

## Appendix A

**Table A1.** Main results of previous literature on SF effects

Research by	Covered period	Units	Econometric method applied	Outcome variable	Main result
Becker et al. (2010)	1989-1993, 1994-1999, 2000-2006	NUTS2 (193-285) and NUTS3 (1015-1213) regions (EU-25)	Cross sectional and panel: difference-in-difference regression discontinuity design (DID-RDD)	Economic and employment growth	Small and positive impact on economic growth, which is robust to period choice and estimation methods, applied. The significant positive effect on employment appears only in the 2000-2006 programming period
Mohl and Hagen (2010)	2000-2006	126 NUTS-1/ NUTS-2 regions (EU-6)	Spatial econometric estimator, GMM estimator	Economic growth	Positive and statistically significant impact on the economic growth. Regional spillovers do have a significant impact on the regional growth rates irrespective of which Objective and time lag is analysed
Kyriacou, Roca-Sagalés (2012)	1994-1999 and 2000-2006	14 EU countries Country-level	Feasible General Least Squares (FGLS), Seemingly Unrelated Regression (SUR)	Convergence	Positive impact on convergence and depends on the level of transfer intensity
Becker et al. (2013)	1989-1993, 1994-1999, 2000-2006	186-251 NUTS 2 regions (EU-25)	Cross sectional: a fuzzy regression discontinuity design (RDD)+HLATE	Economic growth	Positive impact on economic growth only on about 30% of the regions. While the treatment effect is insignificant for regions with a very low level of absorptive capacity.
Pellegrini et al. (2013)	1994-1999, 2000-2006	NUTS-2 regions (EU-15)	Regression discontinuity design (RDD)	Economic growth	Positive impact on economic growth.
Rodriguez-Pose and Novak (2013)	1994-1999 and 2000-2006	133 (EU15) NUTS-1/NUTS-2 regions	Heteroscedasticity-robust fixed effects	Economic growth	Impact of SF on economic growth is insignificant
Accetturo et al. (2014)	2000-2006	NUTS-2 level	Regression discontinuity design (RDD)	Local endowments of trust and cooperation	The transfers reduce local endowments of trust and cooperation.
Fratesi and Perucca (2014)	2004-2006	NUTS-3 regions (10 CEE countries)	Ordinary Least Squares (OLS)	Economic growth	Regional policy is not much effective per se, but effectiveness depend on “territorial capital”.
Pihno et al. (2015a)	1995 – 1999, 2000 – 2006 and 2007 – 2009	92 EU 12 NUTS 1 and NUTS 2 regions	Growth model by FE with Driscoll and Kraay’s correction	Economic growth	Positive impact on economic growth in richer, highly-educated and more innovative regions
Rodriguez-Pose and Garcilazo (2015)	1996-2007	169 European NUTS-1/NUTS-2 regions	Two-way fixed effect panel regression model	Economic growth	Positive impact on regional economic growth, but that above a threshold of cohesion expenditure
Dotti (2016)	2000-2006	NUTS 2 regions in France, Italy and Spain; and NUTS 1 in Germany and UK	Correlation analysis	Economic growth	SF support can lead to regional economic growth and productivity growth, but it depends on the effective distribution of SF, that is linked to political behaviour.
Pellegrini and Cerqua (2016)	1994-1999, 2000-2006, 2007-2013	208 NUTS-2 regions (EU-15)	Counterfactual causal analysis and RDD model	Economic growth	Positive effect on economic growth. However, the effect depends on the intensity of transfers.
Di Cataldo (2017)	1994-1999, 2000-2006, 2007-2013	Two UK NUTS-2 regions: 134 wards of Cornwall and the 94 wards of South Yorkshire	Synthetic control method, difference-in-differences (DID) model	Economic growth and unemployment	Positive impact on reduction of unemployment and on the promotion of economic growth, but this effect depends on funding intensity.
Gagliardi and Percoco (2017)	2000-2006	NUTS 2 regions in EU15 and EU27	Regression discontinuity design (RDD)	Economic growth	SF (expressed as ERDF plus ESF) and CF taken together have positive effect on regional growth. However, the effect depends on the intensity of transfers. Moreover, the effect for EU15 regions is lower comparing with EU27.

Gagliardi and Percoco (2017)	2000-2006	257 NUTS-2 and 1233 NUTS-3 regions (EU-15, EU-10)	Ordinary Least Squares (OLS)	Economic growth	Positive effect on economic growth in lagging regions.
Pontarollo (2017)	2000-2006	202 regions in EU15	Semi-parametric model	Economic growth, productivity	SF support effect depends on intervention area. Expenditure on infrastructure had positive impact on GVA per worker growth, but had a weakly negative impact on per capita GDP growth. Expenditure on human capital had positive impact on per capita GDP growth, but did not have significant impact on GVA per worker growth.
Becker et al. (2018)	1989-1993, 1994-1999, 2000-2006, 2007-2013	NUTS-2 regions (187 in 1989-93, 209 in 1994-99, 253 in 2000-06, and 253 in 2007-2013) of EU-25	A fuzzy regression discontinuity design (RDD)	Economic growth	Positive impact on economic growth is though not very long-lived: the effects of losing. The effects on economic growth are weaker during the Crisis than before.