Effect of sanctions on economic security

Sanctions significantly undermine economic security by exacerbating poverty, inequality, and employment losses while disrupting trade, foreign direct investment (FDI), and GDP growth. Comprehensive sanctions have harmful effect on trade-dependent and labor-abundant economies.

Geographical scope: Global, Europe and Central Asia, Middle East and North Africa, Sub Saharan Africa, South Asia

Effect size: Harmful effect (g=-0.001)

Confidence in study findings: Medium (21 studies with 71 effect sizes)

Short summary

Sanctions—comprehensive and targeted—exert economic pressure by restricting trade, financial systems, and aid. However, they frequently harm economic security, leading to increased poverty, inequality, and employment declines, particularly in trade-reliant industries. Comprehensive sanctions disrupt GDP growth, FDI, and trade flows, with spillover effects on neighboring economies (e.g., CIS countries due to Russia's downturn). Financial sanctions exacerbate income inequality and firm-level declines in revenue and employment, while authoritarian regimes often respond with increased economic control, further misallocating resources. Although targeted sanctions aim to minimize collateral damage, evidence consistently highlights their broader adverse effects on economic stability and security.

Long summary

The intervention

Sanctions are coercive economic measures imposed by states or international bodies to influence target countries' behavior. These sanctions can be comprehensive, affecting entire economies, or targeted, aimed at specific sectors, entities, or individuals. Sanctions include financial restrictions, trade bans, export/import limitations, and aid suspensions. Implementing bodies often include the United Nations, the United States, the European Union, and regional alliances like the Arab League. Sanctions often last for prolonged periods, ranging from years to decades, significantly impacting countries reliant on trade, financial markets, and foreign investments.

How the intervention is expected to affect this outcome

Sanctions are designed to exert economic pressure on target states to encourage compliance with political, security, or human rights objectives. However, they frequently undermine economic security, worsening poverty, inequality, employment, and trade. Trade sanctions limit access to international markets, reducing economic output and disrupting employment in sectors reliant on trade or imported inputs. Financial sanctions restrict access to global financial systems, diminishing investment and depleting capital flows. Targeted sanctions, while designed to minimize collateral damage, often impact broader economic sectors through spillover effects. In addition, governments under sanctions may consolidate economic control, leading to resource misallocation and predatory economic practices, which further harm economic stability.

The evidence base

This cell includes 21 impact evaluations, and the evidence consistently points out on the harmful effect of sanctions on economic security. Most of the studies are rated with medium confidence.

All the studies relied on secondary data, with some analyzing global datasets before narrowing their focus to target states (8), authoritarian regimes (1), and developing economies (1). Two studies specifically examined sanctions imposed jointly by the U.S. and U.N. in target states (2), while three studies explored the broader implications of U.S. sanctions across all target economies (3). Several studies focused on the effects of sanctions on individual economies, including Burundi (1), Syria (1), and Iran (1), with additional analyses on EU-imposed (1) and UN-imposed sanctions on Iran (1). Further studies investigated sanctions on Russia (2), covering both general sanctions and those imposed by the U.S. and EU, as well as sanctions on Myanmar (1) under U.S. and EU measures. One study examined Israel's dual-use list sanctions on the West Bank and Gaza Strip (1).

Evidence findings

Sanctions have a detrimental effect on economic security. Evidence suggests that sanctions increase income inequality and poverty, especially in labor-abundant economies or countries heavily reliant on aid and trade. Employment declines significantly, especially in industries dependent on imported inputs. Comprehensive sanctions have the most harmful effects, severely disrupting trade, FDI, and GDP growth. Financial sanctions, while targeted, exacerbate economic disparities and reduce firms' performance, leading to declines in revenue, asset value, and employment. Sanctions also create spillover effects on neighboring economies, as seen in the CIS, where Russia's downturn reduced GDP growth and trade across the region. In authoritarian regimes, sanctions increase state control over economies, restricting economic freedoms and prompting resource predation. Though sanctions may achieve political objectives in isolated cases, they often exacerbate economic vulnerabilities, undermining economic security in both direct and indirect ways.

Included studies

Afesorgbor and Mahadevan (2016) examine the impact of economic sanctions, both comprehensive and targeted, on income inequality in target states. The study utilized a panel dataset covering 68 target states between 1960 and 2008. The key dependent variable is income inequality, measured through Gini coefficients from two datasets: SWIID (Standardized World Income Inequality Database) and UNU-WIDER. Economic sanctions are the primary independent variable, categorized into financial sanctions, trade sanctions (exports and imports), and combinations thereof. Fixed-effects regression models, robustness checks, and generalized method of moments (GMM) were applied to address endogeneity and omitted variable bias. The study finds that economic sanctions significantly increase income inequality, with Gini coefficients rising by 1.5–1.7 points on average during sanction periods. Longer sanctions were found to worsen inequality more. Across sanction types, financial sanctions were found to have the most harmful effects. The study is rated medium as it is non-experimental and due to its partial description of the intervention.

Ahn (2019) examines the economic impact of targeted sanctions imposed by the United States and European Union on Russian entities following the 2014 Ukraine crisis. It aims to evaluate whether targeted sanctions effectively harm their intended targets while minimizing collateral damage, particularly to the broader Russian economy and neighboring countries. The study utilizes firm-level data from the Orbis database. The analysis tracked the performance of firms for over three years (i.e., 2013-2015). Key metrics include operating revenue, asset value, and employee numbers. The study employs the difference-in-differences (DID) analysis, to compare the economic performance of sanction-targeted countries to a control group of countries that were not subject to sanctions, before and after

sanctions were imposed. The findings suggest that targeted sanctions have a statistically significant negative impact on the economic performance of target states. For one, sanctioned firms experienced a significant average decline: 30% in operating revenue, 55% in asset value, and 30% in employment compared to non-sanctioned peers. Sanctions' overall macroeconomic impact on Russia's GDP was modest, contributing about 1% to the observed economic decline. The study is rated low confidence due its inadequate description of the evaluation questions.

Amodio et al. (2021) examine the impact of security-motivated trade restrictions, specifically the dual-use list imposed by Israel, on political violence in the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT), which include the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The dual-use list restricts the import of goods that can be used for both civilian and military purposes, affecting sectors that rely heavily on these inputs. The context is the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict, with the West Bank being subject to these restrictions since 2008. The research employs a difference-in-differences strategy to compare economic and political outcomes across sectors and localities based on their intensity in dual-use inputs. The study uses data from a repeated cross-section of approximately 33,000 Palestinian manufacturing establishments surveyed from 1999 to 2012. It also incorporates data on political violence from the Integrated Crisis Early Warning System (ICEWS) dataset, covering events from 1999 to 2012. The analysis focuses on the West Bank, with the Gaza Strip serving as a placebo due to its complete blockade during the study period.The study finds that the dual-use list led to a 4.6% loss in the total value of manufacturing output in the West Bank from 2008 to 2012. Sectors more intensive in dual-use inputs experienced a significant decrease in output value and wages, with a 22% differential fall in sectoral wages. The study is rated as medium confidence as it is a non-experimental study.

Apergis & Cooray (2019) examine the impact of human rights on income distribution and poverty, focusing on how aid and trade can influence these outcomes through human rights. The context involves 125 countries across various regions, including Eastern Europe, Central Asia, the Middle East, North Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean, East Asia, the Pacific, South Asia, Africa, and high-income OECD countries. The study aims to understand the relationship between human rights violations and income inequality and poverty, considering the role of trade and aid as channels through which human rights conditions may affect poverty. The study employs a panel data approach using annual data from 1990 to 2014. It utilizes the generalized method of moments (GMM) estimation method to address potential endogeneity bias. The analysis includes various control variables such as per capita income, school enrollment, government expenditure, corruption, population, and political regime quality. The study uses two measures of human rights: the Cingrenelli-Richards (CIRI) Physical Integrity Rights Index and the Political Terror Scale (PTS). The findings suggest that stronger human rights records contribute to greater income equality and poverty reduction. The interaction of human rights with official development assistance (ODA) and trade flows shows that as these increase, or as human rights records improve, both ODA and trade flows reduce poverty and lead to greater income equality. The results are particularly strong for African countries, followed by the Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe. The study is rated as low confidence as attrition was not reported.

Choi (2014) examines the impact of economic sanctions on international terrorism, highlighting how sanctions, often used by major powers to influence the policies of target economies, can unintentionally harm vulnerable groups within those countries. Economic sanctions are described as a foreign policy tool used by governments to pressure target countries into political or behavioral changes, such as promoting democracy or human rights. The study uses cross-sectional, time-series data, drawing on information about economic sanctions from Hufbauer et al. (2008) and terrorism incidents from the ITERATE and GTD databases. The analysis begins with a negative binomial regression model to evaluate the relationship between sanctions and terrorism. To address endogeneity, a two-step model is

introduced: economic sanctions are first examined as a cause of poverty, and then predicted poverty levels are used to assess their impact on domestic terrorism. Robustness checks, including two-step regression models, confirm that sanctions exacerbate poverty, which then mediates the relationship between sanctions and terrorism. This study is rated medium confidence as it is a non-experimental study.

Escribà-Folch (2011) investigates how economic sanctions affect authoritarian regimes' strategies regarding repression and public spending, focusing on how different regime types respond to external pressure. The analysis covers 1970 to 2000, using data on regime types, public expenditures, and repression levels across authoritarian states. The study categorizes regimes into personalist, single-party, and military types, each with different support structures and governing strategies. To analyze the impact of sanctions, the study employs fixed-effects panel regression, instrumental variable Generalized Method of Moments estimator, and an ordered logistic regression. Findings suggest that personalist regimes suffer the most severe economic losses, with foreign aid decreasing by 19–20% and trade by nearly 5%, leading to sharp budget constraints and cuts in public expenditures, particularly capital spending. In contrast, single-party regimes maintain stability by increasing spending on subsidies and transfers to support their key constituencies, as sanctions have minimal effects on their revenue streams. Military regimes respond by reallocating resources to goods and services spending, including wages and military expenditures, to secure military loyalty, despite experiencing a similar 5% decline in trade. The study is rated low confidence due to the absence of detailed information on power calculation. The description of the intervention was also rather little.

Fesharaki (2017) (third essay) examines the economic impact of UN-imposed sanctions on Iran, with a focus on how financial and trade restrictions, particularly post-2010, have affected Iran's overall economic performance. The sanctions are aimed at curtailing Iran's nuclear program and limiting its regional influence, using economic pressure as a means of coercion. The study employs the synthetic control method to estimate Iran's GDP in a hypothetical scenario without sanctions, allowing for a comparison with actual GDP figures. This method creates a counterfactual "synthetic Iran" based on a weighted combination of other countries with similar economic characteristics before sanctions were imposed, spanning several years of economic data. The synthetic control analysis yields highly significant estimates indicating a marked decline in Iran's GDP due to sanctions, particularly following the intensified financial sanctions beginning in 2010. The estimates for trade flows and foreign direct investment also reveal significant decreases under sanctions, demonstrating the economic isolation imposed on Iran. The study is rated low confidence due to the absence of detailed information on evaluation questions.

Ghodsi and Karamelikli (2021) investigate the impact of EU-imposed sanctions on Iran, focusing on general versus targeted sanctions and their effects on bilateral trade between Iran and the 19 euro area countries (EA19). The study differentiates between general sanctions, which target Iran's entire economy, and smart sanctions, which focus on specific entities and individuals linked to military activities. The study uses a nonlinear autoregressive distributed lag (NARDL) model to analyze quarterly trade data from 1999 to 2018, controlling for exchange rate fluctuations and income variables. Trade data covers various sectors to observe sector-specific impacts of each type of sanction. The results indicate that general sanctions severely disrupt trade, significantly decreasing EA19's imports from Iran by over four times the impact seen on exports. General sanctions impact nearly all sectors, except primary industries. In contrast, smart sanctions have a more limited impact, affecting EA19's exports across most sectors but showing little statistical significance for imports. The study is rated low confidence due to lack of power calculations.

Gutmann (2019) investigates the effects of U.S. economic sanctions on human rights, specifically examining whether sanctions are "precision-guided" or "blunt" in their impact

across various human rights categories. The analysis focuses on sanctions imposed by the US, which often aim to influence target countries' policies by creating economic pressure. The study is set within a context where sanctions are intended to address concerns such as political repression or human rights abuses without resorting to military intervention. Using an endogenous treatment-regression model, the study examines the causal impact of sanctions on economic rights, political and civil rights, basic human rights, and emancipatory rights, including women's rights. The dataset spans U.S. sanctions from 1976 to 2012 and includes multiple control variables for economic, political, and international alignment factors. When putting into account the different forms of sanctions, the results show that U.S. economic sanctions, regardless of type or duration, do not significantly impact economic rights in targeted countries. This study is rated medium confidence as it is a non-experimental study.

Harris (2019) explores the humanitarian value of economic sanctions, particularly their effectiveness and unintended consequences. The study examines specific case studies, such as sanctions imposed on Iran, and evaluates their outcomes through historical and empirical analysis. It also investigates the evolution of "smart sanctions" designed to minimize harm to civilian populations while targeting specific actors or sectors. The analysis relies on a literature review of economic sanctions and their historical application from the early 20th century to modern-day cases. It uses data from key sources, including the Hufbauer, Schott, and Elliott dataset on sanctions episodes. Empirical evaluations focus on success rates for different humanitarian objectives, drawing from secondary data and case-specific studies like sanctions on Iran. Sanctions lead to significant reductions in GDP. For example, in the case of Iran (2012–2015), comprehensive sanctions caused a $200 billion GDP loss, severely harming the country's economic performance.

Jeong (2020) examines the relationship between economic sanctions (import sanctions, export sanctions, foreign aid sanctions) and income inequality in sanctioned states. The analysis uses data from 152 countries from 1974 to 2011. It employs econometric modeling techniques to assess the effects of different sanction instruments on income inequality. Import sanctions were found to increase inequality in labor-abundant target countries, but this effect disappeared in labor-scarce targets. The study found no reliable evidence for the effect of export sanctions on inequality. Foreign aid sanctions were shown to reduce inequality in target countries highly dependent on foreign assistance. The study rated as low confidence quantitative study due to small sample size and omitting relevant variables.

Kelishomi (2022): This paper investigates the effect of economic sanctions on employment, specifically the imposition of a series of unexpected and unprecedented international economic sanctions on Iran in 2012. It also estimates the short-run effects of the change in import exposure on manufacturing employment at the industry level. The sanctions severely disrupted trade by limiting import and export activities and targeting industries reliant on imported inputs, aiming to induce financial and trade isolation. A natural experiment design consists of a dataset covering 116 non-oil manufacturing industries in Iran, analyzed over two sub-periods: Pre-sanctions (2008–2010) and post-sanctions (2012–2014). Results suggest that import exposure has no significant effect on employment overall, and the impact of an increase in import exposure decreases with the import share. In short, the study documented significant asymmetric effects of import competition on industries with different ex-ante import shares, indicating significant employment reallocation effects across sectors with different degrees of exposure to international trade. Specifically, the study documented that the sanctions negatively impacted employment. Study estimates suggest that, due to the sanctions, the employment growth rate in the manufacturing sector declined by 16.4 percentage points over 2012–2014. An additional 17,731 jobs could have been preserved in the absence of sanctions over 2012–2014. The article is not found in EGM but can be rated as high impact due to study is well-designed and provides credible evidence on the employment effects of economic sanctions, particularly in a developing economy context using

pre- and post-intervention comparisons and Rigorous statistical controls and robustness checks (e.g., placebo tests, sensitivity analyses).

Khan (2019) assessed how can we pursue justice for atrocity crimes in the absence of the willingness of the state or United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and the mechanisms and instruments are available and how are those applicable in Myanmar context. The research is primarily based on content analysis of relevant UN documents; it includes examining the Resolutions, Statements, Reports, and Letters by state actors, UN agencies, Expert Commissions, Civil Society Organisation (CSOs) related to the four ICTs, human rights issues in Myanmar and the declarations upon ratifications of relevant instruments by states. The quantitative section focuses on the extent of sanctions and international interventions, revealing that Myanmar previously endured 936 sanctioned entities and 564 individuals under EU measures, yet sanctions have had limited success in altering state behavior. Historical comparisons with Cambodia show that significant inflows of foreign aid and FDI coincided with political shifts supporting the establishment of the ECCC. The study was rated as low confidence as it has done content analysis.

Lektzian and Biglaiser (2013) investigate how US economic sanctions impact foreign direct investment (FDI) from non-US firms in sanctioned countries. US sanctions are often intended to weaken targeted states by limiting their access to capital, with the assumption that foreign investors may view sanctioned states as higher-risk environments, thereby reducing FDI. Using panel data on 171 countries from 1969 to 2000, the authors apply fixed-effects regression models to assess the impact of U.S. sanctions on global FDI inflows to these countries. The analysis controls for factors such as economic stability, regime type, and previous U.S. FDI to understand how sanctions influence global investment patterns. The study finds that, rather than deterring foreign investment, U.S. sanctions often lead to an increase in FDI from non-U.S. sources. When U.S. firms disinvest due to sanctions, foreign firms frequently step in to replace them, viewing these situations as opportunities to gain market share. This effect is more pronounced when sanctions do not involve a high economic cost or international cooperation, as these scenarios pose fewer risks to foreign investors. The study is rated medium confidence as it is non-experimental.

Lektzian (2021) investigates how economic sanctions affect economic freedom within targeted countries. It examines the hypothesis that sanctions encourage affected governments to exert more control over their domestic economies. This state intervention typically limits individual economic freedoms in several ways, including reduced freedom to trade, restrictions in legal property rights, currency devaluation, and increased regulation. Economic sanctions have become a common foreign policy tool by powerful states, aiming to alter target states' behavior, as seen in examples like Venezuela, Russia, and North Korea. This study employs a large-N empirical analysis using a cross-sectional time-series dataset, with the unit of analysis being the country-year. It covers 729 sanction cases from 2000 to 2016, focusing on the Economic Freedom of the World (EFW) index from the Fraser Institute. The study showed that 1) sanctions significantly reduce the overall index of economic freedoms, with one additional sanction decreasing freedom by about 12%. 2) Sanctions lead to substantial restrictions on trade freedom, including limitations on international trade and capital control 3) Sanctions correlate with increased government intervention in domestic business regulation, aligning with the hypothesis that governments use sanctions to consolidate economic control. Additionally Initial reductions in government size (due to resource constraints) are observed in the short term, while long-term effects see increased government economic control. However, the impact on monetary soundness and property rights is less significant or clear. The article is not found in EGM but can be rated as as a high level of confidence in its findings due to its large-N design, extensive controls, and use of robust empirical methods.

Neuenkirch (2015a & 2015b) investigates the impact of US economic sanctions on poverty levels in targeted countries. It aims to understand how these sanctions, intended to coerce political change or protect human rights, may inadvertently worsen poverty among the affected populations. The study also investigates the impact of economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations (UN) and the United States (US) on the economic growth of targeted countries. It aims to understand how different levels of sanctions (mild, moderate, and severe) affect GDP growth, considering various time frames around the sanction periods. The research covers a range of countries that have been subjected to US sanctions from 1978 to 2011. Specific countries included in the analysis are Brazil, Cambodia, China, Iran, and others. The authors employed a quasi-experimental design using a nearest neighbour matching approach. It also employs an empirical model to estimate the effects of sanctions on economic growth. The sample consists of country-year observations categorized into those with US sanctions and those without. The study includes various levels of sanctions, defined as mild, moderate, and severe. The study analyzed a total of 60 country-year observations where US sanctions were in place, compared to a larger control group of 247 observations without sanctions. The findings indicate that US sanctions significantly increase the poverty gap in sanctioned countries. The study reports that the poverty gap increased in countries under sanctions. The maximum adverse effect of severe sanctions is reported as a decrease of –7.80 percentage points (pp) in GDP growth when considering only the three years before the sanction period. Not found it EGM but the study should be rated as high and medium confidence study.

Önder (2022) investigates the impact of economic sanctions on minority groups within targeted states. It emphasizes that sanctions can lead to increased discrimination against these groups, particularly in economic, political, and social dimensions. The research aims to understand how different types of sanctions (comprehensive vs. targeted) affect the treatment of minorities. The study employs an empirical approach using ordered logit models to analyze the effects of economic sanctions on minority groups. The sample consists of data related to countries that have experienced economic sanctions, focusing on the treatment of minority groups within these nations. Results show that comprehensive sanctions significantly exacerbate economic marginalization compared to targeted sanctions, with odds ratios nearly three times higher for economic discrimination. The study is rated medium confidence as it is non-experimental and due to its partial description of the intervention.

Peksen (2014) assesses the extent to which economic sanctions prompt the target regime to manipulate the domestic economic conditions through arbitrary confiscation and redistribution of private property and wealth. It is argued that economic coercion as a direct threat to political survival and the coercive capacity of the target government creates incentives for politically insecure elites to engage in the policy of predation to counter the negative economic effects of the coercion on themselves and their constituency. The study was designed as a quasi-experimental study. The study uses time series cross-national data from 1960 to 2005. The sanction regimes that are comprehensive and costly tend to be more detrimental to private property rights than the limited and low-cost sanction regimes ($P<0.01$). The study is rated as medium confidence as it is designed as a non-experimental study design and has partially defined the interventions and outcomes in the study.

Dom and Roger (2018) examine the impacts of economic sanctions and suspension of budget support on a target government, such as in the case of Burundi following the 2015 political crisis. The paper analyses the fiscal response of the Burundian government following shortfall of aid and complete suspension of budget support, as well as the possible interaction between aid and domestic borrowing, and between aid and recurrent expenditure. The study utilized time series analyses using the autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) model and a vector autoregressive (VAR) approach. The dataset includes monthly data from the Burundian Central Bank (BRB) during the period January 2005 to October 2017. The dependent variables include recurrent expenditure and domestic borrowing. The study finds that suspension of cash grants has no effect on recurrent expenditure as it is substituted with domestic borrowing.

After the suspension of budged aid in Burundi due to its 2015 political crisis, the government managed to counterbalance it by increasing its domestic borrowing. Average monthly borrowing 12 months after the crisis resulted to 55%, compared to the 4% before the crisis. However, the study underscored that there may be significant medium to long-term costs related to the approach, which may have implications on fiscal space and economic growth. The study is rated medium confidence due to its partial description of the intervention and outcomes.

Rosenberg et al. (2016) examines the effects of US economic sanctions targeting states and non-state actors (post-9/11 attacks) on foreign investment, corruption, ease of doing business, and other related measures. In this light, the US has used financial/economic sanctions as a tool to address security threats, such as terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and territorial aggression, and what role does it play in national security strategy. The dataset included 22 post-9/11 sanctions cases from Rice University's Threat and Impositions of Sanctions (TIES) dataset, the Petersen Institute for International Economics (PIIE) dataset of 21st century cases, the US Treasury Department's OFAC sanctions website, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Political Risk Services (PRS), the Worldwide Governance Index (WGI), and the Polity IV. The methodology followed an approach previously used by the U.S. Government Accountability Office to assess U.S. sanctions on Iran. This method involved selecting a set of "peer economies" for each sanctioned country—five similar countries matched on regional, economic, and political characteristics. By comparing the sanctioned countries with their peer economies, the study aimed to isolate changes in economic and political conditions that could be attributed to sanctions. Findings suggest that sanctions reduce foreign investment. The study is rated as medium due to its partial description of the intervention.

Shin (2016) investigates the impact of economic sanctions on the economic performance of target countries. It evaluates how sanctions affect international trade and foreign investment. The research aims to provide empirical evidence on whether sanctions achieve their intended economic effects. The study encompasses a global perspective, focusing on 133 developing countries from various regions. The data spans from 1970 to 2005. The research employs a cross-national, time-series data analysis approach. The study's findings indicate that no sanction variables, including severe cost sanctions, consistently emerge as significant predictors of the economic performance of the target countries. The authors conclude that sanctions do not impair target economies significantly, as evidenced by the lack of consistent statistical significance across different models. The study is rated as high and medium confidence quantitative study.

Suliman and Khwanda (2020) assesses the negative impacts of multilateral economic sanctions in the political behaviour of Syria and its effect on the social fiber of the country in terms of its human and economic development. The Syrian economy, historically reliant on trade with Europe and neighboring Arab countries, faced extensive sanctions beginning in 2011, with restrictions imposed by the U.S., EU, and Arab League targeting government entities, individuals, and commercial activities due to the Syrian conflict. The study used a panel gravity model to analyze trade flows between Syria and 78 countries from 1987 to 2017. The countries were identified into two groups, particularly trading partners (42 countries) that imposed diverse type of economic sanctions against Syria and countries (36 countries) that did not impose any economic sanction to Syria. Sanctions and conflict jointly reduced Syria's bilateral trade by approximately 65%. Extensive sanctions by the EU and U.S. decreased trade by 77.5%, while moderate sanctions by the Arab League lowered trade by 49%. The study is rated low due to its inadequate description of the intervention and evaluation questions.

Sultonov (2022) examines the repercussions of international sanctions imposed on Russia and its effects on the economies of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS. These sanctions mainly target Russia but have indirect effects on CIS countries, which share strong trade, financial, and remittance ties with Russia. The paper used the vector autoregressive

(VAR) model and the Granger causality test to assess how Russian economic changes influence other CIS economies. Additionally, the study includes dummy variables to capture the effects of sanctions and the global financial crisis, allowing for an examination of sanctions' direct impacts on Russia and their spillover effects within the CIS. Results show that Russia's economic downturn due to sanctions indirectly reduced GDP growth and trade in neighboring CIS economies, particularly those with high dependence on Russian remittances and trade. Finally, Granger causality tests reveal that changes in the Russian ruble exchange rate influence the currencies of other CIS nations, with the ruble's depreciation leading to similar trends across the CIS region, especially in Armenia and Belarus. The study is rated low due to its inadequate description of the intervention and evaluation questions.

Confidence assessment
Overall medium: There are many large N and impact evaluation studies included in this cell, although the effects tend to vary in some of the studies.

Other outcomes in the study:

Violence and atrocity prevention / Nature and scale of violence or atrocities

Social cohesion / Willingness to participate or help

Social cohesion / Feelings of trust & Acceptance of diversity

Social cohesion / Sense of belonging

Community and state governance / Government performance

Human security / Economic security

Human security / Food security & Nutrition & Health security

Human security / Political security