Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (2015). 995  
 939 41. Aliyar R, Gelli A, Hamdani SH. A review of nutritional guidelines and 996  
 940 menu compositions for school feeding programs in 12 countries. *Front Public* 997  
 941 *Health.* (2015) 3:148. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2015.00148 998  
 942 42. Food and Agricultural Organization and World Food Programme. *Home-* 999  
 943 *Grown School Feeding Resource Framework*. Technical Document. Rome 1000  
 944 (2018). Available online at: [http://www.fao.org/3/ca\(0957\).en/CA\(0957\).EN.](http://www.fao.org/3/ca(0957).en/CA(0957).EN.pdf) 1001  
 945 [pdf](http://www.fao.org/3/ca(0957).en/CA(0957).EN.pdf) 1002  
 946 43. Fernandes M, Galloway R, Gelli A, Mumuni D, Hamdani S, Kiamba J, et al. 1003  
 947 Enhancing linkages between healthy diets, local agriculture, and sustainable 1004  
 948 food systems: the school meals planner package. *Food Nutr Bull.* (2016) 1005  
 949 37:571–84. doi: 10.1177/03795721166659156 1006  
 950 44. Miranda AC, Gyori M, Soares FV. *Phase II of the Purchasing From Africans for* 1007  
 951 *Africa Program: Results and Lessons Learned*. International Policy Centre for 1008  
 952 Inclusive Growth (2017) 1. 1009  
 953 45. Rapsomanikis G. *The Economic Lives of Smallholder Farmers*. Food and 1010  
 954 Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2015). p. 22. Available online 1011  
 955 at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5251.e.pdf> 1012  
 956 46. *Copenhagen Consensus Center*. Available online at: [https://www.](https://www.copenhagenconsensus.com) 1013  
 957 [copenhagenconsensus.com](https://www.copenhagenconsensus.com) 1014  
 958 47. Bhorat H, Kanbur R, Stanwix B. Minimum wages in sub-Saharan Africa: a 1015  
 959 primer. *World Bank Res Observ.* (2017) 32:21–74. doi: 10.1093/wbro/lkw007 1016  
 960 48. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development. *Real Minimum* 1017  
 961 *Wages*. Available online at: [https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=](https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=RMW) 1018  
 962 [RMW](https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=RMW) (accessed March 3, 2019). 1019  
 963 49. Ministry of Labour and Employment. *India's Revised National Floor Level* 1020  
 964 *Minimum Wage*. (2017). Available online at: [https://labour.gov.in/gazette-](https://labour.gov.in/gazette-notification) 1021  
 965 [notification](https://labour.gov.in/gazette-notification) 1022  
 966 50. Wong SA. Minimum wage impacts on wages and hours 1023  
 967 worked of low-income workers in Ecuador. *World Dev.* (2019) 1024  
 968 116:77–99. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.12.004 1025  
 969 51. Alderman H, Bundy D. School feeding programmes and development: are 1026  
 970 we framing the question correctly? *World Bank Res Observ.* (2011) 27:204– 1027  
 971 21. doi: 10.1093/wbro/lkr005 1028  
 972 52. World Bank. *The Human Capital Project*. Washington, DC: World 1029  
 973 Bank (2018). 1030  
 974 53. Filmer D, Rogers H, Angrist N, Sabarwal S. Learning- 1031  
 975 adjusted years of schooling (LAYS): defining a new macro 1032  
 976 measure of education. In: *Policy Research Working Paper 8591*. 1033  
 977 Washington, DC: World Bank (2018). doi: 10.1596/1813-94 1034  
 978 50-8591 1035  
 979 54. World Food Programme. *State of School Feeding Worldwide 2020 Including a* 1036  
 980 *Special Report on the Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic*. Rome: The United 1037  
 981 Nations World Food Programme (2020). 1038  
 982 55. Clark H, Coll-Seck AM, Banerjee A, Peterson S, Dalglish SL, 1039  
 983 Ameratunga S, et al. A future for the world's children? A 1040  
 984 WHO-UNICEF-Lancet Commission. *Lancet.* (2020) 395:605– 1041  
 985 58. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32540-1 1042  
 986 56. De Neve JW, Andriantavison RL, Croke K, Krisam J, Rajoela VH, 1043  
 987 Rakotoarivony RA, et al. Health, financial, and education gains of 1044  
 988 investing in preventive chemotherapy for schistosomiasis, soil-transmitted 1045  
 989 helminthiasis, and lymphatic filariasis in Madagascar: a modeling 1046  
 990 study. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* (2018) 12:e0007002. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd. 1047  
 991 0007002 1048  
 992 57. Verguet S, Kim JJ, Jamison DT. Extended cost-effectiveness analysis for 1049  
 993 health policy assessment: a tutorial. *Pharmacoeconomics.* (2016) 34:913– 1050  
 994 23. doi: 10.1007/s40273-016-0414-z 1051  
 995 58. UNICEF. *The Innocenti Framework on Food Systems for Children and* 1052  
 996 *Adolescents. Food Systems for Children and Adolescents*. (2019) Available 1053  
 997 online at: [https://www.unicef.org/nutrition/food-systems\\_1034.32.html](https://www.unicef.org/nutrition/food-systems_1034.32.html) 1054  
 998 (accessed July 28, 2019). 1055
- Conflict of Interest:** CB and AH were employed by the United Nations World 1000  
 Food Programme while contributing to the study. 1001
- The remaining authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of 1002  
 any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential 1003  
 conflict of interest. 1004
- Copyright © 2020 Verguet, Limasalle, Chakrabarti, Husain, Burbano, Drake and 1005  
 Bundy. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative 1006  
 Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in 1007  
 other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) 1008  
 are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance 1009  
 with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted 1010  
 which does not comply with these terms. 1011