





Sailing through Troubled Waters: Evidence from the APOIAR Program

Ana Martins | João Pereira dos Santos | Fernando Pozzobon

Gabinete de Estratégia e Estudos do Ministério da Economia Office for Strategy and Studies of the Ministry of Economy Avenida da República, n.º 79 - 1069-218 Lisboa, Portugal **www.gee.gov.pt** ISSN (online): 1647-6212









Sailing through Troubled Waters: Evidence from the APOIAR Program

Ana Martins ¹, João Pereira dos Santos ², Fernando Pozzobon ³

Abstract

We exploit the assignment mechanism of the APOIAR Program, a targeted initiative aimed at supporting the firms most affected during the COVID-19 pandemic, to provide causal evidence on the impact of grants on firm survival and performance in times of crisis. Using sharp and fuzzy regression discontinuity designs and drawing on a combination of administrative datasets, we find that eligible firms experienced a short-term increase in profitability in 2021, with \in 1 of support increasing net income by \in 0.658. However, these effects did not persist in 2022, and we found no significant changes in turnover or cost reduction, indicating that the increase in profitability was mechanically due to the subsidy. Firms allocated part of the grant to rental payments and purchases of office supplies, including modest investments in digitalization. Our findings suggest that these funds were particularly important for ex-ante less productive and more indebted firms.

JEL Classification: H25, H32, D22, L20 **Keywords:** COVID-19 pandemic, Small firms' grants

Note: This article is sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the positions of GEE or the Portuguese Ministry of Economy

¹ Gabinete de Estudos do Ministério da Economia (GEE) and ISEG – University of Lisbon: ana.martins@gee.gov.pt.

² Queen Mary University of London, ISEG – University of Lisbon, and IZA: joao.santos@iseg.ulisboa.pt.

³ ESAG - Santa Catarina State University and ISEG – University of Lisbon: fernando.pozzobon@phd.iseg.ulisboa.pt



1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic triggered an unprecedented economic shock, prompting governments around the world to implement immediate policies to shield workers and firms. In responding to the crisis, policymakers faced a central dilemma: Should support prioritize workers directly or focus on preserving the (match with) firms that employ them? The United States and Europe pursued markedly different approaches (Giupponi et al., 2022). While in the U.S., the focus was on increasing the scope and generosity of unemployment insurance, European nations invested in the preservation of worker-firm matches through short-time work schemes to reduce job separations and the loss of firm-specific human capital (Cahuc, 2024).

Although these measures stabilized employment and mitigated mass layoffs (Chetty et al., 2024), they were highly heterogeneous in sectors (Bloom et al., 2023; Archanskaia et al., 2023) and often failed to address the distinct challenges facing small firms and entrepreneurs (Bartik et al., 2020; Fairlie et al., 2023). Many owners of microenterprises (and their families) are not paid formal salaries, and thus remained excluded from labor-centric programs, despite grappling with fixed costs such as rent and utilities. To bridge this gap, several countries introduced complementary firm-focused policies that provided non-repayable financial support to businesses to minimize the destruction of productive capacity and employment, but were they really effective?⁴

In this paper, we identify the causal effects of a targeted instrument put forward by the Portuguese government to support firms in sectors particularly hit by the confinement measures, the APOIAR Program. As a small open economy that is highly dependent on tourism and was therefore highly affected by the pandemic, with debt to GDP levels above 100%, Portugal provides an interesting setting to study these issues.

APOIAR consisted of a generous €1.2 billion non-repayable cash-flow grant to firms that experienced revenue losses equal to or higher than 25% with respect to their pre-pandemic levels. Importantly, this eligibility threshold did not overlap with access to other support programs that were executed before or after. This feature allows us to implement a Regression Discontinuity Design (RDD) to assess differences around the APOIAR threshold. We use both sharp and fuzzy approaches to estimate intention-to-treat and treatment-on-the treated parameters of interest (Cattaneo and Titiunik, 2022). Moreover, we provide evidence that firms were unable to manipulate the threshold to secure access, since they had already reported their sales to the Tax Authority before the announcement of the program. We also show that other determinants of firm performance were continuous around the threshold.

We combine data from three administrative databases that cover the universe of Portuguese private firms. First, we rely on invoice data on monthly sales (the *E-Fatura Emitentes* database), as reported to the Tax Authority and made available by Statistics

⁴ In the context of economic recovery measures, countries like Germany and Italy implemented initiatives involving direct grants to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and self-employed individuals.





Portugal specifically to this project, to estimate the running variable, i.e., revenue losses between 2019 and 2020. We link this information with the list of Approved Projects of the APOIAR Program, which provides a list of beneficiary firms and the amount of support in euros. Finally, we test the causal effect of the APOIAR on a series of firm survival, performance, and labor market outcomes using detailed balance sheet and profit and loss statement data (the *Sistema de Contas Integradas das Empresas* database). We focus on micro and small firms to avoid anticipation effects.

The main findings can be summarized as follows. First, we establish a significant jump in the probability of being treated for firms with more than 25% drop in sales when comparing them with firms slightly above this cutoff. We note that although the APOIAR was run through a simple on-line application process, not all eligible firms applied.

Second, we do not find effects on the probability of bankruptcy for firms that received support in 2021 and 2022. At least in the short-run, and considering firms close to the RDD threshold, the program has not succeeded in boosting survival.

Third, we find that eligible firms experienced a short-term increase in net income in 2021 of, on average, more than \in 3,500 for treated firms. Per \in 1,000 of support, \in 658 were not spent at the end of the year and were then translated into higher reported profits. However, these effects did not persist until 2022. Furthermore, they do not appear to be driven by revenue growth or cost reduction, suggesting that the increase in profitability was mainly due to the subsidy itself and did not contribute to structural changes in the firm. Our results show that firms allocated part of the support for rental payments and to invest in the supply of office services, including modest purchases in digitization services. We do not find any significant effects of the policy on labor market outcomes.

Lastly, we show that our average results hide substantial heterogeneity with respect to prepandemic conditions at the firm level. While ex-ante less productive and more indebted firms spent the APOIAR grant, the observed effects on net income are concentrated on "stronger" firms.

These results are important for policy. The idea that recessions can have cleansing effects by encouraging resources to be reallocated to higher productivity firms is old in economics (Schumpeter, 1939), but it is also known that even firms with good fundamentals can fail in crises such as the one caused by the pandemic. One concern with government policies in times of crisis is that they could fund lower-productivity zombie firms and thus offset reallocation gains (Acharya et al., 2022; Elenev et al., 2022; Hoshi et al., 2023; Meriküll and Paulus, 2024). Using firm-level data on small and medium sized (SMEs) enterprises in 11 European countries, Gourinchas et al. (2025) find that cash grants and pandemic loans save many "viable" SMEs and also save some "weaker" firms. However, the high cost of these policies is due to the vast majority of funds disbursed being channeled to "stronger" firms that do not need support. Our findings are consistent with these conclusions.





The closest paper to ours is Konings et al. (2023), who evaluated the effects of Covid-19 rescue policies on aggregate productivity growth and exit rates in Flanders (Belgium). They rely on a difference-in-differences strategy comparing treated companies with those that applied for, but did not obtain support. An important institutional difference is that public support was mainly granted to firms that experienced higher turnover drops (above 60%, relative to the reference period in 2019) than in our case. They argue that government subsidies reduced firm failures and increased productivity, with effects vanishing after a few quarters.

Our paper contributes to several strands of literature. First, our paper is related with an extensive literature studying the effects of the paycheck protection program (PPP) in the U.S., a loan forgivable on the condition that recipient firms maintained employment and wages at close to pre-crisis levels in the two to six months following the receipt (Humphries et al., 2020; Li and Strahan, 2021; Autor et al., 2022b,a; Granja et al., 2022; Agarwal et al., 2024). As Autor et al. (2022a) point out, the PPP was essentially untargeted in 2020, making causal estimations more challenging. Granja et al. (2022) conclude that the employment effects of the program were small compared to its size and that many firms used the loans to make non-payroll fixed payments and build savings buffers, which can account for small employment effects and likely reflect precautionary motives in the face of uncertainty. Agarwal et al. (2024) show that PPP loans reduced default rates and prevented closures among small businesses. Our paper provides causal evidence on the impact of public support on micro and small firm performance in times of crisis. Moreover, we rely on more comprehensive accounting data covering all private firms.

Second, our work complements recent findings from the literature on short-time work (Kopp and Siegenthaler, 2021; Giupponi and Landais, 2023; Cahuc, 2024; Brinkmann et al., 2024). We examine a policy that was implemented on top of short-time work schemes by providing compensation for other fixed costs and specifically considering entrepreneurs with no formal employment status.

Finally, our paper adds to the literature using RDD for the evaluation of the effects of public policies on firms (Bronzini and Iachini, 2014; De Blasio et al., 2018; Bonfim et al., 2023; Dechezleprêtre et al., 2023; Santoleri et al., 2024; Bajgar and Srholec, 2025). Bonfim et al. (2023) analyze the effects of a government credit certification program in Portugal to explore how these initiatives impact firms' borrowing costs, investment, and employment during economic downturns and recoveries. The authors find that eligible firms borrowed more and at lower rates than non-eligible firms, allowing them to increase investment and employment during crises.

The article is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the APOIAR program. Section 3 explains the empirical strategy and the main data sources. We present the baseline results in Section 4 and robustness in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 concludes.





2. Institutional background

In 2020, the Portuguese economy suffered a severe economic contraction of 8.3% in GDP, making it one of the most affected in the European Union, which saw economic activity drop by, on average, 5.6%. As one of the pillars of the economy, tourism in Portugal was heavily affected by the COVID-19 pandemic (Batalha et al., 2022; Carvalho et al., 2022). In 2020, the number of non-resident tourist arrivals to Portugal decreased by 73.7% compared to 2019 (after growing 7.9% in that year), affecting sectors such as hospitality, restaurants, and retail.

To mitigate the economic impact, the Portuguese government implemented several measures in March and April 2020. The most important consisted of a moratorium on debt payments, state-guaranteed loans, deferred tax payments, and wage subsidies – namely, a subsidized paid furlough scheme under which workers were temporarily laid off, but were still paid 1/3 of the subsidized wages by firms (Nunes et al., 2023). Analyzing the impact of these measures, Kozeniauskas et al. (2022) show that high-productivity firms were less likely to rely on government support, while exit rates among lower-productivity firms did not increase.

Later in 2020, recognizing the need to provide liquidity to micro and small firms to keep them afloat and to retain productive capacity, the Portuguese government announced and launched the APOIAR program in November. The program was designed to provide nonrepayable financial assistance to firms adversely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly in sectors such as tourism, hospitality, and retail. Companies were required to be free of debts to the tax authority and social security. In addition, they were prohibited from laying off workers or distributing dividends in the two months after receiving the grant.

The eligibility criteria evolved over time, and we will exploit this variation in eligibility in our identification strategy. In November 2020, only micro- and small enterprises, as defined by Eurostat rules, qualified for the program. The treated sectors of activity were defined in Portaria-271-A-2020 of November, 24 and applications opened on November, 25. At this time, companies were entitled to receive APOIAR support if they had reported to the Tax Authority a turnover decline of at least 25%, measured as the year-on-year variation for the first three quarters of 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. Eligible firms received non-repayable compensation equal to 20% of their revenue loss, with limits set according to company size.

In January 2021, in response to a new lockdown imposed on January 15, the government announced updated rules and a budget increase for the APOIAR program. The new requirement, while keeping the 25% threshold, was adjusted to consider the entire year of 2020 with respect to 2019 and support was extended to larger companies (medium firms and firms with an annual turnover of less than \in 50 million) and to self-employed (*Empresários em*





Nome Individual), as expressed in Portaria n.º 15-B/2021 of January, 15.⁵ In addition, payment limits were also substantially increased. Taking all the amendments into account, a business qualifying for the maximum amounts could receive over 200,000 in incentives – an amount that could be doubled as a result of the additional support introduced in APOIAR for rental payments.

The application process was simple, with online submission and tracking. Importantly, the cutoffs were specific to this policy. The remaining policies, implemented months before APOIAR, had different eligibility criteria. The simplified lay-off, for example, required a sharp drop in turnover of at least 40% in the month prior to the request compared to the average of the two previous months or compared to the same period in the previous year. The tax deferral required a drop in turnover of at least 20% compared to the three months before the month in which the obligation occurred, in relation to the same period in the previous year.

The financing of the APOIAR Program was made with structural European funds, with a small share coming from national resources (3%). At the end of 2020, 40,949 applications were submitted (39.1% of the total submissions). Despite the short period of time (about a month), 31,698 contracts were signed (32.4%) and, the approved incentives amount to 325,037 (27.1%). Considering the full program, the average incentive was close to 12,000 (Martins and Rebelo, 2023). Micro-enterprises were those that submitted the highest number of applications (corresponding to 88.2% of total applications). The remaining 11.8% combine companies of other sizes: 9.6% from small companies, 1.6% by medium-sized, and 0.6% concerned large companies. The Tourism sector had the highest number of applications (47.5%), followed by the Retail and Trade sector (28.5%). At regional level, the North region was the one with the highest number of applications (38.5%). Lisbon was the region with the second highest weight (28.9%) while Alentejo region was the one with the fewest applications (4.5%). In terms of incentives paid, Lisbon was the region that received the most support (37.9%), followed by the North (31.4%). We present the regional dispersion of the support in Figure A1 in the Appendix.

⁵ In March 2021, the Program was also extended to cover other economic activities, which were part of the value chains of the tourism sector, such as bakery, pastry, and the manufacture of pyrotechnic items. We do not consider these sectors to avoid possible anticipation effects.





3. Empirical strategy

3.1. Data and summary statistics

We link three administrative datasets covering the universe of Portuguese private firms to analyze the causal effects of the APOIAR program on survival, performance, and labor market outcomes. We give an overview below.

Invoice data (the E-Fatura Emitentes database). This data set, made available by Statistics Portugal specifically for this project, collects information on aggregate monthly sales per seller for 2019 and 2020. E-Fatura is an electronic invoicing software system adopted by the Portuguese government in 2013 to combat value-added tax (VAT) fraud. It is mandatory for all individuals or legal entities with a headquarters, stable establishment, or tax domicile in Portugal. As reported to the Tax Authority, the data generated in this platform cover all business-to-business transactions. In addition, it includes a large share of final consumption transactions, thanks to government incentives that encourage consumers to act as tax auditors by requesting an invoice with their taxpayer number at the time of purchase.⁶ In summary, E-Fatura captures around 75% of net-of-VAT consumption reported in the national accounts.

List of Approved Projects of the APOIAR Program. This data set, obtained from COMPETE 2020 (the Portuguese Operational Program for Competitiveness and Internationalization), which acted as the managing authority responsible for the implementation and disbursement of funds to eligible firms, provides the full list of beneficiary firms, as well as the euro amounts of support received.

Business statistics. We use this granular yearly balance sheet and profit and loss statement data (Sistema de Contas Integradas das Empresas, SCIE) from 2019 to 2023, obtained from information reported through Informação Empresarial Simplificada, IES, a joint project of the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Justice, Statistics Portugal, and Banco de Portugal.⁷ We use data on net income, revenues, expenditures, value added, sales, total assets, two-digit sectors of activity, and headquarter locations (i.e., municipalities). It also provides information on the labor market including the number of employees, the total wage expenditure, and average wages. The participation of the firms in the survey is mandatory and non-compliance is penalized.

Considering these data sources, we make a number of sample restrictions. First, we focus on non-financial private firms that belong to eligible sectors, listed according to Portaria-271-

⁶ These incentives include weekly public debt lotteries of, at least, €35.000, deductions on personal income tax payments for expenditures on health, education, nursing homes, and general household spending. The government further rebates 15% of the VAT on expenditures on hotels and restaurants, hairdressers, and car and moto repair.

⁷ This dataset has been used, inter alia, to study how the organization of management production impacts revenues

and productivity (Caliendo et al., 2020), how exporters adjust wages in response to shocks during the Great Recession (Garin and Silvério, 2024), the impact of a government credit certification program (Bonfim et al., 2023), the effects of a sharp rise in transportation costs (Branco et al., 2023).





A-2020 of November, 24. This list includes wholesalers, retailers, and touristic firms such as hotels, restaurants, and cafés. In addition, we exclude not-for-profit and state-owned firms, medium and large firms, startups (defined as firms born in 2019), and companies based in the archipelagos of Madeira or Azores as different eligibility rules apply in those cases. Finally, we do not consider firms with conflicting situations with the fiscal authority or the social security. We also exclude firms with non-positive assets, turnover, equity or employment. We present the sectoral distribution of our sample in Table 1.

Main Sector	Frequency	Percent
		(%)
Accommodation and Food Services	18,280	17.59
Arts, Entertainment, and Sports	3,415	3.29
Administrative and Support Services	3,146	3.03
Retail and Wholesale Trade	57,426	55.25
Consulting and Technical Services	3,222	3.10
Education	2,154	2.07
Manufacturing Industry	1,769	1.70
Information and Communication	1,780	1.71
Other Services	3,456	3.32
Health and Social Support	9,292	8.94
Total	103,940	100.00

Table 1: Distribution of Firms by Main Sector

Our main sample consists of 103,940 firms. To mitigate the influence of outliers, all balancesheet variables are winsorized at the 2.5% on both tails of the distribution (Santoleri et al., 2024). The summary statistics for 2019, the pre-treatment period, are shown in Table 2.





Table 2: Summary Statistics 2019

	Mean	Std. Dev.	p25	p50	p75	p99	Obs.
Non-subsidized							
Turnover	568869.50	858673.80	87794.00	219426.00	607800.00	3747072.00	56515
Number of employees	4.83	5.20	1.00	3.00	6.00	24.00	56515
Wage expenditure	59402.25	79741.07	11659.00	28397.00	68687.00	376204.00	34591
Average wage	8342.40	4606.99	5170.33	7705.00	10367.00	23252.33	34591
Total assets	481206.90	733262.00	74320.00	187373.00	508783.00	3307012.00	56515
Net Income	22463.59	45479.87	859.00	6826.00	24760.00	198959.00	56515
Office Supplies	975.16	1377.14	97.00	417.00	1220.00	5889.00	56515
Rents	9729.95	17317.65	0.00	3490.00	10800.00	89550.00	56515
Investment in equipment	t 9403.20	20231.96	0.00	0.00	7154.00	91109.00	56515
Debt to shareholders	146.78	806.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	4868.00	56515
Subsidized							
Turnover	389658.70	648529.20	64630.00	156463.00	397130.00	3747072.00	47425
Number of employees	4.70	5.37	1.00	3.00	6.00	24.00	47425
Wage expenditure	64320.45	84346.28	12459.00	30657.00	76072.00	376204.00	43387
Average wage	8900.76	4924.08	5414.67	8103.00	11226.00	23252.33	43387
Total assets	368945.90	628137.80	54706.00	137912.00	362875.00	3307012.00	47425
Net Income	17023.14	40741.14	317.00	4973.00	19215.00	198959.00	47425
Office Supplies	743.83	1197.13	50.00	270.00	850.00	5889.00	47425
Rents	11676.77	20238.89	0.00	3725.00	12526.00	89550.00	47425
Investment in equipment	t 7581.04	18272.04	0.00	0.00	3913.00	91109.00	47425
Debt to shareholders	134.48	765.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	4868.00	47425
All							
Turnover	487100.50	775091.90	75866.50	187475.50	499716.00	3747072.00	103940
Number of employees	4.77	5.28	1.00	3.00	6.00	24.00	103940
Wage expenditure	62138.74	82370.93	12087.00	29619.50	72623.00	376204.00	77978
Average wage	8653.07	4794.01	5301.22	7911.50	10839.50	23525.33	77978
Total assets	429985.20	689561.70	64395.50	163344.00	437876.00	3307012.00	103940
Net Income	19981.26	43466.32	584.00	5901.00	22049.50	198959.00	103940
Office Supplies	869.61	1303.20	72.00	343.00	1049.00	5889.00	103940
Rents	10618.23	18732.23	0.00	3600.00	11760.00	89550.00	103940
Investment in equipment	t 8571.80	19383.49	0.00	0.00	5500.00	91109.00	103940
Debt to shareholders	141.17	788.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	4868.00	103940





3.2. Identification

Estimation. We estimate the causal effect of the APOIAR program on firm-level outcomes using a Regression Discontinuity Design (RDD), a quasi-experimental method that requires defining a score or running variable X, a cutoff or threshold c, and a discontinuous treatment assignment rule D (Cattaneo and Titiunik, 2022). In our case, we compare firms that are eligible for the APOIAR program by a small margin with the counterfactual composed by firms "just above the threshold" that are less likely to receive support.

Our definition of the running variable, based on the E-fatura data, aims to capture firms that may have qualified to receive support from, at least, one of the APOIAR phases: the first phase of the APOIAR program considers a revenue decline in the first three quarters of 2020 compared to the same period in 2019, while the second considers a revenue decline for the full year of 2020 compared to 2019. Therefore, we compute the running variable X considering the minimum revenue drop observed for each firm between these two periods:

$$X_i = min\{\text{Drop APOIAR phase 1, Drop APOIAR phase 2}\}$$
 (1)

In cases where perfect treatment compliance is not achieved, both sharp and fuzzy RDDs offer valuable insights into treatment effects. Sharp RDD provides an estimate of the intention-to-treat (ITT), as it reflects the real-world effectiveness of a policy under typical conditions of implementation. However, when compliance is imperfect, the fuzzy RDD becomes particularly relevant, as it accommodates the scenario where not all individuals adhere to their assigned treatment. The Fuzzy specification focuses specifically on the effects for those who comply with the treatment assignment, the treatment on the treated (TOT) effect.

The **Sharp RDD** assumes that the treatment indicator D is assigned on the basis of a specific rule that links the running variable X with a known and predefined cutoff c and given by:

$$D_i = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } X_i < c, \\ 0 \text{ if } X_i \ge c. \end{cases}$$

In practice, this is estimated using a local polynomial regression of the form

$$y_i = \beta D_i + f(X_i) + \epsilon_i \tag{2}$$

where y_{it} is a firm-level outcome measured in 2021 or in 2022, D_i is a binary indicator variable that takes the value 1 if a firm is eligible to receive APOIAR support, $f(X_i)$ are polynomials of the running variable *X* estimated separately for each side of the threshold c, and ϵ is an error term. When there is only partial take-up of the program, the coefficient of interest β^{sharp} is an ITT estimate.

The **Fuzzy RDD** allows for a probabilistic assignment of treatment, when not all individuals near the threshold comply with the treatment assignment. Estimation typically employs instrumental variable methods in which the running variable acts as the instrumental variable.





In other words, the TOT estimate is obtained by scaling up the ITT. Hence, the estimand in a fuzzy RDD takes the form of a ratio of two Sharp RD estimands. In our case, considering that we have access to firm-level data on take-up, we are able to estimate the first stage as in eq. (2) with yi being the APOIAR support (measured in euros). This allows us to interpret β^{fuzzy} as the effect of receiving one APOIAR euro on firm-level outcomes.

The pertinent literature on regression discontinuity design provides guidance on the choice of the bandwidth (Imbens and Kalyanaraman, 2012), the local polynomial order to include in the regression (Gelman and Imbens, 2019; Pei et al., 2022), and the inclusion of covariates (Frölich and Huber, 2019; Calonico et al., 2019). In our baseline results, our choice of bandwidth follows Calonico et al. (2014, 2017), known in the literature as the optimal bandwidth. We show results using a polynomial of order two and without any covariates. We show that our results remain robust if we change these conditions in Section 5.

Assumptions. We now discuss and provide empirical evidence in support of the key identifying assumptions hold in this setting: (i) local randomization (near the threshold, units are assumed to be as-if randomly assigned to treatment or control), (ii) the continuity of potential outcomes, and (iii) exclusion of confounding factors (no other variable changes discontinuously at c besides the treatment). We also discuss the validity of the exclusion restriction in the context of the fuzzy RDD.

First, an underlying assumption in the RDD is that the assignment of firms around the eligibility threshold is as good as random. This implies that firms do not manipulate their financial statements to meet program criteria and receive support. To test this local continuity assumption, McCrary (2008) introduced the concept of manipulation testing. Several authors, such as Cattaneo et al. (2018), have further refined this test. In our study, we examine the distribution of eligibility criteria around the cutoff point using Cattaneo et al. (2018) and Calonico et al. (2017). We present the results of this test in Figure 1 and show that there is no bunching in the distribution of firms with the running variable X computed according to eq. (1).








Figure 1: Manipulation test

This is not a surprising result. Firms had to report sales to the Tax Authority before the announcements of the APOIAR program, so no strategic adjustments are expected from firms as they were not previously informed that the program would take place, extended in early 2021, nor about the cutoff. This was also ensured by the extremely small time lags between announcement and implementation. Moreover, all micro and small firms had to have a certified accountant who files and signs financial reports.

The second assumption requires the continuity of other variables around the APOIAR threshold.

Figure 2 provides supporting evidence that this is likely to hold in this setting by showing that the distribution of several outcome variables around the APOIAR cutoff point was smooth before the pandemic and the introduction of the program, using data for 2019.








Figure 2: Firm Performance and Labor Market in 2019: Graphical evidence

Notes: The running variable is the decrease of turnover (based on E-fatura). The cutoff value of the assignment variable is the decrease of at least 25% yoy. Local polynomial of order 2, the kernel function is triangular, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighbor by firm.

The third condition is also likely met in this context. As mentioned in length in Section 2, the APOIAR cutoff was specific to this measure as there were no other policies that used these eligibility requirements.

Lastly, we discuss the exclusion restriction in the context of the fuzzy RDD. In simple words, we argue that the causal effect of the APOIAR program on firm-level survival and performance occurs only through the funds that these firms receive. We note that, contrary to other contributions in the literature (Dechezleprêtre et al., 2023), we are not using a binary indicator considering whether each firm received support, but the actual money that each firm received, which is arguably more important for firms. In addition, APOIAR did not have a certification component that could signal quality that banks or investors could observe (Bonfim et al., 2023), mitigating concerns that other mechanisms could be affecting our results.





To conclude, while it is not possible to completely rule out the hypothesis of sorting on observables around the threshold, all the evidence (both institutional and statistical) provides clear support for the validity of the research design.





4. Results

The first step in our empirical evaluation is to investigate whether all eligible firms have applied to APOIAR and if we indeed observe a sizable monetary influx at the threshold. We then examine the effects of the program on a broad range of firm-level outcomes that cover various aspects of survival, firm performance, expenditure and liabilities, and employment. For each of these categories, we follow the same structure. First, we present a graphical inspection of the discontinuities at the RDD threshold. Second, we interpret both sharp and fuzzy RDD regressions. Finally, we discuss heterogeneity.

4.1. Take-up

We begin by establishing that i) there is a large discontinuity in the probability of being granted support at the APOIAR threshold, and ii) this discontinuity translates into sizable and relevant resources for micro and small firms. To do so, we rely on the data from the list of beneficiaries provided by COMPETE 2020 and use the RDD framework described above. The results are displayed in fig. 3. In panel a), we show that the probability of being treated significantly increases at the threshold of our running variable from close to zero to almost 50%. The probability increases for firms with turnover reductions greater than 25%, but does not converge to 100%. Therefore, not all firms that are entitled to receive support apply.⁸

In panel b), we highlight that the average incentive at the margin is \in 5,270. Note that, considering that the minimum salary in Portugal in 2021 was 665, this amounts to around 8 minimum monthly wages.

⁸ Bhargava and Manoli (2015) argue that program confusion, informational complexity, and stigma can influence the

take-up of government programs. Cui et al. (2022) show that Chinese firms fail to claim benefits on more than 80% of eligible investments. Bonfim et al. (2023) highlight that take-up of a government credit certification program in Portugal was close to 20% in the first years, but increased to approximately 65%.








Figure 3: First Stage: Graphical evidence

Probability of being granted support

Incentives in €

Notes: The running variable is the decrease of turnover (based on E-fatura). The cutoff value of the assignment variable is the decrease of at least 25% yoy. Local polynomial of order 2, the kernel function is triangular, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighbor by firm.

Considering imperfect compliance, and for the remainder of this paper, we present both sharp and fuzzy RDD results. This provides a nuanced understanding of the program's effectiveness by computing the parameter that policy makers can influence (the ITT) and the parameter on those who actually receive the treatment per euro of support (the TOT).

4.2. Probability of Bankrupcy

Next, we examine whether APOIAR contributed to keeping businesses afloat during and after the pandemic. We recall that this was one of the main indicators that policy makers advanced to develop the program. As micro and small firms often face frictions in access to external financing, which may be even more acute in times of crisis (Blattner et al., 2023), programs such as the APOIAR may be, in theory, a particularly relevant source of liquidity.

The graphical inspection that we present in Figure 4 does not seem to reveal any substantial discontinuity in survival in 2021 and 2022. Although the probability of bankruptcy increased in 2022 with respect to the previous year, these graphs suggest that the subsidy did not appear to affect the probability of survival, at least at the RDD margin.








Figure 4: Probability of bankruptcy: Graphical evidence

Notes: The running variable is the decrease of turnover (based on E-fatura). The cutoff value of the assignment variable is the decrease of at least 25% yoy. Local polynomial of order 2, the kernel function is triangular, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighbor by firm.

We confirm these results by considering both sharp and fuzzy RDD regressions in Table 3. We note that all point estimates are close to zero.

	20	21	2022			
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy		
Coef.	0.004	0.000	0.001	0.000		
Std. Dv.	0.004	0.000	0.005	0.000		
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940		
Obs.left	26,625	24,857	30,016	24,833		
Obs.right	32,647	29,612	37,811	29,586		
Bandwidth	0.265	0.240	0.319	0.240		

Table 3: Probability of bankruptcy: RDD results

Notes: The running variable is computed according to eq. (1). Local polynomial regression-discontinuity estimation with robust bias-corrected confidence intervals and inference procedures: local polynomial of order 2, triangular kernel function, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighborly firms. The treatment status variable used to implement the fuzzy RD estimation is the total amount of incentives.



We also examine possible heterogeneous effects and display the results in Section A.1 in the Appendix. More specifically, we focus on subsamples of firms grouped into terciles based on turnover, labor productivity (computed as value added per worker), and indebtedness (computed as liabilities/ assets), all measured in 2019, before the COVID-19 pandemic. In summary, we do not find significant differences at the RDD threshold when we divide our sample according to pre-pandemic performance for both sharp and fuzzy specifications.

4.3. Probability of Bankrupcy

Next, we study the effect of APOIAR on firm performance. We selected standard indicators of firm performance such as net income, a proxy for profits, turnover (sales of goods and services), and total expenses. We also analyze balance sheet variables, namely, total assets and equity.

First, we visually inspect evidence of discontinuities in these variables in Figure 5 for 2021 and in Figure 6 for 2022. We find an observable discontinuity in net income in 2021, but not in 2022. For all the other indicators, we do not find any differences at the threshold.






Figure 5: Firm Performance in 2021: Graphical evidence

Notes: The running variable is the decrease of turnover (based on E-fatura). The cutoff value of the assignment variable is the decrease of at least 25% yoy. Local polynomial of order 2, the kernel function is triangular, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighbor by firm.










Figure 6: Firm Performance in 2022: Graphical evidence

Notes: The running variable is the decrease of turnover (based on E-fatura). The cutoff value of the assignment variable is the decrease of at least 25% yoy. Local polynomial of order 2, the kernel function is triangular, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighbor by firm.

We confirm these insights by estimating sharp and fuzzy RDD regressions and present the results in Table 4 for 2021. The first two columns illustrate the impact of the program on net income, revealing that eligible firms experienced an average increase of \in 3,522 relative to non-eligible firms, around the eligibility threshold, in 2021. For each \in 1,000 of APOIAR funds, eligible firms that applied and received support increase net income by \in 658. However, in the following columns, we show that, despite positive, no significant differences are observed in turnover or in total expenses, suggesting that the net income surge seems to be a mechanical accounting effect – mainly due to receiving the grant that increases total revenues and, therefore, profits, rather than becoming more competitive or efficient, at least in the short-run. Consistent with this idea, we show that total assets and equity do not seem to be affected by the grant. In other words, we do not find evidence that the grant encouraged investment or reduced debt at the margin.





	N	et	Turr	over	Total		To	tal	Equ	
	Inc	ome	Iuri	lover	Exp	enses	As	sets	Equ	iity
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	3,522**	0.658**	4,924	2.033	3,522	1.979	6,795	1.895	-1,168.2	0.207
Std. Dv.	1,591	0.281	21,679	4.111	20,040	3.865	21,356	3.870	11,034	1.986
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940
Obs.left	21,160	19,542	24,968	20,663	25,358	20,516	24,272	21,218	23,842	21,278
Obs.right	24,259	22,123	29,805	23,603	30,380	23,424	28,739	24,323	28,160	24,434
Bandwidth	0.195	0.176	0.242	0.189	0.248	0.187	0.233	0.195	0.228	0.196

Table 4: Firm Performance in 2021: RDD results

Notes: The running variable is computed according to eq. 1. Local polynomial regression-discontinuity estimation with robust bias-corrected confidence intervals and inference procedures: local polynomial of order 2, triangular kernel function, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighborly firms. The treatment status variable used to implement the fuzzy RD estimation is the total amount of incentives.

Moreover, this effect seems to be short-lived. In Table 5, we show that the effects on net income did not persist in 2022 and, once again, we do not find any differences at the threshold for other standard indicators of firm performance.

	Net Income		Turnover			Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	846.3	0.183	4,317	2.779	2,488	2.426	3,489	1.188	-3,180.4	-0.340	
Std. Dv.	1,772	0.321	24,364	4.767	22,484	4.400	22,633	4.037	12,032	2.143	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	
Obs.left	24,216	21,211	25,534	20,221	$25,\!604$	20,289	24,861	22,128	24,267	21,958	
Obs.right	28,672	24,317	30,946	23,046	31,055	23,134	29,615	25,720	28,733	25,472	
Bandwidth	0.232	0.195	0.250	0.184	0.251	0.185	0.241	0.206	0.233	0.204	

Table 5: Firm Performance in 2022: RDD results

Notes: The running variable is computed according to eq. 1. Local polynomial regression-discontinuity estimation with robust bias-corrected confidence intervals and inference procedures: local polynomial of order 2, triangular kernel function, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighborly firms. The treatment status variable used to implement the fuzzy RD estimation is the total amount of incentives.

We now zoom in on the causal effect of the APOIAR program on net income in 2021 to examine whether these results are heterogeneous with respect to previous performance. We consider sharp RDD results in Figure 7 and fuzzy RDD results in Figure 8. More specifically, the analysis of the heterogeneity of the impact of the subsidy focuses on subsamples of firms grouped into terciles based on turnover, labor productivity, and indebtedness, measured before the COVID-19 pandemic in 2019.








Figure 7: Net income results for 2021 - Sharp

Tercile by indebtedness









Figure 8: Net income results for 2021 - Fuzzy



We find, in both sharp and fuzzy designs, that the bulk of the effects seem to be concentrated in firms with higher ex-ante levels of sales and labor productivity (i.e., those in the last terciles). These firms were arguably more prepared to deal with the adverse effects of the shock and did not spend part of the APOIAR support, therefore increasing net income in 2021.⁹ Consistent with these ideas, we show that there is no increase in net income for firms that were more in debt in 2019, but profits increased for firms in the first and second terciles. The liquidity provided by the program appears to have been particularly important for firms that were already struggling before the pandemic.

We further divide our sample between micro and small firms and present the results in Tables A4 and A5 in the Appendix, respectively. Although we observe a positive effect on net income for micro firms of, on average, €2,587, the results for small firms, although positive,

⁹ Granja et al. (2022) show that American firms used part of the PPP grant to build up savings buffers, which likely reflect precautionary motives (Almeida et al., 2004).





are not statistically significantly different from zero. This may be explained by the fact that small firms are more capable of absorbing and using grants effectively than micro firms.¹⁰

4.4. Expenditure and liabilities

We now take advantage of the detailed balance sheet and profit and loss statement data to shed light on the purposes for which the subsidy may have been allocated. We selected some indicators related to expenditures and liabilities and exhibit the results in Figure 9 for 2021 and Figure 10 for 2022.




Figure 9: Expenditure and liabilities in 2021: Graphical evidence

Investment in equipment

Notes: The running variable is the decrease of turnover (based on E-fatura). The cutoff value of the assignment variable is the decrease of at least 25% yoy. Local polynomial of order 2, the kernel function is triangular, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighbor by firm.

¹⁰ Surveys made in July and August 2021 show that financial literacy indicators are higher among small business owners than among microenterprise owners (Banco de Portugal, 2021).






Figure 10: Expenditure and liabilities in 2022: Graphical evidence

Investment in equipment

Notes: The running variable is the decrease of turnover (based on E-fatura). The cutoff value of the assignment variable is the decrease of at least 25% yoy. Local polynomial of order 2, the kernel function is triangular, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighborby firm.

We confirm these results in RDD regressions in Tables 6 for 2021 and 7 for 2022.

REPÚBLICA PORTUGUESA

ECONOMIA





	Investn		Re	Rents		ce lies	Liabilities - Shareholders	
	Sharp	Equipment Sharp Fuzzy Sha		Sharp Fuzzy		Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	-101.600	-0.029	1,086**	0.196	96.190***	0.019**	-10.840	-0.002
Std. Dv.	506.500	0.096	553.600	0.097	35.530	0.007	10.010	0.002
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940
Obs.left	24,981	$21,\!625$	$21,\!488$	20,102	28,127	21,774	23,734	22,633
Obs.right	29,821	$24,\!954$	24,744	22,923	34,985	25,218	28,014	26,428
Bandwidth	0.242	0.200	0.198	0.183	0.289	0.202	0.226	0.213

Table 6: Firm Liabilities and Expenditure	in 2021: RDD results
---	----------------------

Notes: the running variable is computed according to eq. 1. Local polynomial regression-discontinuity estimation with robust bias-corrected confidence intervals and inference procedures: local polynomial of order 2, triangular kernel function, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighborly firms. The treatment status variable used to implement the fuzzy RD estimation is the total amount of incentives

		nent in oment	Re	Rents Office Supplies		Liabilities - Shareholders		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	933.200	0.183*	944.400	0.179	78.770*	0.016**	-16.620***	-0.003***
Std. Dv.	594.600	0.107	607.500	0.108	40.940	0.008	6.408	0.001
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940
Obs.left	$25,\!816$	22,608	22,138	20,286	26,045	20,761	22,462	23,943
Obs.right	31,342	26,390	25,730	23,132	31,766	23,740	26,187	28,307
Bandwidth	0.254	0.212	0.206	0.185	0.257	0.190	0.210	0.229

Table 7: Firm Liabilities and Expenditure in 2022: RDD results

Notes: the running variable is computed according to eq. 1. Local polynomial regression-discontinuity estimation with robust bias-corrected confidence intervals and inference procedures: local polynomial of order 2, triangular kernel function, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighborly firms. The treatment status variable used to implement the fuzzy RD estimation is the total amount of incentives

We start by pointing out that we do not observe a rise in investment in equipments in 2021 and only a noisy suggestion that spending on this item increased in 2022 in the fuzzy specification. Conditional on receiving support, we calculate a positive effect of \in 0.183 (per euro of subsidy received). No statistically significant effects are identified for other types of investment. These results are consistent with the increased real option value of postponing investment under uncertainty.¹¹

¹¹ Guceri and Albinowski (2021) show that, in periods of high uncertainty, firms' investment decisions may be less responsive to changes in public policies. Harju et al. (2022) show that small firms' investment was largely unresponsive to a sizable reduction of the corporate income tax in Finland.





Firms eligible to participate in the program spent a sizable portion of the support on rental payments: €1,086 more, on average, than the counterfactual in 2021. These effects, while positive, are not precisely estimated in the fuzzy design and for both the sharp and fuzzy designs in 2022. Note that as early as April 2020, a moratorium regime was established for delays in the payment of rents under non-residential urban lease agreements. Tenants who were eligible due to income losses were allowed to defer rents due during the state of emergency and the following month, repaying the total amount over the next 12 months in monthly installments of at least one-twelfth, in addition to the rent due each month. This measure lasted until June 2021. These results suggest that treated firms were better equipped to honour these fixed costs. It is important to highlight that the variable Rents used in the analysis refers to the accounting registration of rental expenses, not to actual rent payments. As such, the observed treatment effects should be interpreted with caution. The increase in Rents may reflect the reactivation of deferred obligations, possibly triggered by the liquidity relief provided through the APOIAR subsidy. In this context, the effect may be primarily accounting-based—indicating that firms resumed or formalized rental expense recognition.

Spending on Office supplies (External supplies and services – Office supplies) increased both in 2021 and in 2022, with €96.19 more, on average, compared to the counterfactual, with this amount decreasing to €78.77 in 2022. However, this account is relatively broad and may include various types of expenditures. Although we hypothesize that part of this increase may be associated with digitization-related purchases, such as IT peripherals (e.g. printers, scanners, webcams) or home office equipment, this interpretation cannot be confirmed with the available data. These expenses were likely influenced by factors such as the acquisition of digital equipment to support remote work, online sales, and health and safety measures.¹²

Lastly, eligible firms appear to have used the subsidy to reduce debt to shareholders in 2022, with this type of debt decreasing by ≤ 16.62 , on average, compared with the counterfactual, possibly to repay loans by shareholders during the early stages of the pandemic crisis.

4.5. Labor Market

Lastly, we investigate whether APOIAR had a causal impact on labor market outcomes.¹³ We focus our attention on average wages, total employment, total wage bill, and labor productivity (computed as value added per worker). We start by presenting the graphical inspection for potential changes at the threshold in 2021 and 2022 in Figures 11 and 12, respectively.

¹² Gaspar et al. (2024) present empirical support for the hypothesis that digital intensity contributed to firm resilience during the COVID-19 shock by enhancing the ability to respond quickly to new conditions by finding new revenue streams or replacing old ones.

¹³ For reference, and according to Statistics Portugal, the annual unemployment rate decreased from 6.7% in 2021 to 6.2% in 2022.








Figure 11: Labor Market in 2021: Graphical evidence

Total wage bill

Labor productivity

Notes: The running variable is the decrease of turnover (based on E-fatura). The cutoff value of the assignment variable is the decrease of at least 25% yoy. Local polynomial of order 2, the kernel function is triangular, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighbor by firm.






Figure 12: Labor Market in 2022: Graphical evidence

Notes: The running variable is the decrease of turnover (based on E-fatura). The cutoff value of the assignment variable is the decrease of at least 25% yoy. Local polynomial of order 2, the kernel function is triangular, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighbor by firm.







	Total Employment		Total W	age Bill	Averag	e Wage	Labor Productivity	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	-0.0981	-0.00002	1,250.9	-0.035	121.59	0.027	1.375	0.255
Std. Dv.	0.149	0.00003	2,461.2	0.485	158.68	0.025	905.1	0.169
Obs.	103,940	103,940	75,083	75,083	75,083	75,083	101.325	101.325
Obs.left	25,237	20,421	$21,\!512$	14,043	18,848	$15,\!578$	$22,\!677$	19,368
Obs.right	30,200	23,305	28,602	16,320	23,793	18,513	$26,\!804$	22,108
Bandwidth	0.246	0.186	0.303	0.165	0.245	0.188	0.218	0.178

Table 8: Labor market in 2021: RDD results

Notes: the running variable is computed according to eq. 1. Local polynomial regression-discontinuity estimation with robust bias-corrected confidence intervals and inference procedures: local polynomial of order 2, triangular kernel function, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighborly firms. The treatment status variable used to implement the fuzzy RD estimation is the total amount of incentives

	Total Employment		Total W	Total Wage Bill		Average Wage		Labor Productivity	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	-0.0857	-0.00002	-255.55	-0.121	176.72	0.038	520.3	0.081	
Std. Dv.	0.157	0.00003	3,198.8	0.538	183.45	0.028	877.2	0.171	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	73,934	73,934	73,934	73,934	99.121	99.121	
Obs.left	$25,\!459$	20,720	17,898	13,769	17,292	14,683	$27,\!146$	20,992	
Obs.right	30,549	23,695	22,402	16,119	21,465	$17,\!394$	34,452	24,640	
Bandwidth	0.249	0.190	0.233	0.165	0.222	0.179	0.290	0.202	

Table 9: Labor market in 2022: RDD results

Notes: the running variable is computed according to eq. 1. Local polynomial regression-discontinuity estimation with robust bias-corrected confidence intervals and inference procedures: local polynomial of order 2, triangular kernel function, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighborly firms. The treatment status variable used to implement the fuzzy RD estimation is the total amount of incentives

Overall, analyzing various employment-related variables in RDD regressions, shown in Table 8 for 2021 and 9 for 2022, we do not find significant effects. This lack of impact may be attributed to the simplified layoff program implemented during the first half of 2020, which effectively reduced layoffs for all firms.





5. Robustness

In this section, we analyze the robustness of our main estimates to variations in methodological choices, including polynomial order, bandwidth selection, and the inclusion of covariates. We present the results in Section B in the Appendix.

First, we show in Tables A6 and A7 that our results remain robust if we rely on a linear rather than a quadratic polynomial. Next, we reduce and extend the optimal bandwidth à la Calonico et al. (2017), for each outcome variable, by 10%. We show that all results remain consistent in Tables A8 and A9 for a reduced and in Tables A10 and A11 for an augmented sample. We also include different vectors of fixed effects to mitigate concerns about systematic differences between firms near the threshold. Specifically, we control for region- (in Tables A12 and A13), sector- (in Tables A14 and A15), and sector- and region-fixed effects (in Tables A16 and A17).11¹⁴ As can be seen, the point estimates are very similar to baseline, lending further credibility to the internal validity of our identification strategy.

¹⁴ These vectors include the ten sectors of activity described in Table 1 and 5 regions in mainland Portugal (North, Center, Lisbon, Alentejo, and Algarve).



6. Concluding Remarks

This paper studies the causal effects of APOIAR, a program aimed at providing liquidity to the firms in sectors most affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Relying on sharp and fuzzy RDD and combining data from several administrative data sources, we find a rise in short-term profitability, as demonstrated by a significant increase in net income in 2021. This is coupled with and modest increases in spending in categories like rents and office supplies. However, these effects were short-lived, with no persistence into 2022, highlighting the program's limited capacity to drive sustained financial resilience.

While the subsidy may have contributed to firms' operational adjustments, its impact on broader metrics such as turnover, employment, wages, and survival rates was negligible. This underscores the need for complementary measures to strengthen firms' long-term adaptability and competitiveness, such as fostering innovation, facilitating access to credit, and enhancing digital transformation.

Heterogeneity analyzes reveal that firms with higher sales and productivity before the pandemic did not use part of the subsidy in 2021. This suggests that targeted financial support may yield the greatest returns when directed toward firms with greater initial capacity to leverage the assistance effectively.

Our results apply to the subpopulation of firms that rank near the threshold. We acknowledge that these may not be representative of the most in need of public support if targeting was not sufficiently adequate (Bertanha and Imbens, 2020). Hence, while the RDD estimates causal effects for these firms, known as local average treatment effects (LATE), it does not allow to draw conclusions about the ATE or the overall effectiveness induced by the policy.





References

Acharya, V. V., Crosignani, M., Eisert, T., and Steffen, S. (2022). Zombie lending: Theoretical, international, and historical perspectives. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 14(1):21–38.

Agarwal, S., Ambrose, B. W., Lopez, L. A., and Xiao, X. (2024). Did the paycheck protection program help small businesses? Evidence from commercial mortgage-backed securities. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 16(3):95–132.

Almeida, H., Campello, M., and Weisbach, M. S. (2004). The cash flow sensitivity of cash. *The Journal of Finance*, 59(4):1777–1804.

Archanskaia, E., Canton, E., Hobza, A., Nikolov, P., and Simons, W. (2023). The asymmetric impact of covid-19: A novel approach to quantifying financial distress across industries. *European Economic Review*, 104509.

Autor, D., Cho, D., Crane, L. D., Goldar, M., Lutz, B., Montes, J., Peterman, W. B., Ratner, D., Villar, D., and Yildirmaz, A. (2022a). The \$800 billion paycheck protection program: where did the money go and why did it go there? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 36(2):55–80.

Autor, D., Cho, D., Crane, L. D., Goldar, M., Lutz, B., Montes, J., Peterman, W. B., Ratner, D., Villar, D., and Yildirmaz, A. (2022b). An evaluation of the paycheck protection program using administrative payroll microdata. *Journal of Public Economics*, 211:104664.

Bajgar, M. and Srholec, M. (2025). Crowding in or crowding out? Evidence from discontinuity in the assignment of business R&D subsidies. *Journal of Public Economics*, 245:105357.

Banco de Portugal (2021). Relatório do 1º inquérito sobre a literacia financeira de empresários de micro e pequenas empresas e os desafios da covid-19 em portugal. Technical report, Banco de Portugal, Rua Castilho, 24, 1250-069 Lisboa. Edição Departamento de Estabilidade Financeira; ISSN (impresso) 1646-2254; ISSN (online) 2182-0384.

Bartik, A. W., Bertrand, M., Cullen, Z., Glaeser, E. L., Luca, M., and Stanton, C. (2020). The impact of covid-19 on small business outcomes and expectations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(30):17656–17666.

Batalha, M., Gonçalves, D., Peralta, S., and dos Santos, J. P. (2022). The virus that devastated tourism: The impact of covid-19 on the housing market. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 95:103774.

Bertanha, M. and Imbens, G. W. (2020). External validity in fuzzy regression discontinuity designs. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 38(3):593–612.

Bhargava, S. and Manoli, D. (2015). Psychological frictions and the incomplete take-up of social benefits: Evidence from an IRS field experiment. *American Economic Review*, 105(11):3489–3529.

Blattner, L., Farinha, L., and Rebelo, F. (2023). When losses turn into loans: The cost of weak banks. *American Economic Review*, 113(6):1600–1641.





Bloom, N., Bunn, P., Mizen, P., Smietanka, P., and Thwaites, G. (2023). The impact of covid-19 on productivity. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, pages 1–45.

Bonfim, D., Custódio, C., and Raposo, C. (2023). Supporting small firms through recessions and recoveries. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 147(3):658–688.

Branco, C., Dohse, D. C., dos Santos, J. P., and Tavares, J. (2023). Nobody's gonna slow me down? The effects of a transportation cost shock on firm performance and behavior. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 136:103569.

Brinkmann, C., Jäger, S., Kuhn, M., Saidi, F., and Wolter, S. (2024). Short-time work extensions. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bronzini, R. and Iachini, E. (2014). Are incentives for r&d effective? evidence from a regression discontinuity approach. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 6(4):100–134.

Cahuc, P. (2024). The micro and macro economics of short-time work. In *Handbook of Labor Economics*, volume 5, pages 385–433. Elsevier.

Caliendo, L., Mion, G., Opromolla, L. D., and Rossi-Hansberg, E. (2020). Productivity and orga- nization in Portuguese firms. *Journal of Political Economy*, 128(11):4211–4257.

Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M. D., Farrell, M. H., and Titiunik, R. (2017). rdrobust: Software for regression-discontinuity designs. *The Stata Journal*, 17(2):372–404.

Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M. D., Farrell, M. H., and Titiunik, R. (2019). Regression discontinuity designs using covariates. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 101(3):442–451.

Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M. D., and Titiunik, R. (2014). Robust nonparametric confidence intervals for regression-discontinuity designs. *Econometrica*, 82(6):2295–2326.

Carvalho, B. P., Peralta, S., and Pereira dos Santos, J. (2022). Regional and sectorial impacts of the covid-19 crisis: Evidence from electronic payments. *Journal of Regional Science*, 62(3):757–798.

Cattaneo, M. D., Jansson, M., and Ma, X. (2018). Manipulation testing based on density discontinuity. *The Stata Journal*, 18(1):234–261.

Cattaneo, M. D. and Titiunik, R. (2022). Regression discontinuity designs. *Annual Review* of *Economics*, 14(1):821–851.

Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., and Stepner, M. (2024). The economic impacts of covid-19: Evidence from a new public database built using private sector data. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 139(2):829–889.

Cui, W., Hicks, J., and Xing, J. (2022). Cash on the table? imperfect take-up of tax incentives and firm investment behavior. *Journal of Public Economics*, 208:104632.

De Blasio, G., De Mitri, S., D'Ignazio, A., Russo, P. F., and Stoppani, L. (2018). Public guarantees to SME borrowing. A RDD evaluation. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 96:73–86.

Dechezleprêtre, A., Einiö, E., Martin, R., Nguyen, K.-T., and Van Reenen, J. (2023). Do tax incentives increase firm innovation? An RD design for R&D, patents, and spillovers. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 15(4):486–521.





Elenev, V., Landvoigt, T., and Van Nieuwerburgh, S. (2022). Can the covid bailouts save the economy? *Economic Policy*, 37(110):277–330.

Fairlie, R., Fossen, F. M., Johnsen, R., and Droboniku, G. (2023). Were small businesses more likely to permanently close in the pandemic? *Small Business Economics*, 60(4):1613–1629.

Frölich, M. and Huber, M. (2019). Including covariates in the regression discontinuity design. J. Bus. Econ. Stat., 37(4):736–748.

Garin, A. and Silvério, F. (2024). How responsive are wages to firm-specific changes in labour demand? Evidence from idiosyncratic export demand shocks. *Review of Economic Studies*, 91(3):1671–1710.

Gaspar, J.-M., Wang, S., and Xu, L. (2024). Digitalization and the performance of nontechnological firms: Evidence from the COVID-19 and natural disaster shocks. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 89:102670.

Gelman, A. and Imbens, G. (2019). Why high-order polynomials should not be used in regression discontinuity designs. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 37(3):447–456.

Giupponi, G. and Landais, C. (2023). Subsidizing labour hoarding in recessions: the employment and welfare effects of short-time work. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 90(4):1963–2005.

Giupponi, G., Landais, C., and Lapeyre, A. (2022). Should we insure workers or jobs during recessions? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 36(2):29–54.

Gourinchas, P.-O., Kalemli-Özcan, Ş., Penciakova, V., and Sander, N. (2025). SME failures under large liquidity shocks: An application to the COVID-19 crisis. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 23(2):431–480.

Granja, J., Makridis, C., Yannelis, C., and Zwick, E. (2022). Did the paycheck protection program hit the target? *Journal of Financial Economics*, 145(3):725–761.

Guceri, I. and Albinowski, M. (2021). Investment responses to tax policy under uncertainty. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 141(3):1147–1170.

Harju, J., Koivisto, A., and Matikka, T. (2022). The effects of corporate taxes on small firms. *Journal of Public Economics*, 212:104704.

Hoshi, T., Kawaguchi, D., and Ueda, K. (2023). Zombies, again? The COVID-19 business support programs in Japan. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 147:106421.

Humphries, J. E., Neilson, C. A., and Ulyssea, G. (2020). Information frictions and access to the paycheck protection program. *Journal of Public Economics*, 190:104244.

Imbens, G. and Kalyanaraman, K. (2012). Optimal bandwidth choice for the regression discontinuity estimator. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 79(3):933–959.

Konings, J., Magerman, G., and Van Esbroeck, D. (2023). The impact of firm-level covid rescue policies on productivity growth and reallocation. *European Economic Review*, 152:103967.





Kopp, D. and Siegenthaler, M. (2021). Short-time work and unemployment in and after the great recession. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 19(4):2283–2321.

Kozeniauskas, N., Moreira, P., and Santos, C. (2022). On the cleansing effect of recessions and government policy: Evidence from covid-19. *European Economic Review*, 144:104097.

Li, L. and Strahan, P. E. (2021). Who supplies PPP loans (and does it matter)? Banks, relationships, and the COVID crisis. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 56(7):2411–2438.

Martins, A. and Rebelo, T. (2023). Apoiar em tempos de pandemia: Balanço de um programa de apoio às empresas. Tema Económico GEE (Gabinete Estratégia e Estudos – Ministério Economia e Mar).

McCrary, J. (2008). Manipulation of the running variable in the regression discontinuity design: a density test. J. Econom., 142(2):698–714.

Meriküll, J. and Paulus, A. (2024). Were jobs saved at the cost of productivity in the covid-19 crisis? *European Economic Review*, 161:104618.

Nunes, C., Carvalho, B. P., Pereira dos Santos, J., Peralta, S., and Tavares, J. (2023). Failing young and temporary workers? The impact of a disruptive crisis on a dual labour market. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 23(2):349–395.

Pei, Z., Lee, D. S., Card, D., and Weber, A. (2022). Local polynomial order in regression discontinuity designs. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 40(3):1259–1267.

Santoleri, P., Mina, A., Di Minin, A., and Martelli, I. (2024). The Causal Effects of RD Grants: Evidence from a Regression Discontinuity. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 106(6):1495– 1510.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1939). Business cycles: A theoretical, historical and statistical analysis of the capitalist process. Springer.

Appendix

A Heterogeneity – Further results

A.1 Probability of Bankruptcy

	Turnover			Pr	oductiv	ity	Indebtedness			
	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	
Coef.	0.004	0.002	0.004	0.009	0.000	0.004	0.012	-0.005	0.008	
Std. Dv.	0.010	0.007	0.006	0.011	0.007	0.006	0.009	0.006	0.009	
Obs.	34,172	34,873	34,895	34,249	34,860	34,831	34,543	34,743	34,654	
Obs. (left)	9,346	7,874	6,854	9,096	8,225	6,587	7,273	8,510	7,822	
Obs. (right)	9,277	8,967	9,615	8,569	9,759	9,210	8,855	10,861	8,208	
Bandwidth	0.285	0.201	0.208	0.263	0.217	0.199	0.203	0.254	0.218	

Table A1: Survival - Heterogeneity by tercile - Sharp RDD

Notes: The running variable is the decrease of turnover – the minimum drop observed for each firm between the first three quarters of 2020 (compared to the same period in 2019) or the decline for the year of 2020 (compared to 2019). The cutoff value of the assignment variable is the decrease of at least 25% yoy. Local polynomial regression-discontinuity estimation with robust bias-corrected confidence intervals and inference procedures: local polynomial of order 2, the kernel function is triangular, one common mean squared error (MSE)-optimal bandwidth selector, standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust using 3 nearest neighborly firm. The treatment status variable used to implement the sharp RD estimation is the actual eligibility status.

Table A2: Survival - Heterogeneity by tercile - Fuzzy RDD	

]	Turnover			oductiv	ity	Indebtedness			
	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	T1	T2	Т3	
Coef.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.001	0.000	
Std. Dv.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.002	
Obs.	34,172	34,873	34,895	34,249	34,860	34,831	34,543	34,743	34,654	
Obs. (left)	9,706	7,382	7,778	6,240	8,257	7,873	9,118	8,672	6,879	
Obs. (right)	9,614	8,329	11,749	5,777	9,798	12,210	12,152	11,155	7,146	
Bandwidth	0.300	0.185	0.250	0.169	0.218	0.261	0.283	0.261	0.187	

	Co	onditiona	al to Sect	or	Conditional to Region				
	Surviv	al 2021	Survival 2022		Survival 2021		Survival 2022		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	0.003	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.001	0.000	
Std. Dv.	0.004	0.001	0.005	0.001	0.004	0.001	0.005	0.001	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	
Obs. (left)	26,361	21,296	30,048	22,949	26,702	24,113	30,175	23,622	
Obs. (right)	32,258	24,459	37,845	26,922	32,818	28,554	38,006	27,829	
Bandwidth	0.262	0.196	0.320	0.216	0.267	0.231	0.322	0.225	

Table A3: RDD Robust - Survival analysis

	Conditi	onal to S	Sector an	d Region	Polynomial 1					
	Surviv	al 2021	Surviv	al 2022	Surviv	al 2021	Survival 2022			
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy		
Coef.	0.003	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.001	0.000		
Std. Dv.	0.004	0.001	0.005	0.001	0.004	0.001	0.005	0.001		
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940		
Obs. (left)	26,436	17,292	30,138	17,970	18,902	17,493	22,325	19,753		
Obs. (right)	32,346	19,239	37,963	20,143	21,386	19,507	26,013	22,414		
Bandwidth	0.263	0.152	0.321	0.160	0.170	0.154	0.209	0.179		

	F	irm Siz	e - Micr	0	Firm Size - Small					
	Survival 2021		Survival 2022		Surviv	al 2021	Survival 2022			
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy		
Coef.	0.006	0.002	0.003	0.000	-0.005	-0.000	-0.004	-0.000		
Std. Dv.	0.005	0.001	0.006	0.002	0.007	0.000	0.010	0.001		
Obs.	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613		
Obs. (left)	23,221	22,267	25,897	21,562	4,108	3,472	4,419	3,651		
Obs. (right)	28 <i>,</i> 518	27,062	32,418	25,624	5,235	4,224	5,745	4,512		
Bandwidth	0.277	0.260	0.327	0.248	0.272	0.218	0.304	0.232		

A.2 Firm Performance

	Firm Performance - 2021										
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Assets		Equity		Total Expenses		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	2,587**	0.408*	-1,348	-0.013	8,095	0.285	3,626	-0.693	-2,633	-0.036	
Std. Dv.	1,240	0.231	14,048	4.051	14,043	3.385	8,177	2.015	13,197	3.889	
Obs.	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	
Obs.left	17,515	28,816	19,705	18,694	20,565	24,431	20,474	24,162	20,035	18,401	
Obs.right	19,959	36,329	22,970	21,575	24,156	30,351	24,061	30,001	23,431	21,221	
Bandwidth	0.189	0.394	0.219	0.205	0.232	0.299	0.231	0.294	0.224	0.201	

Table A4: Firm Performance - 2021 and 2022 - Firm Size - Micro

			Firr	n Perfor	mance -	2022				
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Assets		Equity		Total Expenses	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	613.600	-0.122	-380.800	-0.556	2,784	-0.190	1,440	-1.385	-1,536	-1.194
Std. Dv.	1,287	0.334	16,003	4.462	14,975	4.135	8,784	2.045	15,116	4.159
Obs.	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327	89,327
Obs.left	22,554	24,705	19,796	19,841	20,970	21,438	20,751	25,525	19,499	20,050
Obs.right	27,480	30,706	23,085	23,166	24,719	25,424	24,411	31,939	22,734	23,456
Bandwidth	0.265	0.304	0.221	0.221	0.238	0.246	0.235	0.320	0.217	0.224

			Fi	rm Perfo	ormance	- 2021				
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Assets		Equity		Total Expenses	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	6,543	0.367	-54,855	-0.963	-77,134	-4.382	-49,411	-2.793	-60,774	-0.231
Std. Dv.	6,892	0.362	89,337	5.143	88,535	4.481	48,037	2.506	77,135	4.848
Obs.	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613
Obs.left	3,525	3,424	4,105	3,401	3,815	3,713	3,464	3,413	4,465	3,292
Obs.right	4,299	4,114	5,229	4,070	4,789	4,623	4,204	4,084	5,814	3,882
Bandwidth	0.222	0.212	0.272	0.210	0.248	0.239	0.217	0.211	0.309	0.201

Table A5: Firm Performance - 2021 and 2022 - Firm Size - Small

			Fir	m Perfo	rmance -	2022				
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Assets		Equity		Total Expenses	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	-1,901	-0.093	-102,635	0.318	-86,628	-2.499	-59,671	-2.544	-84,141	0.602
Std. Dv.	8,061	0.421	94,555	6.239	93,648	5.273	51,993	2.886	88,178	5.805
Obs.	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613	14,613
Obs.left	3,616	3,452	4,535	3,184	3,918	3,382	3,639	3,279	4,434	3,118
Obs.right	4,459	4,188	5,910	3,686	4,932	4,048	4,492	3,855	5,764	3,597
Bandwidth	0.229	0.216	0.316	0.191	0.256	0.209	0.231	0.200	0.306	0.186

B Robustness

Table A6: RDD Robust1 (polynomial 1): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2021

			Fir	m Perfo	-mance	2021				
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	2,832**	0.629***	7,344.600	2.031	7,264	1.934	10,035	1.752	-384.900	0.094
Std. Dv.	1,111	0.240	19,379	3.420	18,274	3.234	16,681	2.645	8,823	1.468
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940
Obs.left	20,178	12,124	17,696	13,076	17,412	12,898	19,986	17,385	20,180	15,902
Obs.right	23,001	12,984	19,744	14,043	19,391	13,841	22,757	19,356	23,004	17,453
Bandwidth	0.184	0.102	0.156	0.111	0.153	0.109	0.181	0.153	0.184	0.138

		Firm	Liabilitie	es and Ex	penditure	- 2021			
		nent in oment	Rents		Offi Suppl		Liabil Shareh	ities - olders	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	116.240	0.025	691.200	0.153	98.080***	0.016	-4.890	-0.001	
Std. Dv.	420.600	0.059	397.020	0.075	32.510	0.005	8.046	0.001	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	
Obs.left	20,096	19,198	20,289	13,790	17,215	15,375	19,990	16,661	
Obs.right	22,914	21,726	23,134	14,895	19,132	16,861	22,766	18,461	
Bandwidth	0.183	0.173	0.185	0.117	0.151	0.133	0.182	0.146	

	Employment - 2021										
		tal yment	Salario Emplo		Average Wage						
	Sharp	arp Fuzzy Sharp Fuzzy				Fuzzy					
Coef.	-0.006	-0.000	2,026.600	0.026	176.310	0.024					
Std. Dv.	0.130	0.000	2,202.500	0.402	133.720	0.020					
Obs.	103,940	103,940	75,083	75,083	75,083	75,083					
Obs.left	19,007	14,016	16,388	8,972	14,355	10,716					
Obs.right	21,496	15,181	19,791	9,865	16,797	11,970					
Bandwidth	0.171	0.120	0.202	0.099	0.170	0.120					

Table A7: RDD Robust1 (polynomial 1): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2022

			I	Firm Perf	ormance -	2022				
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	971.390	0.208	12,597	2.321	9,899.500	2.054	4,405.500	1.002	-643.400	-0.323
Std. Dv.	1,687.400	0.198	23,491	3.805	21,457	3.601	17,957	2.920	9,080	1.627
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940
Obs.left	15,069	19,467	16,123	13,581	16,547	13,213	19,979	16,892	21,188	15,823
Obs.right	16,471	22,074	17,763	14,666	18,326	14,210	22,730	18,773	24,296	17,378
Bandwidth	0.130	0.176	0.140	0.116	0.145	0.112	0.181	0.148	0.195	0.137

Firm Liabilities and Expenditure - 2022											
	Investment in Equipment		Rents		Office Supplies		Liabilities - Shareholders				
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy			
Coef.	844.960	0.135	660.740	0.137	78.250**	0.013	-11.960**	-0.002**			
Std. Dv.	541.800	0.086	451.470	0.085	37.070	0.005	5.410	0.001			
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940			
Obs.left	16,634	15,368	19,788	13,582	17,188	18,836	17,229	17,857			
Obs.right	18,434	16,841	22,461	14,669	19,107	21,290	19,160	20,001			
Bandwidth	0.145	0.133	0.179	0.116	0.151	0.169	0.152	0.158			

Employment - 2022										
	Total Em	ployment	Salaries of	fEmployees	Average Wage					
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy				
Coef.	0.006	-0.000	1,553.500	0.116	156.280	0.024				
Std. Dv.	0.136	0.000	2,677.700	0.428	147.870	0.017				
Obs.	103,940	103,940	73,934	73,934	73,934	73,934				
Obs.left	19,641	13,687	15,032	9,405	14,156	13,779				
Obs.right	22,282	14,780	17,907	10,430	16,697	16,145				
Bandwidth	0.177	0.116	0.184	0.106	0.171	0.165				

Table A8: RDD Robust1 (bandwidth -10%): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2021

	Firm Performance - 2021											
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity			
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy		
Coef.	3,329*	0.598*	17,451	1.961	16,481	1.421	17,398	3.150	7,796	1.348		
Std. Dv.	1,930	0.359	26,182	5.148	24,235	4.831	25,866	4.914	13,436	2.532		
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940		
Obs.left	19,431	17,878	23,064	18,929	23,465	18,793	22,371	19,472	21,986	19,551		
Obs.right	22,023	20,031	27,070	21,411	27,617	21,244	26,072	22,079	25,509	22,173		
Bandwidth	0.175	0.159	0.218	0.170	0.223	0.169	0.209	0.176	0.205	0.176		

Firm Liabilities and Expenditure - 2021											
		Investment in Equipment		Rents		fice olies	Liabilities - Shareholders				
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy			
Coef.	56.380	0.018	335.300	0.054	112	0.024	-13.050	-0.002			
Std. Dv.	618	0.119	680.300	0.122	43.210	0.009	12.390	0.002			
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940			
Obs.left	23,073	19,908	19,745	18,445	26,216	20,022	21,901	20,859			
Obs.right	27,083	22,615	22,412	20,747	32,049	22,826	25,385	23,886			
Bandwidth	0.218	0.180	0.179	0.165	0.260	0.182	0.204	0.191			

Employment - 2021										
	To Emplo	tal yment	Salario Emplo		Average Wage					
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy				
Coef.	-0.154	-0.000	-793.300	-0.033	268.510	0.054				
Std. Dv.	0.187	0.000	3,096.800	0.604	195.490	0.032				
Obs.	103,940	103,940	75,083	75,083	75,083	75,083				
Obs.left	23,358	18,721	20,163	12,890	17,513	14,333				
Obs.right	27,453	21,153	26,206	14,785	21,558	16,777				
Bandwidth	0.221	0.168	0.272	0.149	0.221	0.170				

Table A9: RDD Robust1 (bandwidth -10%): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2022

	Firm Performance - 2022											
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity			
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy		
Coef.	796.1	0.088	21,351	2.125	19,290	1.474	12,274	2.114	3,236	0.467		
Std. Dv.	2,150.2	0.409	29,476	5.936	27,215	5.472	27,361	5.123	14,623	2.724		
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940		
Obs.left	22,329	19,469	23,643	18,522	23,706	18,580	22,951	20,356	22,369	20,218		
Obs.right	26,020	22,075	27,869	20,869	27,974	20,963	26,925	23,244	26,067	23,040		
Bandwidth	0.209	0.176	0.225	0.166	0.226	0.166	0.216	0.186	0.209	0.184		

Firm Liabilities and Expenditure - 2022											
	Investment in Equipment		Rents		Office Supplies		Liabilities - Shareholders				
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy			
Coef.	1,300*	0.285**	340.600	0.037	102	0.022	-21.770***	-0.004***			
Std. Dv.	733.500	0.138	744.400	0.136	49.760	0.010	8.061	0.001			
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940			
Obs.left	23,902	20,842	20,366	18,578	24,141	19,040	20,704	22,084			
Obs.right	28,241	23,860	23,251	20,963	28,580	21,537	23,679	25,670			
Bandwidth	0.228	0.191	0.186	0.166	0.231	0.171	0.189	0.206			

	Employment - 2022										
		tal yment	Salario Emplo		Average Wage						
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy					
Coef.	-0.107	-0.000	826.400	0.081	320.970	0.054					
Std. Dv.	0.196	0.000	3,992.200	0.669	222.770	0.035					
Obs.	103,940	103,940	73,934	73,934	73,934	73,934					
Obs.left	23,592	19,008	30,829	12,646	16,013	13,489					
Obs.right	27,782	21,497	20,260	14,604	19,364	15,727					
Bandwidth	0.224	0.171	0.210	0.149	0.200	0.161					

Table A10: RDD Robust1 (bandwidth +10%): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2021

Firm Performance - 2021											
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total .	Assets	Equity		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	3,719**	0.676**	7,423	3.160	6,043	2.881	11,787	3.014	3,939	1.249	
Std. Dv.	1,757	0.319	23,852	4.633	22,108	4.345	23,506	4.424	12,184	2.279	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	
Obs.left	22,750	21,086	26,678	22,234	27,086	22,086	25,978	22,811	25,548	22,872	
Obs.right	26,620	24,188	32,780	25,861	33,405	25,672	31,633	26,692	30,958	26,812	
Bandwidth	0.214	0.194	0.266	0.208	0.272	0.206	0.256	0.215	0.250	0.216	

Firm Liabilities and Expenditure - 2021										
	Investment	t in Equipment	Rents		Office Supplies		Liabilities - Shareholde			
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy		
Coef.	-164.200	0.009	895.600	0.128	97.290**	0.023	-13.430	-0.002		
Std. Dv.	561.300	0.107	616.600	0.109	39.370	0.008	11.210	0.002		
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940		
Obs.left	26,690	23,288	23,090	21,688	29,930	23,448	25,440	24,346		
Obs.right	32,804	27,334	27,118	25,083	37,665	27,584	30,527	28,840		
Bandwidth	0.267	0.220	0.218	0.201	0.317	0.222	0.249	0.234		

		Emplo	yment - 20	21			
	Total Em	ployment	Salaries of	Employees	Average Wage		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	-0.165	-0.000	-495.730	-0.033	201.850	0.041	
Std. Dv.	0.170	0.000	2,825.600	0.604	177.710	0.028	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	75,083	75,083	75,083	75,083	
Obs.left	26,969	22,011	22,728	12,890	20,042	16,727	
Obs.right	33,219	25,534	30,782	14,785	26,000	20,291	
Bandwidth	0.270	0.205	0.333	0.149	0.270	0.207	

Table A11: RDD Robust1 (bandwidth +10%): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2022

Firm Performance - 2022											
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total A	Assets	Equity		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	941.800	0.151	8,784	3.603	6,844	3.197	7,840	2.220	308	0.453	
Std. Dv.	1,953	0.368	26,957	5.334	24,909	4.925	24,877	4.641	13,260	2.464	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	
Obs.left	25,938	22,806	27,287	21,794	27,338	21,869	26,570	23,803	25,975	23,629	
Obs.right	31,574	26,690	33,664	25,242	33,750	25,353	32,562	28,110	31,625	27,839	
Bandwidth	0.255	0.215	0.275	0.202	0.276	0.203	0.265	0.227	0.256	0.225	

Firm Liabilities and Expenditure - 2022										
	Investmen	t in Equipment	Rents		Office S	upplies	Liabilities -	Shareholders		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy		
Coef.	1,001	0.227*	903.600	0.118	80.420*	0.018	-21.160***	-0.004***		
Std. Dv.	666.600	0.125	674.400	0.121	45.210	0.009	7.300	0.001		
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940		
Obs.left	27,536	24,323	23,811	21,868	27,774	22,335	24,165	25,664		
Obs.right	34,033	28,815	28,122	25,352	34,411	26,031	28,601	31,130		
Bandwidth	0.279	0.234	0.227	0.203	0.283	0.209	0.232	0.252		

		Emplo	yment - 20	22			
	Total En	nployment	Salaries of	fEmployees	Average Wage		
	Sharp Fuzzy		Sharp Fuzzy		Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	-0.144	-0.000	328.690	0.081	294.930	0.047	
Std. Dv.	0.179	0.000	3,642.900	0.669	201.960	0.031	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	73,934	73,934	73,934	73,934	
Obs.left	27,223	22,290	19,048	12,646	18,483	15,820	
Obs.right	33,564	25,964	24,524	14,604	23,468	19,029	
Bandwidth	0.274	0.209	0.256	0.149	0.245	0.197	

Table A12: RDD Robust1 (conditional to region): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2021

	Firm Performance - 2021												
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity				
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy			
Coef.	3.482**	0.656**	5.209	2.294	3.864	2.244	6.380	2.070	-1.476	0.371			
Std. Dv.	1.593	0.283	21.689	4.153	20.044	3.901	21.350	3.944	11.030	2.024			
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940			
Obs.left	21,068	19,102	24,942	19,990	25,349	19,915	24,259	20,132	23,844	20,220			
Obs.right	24,168	21,627	29,750	22,766	30,365	22,627	28,722	22,949	28,161	23,041			
Bandwidth	0.194	0.172	0.242	0.182	0.247	0.180	0.233	0.183	0.228	0.184			

		Firm Li	abilities	and Exp	enditure - 2	2021			
		nent in oment	Rents		Off Supp		Liabilities - Shareholders		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	-93.140	-0.022	1.013*	0.180*	94.960***	0.020***	-11.440	-0.002	
Std. Dv.	506.200	0.096	550.200	0.097	35.830	0.007	10.020	0.002	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	
Obs.left	24,956	21,044	21,576	19,847	27,773	20,664	23,678	22,644	
Obs.right	29,791	24,121	24,871	22,534	34,402	23,610	27,933	26,457	
Bandwidth	0.242	0.193	0.200	0.180	0.283	0.189	0.226	0.213	

	Employment - 2021										
	To Emplo	tal yment	Salarie Emplo	05 01	Average Wage						
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy					
Coef.	-0.100	-0.000	-867.870	-0.098	101.160	0.024					
Std. Dv.	0.149	0.000	2,734.100	0.486	146.190	0.025					
Obs.	103,940	103,940	75,083	75,083	75,083	75,083					
Obs.left	25,190	20,153	18,347	14,005	20,246	15,025					
Obs.right	30,154	22,978	22,886	16,272	26,339	17,696					
Bandwidth	0.245	0.183	0.236	0.165	0.274	0.180					

Table A13: RDD Robust1 (conditional to region): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2022

			F	irm Perfo	ormance	-2022				
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	735.100	0.163	4.299	2.927	2.626	2.644	3.081	1.370	-3.520	-0.230
Std. Dv.	1.773	0.326	24.384	4.804	22.505	4.435	22.626	4.121	12.025	2.185
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940
Obs.left	24,130	20,372	25,495	19,722	25,586	19,779	24,838	20,766	24,267	20,772
Obs.right	28,568	23,260	30,603	22,391	31,014	22,450	29,591	23,743	28,733	23,749
Bandwidth	0.231	0.186	0.250	0.178	0.251	0.179	0.240	0.190	0.233	0.190

	Firm Liabilities and Expenditure - 2022											
	Investment in Equipment		Rents		Office Supplies		Liabilities - Shareholders					
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy				
Coef.	933.500	0.186*	862.700	0.163	76.400*	0.015*	-17.170***	-0.003***				
Std. Dv.	592.500	0.110	604.300	0.108	41.040	0.008	6.417	0.001				
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940				
Obs.left	25,926	20,961	22,214	20,069	25,921	19,968	22,364	24,122				
Obs.right	31,557	24,012	25,827	22,883	31,547	22,709	26,063	28,563				
Bandwidth	0.255	0.192	0.207	0.183	0.255	0.181	0.209	0.231				

	Employment - 2022										
	To Emplo	tal yment	Salario Emplo		Average Wage						
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy					
Coef.	-0.088	-0.000	-596.380	0.043	133.610	0.034					
Std. Dv.	0.157	0.000	3,264.900	0.540	180.140	0.028					
Obs.	103,940	103,940	73,934	73,934	73,934	73,934					
Obs.left	25,429	20,329	17,266	13,730	17,505	14,421					
Obs.right	30,502	23,193	21,411	16,073	21,827	17,051					
Bandwidth	0.249	0.185	0.222	0.164	0.226	0.175					

Table A14: RDD Robust1 (conditional to sector): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2021

	Firm Performance - 2021												
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity				
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy			
Coef.	3.369**	0.612**	-469	0.789	-1.267	0.783	2.116	0.952	-3.011	-0.064			
Std. Dv.	1.574	0.271	21.556	3.950	19.831	3.703	21.097	3.785	10.957	1.975			
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940			
Obs.left	21,098	20,092	23,803	20,710	24,326	20,581	24,064	20,941	23,667	20,702			
Obs.right	24,196	22,912	28,112	23,683	28,821	23,498	28,472	23,982	27,914	23,671			
Bandwidth	0.194	0.183	0.227	0.189	0.234	0.188	0.230	0.192	0.225	0.189			

		Firm Lia	abilities a	nd Expe	nditure - 2	2021		
	Investment in Equipment		Rents		Of Supj	fice plies	Liabilities - Shareholders	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	-103.600	-0.017	1.037*	0.182*	87.310**	0.018***	-11.960	-0.002
Std. Dv.	518	0.093	549.800	0.096	34.670	0.007	10.070	0.002
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940
Obs.left	23,543	21,410	21,554	19,809	28,319	20,719	23,364	22,593
Obs.right	27,708	24,612	24,841	22,487	35,294	23,692	27,464	26,369
Bandwidth	0.224	0.197	0.199	0.179	0.291	0.190	0.221	0.212

	Employment - 2021								
	To Emplo	tal yment	Salario Emplo		Average Wage				
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy			
Coef.	-0.036	-0.000	-254.430	0.002	174.710	0.023			
Std. Dv.	0.143	0.000	2,658.100	0.469	136.180	0.025			
Obs.	103,940	103,940	75,083	75,083	75,083	75,083			
Obs.left	26,104	20,140	18,994	14,203	22,199	15,098			
Obs.right	31,864	22,959	24,007	16,585	29,854	17,827			
Bandwidth	0.258	0.183	0.248	0.168	0.320	0.181			

Table A15: RDD Robust1 (conditional to sector): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2022

	Firm Performance - 2022									
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	792.500	0.155	840.700	1.557	-1.564	1.234	-898.800	0.263	-5.235	-0.605
Std. Dv.	1.805	0.318	24.389	4.611	22.342	4.242	22.474	3.945	11.938	2.138
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940
Obs.left	23,371	21,100	24,593	20,173	24,814	20,229	24,521	21,819	24,130	21,300
Obs.right	27,471	24,198	29,239	22,988	29,566	23,057	29,109	25,276	28,568	24,463
Bandwidth	0.222	0.194	0.237	0.184	0.240	0.184	0.236	0.203	0.231	0.196

	Firm Liabilities and Expenditure - 2022								
	Investment in Equipment		Rents		Office Supplies		Liabilities - Shareholders		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	1.005*	0.202*	890.600	0.166	74.500*	0.015*	-17.160***	-0.003***	
Std. Dv.	563.500	0.111	602.700	0.107	40.030	0.008	6.428	0.001	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	
Obs.left	27,709	20,278	22,267	19,914	26,535	19,956	22,313	24,090	
Obs.right	34,316	23,128	25,911	22,623	32,498	22,692	25,992	28,514	
Bandwidth	0.282	0.185	0.208	0.180	0.264	0.181	0.209	0.231	

Employment - 2022								
Total Employment				Average Wage				
Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy			
-0.012	-0.000	-26.912	0.171	115.300	0.033			
0.151	0.000	3,153.700	0.522	174.030	0.027			
103,940	103,940	73,934	73,934	73,934	73,934			
26,302	20,289	18,095	13,830	17,959	14,545			
32,180	23,135	22,762	16,239	22,495	17,207			
0.261	0.185	0.237	0.166	0.234	0.177			
	Emplo Sharp -0.012 0.151 103,940 26,302 32,180	Total Employment Sharp Fuzzy -0.012 -0.000 0.151 0.000 103,940 103,940 26,302 20,289 32,180 23,135	Total Salarie Employment Salarie Sharp Fuzzy Sharp -0.012 -0.000 -26.912 0.151 0.000 3,153.700 103,940 103,940 73,934 26,302 20,289 18,095 32,180 23,135 22,762	Total Salaries of Employment Sharp Fuzzy Sharp Fuzzy -0.012 -0.000 -26.912 0.171 0.151 0.000 3,153.700 0.522 103,940 103,940 73,934 73,934 26,302 20,289 18,095 13,830 32,180 23,135 22,762 16,239	Total Salarise of Employment Aver Employees Sharp Fuzzy Sharp Fuzzy Sharp -0.012 -0.000 -26.912 0.171 115.300 0.151 0.000 3,153.700 0.522 174.030 103,940 103,940 73,934 73,934 73,934 26,302 20,289 18,095 13,830 17,959 32,180 23,135 22,762 16,239 22,495			

Table A16: RDD Robust1 (conditional to sector and region): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2021

	Firm Performance - 2021									
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	3.322**	0.584**	-912.600	0.870	-1.668	0.797	1.167	0.979	-3.561	0.275
Std. Dv.	1.576	0.265	21.591	4.154	19.861	3.874	21.084	4.141	10.953	2.143
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940
Obs.left	21,049	21,596	23,727	18,018	24,255	18,078	24,055	17,287	23,664	17,329
Obs.right	24,125	24,910	27,999	20,188	28,717	20,258	28,462	19,234	27,907	19,294
Bandwidth	0.193	0.200	0.226	0.160	0.233	0.161	0.230	0.152	0.225	0.153

	Firm Liabilities and Expenditure - 2021								
	Investment in Equipment		Rents		Off Supp		Liabilities - Shareholders		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	-97.590	-0.002	967.600*	0.154	85.360**	0.019**	-12.600	-0.003	
Std. Dv.	517.900	0.102	546.100	0.098	35.020	0.008	10.090	0.002	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	
Obs.left	23,471	17,343	21,647	18,697	27,886	17,350	23,299	17,740	
Obs.right	27,627	19,302	25,007	21,119	34,585	19,310	27,353	19,816	
Bandwidth	0.223	0.153	0.201	0.167	0.285	0.153	0.221	0.157	

	Employment - 2021								
	Total Employment		Salarie Emplo		Average Wage				
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy			
Coef.	-0.047	-0.000	-801.640	-0.077	69.450	0.023			
Std. Dv.	0.144	0.000	2,775.200	0.475	154.150	0.026			
Obs.	103,940	103,940	75,083	75,083	75,083	75,083			
Obs.left	25,920	18,500	17,916	13,661	18,673	13,512			
Obs.right	31,538	20,829	22,221	15,815	23,461	15,603			
Bandwidth	0.255	0.165	0.228	0.160	0.242	0.157			

Table A17: RDD Robust1 (conditional to sector and region): Comparison of Sharp and Fuzzy Versions Across Key Metrics for 2022

	Firm Performance - 2022									
	Net Income		Turnover		Total Expenses		Total Assets		Equity	
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy
Coef.	662	0.090	61.240	1.510	-2.147	1.279	-1.880	0.156	-5.829	-0.409
Std. Dv.	1.805	0.343	24.442	4.728	22.389	4.342	22.460	4.411	11.931	2.360
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940
Obs.left	23,321	17,744	24,471	18,574	24,700	18,698	24,500	17,352	24,125	17,298
Obs.right	27,389	19,822	29,022	20,948	29,381	21,126	29,091	19,311	28,564	19,255
Bandwidth	0.221	0.157	0.235	0.166	0.238	0.168	0.236	0.153	0.231	0.152

	Firm Liabilities and Expenditure - 2022								
	Investment in Equipment		Rents		Office Supplies		Liabilities - Shareholders		
	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
Coef.	993*	0.223*	811.400	0.138	72.050*	0.015*	-17.720***	-0.004***	
Std. Dv.	560.100	0.120	598.500	0.109	40.150	0.008	6.434	0.001	
Obs.	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	103,940	
Obs.left	27,917	17,486	22,375	18,649	26,379	17,594	22,242	17,305	
Obs.right	34,648	19,494	26,075	21,043	32,270	19,620	25,874	19,268	
Bandwidth	0.285	0.154	0.209	0.167	0.262	0.155	0.208	0.152	

	tal	Salarie	f			
сшрю	Total Employment			Average Wage		
Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	Sharp	Fuzzy	
-0.022	-0.000	-457.660	0.083	78.286	0.029	
0.151	0.000	3,212.900	0.525	169.640	0.027	
103,940	103,940	73,934	73,934	73,934	73,934	
26,127	18,226	17,435	13,549	18,263	13,920	
31,912	20,452	21,689	15,815	23,050	16,379	
0.258	0.162	0.225	0.162	0.240	0.168	
	Sharp -0.022 0.151 103,940 26,127 31,912	SharpFuzzy-0.022-0.0000.1510.000103,940103,94026,12718,22631,91220,452	SharpFuzzySharp-0.022-0.000-457.6600.1510.0003,212.900103,940103,94073,93426,12718,22617,43531,91220,45221,689	SharpFuzzySharpFuzzy-0.022-0.000-457.6600.0830.1510.0003,212.9000.525103,940103,94073,93473,93426,12718,22617,43513,54931,91220,45221,68915,815	SharpFuzzySharpFuzzySharp-0.022-0.000-457.6600.08378.2860.1510.0003,212.9000.525169.640103,940103,94073,93473,93473,93426,12718,22617,43513,54918,26331,91220,45221,68915,81523,050	




Figure A1: Comparison of Beneficiaries and Incentives in 2020

(a) Beneficiaries, nr (2020)




Table	A18:	Variable Description
rubic	1110.	variable Debeliption

Variable	Description
	Binary variable that identifies whether the company ceased its
Survival	activity during year N. Value of 1 indicates that the company
Survival	died (i.e., stopped operating), while value of 0 indicates that it
	remained active.
	Total net revenue generated by a company from the sale of goods
Turnover	and the provision of services during a specific period, excluding
	value-added tax (VAT) and other taxes directly related to sales.
	Total value of company's economic resources, comprising current
Total Assets	and non-current assets. Includes tangible and intangible fixed
Total Assets	assets, investment properties, biological assets, inventories,
	receivables, cash and cash equivalents, and other assets.

Variable	Description
Net Income	Net value after taxes generated by the company during its
	financial year, calculated as total revenues minus total expenses
	(including taxes).
Equity	Company's own funds, representing the residual value of its
	assets after deducting all liabilities. It includes share capital,
	retained earnings, reserves, and the net result for the period.
Total Expenditure	Total amount of costs incurred by the company during the
	financial year, including the cost of goods sold and materials
	consumed, external supplies and services, personnel expenses,
	depreciation and amortization, interest expenses and taxes.
Office Supplies	External supplies and services - Office supplies: Expenses related
	to the purchase of office materials and consumables used in the
	company's administrative and operational activities. This
	includes items such as paper, pens, printer cartridges, folders,
	and other general office supplies that are not capitalised as assets.
Rents	External supplies and services - Rents and leases: Operating
	expenses incurred by the company for the rental or lease of
	property, equipment, or other assets that are not owned by the
	company.
	Investment in basic, transport, administrative, and biological
Investment in Equipment	equipment: Capital expenditure incurred by the company for the
	acquisition of equipment used in production (basic), logistics and
	distribution (transport), office and management functions
	(administrative), and biological production processes (biological).
Liabilities to Shareholders	Amount owed by the company to its shareholders.
Total Employment	Nr of individuals who, during the reference period, took part in
	the company's activity, regardless of the duration of their
	participation.
Wage Expenditure	Amount corresponding to fixed or periodic remuneration paid to
	employees (regardless of their role in the company), social
	security contributions, pensions and pension premiums,
	mandatory payroll taxes, work accident and occupational disease
	insurance, social welfare costs, and other personnel-related
	expenses such as recruitment, training, occupational health
	services, health insurance, severance payments, and optional
	retirement benefits.

Variable	Description
Average Wage	Average amount spent by the company on each worker,
	calculated as the ratio between total wage expenditure and the
	number of employees working in the company.
Labor Productivity	Gross Value Added per employee





GEE Papers

- 1: Evolução do Comércio Externo Português de Exportação (1995-2004) João Ferreira do Amaral
- 2: Nowcasting an Economic Aggregate with Disaggregate Dynamic Factors: An Application to Portuguese GDP Antonio Morgado | Luis Nunes | Susana Salvado
- 3: Are the Dynamics of Knowledge-Based Industries Any Different? Ricardo Mamede | Daniel Mota | Manuel Godinho
- 4: Competitiveness and convergence in Portugal Jorge Braga de Macedo
- 5: Produtividade, Competitividade e Quotas de Exportação Jorge Santos
- 6: Export Diversification and Technological Improvement: Recent Trends in the Portuguese Economy Manuel Cabral
- 7: Election Results and Opportunistic Policies: An Integrated Approach Toke Aidt | Francisco Veiga | Linda Veiga
- 8: Behavioural Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment Ricardo Pinheiro-Alves
- 9: Structural Transformation and the role of Foreign Direct Investment in Portugal: a descriptive analysis for the period 1990-2005 Miguel de Freitas | Ricardo Mamede
- 10: Productive experience and specialization opportunities for Portugal: an empirical assessment Miguel de Freitas | Susana Salvado | Luis Nunes | Rui Costa Neves
- 11: The Portuguese Active Labour Market Policy during the period 1998-2003 - A Comprehensive Conditional Difference-In-Differences Application Alcina Nunes | Paulino Teixeira
- 12: Fiscal Policy in a Monetary Union: Gains from Changing Institutions Susana Salvado
- 13: Coordination and Stabilization Gains of Fiscal Policy in a Monetary Union Susana Salvado
- 14: The Relevance of Productive Experience in the Process of Economic Growth: an Empirical Study Diana Vieira

- 15: Employment and Exchange rates: the Role of Openness and Technology Fernando Alexandre | Pedro Bação | João Cerejeira | Miguel Portela
- 16: Aggregate and sector-specific exchange rate indexes for the Portuguese economy Fernando Alexandre | Pedro Bação | João Cerejeira | Miguel Portela
- 17: The Macroeconomic Determinants of Cross Border Mergers and Acquisitions and Greenfield Investments Paula Neto | Antonio Brandao | António Cerqueira
- 18: Does the location of manufacturing determine service sectors' location choices? Evidence from Portugal Nuno Crespo | Maria Paula Fontoura
- 19: A hipótese do Investment Development Path: Uma Abordagem por Dados em Painel. Os casos de Portugal e Espanha Miguel Fonseca | António Mendonça | José Passos
- 20: Outward FDI Effects on the Portuguese Trade Balance, 1996-2007 Miguel Fonseca | António Mendonça | José Passos
- 21: Sectoral and regional impacts of the European Carbon Market in Portugal Margarita Robaina Alves | Miguel Rodriguez | Catarina Roseta-Palma
- 22: Business Demography Dynamics in Portugal: A Non-Parametric Survival Analysis Alcina Nunes | Elsa Sarmento
- 23: Business Demography Dynamics in Portugal: A Semi-parametric Survival Analysis Alcina Nunes | Elsa Sarmento
- 24: Digging Out the PPP Hypothesis: an Integrated Empirical Coverage Miguel de Carvalho | Paulo Júlio
- 25: Regulação de Mercados por Licenciamento Patrícia Cerqueira | Ricardo Pinheiro Alves
- 26: Which Portuguese Manufacturing Firms Learn by Exporting? Armando Silva | Óscar Afonso | Ana Paula Africano
- 27: Building Bridges: Heterogeneous Jurisdictions, Endogenous Spillovers, and the Benefits of Decentralization Paulo Júlio | Susana Peralta





- 28: Análise comparativa de sobrevivência empresarial: o caso da região Norte de Portugal Elsa Sarmento | Alcina Nunes
- 29: Business creation in Portugal: Comparison between the World Bank data and Quadros de Pessoal Elsa Sarmento | Alcina Nunes
- 30: The Ease of Doing Business Index as a tool for Investment location decisions João Zambujal Oliveira | Ricardo Pinheiro Alves
- 31: The Politics of Growth: Can Lobbying Raise Growth and Welfare? Paulo Júlio
- 32: The choice of transport technology in the presence of exports and FDI José Pedro Ponte | Armando Garcia Pires
- 33: Tax Competition in an Expanding European Union

Ronald Davies | Johannes Voget

- 34: The usefulness of State trade missions for the internationalization of firms: an econometric analysis Ana Paula Africano | Aurora Teixeira | André Caiado
- 35: The role of subsidies for exports: Evidence from Portuguese manufacturing firms Armando Silva
- 36: Criação de empresas em Portugal e Espanha: análise comparativa com base nos dados do Banco Mundial Elsa Sarmento | Alcina Nunes
- 37: Economic performance and international trade engagement: the case of Portuguese manufacturing firms Armando Silva | Oscar Afonso | Ana Paula Africano
- 38: The importance of Intermediaries organizations in international R&D cooperation: an empirical multivariate study across Europe Aurora Teixeira | Margarida Catarino
- 39: Financial constraints, exports and monetary integration - Financial constraints and exports: An analysis of Portuguese firms during the European monetary integration Filipe Silva | Carlos Carreira
- 40: FDI and institutional reform in Portugal Paulo Júlio | Ricardo Pinheiro-Alves | José Tavares
- 41: Evaluating the forecast quality of GDP components
 Paulo Júlio | Pedro Esperança | João C. Fonseca
- 42: Assessing the Endogeneity of OCA conditions in EMU Carlos Vieira | Isabel Vieira

- 43: Labor Adjustment Dynamics: An Application of System GMM Pedro Esperanca
- 44: Corporate taxes and the location of FDI in Europe using firm-level data Tomás Silva | Sergio Lagoa
- 45: Public Debt Stabilization: Redistributive Delays versus Preemptive Anticipations Paulo Júlio
- 46: Organizational Characteristics and Performance of Export Promotion Agencies: Portugal and Ireland compared Inês Ferreira | Aurora Teixeira
- 47: Evaluating the forecast quality of GDP components: An application to G7 Paulo Júlio | Pedro Esperança
- 48: The influence of Doing Business' institutional variables in Foreign Direct Investment Andreia Olival
- 49: Regional and Sectoral Foreign Direct Investment in Portugal since Joining the EU: A Dynamic Portrait Irina Melo | Alexandra Lopes
- 50: Institutions and Firm Formation: an Empirical Analysis of Portuguese Municipalities Simão Arouca
- 51: Youth Unemployment in Southern Europe João Leão | Guida Nogueira
- 52: Financiamento da Economia Portuguesa: um Obstáculo ao Crescimento? João Leão | Ana Martins | João Gonçalves
- 53: O Acordo de Parceria Transatlântica entre a UE e os EUA constitui uma ameaça ou uma oportunidade para a Economia Portuguesa? João Leão | Guida Nogueira
- 54: Prescription Patterns of Pharmaceuticals Ana Gonçalves
- 55: Economic Growth and the High Skilled: the Role of Scale Eects and of Barriers to Entry into the High Tech Pedro Gil | Oscar Afonso | Paulo Brito
- 56: Finanças Públicas Portuguesas Sustentáveis no Estado Novo (1933-1974)? Ricardo Ferraz
- 57: What Determines Firm-level Export Capacity? Evidence from Portuguese firms Ana Gouveia | Ana Luisa Correia
- 58: The effect of developing countries' competition on regional labour markets in Portugal Tiago Pereira
- 59: Fiscal Multipliers in the 21st century Pedro Brinca | Hans Holter | Per Krusell | Laurence Malafry



the Tradable Sector

Inês Pereira

- 60: Reallocation of Resources between Tradable 75: Is All I and Non-Tradable Sectors in Portugal: The C Developing a new Identification Strategy for Alfree
- Ana Fontoura Gouveia | Filipa Canas 61: Is the ECB unconventional monetary policy effective?
- 62: The Determinants of TFP Growth in the Portuguese Manufacturing Sector Daniel Gonçalves | Ana Martins
- 63: Practical contribution for the assessment and monitoring of product market competition in the Portuguese Economy – estimation of price cost margins Luis Folque
- 64: The impact of structural reforms of the judicial system: a survey Ana Gouveia | Silvia Santos | Corinna Herber
- 65: The short-term impact of structural reforms on productivity growth: beyond direct effects Ana Gouveia | Silvia Santos | Inês Gonçalves
- 66: Assessing the Competitiveness of the Portuguese Footwear Sector Fábio Batista | José Matos | Miguel Matos
- 67: The empirics of agglomeration economies: the link with productivity Ana Gouveia | Silvia Santos | Marli Fernandes
- 68: Determinants of the Portuguese GDP stagnation during the 2001-2014 period: an empirical investigation Carlos Figueira
- 69: Short-run effects of product markets' deregulation: a more productive, more efficient and more resilient economy? Ana Gouveia | Silvia Santos | Gustavo Monteiro
- 70: Portugal: a Paradox in Productivity Ricardo Pinheiro Alves
- 71: Infrastructure Investment, Labor Productivity, and International Competitiveness: The Case of Portugal Alfredo Pereira | Rui Pereira
- 72: Boom, Slump, Sudden stops, Recovery, and Policy Options. Portugal and the Euro Olivier Blanchard | Pedro Portugal
- 73: Case Study: DBRS Sovereign Rating of Portugal. Analysis of Rating Methodology and Rating Decisions Annika Luisa Hofmann | Miguel Ferreira | João Lampreia
- 74: For Whom the Bell Tolls: Road Safety Effects of Tolls on Uncongested SCUT Highways in Portugal Alfredo Pereira | Rui Pereira | João Pereira dos Santos

75: Is All Infrastructure Investment Created Equal? The Case of Portugal Alfredo Pereira | Rui Pereira

REPÚBLICA PORTUGUESA

ECONOMIA

- 76: Why Virtuous Supply-Side Effects and Irrelevant Keynesian Effects are not Foregone Conclusions: What we Learn from an Industry-Level Analysis of Infrastructure Investments in Portugal Alfredo Pereira | Rui Pereira
- 77: The Role of Gravity Models in Estimating the Economic Impact of Brexit Graham Gudgin | Ken Coutts | Neil Gibson | Jordan Buchanan
- 78: Infrastructure Investment in Portugal and the Traded/Non-Traded Industry Mix Alfredo Pereira | Rui Pereira
- 79: Goods and Factor Market Integration: A Quantitative Assessment of the EU Enlargement Lorenzo Caliendo | Fernando Parro | Luca David Opromolla | Alessandro Sforza
- 80: Understanding productivity dynamics:a task taxonomy approach Tiago Fonseca | Francisco Lima | Sonia C. Pereira
- 81: On the Effects of Infrastructure Investments on Industrial CO2 Emissions in Portugal Alfredo Pereira | Rui Pereira
- 82: Assessing Competition With the Panzar-Rosse Model: An empirical analysis of European Union banking industry Suzana Cristina Silva Andrade
- 83: Health Care Investments and Economic Performance in Portugal: An Industry Level Analysis Alfredo Pereira | Rui Pereira | Pedro G. Rodrigues
- 84: Is deregulation of product and labour markets promoting employment and productivity? A difference-in-differences approach Hugo Correia | Ana Fontoura Gouveia
- 85: Foreign acquisition and internal organization Paulo Bastos | Natália P. Monteiro | Odd Rune Straume
- 86: Learning, Prices, and Firm Dynamics Paulo Bastos | Daniel A. Dias | Olga A. Timoshenko
- 87: The Diffusion of Knowledge via Managers' Mobility Giordano Mion | Luca David Opromolla | Alessandro Sforza
- 88: Empresas Zombie em Portugal Os sectores não transacionáveis da Construção e dos Serviços
 Gabriel Osório de Barros | Filipe Bento Caires | Dora Xarepe Pereira





- 89: Collective bargaining through the magnifying glass: A comparison between the Netherlands and Portugal Alexander Hijzen | Pedro Martins | Jante Parleyliet
- 90: A Lower VAT Rate on Electricity in Portugal: Towards a Cleaner Environment, Better Economic Performance, and Less Inequality Alfredo Pereira | Rui Manuel Pereira
- 91: Who Seeks Re-Election: Local Fiscal Restraints and Political Selection Susana Peralta | João Pereira dos Santos
- 92: Assessing the Competitiveness of the Metalworking Sector João Marinho | Pedro Carvalho
- 93: The efficiency of Portuguese Technology Transfer Offices and the importance of university characteristics Aurora Teixeira | André Monteiro
- 94: Persistence in innovation and innovative behavior in unstable environments Joana Costa | Anabela Botelho | Aurora Teixeira
- 95: The effect of entrepreneurial origin on firms' performance - The case of Portuguese academic spinoffs Natália Barbosa | Ana Paula Faria
- 96: Absorptive Capacity and Firms' Generation of Innovation - Revisiting Zahra and George's Model Dina Pereira | João Leitão
- 97: Innovations in digital government as business facilitators: implications for Portugal João Martins | Linda Veiga
- 98: Innovation and the economic downturn: Insights from Portuguese firms Hugo Pinto | Tiago Santos Pereira | Elvira Uyarra
- 99: European Funds and Firm Dynamics: Estimating Spillovers from Increased Access João Pereira dos Santos | José Tavares
- 100: Corporate Leverage and Investment in Portugal Ana Martins | José Henrique Gonçalves | João Mário Ferreira Duque
- 101: The effects of official and unofficial information on tax compliance Filomena Garcia | Luca David Opromolla | Andrea Vezzulli | Rafael Marques
- 102: Competition effect on innovation and productivity - The Portuguese case Anabela Santos | Michele Cincera | Paulo Neto | Maria Manuel Serrano
- 103: Measuring the Welfare of Intermediation in Vertical Markets Javier D. Donna | Pedro Pereira | Tiago Pires | Andre Trindade

- 104: Of course Collusion Should be Prosecuted. But Maybe... Or (The case for international antitrust agreements) Filomena Garcia | Jose Manuel Paz y Minõ | Gustavo Torrens
- 105: Product market competition and gender discrimination Dudley Cooke | Ana P. Fernandes | Priscila Ferreira
- 106: Integration of Small Technology-Based Firms in Aeronautics Anabela Reis | Joana Mendonça | Ligia Urbina
- 107: The Effects of Highway Tolls on Private Business Activity – Results from a Natural Experiment João Pereira dos Santos | David B. Audretsch | Dirk Dohse
- 108: Competition and Firm Productivity: Evidence from Portugal Pedro Carvalho
- 109: Do Exchange Traded Funds (ETFs) Outperform the Market? Evidence from the Portuguese Stock Index Carlos Manuel Pinheiro | Hugo Hilário Varela
- 110: Assessing the Competitiveness of the Portuguese Chemical Sector Ana Rita Margues | Cátia Silva
- 111: A General Equilibrium Theory of Occupational Choice under Optimistic Beliefs about Entrepreneurial Ability Michele Dell'Era | Luca David Opromolla | Luis Santos-Pinto
- 112: O Mercado Segurador em Portugal: O Papel dos Gestores na Constituição de Provisões Soraia de Sousa Bornett | Carlos Manuel Pinheiro
- 113: Exploring the implications of di erent loan-tovalue macroprudential policy designs Rita Basto | Sandra Gomes | Diana Lima
- 114: The Determinants of TFP Growth in the Portuguese Service Sector Ana Martins | Tiago Domingues | Catarina Branco
- 115: Agglomeration and Industry Spillover Effects in the Aftermath of a Credit Shock José Jorge | Joana Rocha
- 116: Entrepreneurial Human Capital and Firm Dynamics Francisco Queiró
- 117: Global Value Chains and Vertical Specialization: The case of Portuguese Textiles and Shoes exports Tiago Domingues
- 118: Firm heterogeneity and exports in Portugal: Identifying export potential Frederico Oliveira Torres





119: Vantagens Comparativas Reveladas e suas determinantes: Uma Aplicação à Economia Portuguesa Guida Nogueira | António Portugal Duarte

120: A Look at the main channels of Potential Impact of Brexit on the Portuguese Economy Guida Nogueira | Paulo Inácio

- 121: How internationalization and competitiveness contribute to get public support to innovation? The Portuguese case Anabela Santos, Michele Cincera, Paulo Neto | Maria Manuel Serrano
- 122: Grande Guerra e Guerra Colonial: Quanto Custaram aos Cofres Portugueses? Ricardo Ferraz
- 123: Financing a Renewable Energy Feed-in Tariff with a Tax on Carbon Dioxide Emissions: A Dynamic Multi-Sector General Equilibrium Analysis for Portugal Rui M. Pereira | Alfredo M. Pereira
- 124: Brown Sugar, how come you taste so good? The impact of a soda tax on prices and consumption Judite Gonçalves | João Pereira dos Santos
- 125: ARFIMA Reference Forecasts for Worldwide CO2 Emissions and the National Dimension of the Policy Efforts to Meet IPCC Targets José Beirute | Alfredo M. Pereira
- 126: Reference Forecasts for CO2 Emissions from Fossil-Fuel Combustion and Cement Production in Portugal José M. Belbute | Alfredo M. Pereira
- 127: Regulated Early Closures of Coal-Fired Power Plants and Tougher Energy Taxation on Electricity Production: Synergy or Rivalry? Alfredo Marvão Pereira | Rui Manuel Pereira
- 128: Picking Our Environmental Battles: Removal of Harmful Subsidies or Carbon Taxation? Alfredo Marvão Pereira | Rui Marvão Pereira
- 129: Financing Future Feed-in Tariffs from Currently Installed RES-E Generating Capacity Alfredo Marvão Pereira | Rui Marvão Pereira
- 130: Foreign Direct Investment, Income Inequality and Poverty in Portugal, 1973-2014: What does cointegration analysis tell us? Aurora Teixeira | Ana Sofia Loureiro
- 131: On the Spillover Effects of CO2 Taxation on the Emissions of other Air Pollutants Alfredo Marvão Pereira | Rui Marvão Pereira
- 132: On the Macroeconomic and Distributional Effects of the Regulated Closure of Coal-Operated Power Plants Alfredo Marvão Pereira | Rui Manuel Pereira
- 133: The China Shock and Employment in Portuguese Firms Lee Branstetter | Brian Kovak | Jacqueline Mauro | Ana Venâncio

- 134: Energy Taxation Reform with an Environmental Focus Alfredo Marvão Pereira | Rui Manuel Pereira
- 135: ARFIMA Reference Forecasts for Worldwide CO2 Emissions and the Need for Large and Frontloaded Decarbonization Policies José M. Belbute | Alfredo M. Pereira
- 136: Exporter Firms Behaviour, Evidence From Portuguese Firms Using Microdata Luís Pedro Manso Machado
- 137: Collateral Value and Entrepreneurship: Evidence from a Property Tax Reform Miguel Ferreira | João Pereira dos Santos | Ana Venâncio
- 138: The Financial Channels of Labor Rigidities: Evidence from Portugal Edoardo M. Acabbi | Ettore Panetti | Alessandro Sforza
- 139: Can a small leak sink a great ship? A comprehensive analysis of the Portuguese household savings Tiago Domingues | Margarida Castro Rego
- 140: Corporate taxes and high-quality entrepreneurship: evidence from a tax reform Ana Venâncio | Victor Barros | Clara Raposo
- 141: Built Like a House of Cards? Corporate Indebtedness and Productivity Growth in the Portuguese Construction Sector1 José Santos | Nuno Tavares | Gabriel Osório de Barros
- 142: Effectiveness of Simplex: The Case of Portuguese Social Security António Alberto Nifrário de Pinho Tavares
- 143: Digital innovation in higher education: A questionnaire to Portuguese universities and polytechnic institutes Paulo Nuno Vicente |Margarida Lucas | Vânia Carlos
- 144: Portugal in the Global Innovation Index: A panel data analysis Marcelo P. Duarte | Fernando M. P. O. Carvalho
- 145: Intangible investments and productivity performance Michele Cincera | Julie Delanote | Pierre Mohnen | Anabela Santos | Christoph Weiss
- 146: Digitalization in Two-sided Platform Competition Filomena Garcia | Muxin Li
- 147: Collusion between two-sided platforms Joana Pinho | Yassine Lefouili
- 148: Da confluência entre Big Data e Direito da Concorrência: As concentrações digitais - O caso Facebook/WhatsApp Ana Rodrigues Bidarra





- 149: The Determinants of Total Factor Productivity in the Portuguese Quaternary Sector Paulo Matos | Pedro Neves
- 150: Os modelos Input-Output, a estrutura setorial das economias e o impacto da crise da COVID 19 Pedro N. Ramos | João Ferreira | Luís Cruz | Eduardo Barata
- 151: Public Expenditure and private firm performance: using religious denominations for causal inference Henrique Alpalhão | Marta Lopes | João Santos| José Tavares
- 152: Employee Training and Firm Performance: Quasi-experimental evidence from the European Social Fund Pedro S. Martins
- 153: Dream Jobs Luca David Opromolla | Giordano Mion | Gianmarco I.P. Ottaviano
- 154: Minimum wage and financially distressed firms: another one bites the dust
 F. Alexandre | P. Bação | J. Cerejeira | H. Costa | M. Portela
- 155: Do short-term rentals increase housing prices? Quasi-experimental evidence from Lisbon Susana Peralta | João Pereira dos Santos | Duarte Goncalves
- 156: Economic and social policies under EMU Ricardo Pinheiro Alves
- 157: International Sourcing in Portuguese Companies - Evidence from Portuguese Micro Data Ana Martins | Guida Nogueira | Eva Pereira
- 158: The Impact of R&D tax incentives in Portugal Rita Bessone Basto | Ana Martins | Guida Nogueira
- 159: The Determinants of Competitiveness of the Portuguese Defense Industry Roxanne Merenda
- 160: How is the Minimum Wage Shaping the Wage Distribution: Bite, Spillovers, and Wage Inequality Carlos Oliveira
- 161: Macroeconomy Impacts of the Covid-19 Pandemic in Some European Union Countries: a Counterfactual Analysis António Portugal Duarte | Fátima Sol Murta
- 162: Digital adoption and productivity: understanding micro drivers of the aggregate effect Natália Barbosa | Ana Paula Faria
- 163: Job Creation and Destruction in the Digital Age: What about Portugal? Anabela M. Santos | Javier Barbero Jimenez | Simone Salotti | Andrea Conte

- 164: Is digital government facilitating entrepreneurship? A comparative statics analysis. Joana Costa | Luís Carvalho
- 165: Automation trends in Portugal: implications in productivity and employment Marta Candeias | Nuno Boavida | António Brandão Moniz
- 166: Digital Technologies for Urban Greening Public Policies Maria José Sousa
- 167: The impact of a rise in transportation costs on firm performance and behaviour Catarina Branco | Dirk C. Dohse | João Pereira dos Santos | José Tavares
- 168: Outward FDI, restructuring, performance upgrading and resilience: Firm-level evidence from Portugal Natália Barbosa
- 169: Firm adaptation in COVID-19 times: The case of Portuguese exporting firms João Capella-Ramos | Romina Guri
- 170: Supporting small firms through recessions and recoveries Diana Bonfim | Cláudia Custódio | Clara Raposo
- 171: The Credit Channel of Public Procurement Ricardo Duque Gabriel
- 172: Autonomia Estratégica Aberta na União Europeia: desafios e oportunidades na era da tecnologia digital Gabriel Osório de Barros | Catarina Castanheira Nunes
- 173: R&D subsidies and Portuguese firms' performance: A longitudinal firm-level study Inês Ferraz Teixeira | Aurora A.C. Teixeira | Luís Delfim Santos
- 174: Does scientific research output matter for Portugal's economic growth? Tânia Pinto | Aurora A.C. Teixeira
- 175: Science and productivity in European firms: How do regional innovation modes matter? Natália Barbosa | Ana Paula Faria
- 176: Employment versus Efficiency: Which Firms Should R&D Tax Credits Target? Anna Bernard | Rahim Lila | Joana Silva
- 177: Forging AI Pathways: Portugal's Journey within the EU Digital Landscape Gabriel Osório de Barros
- 178: Revisitar as Empresas Zombie em Portugal (2008-2021) Ricardo Pinheiro Alves | Nuno Tavares | Gabriel Osório de Barros
- 179: A dependência da União Europeia no lítio e nas baterias de ião-de-lítio: análise à luz da autonomia estratégica Beatriz Raichande





- 180: Artificial Intelligence in Agriculture: Revolutionizing Methods and Practices in Portugal Maria José Sousa
- 181: EU-funded investment in Artificial Intelligence and regional specialization Anabela Marques Santos, Francesco Molica e Carlos Torrecilla Salinas
- 182: Distance to Export: A Machine Learning Approach with Portuguese Firms Paulo Barbosa, João Cortes e João Amador
- 183: Artificial Intelligence and exporting performance: Firm-level evidence from Portugal Natália Barbosa
- 184: Inteligência Artificial Ética Contributos Interdisciplinares para a Ação Ana Cláudia Albergaria
- 185: Utilização de IA para previsão de desastres naturais em Portugal Pedro Gomes e Tiago Cardoso
- 186: Ethics and Responsibility in Artificial Intelligence: A Global Perspective and Portugal's AI Governance Ana Cristina Saraiva
- 187: Inteligência Artificial no setor da saúde: desafios jurídicos e regulação Marta da Paixão Cansado
- 188: Too Many Changes? Post-Displacement Job Mobility and Wages: an Analysis of Displaced Workers in Portugal Tiago Leitão, Laura Bartolomeu e Francesca di Biase
- 189: European Framework for Strategic Dependencies: insights from Portugal between 2019 and 2024 Guida Nogueira, Paulo Inácio e Joana Almodovar





