



THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF COVID-19 RECOVERY POLICIES IN INDIA

***Dr. Nagaraja L, Associate Professor of Economics, Govt. First Grade Women's College, Doddaballapura.**

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic created an exceptional economic disruption in India, affecting production, employment, consumption, investment, trade, public finances and household welfare. The nationwide lockdown introduced in 2020 interrupted economic activity at a time when growth had already weakened. India's real GDP contracted by 7.3 percent in 2020-21, while GDP declined by 24.4 percent year-on-year in the second quarter of 2020-21 (IMF, 2021). In response, the Government of India and the Reserve Bank of India introduced fiscal, monetary, credit, social protection and structural measures. These included the Pradhan Mantri Garib Kalyan package, food assistance, employment support, emergency credit guarantees, liquidity facilities, loan restructuring, reductions in policy rates, increased public investment and production-linked incentives. The recovery strategy gradually moved from immediate relief toward investment, infrastructure development, manufacturing support and demand revival. The study examines how these policies influenced economic stabilization and recovery, with particular attention to vulnerable households, micro, small and medium enterprises, agriculture, employment, financial markets and investment. Secondary information from government reports, RBI publications, international institutions and academic studies is examined descriptively. Evidence indicates that policy interventions helped prevent deeper financial stress and supported reopening, although recovery remained uneven across sectors and income groups. The experience also highlighted the importance of stronger social protection, coordinated fiscal and monetary policy, public investment and resilient supply chains for future economic shocks.

Keywords: COVID-19, Economic Recovery, Fiscal Policy, Monetary Policy, Employment, India.

INTRODUCTION

COVID-19 transformed India's economic environment by simultaneously creating a public health emergency and a severe disruption in production and demand. The nationwide lockdown restricted mobility, closed establishments and interrupted domestic and international supply chains. India entered the pandemic with slowing economic growth, making the shock particularly difficult for households, businesses and governments. Real GDP contracted by 7.3 percent in 2020-21, while the contraction in the second quarter reached 24.4 percent year-on-year (IMF, 2021). The policy response combined fiscal assistance, food

distribution, employment measures, credit guarantees, monetary easing, liquidity support and regulatory relief. The Reserve Bank of India reduced policy rates and introduced liquidity measures, while the central government expanded support for vulnerable households and businesses. These measures were subsequently complemented by vaccination, infrastructure spending, manufacturing incentives and economic reforms.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. **DEV AND SENGUPTA (2020)** examined the initial economic consequences of COVID-19 and lockdown restrictions in India. They assessed disruptions to agriculture, manufacturing, services, employment and financial conditions and reviewed government and RBI interventions. Their study emphasized targeted assistance, sector-specific support and measures protecting vulnerable households and workers.
2. **CHAKRABORTY AND THOMAS (2020)** analysed macroeconomic uncertainty created by COVID-19 and examined the interaction between fiscal and monetary responses. They argued that stronger policy coordination was required to address health, livelihood and demand pressures. Their study also discussed unconventional financing options for strengthening emergency public expenditure.
3. **GHOSH (2020)** assessed India's pandemic response by examining lockdown effects, employment disruption, poverty and household insecurity. The study argued that economic consequences were particularly severe for informal workers and poorer households. It highlighted weaknesses in income protection and emphasized the need for broader fiscal assistance during the crisis.
4. **PATNAIK AND SENGUPTA (2020)** examined alternative fiscal scenarios under different assumptions regarding GDP contraction and tax revenue. They estimated substantial pressure on the central government's fiscal position and demonstrated the difficulty of simultaneously financing relief measures and maintaining fiscal sustainability during the pandemic.
5. **DEB AND XU (2021)** investigated the state-level health and economic effects of containment measures during India's first COVID-19 wave. Their analysis showed considerable variation across states and examined how containment restrictions and voluntary social distancing influenced both virus transmission and economic activity.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The COVID-19 pandemic produced a sharp contraction in India's economic activity and exposed vulnerabilities in employment, household income, informal work, small enterprises, health infrastructure and public finances. Although several recovery policies were introduced, their effects differed across sectors and population groups. The problem therefore concerns assessing how fiscal, monetary, credit, social protection and investment measures contributed to economic stabilization and recovery while considering their limitations and uneven outcomes.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study is significant because it explains the economic role of COVID-19 recovery policies in India and identifies the channels through which government and RBI interventions influenced production, employment, consumption, investment and financial stability. It also provides useful evidence for designing stronger responses to future economic disruptions.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study covers India's major economic recovery policies introduced during and after the COVID-19 crisis, particularly fiscal assistance, monetary easing, credit support, social protection, employment measures, infrastructure spending and manufacturing incentives. It considers their effects on households, MSMEs, agriculture, industry, services, investment and macroeconomic stability using secondary information from 2020 onward.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To examine the economic impact of major COVID-19 recovery policies in India and assess their contribution to economic stabilization, employment, investment, business activity and recovery.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used secondary data from RBI, Government of India, IMF, World Bank reports, academic studies, official statistics and published research, analysed through descriptive and comparative interpretation.

1. FISCAL RELIEF, SOCIAL PROTECTION AND HOUSEHOLD RECOVERY

The first major component of India's COVID-19 recovery strategy involved protecting households from the immediate loss of income, employment and access to essential goods. The nationwide lockdown sharply reduced opportunities for informal workers, migrant labourers, small traders, self-employed persons and casual workers. Since a substantial share of India's workforce operates outside formal employment arrangements, the sudden interruption of economic activity created a serious income shock. Government intervention therefore focused on food security, cash assistance, employment support and protection of vulnerable groups. The Pradhan Mantri Garib Kalyan package expanded access to food grains, cooking gas and selected cash transfers, while the public distribution system became an important mechanism for maintaining minimum consumption. According to the IMF, India's early above-the-line measures focused significantly on social protection, employment support and healthcare, including food, cooking gas and cash assistance to lower-income households (IMF, 2021). The government subsequently extended free food grain support during later phases of the pandemic. In 2021, free food grains were announced for approximately 800 million people for May and June, with an estimated cost of about ₹260 billion (IMF, 2021). These interventions were economically important because maintaining basic consumption helped prevent a further decline in aggregate demand. Food assistance also reduced the immediate requirement for households to spend scarce cash resources on essential commodities. For rural households, employment support through

programmes such as MGNREGA provided an additional income channel when private-sector employment opportunities were restricted. The significance of these measures was greater because informal employment was highly exposed to lockdown-related disruptions. Dev and Sengupta (2020) emphasized that the pandemic affected several segments of the economy simultaneously and required policy support directed toward vulnerable workers and sectors.

Fiscal intervention also influenced the speed at which household demand could return after restrictions were relaxed. A household receiving food support or temporary income assistance had greater capacity to preserve essential consumption and avoid distress asset sales or high-cost borrowing. However, the effectiveness of relief depended on access, timing and administrative delivery. Migrant workers experienced significant difficulties during the initial lockdown because their employment and accommodation arrangements were disrupted simultaneously. The experience demonstrated that national economic policy cannot depend exclusively on aggregate fiscal expenditure figures. The distribution mechanism is equally important. Ghosh (2020) drew attention to the economic vulnerability of informal workers and poorer households and argued that the crisis generated substantial livelihood insecurity. Fiscal support also affected state governments because health expenditure, food distribution and local relief responsibilities increased while revenue collection weakened. This created pressure on state finances and increased the importance of central transfers and borrowing arrangements. The central government consequently used additional borrowing space and other financial measures to support state-level expenditure. The fiscal response therefore had two interconnected dimensions. The first was immediate protection of household consumption, while the second involved preserving the capacity of governments to provide essential public services. The economic effect of these interventions cannot be measured only through direct income transfers. They also reduced the probability of a deeper contraction by sustaining minimum purchasing power during the shutdown. At the same time, the limited fiscal space available to governments meant that policymakers had to balance immediate relief against debt and deficit considerations. Patnaik and Sengupta (2020) demonstrated that the sharp fall in economic activity and tax revenue created substantial fiscal pressure and made the financing of additional expenditure a difficult policy issue.

The household recovery process became increasingly connected with the reopening of labour markets, vaccination and restoration of mobility. Relief programmes were most important during the period when households could not earn normally, while employment creation became increasingly important as restrictions were removed. This distinction is important because income support alone cannot produce sustained economic recovery. Households ultimately require regular employment, stable wages and access to productive opportunities. The policy experience therefore indicates that social protection should function as a bridge between economic disruption and employment recovery. Public works can support rural demand, while urban employment measures and support for small businesses can assist the return of workers to productive activity. The IMF noted that fiscal measures in India later shifted toward public investment and sectoral support as the recovery developed (IMF, 2021). The recovery also benefited from vaccination and gradual reopening, which reduced restrictions on economic activity. Thus, fiscal relief affected recovery through both direct and indirect channels. Directly, it protected consumption and essential livelihoods.

Indirectly, it supported confidence, reduced distress and allowed households to participate in the reopening phase. The major policy lesson was that social protection should remain sufficiently flexible to expand quickly during severe disruptions. A resilient recovery framework requires reliable food systems, digital payment infrastructure, employment databases, accessible banking facilities and coordination between central and state governments. These institutional capabilities determine whether announced assistance reaches intended beneficiaries rapidly. The economic impact of COVID-19 recovery policies therefore included not only the amount of public money spent but also the extent to which policy reduced household vulnerability and maintained consumption during the most disruptive stages of the crisis.

2. MONETARY POLICY, LIQUIDITY SUPPORT AND FINANCIAL STABILITY

The second major policy channel was monetary and financial intervention led by the Reserve Bank of India. The pandemic created simultaneous liquidity and solvency risks. Businesses faced falling revenues, households experienced income losses and financial institutions confronted the possibility of rising loan defaults. If these problems had developed into a widespread credit crisis, the economic contraction could have become deeper and more persistent. The RBI therefore used reductions in policy rates, liquidity facilities, regulatory flexibility and other financial measures to maintain the flow of credit. According to the IMF, the RBI reduced the repo rate by 115 basis points and the reverse repo rate by 155 basis points from March 2020, taking the repo rate to 4.0 percent and the reverse repo rate to 3.35 percent. The central bank also introduced liquidity measures including long-term repo operations, a reduction in the cash reserve ratio and open market operations (IMF, 2021). These actions reduced the cost of funds and provided banks and financial institutions with greater liquidity during a period of uncertainty. Monetary easing was important because businesses required working capital even when revenues had declined. Without temporary financial support, otherwise viable firms could have failed simply because cash flows were interrupted. The RBI also introduced measures to provide relief to borrowers and lenders, while regulatory adjustments attempted to prevent temporary pandemic-related payment difficulties from immediately becoming permanent financial distress. Such measures were particularly relevant for MSMEs, which generally have smaller cash buffers and more limited access to capital markets.

Credit support became another important element of the recovery strategy. The Emergency Credit Line Guarantee Scheme provided guaranteed credit to eligible businesses, particularly MSMEs, helping banks lend during a period of heightened risk. Government-backed guarantees reduced the immediate credit risk faced by financial institutions and encouraged lending to businesses whose cash flows had been affected by the pandemic. The IMF estimated that business-support measures included substantial credit support, while financial-sector interventions also targeted MSMEs and non-bank financial companies (IMF, 2021). This policy approach differed from direct fiscal transfers because the government used guarantees and financial mechanisms to facilitate borrowing rather than meeting the entire financing requirement through budgetary expenditure. The approach was particularly relevant to firms expected to recover once economic activity resumed. The RBI's regulatory measures also included loan moratoriums and restructuring arrangements that provided temporary repayment relief. Such measures helped households and firms avoid immediate

default when their income had been disrupted by lockdowns. However, loan relief did not eliminate the underlying loss of income. It primarily shifted repayment obligations into the future. Consequently, the eventual effectiveness of these measures depended on the speed of economic reopening and the ability of borrowers to generate sufficient income later. Chakraborty and Thomas (2020) argued that the scale of macroeconomic uncertainty required stronger coordination between fiscal and monetary policies. This coordination was necessary because monetary policy could provide liquidity, but it could not by itself replace lost household income or create demand where businesses remained closed.

The financial system also benefited from improved liquidity conditions in capital markets and accommodative monetary policy. Lower interest rates and liquidity operations supported government securities markets and helped maintain financial stability during an uncertain period. However, the transmission of monetary policy was not uniform. Large companies with established banking relationships or access to capital markets could often obtain finance more easily than small informal businesses. The IMF observed that bank credit growth remained subdued even as larger corporates benefited from easier capital-market conditions (IMF, 2021). This indicates that monetary accommodation should not be interpreted as automatically producing equal credit access across the economy. Creditworthy firms may benefit more quickly than financially weaker enterprises. Therefore, targeted credit guarantees and restructuring mechanisms were important complements to general monetary easing. Financial stability also depended on the ability of banks to recognize and manage future non-performing assets. During the immediate crisis, regulatory flexibility could prevent unnecessary financial stress, but prolonged recognition delays could create problems if weak borrowers failed to recover. Policymakers consequently needed to balance temporary relief with long-term banking-sector transparency. The RBI's response demonstrated the importance of central-bank flexibility during a major economic shock, but it also showed that monetary policy works most effectively when combined with fiscal assistance, public investment and health measures. Monetary policy could reduce financing costs and maintain liquidity, while fiscal policy could support incomes and demand. Health interventions could allow businesses to reopen safely. The interaction among these instruments was therefore central to India's recovery. The pandemic demonstrated that financial stability is not separate from public health or employment conditions. A disruption in production can become a credit problem, and a credit problem can subsequently reduce investment and employment. The recovery policies attempted to interrupt this chain by ensuring that temporary cash-flow problems did not automatically become permanent business failures or financial instability.

3. MSMES, EMPLOYMENT, INDUSTRY AND SUPPLY-SIDE RECOVERY

Micro, small and medium enterprises were among the most economically sensitive groups during the pandemic because many operated with limited working capital, depended on regular customer demand and employed workers in labour-intensive activities. Lockdowns interrupted production, retail activity, transportation, hospitality and personal services. The resulting reduction in sales created pressure on wages, rents, interest payments and supplier obligations. The government therefore incorporated MSMEs into the recovery strategy through credit guarantees, collateral-free lending support, subordinated debt measures and

changes in the definition of MSMEs. These measures attempted to preserve productive capacity until demand returned. The importance of preserving firms was greater than the immediate value of individual loans because business closures could permanently destroy employment relationships, supplier networks and local market capacity. Dev and Sengupta (2020) identified supply-chain disruption and reduced demand as major channels through which the pandemic affected the Indian economy. The Emergency Credit Line Guarantee Scheme helped reduce financing constraints by allowing eligible firms to access additional working capital and term loans with government-backed guarantees. Such measures were intended to prevent a temporary liquidity shortage from becoming a permanent solvency problem. The policy also recognized that many businesses could become viable again once restrictions were lifted. At the same time, the benefits of credit-based support depended on whether enterprises expected future demand to recover. Borrowing is less attractive to a firm when sales prospects remain uncertain. Consequently, credit intervention needed to be combined with reopening, consumer demand and infrastructure expenditure.

Employment recovery was closely connected with the recovery of business activity. The first phase of the pandemic produced substantial labour-market disruption, particularly among informal workers, migrants and workers in contact-intensive sectors. When establishments reopened, employment gradually recovered, but the quality and stability of jobs remained important concerns. Government employment programmes, rural public works and support for small enterprises provided alternative channels for income generation. MGNREGA became particularly significant in rural areas because it offered wage employment during a period when private-sector opportunities were weak. At the macroeconomic level, employment support helped maintain household consumption. At the microeconomic level, it reduced the pressure on families to reduce essential expenditure or sell productive assets. Ghosh (2020) emphasized the severe livelihood consequences of the lockdown, particularly for informal workers. The pandemic also accelerated changes in the structure of economic activity. Digital payments, online commerce, remote work, digital education and technology-based business models expanded as physical interaction became difficult. This transformation created opportunities for some sectors but increased the vulnerability of workers without digital access or relevant skills. The recovery policy therefore had to address both short-term employment losses and longer-term structural changes. Skill development, digital connectivity and access to finance became important components of post-pandemic economic adjustment. The policy response also recognized the role of manufacturing in strengthening domestic supply chains. The Production Linked Incentive scheme was introduced across priority sectors with the intention of encouraging domestic production and investment. According to the IMF, the scheme was expected to cost around 0.8 percent of GDP over five years based on the policy estimates available in 2021 (IMF, 2021).

The shift toward manufacturing support reflected a broader attempt to make the recovery more investment-oriented. The pandemic revealed weaknesses in global supply chains and increased policy interest in domestic production capacity. Production incentives, infrastructure investment and reforms were therefore connected to the longer-term recovery strategy. However, the effectiveness of such measures depends on implementation, investment response, productivity improvements and international competitiveness. Incentives alone cannot guarantee sustained industrial expansion. Firms also require reliable electricity,

logistics, skilled labour, access to finance, efficient regulation and predictable demand. Public investment consequently became increasingly important. The RBI has documented a shift in the composition of fiscal policy toward infrastructure-focused recovery, with central government capital outlay rising from 1.6 percent of GDP in 2020-21 to a budgeted 2.8 percent in 2024-25. Infrastructure spending can influence recovery through construction employment, demand for materials, improved logistics and increased productive capacity. It can therefore have a broader economic effect than temporary consumption support when projects are efficiently implemented. The recovery policy also encouraged investment through tax and regulatory reforms, while measures supporting agriculture attempted to improve rural infrastructure and credit access. The supply-side response was thus broader than simply reopening factories. It involved strengthening production capacity, supporting enterprises, improving infrastructure and encouraging domestic manufacturing. The experience showed that economic recovery is a process in which liquidity support, employment protection and productive investment need to operate together. MSME support was useful for preserving existing capacity, while infrastructure and manufacturing policies attempted to create additional capacity. Employment programmes helped maintain income during the transition. The combination contributed to the movement from emergency stabilization toward a longer-term growth strategy. Nevertheless, uneven access to credit, differences between formal and informal enterprises, and unequal recovery across sectors remained important challenges. Policies directed toward future resilience therefore need to improve access to institutional finance, technology, markets and social protection for smaller enterprises and workers.

4. PUBLIC INVESTMENT, STRUCTURAL REFORMS AND LONG-TERM ECONOMIC RECOVERY

India's COVID-19 recovery strategy gradually moved beyond immediate relief toward investment-led growth and structural transformation. During the early months of the pandemic, the central concern was preventing economic collapse and protecting vulnerable households and businesses. As restrictions were relaxed, policymakers increasingly focused on reviving investment, strengthening infrastructure, encouraging manufacturing and improving the productive capacity of the economy. This shift was important because temporary relief could reduce immediate hardship but could not by itself generate sustained economic expansion. Public investment became an important mechanism for supporting demand while simultaneously increasing future productive capacity. Roads, railways, logistics systems, urban infrastructure, digital connectivity and health facilities can create employment during construction and reduce business costs after completion. The RBI has identified the pandemic period and subsequent years as a phase in which fiscal policy increasingly emphasized infrastructure-focused recovery, with capital outlay rising substantially as a share of GDP. The government also introduced interest-free loans to states for capital expenditure and increased infrastructure-oriented support during the recovery period. The IMF reported that additional public investment measures and interest-free loans to states were incorporated into the later stages of the pandemic response (IMF, 2021). These policies attempted to encourage states to maintain capital spending even when their own revenues were under pressure. Infrastructure investment can have a multiplier effect because government expenditure creates demand for construction materials,

transport, engineering services and labour. At the same time, completed infrastructure can improve productivity and reduce logistics costs. The long-term economic effect therefore depends heavily on the quality, timing and efficiency of public investment.

Structural reforms formed another part of the recovery strategy. During the pandemic period, India advanced reforms related to labour markets, agriculture, manufacturing incentives, privatization and other areas. The policy intention was to use the disruption as an opportunity to improve the conditions for investment and productivity. The IMF noted that India continued structural reforms despite the pandemic, including labour reforms and a privatization plan (IMF, 2021). Production-linked incentives represented an attempt to attract investment and expand domestic manufacturing capacity. The broader objective was to increase the role of manufacturing in employment and exports while reducing vulnerability arising from international supply-chain disruptions. However, structural reforms can generate benefits only when supported by effective implementation and complementary infrastructure. Businesses considering long-term investment evaluate market size, logistics, taxation, labour availability, financing conditions and regulatory stability. Consequently, reforms should be considered as part of a wider economic environment rather than as isolated interventions. The pandemic also demonstrated the importance of healthcare infrastructure as an economic asset. Weak health capacity can force governments to impose restrictions that disrupt economic activity. Investment in hospitals, laboratories, vaccination systems and public health therefore has both social and economic returns. The fiscal response included additional healthcare expenditure, vaccination funding and health-related infrastructure. In the 2021 budget, a substantial provision was made for COVID-19 vaccination, while other health allocations were increased (IMF, 2021). Vaccination subsequently became central to restoring mobility and economic activity because it reduced the need for severe restrictions.

Long-term recovery also required attention to fiscal sustainability. The pandemic reduced tax revenues while increasing expenditure requirements, resulting in wider fiscal deficits. The IMF estimated that India's central government fiscal deficit reached 8.6 percent of GDP in FY2020-21, while the general government deficit was estimated at 12.8 percent of GDP (IMF, 2021). These figures demonstrate the scale of the fiscal shock. Higher deficits were associated with emergency expenditure, weaker revenues and economic contraction. At the same time, withdrawing support too rapidly could have weakened the recovery. The appropriate policy challenge therefore involved sequencing. Emergency assistance needed to remain available while the economy was severely restricted, followed by a gradual shift toward investment and productivity-enhancing expenditure. The IMF's global assessment similarly emphasized that fiscal support should not be withdrawn too quickly and should gradually move from protecting jobs toward supporting reopening and recovery (IMF, 2020). India's experience also demonstrated that recovery can be uneven across sectors. Agriculture showed greater resilience than several contact-intensive services, while manufacturing and construction recovered at different speeds depending on restrictions and demand. The second COVID-19 wave created additional uncertainty in 2021 and temporarily interrupted the recovery process. Deb and Xu (2021) found considerable variation across Indian states in the economic effects of containment and voluntary social distancing. This suggests that future recovery policy should account for regional differences rather than relying exclusively on uniform national measures. States differ in industrial

structure, employment patterns, health capacity and fiscal resources. A flexible policy framework can therefore allocate assistance according to the intensity of economic disruption. Long-term resilience also requires stronger social protection, digital public infrastructure, health capacity, employment databases and institutional coordination. The pandemic showed that economic policy cannot be separated from public health policy. Effective health management allows economic activity to continue, while stable employment and household incomes improve the ability of people to withstand future disruptions. The post-pandemic strategy consequently needs to combine fiscal responsibility with productive investment, stronger institutions and protection for vulnerable groups. Such an approach can improve the capacity of the Indian economy to absorb future shocks without allowing temporary disruptions to become prolonged economic setbacks.

CONCLUSION

COVID-19 recovery policies played an important role in stabilizing the Indian economy after the severe contraction of 2020-21. Fiscal relief protected household consumption, food security and employment, while monetary easing and credit measures supported liquidity and business continuity. MSME assistance helped preserve productive capacity, and public investment increasingly became an important instrument for recovery and long-term growth. However, the recovery remained uneven because informal workers, small enterprises and contact-intensive sectors experienced greater disruption. The pandemic also widened fiscal pressures and exposed weaknesses in social protection and health infrastructure. India's experience demonstrates the importance of coordinated fiscal and monetary action, timely social protection, accessible credit, productive public investment and stronger institutional capacity for managing future economic shocks.

REFERENCES

1. Chakraborty, L., & Thomas, E. (2020). *COVID-19 and macroeconomic uncertainty: Fiscal and monetary policy response* (NIPFP Working Paper No. 302). National Institute of Public Finance and Policy.
2. Deb, P., & Xu, T. (2021). *State-level health and economic impact of COVID-19 in India* (IMF Working Paper No. 2021/279). International Monetary Fund. <https://doi.org/10.5089/9781616354695.001>
3. Dev, S. M., & Sengupta, R. (2020). *Covid-19: Impact on the Indian economy* (IGIDR Working Paper No. WP-2020-013). Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research.
4. Ghosh, J. (2020). A critique of the Indian government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Economia Politica*, 37(3), 519-530. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40812-020-00170-x>
5. International Monetary Fund. (2020). *Fiscal Monitor: Policies for the recovery*. International Monetary Fund.
6. International Monetary Fund. (2021). *India: 2021 Article IV consultation, press release; staff report; and statement by the executive director for India* (IMF Country Report No. 2021/230). International Monetary Fund.
7. Patnaik, I., & Sengupta, R. (2020). *Impact of Covid-19 on Indian economy: An analysis of fiscal scenarios* (IGIDR Working Paper No. WP-2020-026). Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research.
8. Reserve Bank of India. (2025). *RBI Bulletin: Pandemic shock and infrastructure-focused recovery*. Reserve Bank of India.