

Appendix table 1: Percentage of poor and nonpoor households by household characteristics

Household characteristics	Poor	Nonpoor
Households that received government assistance at least once	18.8%	10.6%
Location		
Rural	84.5%	54.7%
Urban	15.5%	45.3%
Gender of the household head		
Female	22.0%	25.7%
Male	78.0%	74.3%
Education status of the household head		
Did not attend school	63.5%	40.3%
Attended school	36.6%	59.7%

Appendix table 2: Cox proportional hazards regression model, scaled Schoenfeld test, and stratified Cox proportional regression model for the outcome variable 'time to first receipt government food assistance'

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Cox Proportional Hazards Regression Model	Scaled Schoenfeld residual tests	Stratified Cox Regression Model, stratified by the gender of the household head without interaction terms	Stratified Cox Regression Model, stratified by gender of the household head with interaction terms
	Hazards ratio	Prob>chi2	Hazards ratio	Hazards ratio
Household location (0=rural, 1=urban)	0.849 (0.194)	0.3128	0.890 (0.182)	0.547** (0.158)
Gender of household head (0=male, 1=female)	1.934** (0.512)	0.0075		
Schooling status of the household head (0=attended school, 1=did not attend school)	0.849 (0.243)	0.0017		
Economic status of the household based on consumption expenditure (0= nonpoor, 1=poor)	1.407 (0.345)	0.0526	1.382 (0.340)	1.057 (0.349)
Ratio of number of dependent members to total number of household members	1.010** (0.00427)	0.0972	1.010** (0.00417)	1.005 (0.00604)
Interaction term: Gender of household head (0=male, 1=female) * Household location (0=rural, 1=urban)				2.855** (1.226)
Interaction term: Gender of household head (0=male, 1=female) * Economic status of the household based on consumption expenditure (0= nonpoor, 1=poor)				2.194* (0.978)
Interaction term: Gender of household head (0=male, 1=female) * Ratio of number of dependent members to total number of household members				1.009 (0.00829)
Global test		0.0001		
Observations	3,246		3,246	3,246

Robust seeform in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Schooling status of the household head was deleted from models in columns 3 and 4 as the variable did not satisfy the proportionality assumption and was not significant in the model reported in column 1.

Appendix table 3: Cox proportional hazards regression model, scaled Schoenfeld test, and stratified Cox proportional regression model for the outcome variable 'time to first receipt government cash assistance'

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Cox Proportional Hazards Regression Model Hazards ratio	Scaled Schoenfeld residual tests Prob>chi2	Stratified Cox Regression Model, stratified by the gender of the household head without interaction terms Hazards ratio	Stratified Cox Regression Model, stratified by the gender of the household head with interaction terms Hazards ratio
Household location (0=rural, 1=urban)	0.525** (0.153)	0.1004	0.483** (0.138)	0.563 (0.238)
Gender of household head (0=male, 1=female)	4.226*** (1.306)	0.0568		
Schooling status of the household head (0=attended school, 1=did not attend school)	1.429 (0.445)	0.002		
Economic status of the household based on consumption expenditure (0= nonpoor, 1=poor)	2.166** (0.707)	0.5401	2.293** (0.750)	1.840 (0.850)
Ratio of number of dependent members to total number of household members	0.998 (0.00622)	0.3327	0.998 (0.00637)	1.011 (0.00872)
Interaction term: Gender of household head (0=male, 1=female) * Household location (0=rural, 1=urban)				0.832 (0.463)
Interaction term: Gender of household head (0=male, 1=female) * Economic status of the household based on consumption expenditure (0= nonpoor, 1=poor)				1.486 (0.940)
Interaction term: Gender of household head (0=male, 1=female) * Ratio of number of dependent members to total number of household members				0.981 (0.0115)
Global test		0.0207		
Observations	3,246		3,246	3,246

Robust seeform in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Schooling status of the household head was deleted from models in columns 3 and 4 as the variable did not satisfy the proportionality assumption and was not significant in the model reported in column 1.