

Gendered Pathways in Youth Inclusion: Long-Term Experimental Evidence from Brazil's Protejo Program

Ricardo Paes de Barros Ciro Biderman Gabriel Weber Costa
Lycia Lima André Portela Souza

Amazon Week 2026

Brussels - June 2026



- 1 Motivation and institutional context
- 2 Protejo program and implementation
- 3 Experimental design and data
- 4 Empirical strategy
- 5 Main administrative results
- 6 Mechanisms from follow-up survey
- 7 Discussion and policy implications

- The paper studies a multidimensional youth program implemented in violent and socially excluded urban communities in Brazil.
- Protejo was part of PRONASCI and targeted youth aged 15–24 in vulnerable territories.
- The evaluation uses randomized selection of applicants in Rio de Janeiro and links applicants to administrative and survey data ten years later.

- Launched in 2008 under PRONASCI, coordinated through SENASP/Ministry of Justice.
- Combined: structured educational and civic activities; short vocational courses; and a monthly stipend of R\$100 conditional on attendance.
- Around 800 hours of structured activities over 12 months, usually four to five times per week.
- Implemented locally by civil-society organizations, often with municipalities.

- Implemented alongside Mulheres da Paz, which trained female community leaders in targeted areas.
- These women identified potential participants, encouraged attendance, and mediated between families, schools, and service networks.
- In the evaluation sample, 84% reported being referred by a Woman of Peace or another institution; two-thirds of referrals came directly from Mulheres da Paz.

- Lottery-based assignment of limited program slots in Rio de Janeiro in 2010.
- Randomization across 19 communities, stratified by gender, educational attainment, and vulnerability.
- 4,377 youth competed for limited slots in 128 strata; 1,945 were assigned to receive an initial offer.
- Treatment is defined using the initial offer, preserving experimental variation in a waiting-list design.

$$X_{is} = \alpha + \tau W_{is} + \mu_s + \varepsilon_{is} \quad (1)$$

- X_{is} : observed pre-treatment variable for individual i in stratum s .
- W_{is} : indicator for being selected by lottery assignment.
- μ_s : stratum fixed effect.

$$y_{is} = \alpha + \tau_{ITT} W_{is} + X'_{is} \beta + \mu_s + \varepsilon_{is}. \quad (2)$$

- τ_{ITT} is the effect of being offered access to Protejo.
- Robust standard errors clustered at the randomization-stratum level.

$$P_{is} = \alpha + \pi W_{is} + X'_{is}\beta + \mu_s + \varepsilon_{is}. \quad (3)$$

- P_{is} denotes program participation, measured with administrative stipend records.
- The LATE uses random assignment as an instrument for actual participation.

- Baseline application forms from October 2010.
- Mortality records from civil registration up to April 2019.
- RAIS matched employer–employee records for formal employment, 2010–2018.
- Bolsa Família records, 2013–2021, and Auxílio Emergencial in 2020.
- Follow-up survey two years after the 800-hour training cycle.

Table 1: Balancedness tests – full sample

Variable	Female				Male			
	N	Control	Diff. T-C	p-value	N	Control	Diff. T-C	p-value
Age	2787	17.50	-0.09	0.43	1573	16.67	0.12	0.24
Household size	2607	5.66	-1.35	0.14	1435	4.74	0.64	0.39
Pardo or black	2801	0.73	0.01	0.74	1576	0.72	0.00	0.93
Has a child	2730	0.19	0.01	0.53	1537	0.05	0.01	0.37
Attended school	2779	0.76	0.01	0.79	1565	0.86	-0.01	0.68
Satisfied with current educational level	2766	0.59	0.00	0.92	1557	0.62	0.02	0.45
Mother was alive	2793	0.96	-0.01	0.47	1567	0.96	0.01	0.54
Mother is literate	2651	0.89	-0.01	0.62	1462	0.92	-0.01	0.52
Referred by woman of peace	2801	0.52	-0.01	0.65	1576	0.43	0.01	0.76
Worked in August 2010	2722	0.11	0.01	0.46	1535	0.18	0.02	0.42
Self-esteem indicator	2793	0.64	-0.01	0.53	1574	0.63	0.02	0.40
Impulsivity indicator	2794	0.47	0.02	0.28	1572	0.45	-0.02	0.36
Victim of violence in the last year	2701	0.08	0.02	0.18	1534	0.09	-0.03	0.12
Ever had contact with drugs	2801	0.35	0.01	0.53	1576	0.38	0.00	0.92

Joint F test: female 0.73; male 0.42.

Table 1: Balancedness tests – low education

Variable	Female				Male			
	N	Control	Diff. T-C	p-value	N	Control	Diff. T-C	p-value
Age	1371	17.06	-0.17	0.27	887	16.14	0.08	0.56
Household size	1273	6.70	-2.25	0.18	818	4.86	0.78	0.45
Pardo or black	1379	0.75	0.02	0.44	888	0.74	-0.03	0.40
Has a child	1339	0.26	-0.01	0.60	865	0.06	-0.01	0.51
Attended school	1357	0.71	0.04	0.14	877	0.87	0.00	0.96
Satisfied with current educational level	1358	0.55	0.03	0.37	875	0.60	0.03	0.46
Mother was alive	1372	0.95	-0.02	0.27	881	0.97	-0.01	0.38
Mother is literate	1290	0.87	-0.02	0.27	812	0.90	-0.01	0.55
Referred by woman of peace	1379	0.50	0.01	0.68	888	0.37	0.03	0.43
Worked in August 2010	1335	0.12	0.02	0.40	860	0.22	0.00	0.99
Self-esteem indicator	1373	0.57	-0.02	0.50	887	0.58	0.00	0.91
Impulsivity indicator	1374	0.52	0.00	0.92	886	0.51	-0.04	0.13
Victim of violence in the last year	1325	0.11	0.02	0.37	869	0.10	-0.03	0.22
Ever had contact with drugs	1379	0.38	-0.01	0.75	888	0.37	-0.01	0.83

Joint F test: female 0.66; male 0.36.

Table 1: Balancedness tests – high education

Variable	Female				Male			
	N	Control	Diff. T-C	p-value	N	Control	Diff. T-C	p-value
Age	1416	17.80	0.01	0.93	686	17.16	0.17	0.29
Household size	1334	4.97	-0.23	0.18	617	4.63	0.48	0.66
Pardo or black	1422	0.72	-0.01	0.72	688	0.69	0.03	0.47
Has a child	1391	0.14	0.04	0.08	672	0.03	0.04	0.05
Attended school	1422	0.79	-0.04	0.17	688	0.86	-0.02	0.54
Satisfied with current educational level	1408	0.62	-0.04	0.25	682	0.63	0.01	0.74
Mother was alive	1421	0.97	0.00	0.73	686	0.95	0.03	0.14
Mother is literate	1361	0.91	0.01	0.48	650	0.93	-0.01	0.78
Referred by woman of peace	1422	0.53	-0.03	0.21	688	0.50	-0.01	0.66
Worked in August 2010	1387	0.11	0.00	0.88	675	0.14	0.04	0.19
Self-esteem indicator	1420	0.69	-0.01	0.85	687	0.69	0.04	0.27
Impulsivity indicator	1420	0.43	0.04	0.12	686	0.39	0.00	0.90
Victim of violence in the last year	1376	0.06	0.02	0.29	665	0.08	-0.02	0.36
Ever had contact with drugs	1422	0.33	0.04	0.19	688	0.40	0.00	0.95

Joint F test: female 0.74; male 0.34.

Table 2: ITT estimates on program participation

	Full sample	Low education	High education
Panel A: Females			
Lottery dummy	0.2543 (0.021) [0.000]	0.2234 (0.028) [0.000]	0.2896 (0.032) [0.000]
Control mean	0.3037	0.3196	0.2932
N. obs.	2801	1379	1422
Panel B: Males			
Lottery dummy	0.1676 (0.028) [0.000]	0.2022 (0.037) [0.000]	0.1228 (0.041) [0.003]
Control mean	0.3668	0.3172	0.4119
N. obs.	1576	888	688

Table 3: Participants vs nonparticipants: initial-offer treatment group

Variable	Female				Male			
	N	Non part.	Diff.	p-value	N	Non part.	Diff.	p-value
Age	972	17.77	-0.62	0.00	965	16.92	-0.38	0.01
Household size	901	4.69	0.03	0.85	877	4.59	1.97	0.20
Pardo or black	977	0.71	0.06	0.06	968	0.75	-0.05	0.12
Has a child	947	0.32	-0.11	0.00	942	0.09	-0.04	0.06
Attended school	969	0.65	0.11	0.00	961	0.78	0.09	0.00
Satisfied with current educational level	965	0.51	0.08	0.03	957	0.59	0.05	0.14
Mother was alive	972	0.91	0.02	0.21	959	0.94	0.02	0.15
Mother is literate	912	0.85	0.01	0.64	885	0.87	0.06	0.01
Referred by woman of peace	977	0.57	0.04	0.17	968	0.57	0.08	0.01
Worked in August 2010	951	0.16	-0.05	0.03	939	0.25	-0.05	0.06
Self-esteem indicator	973	0.55	0.04	0.28	966	0.59	0.03	0.34
Impulsivity indicator	974	0.54	-0.03	0.33	965	0.52	-0.06	0.02
Victim of violence in the last year	948	0.19	-0.04	0.07	938	0.16	-0.02	0.32
Ever had contact with drugs	977	0.43	-0.08	0.02	968	0.49	-0.11	0.00

Table 3: Participants vs nonparticipants: initial-offer control group

Variable	Female				Male			
	N	Non part.	Diff.	p-value	N	Non part.	Diff.	p-value
Age	1815	17.63	-0.47	0.00	608	16.80	-0.47	0.00
Household size	1706	5.69	-0.61	0.54	558	4.98	-0.34	0.11
Pardo or black	1824	0.73	0.01	0.68	608	0.70	0.04	0.33
Has a child	1783	0.20	-0.05	0.01	595	0.05	-0.02	0.23
Attended school	1810	0.75	0.07	0.00	604	0.84	0.09	0.01
Satisfied with current educational level	1801	0.56	0.09	0.00	600	0.60	0.04	0.32
Mother was alive	1821	0.95	0.02	0.06	608	0.96	0.00	0.82
Mother is literate	1739	0.89	0.01	0.59	577	0.91	0.01	0.59
Referred by woman of peace	1824	0.49	0.06	0.00	608	0.39	0.07	0.04
Worked in August 2010	1771	0.11	-0.01	0.37	596	0.20	-0.07	0.04
Self-esteem indicator	1820	0.64	0.01	0.59	608	0.64	-0.05	0.26
Impulsivity indicator	1820	0.47	-0.03	0.18	607	0.46	-0.03	0.44
Victim of violence in the last year	1753	0.08	0.01	0.54	596	0.10	-0.02	0.37
Ever had contact with drugs	1824	0.36	-0.05	0.05	608	0.39	0.00	0.97

Table 4: ITT estimates on formal employment

	Female			Male		
	2011–2018	2011–2014	2015–2018	2011–2018	2011–2014	2015–2018
Panel A: Full sample						
Lottery dummy	-0.0264 (0.022) [0.224]	-0.0289 (0.021) [0.178]	0.0064 (0.021) [0.762]	0.0556 (0.028) [0.050]	0.0566 (0.028) [0.042]	0.0656 (0.028) [0.021]
Adj. p-value	0.3067	0.3067	0.7582	0.0629	0.0629	0.0410
Control mean	0.5005	0.4309	0.3931	0.4852	0.4112	0.4046
N. obs.	2801	2801	2801	1576	1576	1576
Panel B: Low education						
Lottery dummy	-0.0196 (0.029) [0.498]	-0.0238 (0.028) [0.400]	-0.0035 (0.028) [0.899]	0.0616 (0.039) [0.119]	0.0683 (0.038) [0.073]	0.064 (0.039) [0.102]
Control mean	0.4636	0.3868	0.3676	0.4621	0.3621	0.3966
N. obs.	1379	1379	1379	888	888	888
Panel C: High education						
Lottery dummy	-0.0425 (0.033) [0.197]	-0.0376 (0.033) [0.253]	0.0092 (0.033) [0.776]	0.0448 (0.041) [0.275]	0.0452 (0.041) [0.268]	0.0682 (0.042) [0.101]
Control mean	0.5251	0.4603	0.4100	0.5063	0.4560	0.4119
N. obs.	1422	1422	1422	688	688	688

Table 5: LATE estimates on formal employment

	Female		Male	
	At least 1 stipend	7+ stipends	At least 1 stipend	7+ stipends
Panel A: Full sample				
Treatment dummy	-0.1037 (0.086) [0.229]	-0.1808 (0.152) [0.235]	0.3316 (0.175) [0.059]	0.5246 (0.287) [0.068]
Control mean	0.5005	0.5005	0.4852	0.4852
N. obs.	2801	2801	1576	1576
First stage coef.	0.2543	0.1459	0.1676	0.1059
F test	144.23	55.87	36.79	17.53
Panel B: Low education				
Treatment dummy	-0.0875 (0.131) [0.503]	-0.1752 (0.265) [0.509]	0.3047 (0.201) [0.129]	0.4944 (0.338) [0.144]
First stage coef.	0.2234	0.1117	0.2022	0.1246
F test	62.30	18.96	29.47	12.17
Panel C: High education				
Treatment dummy	-0.1469 (0.115) [0.203]	-0.2318 (0.185) [0.210]	0.3645 (0.349) [0.297]	0.5188 (0.506) [0.306]
First stage coef.	0.2896	0.1835	0.1228	0.0863
F test	82.46	37.8	9.06	5.65

Table 6: ITT estimates on welfare receipt – female

	AE	Ever BF	BF 2013–14	BF 2015–18	BF 2019–21
Panel A: Full sample					
Lottery dummy	-0.0056 (0.021) [0.794]	0.0171 (0.021) [0.414]	-0.0182 (0.017) [0.290]	0.0306 (0.021) [0.140]	0.0136 (0.021) [0.517]
Control mean	0.4375	0.4633	0.2056	0.3849	0.3553
N. obs.	2801	2801	2801	2801	2801
Panel B: Low education					
Lottery dummy	0.0327 (0.029) [0.260]	0.0473 (0.028) [0.089]	-0.0041 (0.024) [0.865]	0.0531 (0.028) [0.060]	0.0462 (0.028) [0.105]
Control mean	0.4897	0.5117	0.2346	0.4376	0.4088
N. obs.	1379	1379	1379	1379	1379
Panel C: High education					
Lottery dummy	-0.0495 (0.032) [0.121]	-0.0181 (0.032) [0.572]	-0.0340 (0.025) [0.171]	0.0026 (0.031) [0.933]	-0.0199 (0.031) [0.523]
Control mean	0.4027	0.4311	0.1863	0.3498	0.3196
N. obs.	1422	1422	1422	1422	1422

Table 6: ITT estimates on welfare receipt – male

	AE	Ever BF	BF 2013–14	BF 2015–18	BF 2019–21
Panel A: Full sample					
Lottery dummy	0.0394 (0.024) [0.105]	0.0164 (0.017) [0.346]	0.0023 (0.009) [0.800]	0.0086 (0.014) [0.546]	0.0101 (0.014) [0.481]
Control mean	0.2122	0.0938	0.0247	0.0576	0.0625
N. obs.	1576	1576	1576	1576	1576
Panel B: Low education					
Lottery dummy	0.0295 (0.035) [0.396]	0.0041 (0.024) [0.863]	0.0172 (0.012) [0.146]	0.0073 (0.020) [0.716]	-0.0113 (0.021) [0.591]
Control mean	0.2172	0.1000	0.0241	0.0655	0.0759
N. obs.	888	888	888	888	888
Panel C: High education					
Lottery dummy	0.0533 (0.034) [0.122]	0.0343 (0.025) [0.170]	-0.0108 (0.014) [0.436]	0.0139 (0.019) [0.476]	0.0387 (0.019) [0.042]
Control mean	0.2075	0.0881	0.0252	0.0503	0.0503
N. obs.	688	688	688	688	688

Table 7: ITT estimates on family formation outcomes

	Female					Male				
	Children	Married	Single	Marr.+child	Single parent	Children	Married	Single	Marr.+child	Single parent
Panel A: Full sample										
Lottery dummy	0.0646 (0.025) [0.010]	0.0120 (0.025) [0.635]	-0.0104 (0.027) [0.703]	0.0113 (0.018) [0.539]	0.0457 (0.018) [0.010]	0.0150 (0.020) [0.461]	0.0228 (0.022) [0.309]	-0.0168 (0.023) [0.463]	0.0241 (0.015) [0.108]	-0.0072 (0.014) [0.603]
Control mean	0.1876	0.2158	0.6792	0.0919	0.0732	0.0729	0.0758	0.9155	0.0262	0.0437
N. obs.	1101	1101	1101	1101	1101	678	678	678	678	678
Panel B: Low education										
Lottery dummy	0.0655 (0.034) [0.055]	0.0217 (0.034) [0.520]	-0.0049 (0.036) [0.891]	-0.0005 (0.026) [0.984]	0.0609 (0.024) [0.013]	0.0083 (0.031) [0.789]	0.0572 (0.035) [0.102]	-0.0463 (0.035) [0.191]	0.0235 (0.023) [0.314]	-0.0152 (0.022) [0.480]
Control mean	0.2188	0.2344	0.6438	0.1156	0.0813	0.0944	0.0889	0.9000	0.0333	0.0611
N. obs.	671	671	671	671	671	353	353	353	353	353
Panel C: High education										
Lottery dummy	0.0602 (0.038) [0.110]	-0.0072 (0.037) [0.847]	-0.0048 (0.041) [0.906]	0.0243 (0.024) [0.321]	0.0250 (0.026) [0.339]	0.0112 (0.026) [0.662]	-0.0084 (0.027) [0.758]	0.0114 (0.028) [0.679]	0.0220 (0.020) [0.276]	-0.0032 (0.017) [0.849]
Control mean	0.1408	0.1878	0.7324	0.0563	0.0610	0.0491	0.0613	0.9325	0.0184	0.0245
N. obs.	430	430	430	430	430	325	325	325	325	325

Table 8: ITT estimates on educational outcomes – female

	Appr.	Failed	Dropout	No attend	Satisfied	Technical	Undergrad	Graduate
Panel A: Full sample								
Lottery dummy	-0.0296	0.0336	-0.0428	0.0388	0.0130	-0.0077	-0.0047	-0.0080
SE	(0.027)	(0.015)	(0.019)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.013)	(0.029)	(0.024)
p-value	[0.277]	[0.026]	[0.026]	[0.149]	[0.656]	[0.560]	[0.869]	[0.742]
Control mean	0.3921	0.0525	0.1295	0.4259	0.4784	0.0507	0.4991	0.2364
Panel B: Low education								
Lottery dummy	-0.0510	0.0503	-0.0608	0.0615	-0.0118	-0.0012	-0.0251	0.0114
SE	(0.034)	(0.022)	(0.028)	(0.033)	(0.038)	(0.016)	(0.037)	(0.030)
p-value	[0.134]	[0.024]	[0.033]	[0.062]	[0.754]	[0.944]	[0.493]	[0.701]
Control mean	0.3719	0.0656	0.1844	0.3781	0.4969	0.0437	0.4781	0.1750
Panel C: High education								
Lottery dummy	-0.0143	-0.0075	-0.0114	0.0331	0.0496	-0.0243	0.0163	-0.0464
SE	(0.046)	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.046)	(0.048)	(0.022)	(0.047)	(0.043)
p-value	[0.757]	[0.686]	[0.591]	[0.469]	[0.299]	[0.276]	[0.729]	[0.283]
Control mean	0.4225	0.0329	0.0469	0.4977	0.4507	0.0610	0.5305	0.3286

Table 8: ITT estimates on educational outcomes – male

	Appr.	Failed	Dropout	No attend	Satisfied	Technical	Undergrad	Graduate
Panel A: Full sample								
Lottery dummy	0.0040	0.0049	0.0095	-0.0180	-0.0779	0.0194	0.0827	-0.0299
SE	(0.036)	(0.022)	(0.026)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.019)	(0.037)	(0.031)
p-value	[0.911]	[0.824]	[0.714]	[0.589]	[0.033]	[0.315]	[0.027]	[0.328]
Control mean	0.4402	0.0845	0.1224	0.3528	0.5773	0.0583	0.4140	0.2245
Panel B: Low education								
Lottery dummy	-0.0292	0.0269	-0.0231	0.0255	-0.1170	-0.0247	0.1485	-0.0189
SE	(0.052)	(0.037)	(0.041)	(0.044)	(0.053)	(0.027)	(0.051)	(0.039)
p-value	[0.572]	[0.463]	[0.573]	[0.565]	[0.027]	[0.359]	[0.004]	[0.633]
Control mean	0.4722	0.1056	0.1722	0.2500	0.5944	0.0722	0.3389	0.1611
Panel C: High education								
Lottery dummy	0.0441	-0.0191	0.0484	-0.0740	-0.0440	0.0532	0.0285	-0.0528
SE	(0.052)	(0.024)	(0.033)	(0.053)	(0.052)	(0.029)	(0.055)	(0.048)
p-value	[0.398]	[0.423]	[0.141]	[0.164]	[0.395]	[0.064]	[0.604]	[0.273]
Control mean	0.4049	0.0613	0.0675	0.4663	0.5583	0.0429	0.4969	0.2945

Table 9: ITT estimates on soft skills – female

	Extra.	Agree.	Consc.	Neuro.	Open.	Self-esteem	Impuls.	Criticism
Panel A: Full sample								
Lottery dummy	-0.1154	-0.0569	-0.0463	-0.0200	-0.1045	0.0185	0.0491	-0.0129
SE	(0.061)	(0.058)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.057)	(0.060)	(0.059)
p-value	[0.057]	[0.326]	[0.435]	[0.736]	[0.075]	[0.746]	[0.416]	[0.827]
Control mean	0.0002	0.0062	0.0275	0.2116	0.0500	-0.0206	0.0561	0.0117
Panel B: Low education								
Lottery dummy	-0.1950	-0.0404	-0.0686	0.0010	-0.1421	0.0088	0.1499	-0.0294
SE	(0.079)	(0.074)	(0.078)	(0.080)	(0.078)	(0.075)	(0.081)	(0.075)
p-value	[0.013]	[0.583]	[0.382]	[0.990]	[0.070]	[0.907]	[0.063]	[0.697]
Control mean	0.0350	0.0117	0.0322	0.2662	0.0525	-0.1158	0.0639	0.0499
Panel C: High education								
Lottery dummy	-0.0370	-0.0955	-0.0140	-0.0630	-0.0767	0.0103	-0.0721	0.0377
SE	(0.098)	(0.095)	(0.092)	(0.087)	(0.092)	(0.089)	(0.089)	(0.095)
p-value	[0.707]	[0.316]	[0.879]	[0.469]	[0.403]	[0.908]	[0.421]	[0.693]
Control mean	-0.0521	-0.0020	0.0205	0.1295	0.0462	0.1224	0.0444	-0.0457

Table 9: ITT estimates on soft skills – male

	Extra.	Agree.	Consc.	Neuro.	Open.	Self-esteem	Impuls.	Criticism
Panel A: Full sample								
Lottery dummy	0.0096	0.0996	0.0652	0.0729	-0.0040	0.0449	-0.0070	0.0511
SE	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.074)	(0.074)	(0.075)	(0.073)	(0.076)	(0.076)
p-value	[0.900]	[0.189]	[0.378]	[0.323]	[0.958]	[0.536]	[0.927]	[0.502]
Control mean	-0.0003	-0.0097	-0.0427	-0.3290	-0.0777	0.0320	-0.0871	-0.0182
Panel B: Low education								
Lottery dummy	0.0495	0.0628	0.1263	0.1097	-0.0650	-0.0197	0.0032	0.2818
SE	(0.102)	(0.109)	(0.111)	(0.112)	(0.107)	(0.107)	(0.114)	(0.109)
p-value	[0.630]	[0.566]	[0.257]	[0.326]	[0.545]	[0.853]	[0.977]	[0.010]
Control mean	-0.0555	-0.0304	-0.1259	-0.2470	-0.0437	-0.0103	-0.0249	-0.0725
Panel C: High education								
Lottery dummy	-0.0313	0.1243	0.0317	0.0445	0.0827	0.1298	-0.0309	-0.1729
SE	(0.117)	(0.104)	(0.100)	(0.100)	(0.107)	(0.099)	(0.102)	(0.102)
p-value	[0.788]	[0.235]	[0.750]	[0.658]	[0.441]	[0.189]	[0.762]	[0.092]
Control mean	0.0607	0.0132	0.0491	-0.4190	-0.1152	0.0788	-0.1559	0.0418

Table 10: Incidence rate ratio estimates on deaths up to 2019

	All	Female	Male
Lottery dummy	2.7147 (0.529) [0.059]	2.0846 (0.691) [0.288]	4.6825 (1.036) [0.137]
Control mean	0.0025	0.0027	0.0016
N. obs.	4377	2801	1576

Negative binomial regressions with strata fixed effects and pre-intervention covariates.

- Men offered Protejo show large and persistent formal-employment gains.
- Women do not show formal-employment gains.
- Lower-education women display increased Bolsa Família receipt in later periods.
- Survey evidence shows higher fertility and single parenthood among women, especially lower-education women.
- Mortality estimates are imprecise because deaths are rare, but point estimates are positive rather than negative.

- For men, structured engagement may have supported work readiness and institutional attachment.
- For women, the institutional configuration and community intermediaries may have shifted trajectories toward family formation and welfare-oriented pathways rather than labor-market participation.
- The paper emphasizes that youth programs designed as gender-neutral can produce gendered outcomes once implemented through community-based delivery structures and existing social norms.

- Protejo provides rare long-term experimental evidence from a large-scale youth inclusion program in high-violence communities.
- The intervention generated sustained formal-employment gains for men.
- Effects for women occurred mainly in family and social-assistance domains.
- Program design, delivery arrangements, community intermediaries, and gendered responses are central for policy interpretation.