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Importance of Long-term Evidence
Importance of Long-term Evidence

• Over the past 30 years, accumulation of robust evidence from RCTs documents short-term impact of a number of interventions

• In contrast, little evidence on long-term impact

• Notable exceptions (e.g., Baird et al., 2016, 2018; Gertler et al., 2014; Attanasio et al., 2017)

• Of utmost importance to policy-making (both cost and benefit side)
Long-term Impact Discovery Project (LID)
The LID Project

• Team of CEGA-affiliated economists
• Funded by grant from GiveWell

• Main Objective
• Develop new opportunities to identify long-term effects of childhood interventions that have the potential to be life-transforming

• General criteria
• Rigorous: Classical randomized control trials with sound design
• Long-term: Conducted at least 8 years ago
• Feasible: Research design likely still intact, potential to follow-up
• Focused: As of now, child-health or cash-transfer interventions
Methodology

1. Systematic review of the study universe
2. Rigorous selection procedure to identify set of methodologically soundest studies (next slide)
3. In-depth evaluation to assess feasibility of follow-up (next slide)
4. Implementation of follow-up
## Methodology II

2 phases of study selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Methodological</strong></td>
<td>Statistical power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient (differential) exposure to treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of short-term effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Feasibility</strong></td>
<td>Unique identifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual tracking, re-sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concurrent conflict, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey attrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Output

• Finalized **systematic reviews** on …
  1. Cash transfers
  2. Malaria treatments
  3. Nutrition supplementation
  4. Diarrhea treatments

• Including **power calculations** for long-term income effects
• Including preliminary **implementation budget**

➢ **28 high-caliber studies recommended for follow-up**
Output: Examples

- **Seasonal Malaria Chemoprevention in Mali** (Dicko et al., 2011)
  - Individual-level, placebo-controlled RCT
  - 3,017 children 3–59 months of age
  - Finds reduction in *malaria* and *anaemia* (mortality not reported)

- **Bednets in India** (Nevill et al., 1996)
  - Clustered RCT (no placebo; phase-in after 2 years)
  - 35,484 participants (including children), 56 clusters
  - Finds reduction in *malaria* and *mortality* (anaemia not reported)
Conclusion

28 high-caliber studies recommended for follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash transfers</td>
<td>9 studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria treatments</td>
<td>7 studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition supplements</td>
<td>12 studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ready to contact original PIs (*partly done*) and implement follow-up
- **Low cost/high returns funding** opportunity
- Methodology *easily transportable* to study space of choice
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