This table represents studies that test the impacts of individual components of the Graduation program relative to the full suite.

Study	Asset	Technical Training	Consumption Support	Savings	Coaching	Health and Psychosocial Support	Finding
Ghana Banerjee, Abhijit et al. [7]	~	~	✓	~	~	✓	The full program had ↑ impacts on income, assets, and financial inclusion.
	✓	~	✓	×	~	✓	The full program without savings collection service access had similar impacts on income and assets as the full program, though it had a smaller impact on financial inclusion.
	✓	×	×	×	×	×	The asset transfer alone had no impact across economic well-being measures.
	×	×	×	✓	×	×	Savings collection services had short-term impacts on consumption and financial inclusion, though they did not persist.
Nepal Janzen, Sarah et al. [18]	~	~	✓	✓	~	(values-based training)	 The full program ↑ herd size, profitability, goat-rearing practices, control over goat enterprises, savings, and ↓ debt.
	×	~	✓	✓	✓	(values-based training)	 Compared to the full suite, removing the asset transfer led to smaller impacts on outcomes related to goats, such as herd dynamics (e.g., goats received, given away, sold), herd size, and adoption of best practices in goat enterprises. Most other outcomes were similar.
	✓	~	✓	✓	~	(values-based training)	Compared to the full suite, removing additional values- based training led to a smaller impact on the total number of goats, goat profit, savings, and technology adoption.

^[7] Banerjee, Abhijit, Dean Karlan, Robert Osei, Hannah Trachtman, and Christopher Udry. 2022. "Unpacking a Multi-Faceted Program to Build Sustainable Income for the Very Poor."

Journal of Development Economics 155: 102781.

^[18] Janzen, Sarah A., Nicholas Magnan, Sudhindra Sharma, and William M. Thompson. "Pay It Forward: A Mechanism for Achieving Scale in Anti-Poverty Programs." Working Paper, June 2023.

Study	Asset	Technical Training	Consumption Support	Savings	Coaching	Health and Psychosocial Support	Finding
Niger Bossuroy, Thomas, et al. [12]	✓	~	~	✓	✓	✓	The full program ↑ consumption, food security, revenue, mental health, self-efficacy, social cohesion, and control over earnings. Largest impacts across most outcomes.
	✓	✓	~	✓	✓	×	Compared to the full suite, removing the psychosocial component led to smaller impacts on consumption, revenue, mental health, and self-efficacy. Least cost-effective
	×	✓	~	✓	✓	✓	Compared to the full suite, removing the lump sum led to smaller impacts on revenue and control over earnings. Most cost-effective
Uganda Sedlmayr, R., Shah, A., & Sulaiman, M. [22]	✓	✓	~	✓	✓	×	 Full program ↑ consumption, assets, productive cash inflows, nutrition, psychological outlook, and perception of social conditions.
	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	×	 Compared to the full suite, removing training sessions on savings group formation had no impact on asset accumulation. However, savings groups did have a positive impact on self-employment activities and perceptions of social conditions in the community.
	X	×	✓	×	×	×	 Compared to the full suite, the lump-sum cash transfer alone led to similar impacts on assets. However, the transfer by itself had no impact on consumption, productive cash inflows, nutrition, psychological outlook, or social conditions.
	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	 Compared to the full suite, a light-touch psychological intervention with a lump-sum cash transfer did not appear to effectively substitute the integrated Graduation-style approach. However, it did ↑ psychological outlook and asset stock.

^[12] Bossuroy, Thomas, Markus Goldstein, Bassirou Karimou, Dean Karlan, Harounan Kazianga, William Parienté, Patrick Premand, Catherine C. Thomas, Christopher Udry, Julia Vaillant, and Kelsey A. Wright. 2022. "Tackling Psychosocial and Capital Constraints to Alleviate Poverty." Nature 605, no. 7909: 291–297.

^[22] Sedlmayr, Richard, Anuj Shah, and Munshi Sulaiman. 2020. "Cash-Plus: Poverty Impacts of Alternative Transfer-Based Approaches." Journal of Development Economics 144: 102418.

Study	Asset	Technical Training	Consumption Support	Savings	Coaching	Health and Psychosocial Support	Finding
Uganda Blattman, WINGS, Phase 1 [9]	~	✓	X	~	✓	×	The full program ↑ assets, cash earnings, hours worked, and food security.
	✓	✓	×	×	✓	×	Compared to the full program, removing group formation training (savings) led to smaller impacts on earnings, the likelihood of group membership, frequency of group meetings, likelihood of saving together or lending to one another, loans to and from other households, and communal farming.
Uganda Blattman, WINGS, Phase 2 [9]	✓	✓	×	✓	(two home visits)	×	 Compared to those who had no supervision on how the grant was spent, two home supervision visits ↑ likelihood of businesses surviving and hours of nonfarm work one year after. Given it costs two to three times as much as the grant, they found no evidence that supervision increased long-run performance.
	✓	✓	×	~	(five home visits)	×	Compared to those who had no supervision, recipients who received five home visits had similar impacts to two visits.

^[9] Blattman, Christopher, Eric Green, Julian Jamison, Christian Lehmann, and Jeannie Annan. 2016. "The Returns to Microenterprise Support among the Ultrapoor: A Field Experiment in Post-War Uganda." American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 8 (2): 35–64. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20150023.