Determining Optimal Public Debt in Nepal

Laxmi Prasad Prasai[1]

1. Tribhuvan University, Office of the Dean
   ✉ lpprasai@iuj.ac.jp
   ⓘ https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6874-4941

Abstract

This study examines the optimal thresholds of public debt that can facilitate economic growth in Nepal. The effect of public debt on economic growth has been estimated through the non-linear relationship between public debt and GDP growth using 47 years of yearly time series data from FY 1974/75 to 2021/22. This paper also considers the relationship between economic growth and other several controlling variables, i.e., government debt, gross capital formation, trade openness, population growth, domestic saving rate, in Nepal's context. The ideal ratio of public debt for higher economic growth is found to be 35.44 percent of real GDP in Nepal. The tools used for time series data analysis include auto regressive distributive lag (ARDL) for long run structural modeling and error correction model for short run relationships. In the recent context of increasing volume of public debt, weakening revenue mobilization capacity of the government and volatility in GDP growth rate of Nepal, this study will be useful for the government and policy maker to adopt appropriate strategies to maintain optimal threshold of public debt for sustainable growth in Nepal. The result advocates that government should use public debt cautiously to facilitate economic growth through productive sector investments by maintaining appropriate level of public debt.

Keywords: fiscal policy, public debt, budget deficit, debt threshold, economic growth.

JEL Classification: E62, F34, H68, H74, O47

Introduction

Fiscal deficit financing is crucial from the viewpoint of the ability to meet debt servicing obligations without debt deferral or debt rescheduling. In this regard, public debt is a vital tool of fiscal policy of the government to meet its resource gap in the country (Akram, 2011). Total public debt including domestic debt and external debt are considered to find optimal threshold in the study

Excessive debt burden triggers country in debt trap whereas underutilization public debt decreases economic growth by not fulfilling the resource gap. In this regard, finding an optimal public debt level can be helpful to facilitate economic growth. The effects of debt on economic growth are also studied by Krugman (1998), Sachs (1989) and Cohen (1992).

Indicator of public debt presented in Annexure 1 shows that the GDP growth rates remained fluctuating in Nepal over the last four decades. The average growth rate of GDP was 4.56 percent during the last four decades. The fiscal deficit witnessed an increase from 4.10

percent during the 2000s to 4.60 percent during the 2010s. In the past four decades, the average fiscal deficit as percentage of nominal GDP was 5.5 percent, which shows a moderate level of fiscal deficit. Public debt was 32.14 percent of GDP during the 1980s. This ratio increased to 64.84 percent during the 1990s and then decreased to 50.72 percent during the 2000s. During the 2010s, public debt was 26.91 percent of GDP. In recent years, this percentage is gradually increasing and reached 41.43 percent in FY 2021/22.

After FY 2010/11, there was an increment in the fiscal deficit to GDP ratio, debt to GDP ratio and current account deficit to GDP ratio. Similarly, the public debt to revenue ratio also surged up to 188.22 percent in FY 2021/22 from 114.53 percent in FY 2016/17. (Source: Annexure 1: Indicator of Public Debt in Nepal)

Bhatta & Mishra (2020) estimated a quadratic bivariate model to find the growth maximizing debt ratio. The model was based on ARDL coefficents using time series data and found that the optimal level of public debt to GDP ratio is 33 percent in Nepal's context.

The main motivation of the study is the limited availability of prior investigations to find out the optimal public debt threshold, based on the relationship between government public debt and economic growth, using long time series data incorporating important and relevant controlling variables such as capital formation in Nepal. Rapid growth of Nepal's public debt and recent declining government revenue mobilization capacity accentuates to identify the optimal public debt threshold in Nepal.

The study aims to determine the optimal level public debt for sustainable economic growth in Nepal and to find major implications on formulation of economic policies. Based on the above backdrop, debt to GDP ratios increased during the 2010s, and such increase will persist continuously in forthcoming periods, provided that the twin deficits (both fiscal deficit and current account deficit) prevail and remain high. As a result, there may be sluggish and volatile GDP growth rate with higher fluctuations in the exchange rate and interest rate. Suggesting appropriate public debt threshold for sustainable growth is the basic reason and motivation of this study in Nepal. The objectives of the study are specified into: (a) to investigate the relationship between public debt and economic growth in Nepal and (b) to find the optimal level of public debt that supports ideal economic growth.

Literature Review

Theoretical Underpinnings

Debt sustainability helps make borrowing decisions and matches financing needs with its ability to repay. The International Monetary Fund (IMF, 2020) has classified countries' debt-carrying capacity into strong, medium, and weak categories in its Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF). An optimal threshold of public debt supports debt sustainability.

The Domar Model has given more importance on increasing economic growth than to the negative effects of higher level of debt to meet its debt obligation (Washington 20150.

One of the important traditional methods to examine debt sustainability is through debt indicators approach as referred by Gray (1998). The comparison is made by evaluating the ratio of debt stock and debt servicing to certain macroeconomic indicators, contrasting them with benchmark thresholds established for debt sustainability indicators accredited by international organizations.

The debt threshold indicators defined by the IMF/World Bank vary with those defined by the European Union (EU) and the Commonwealth. The EU has set threshold values for key fiscal parameters, including a fiscal deficit limit of 3 percent, a cap of 25 percent for public debt, a maximum of 15 percent for public debt servicing, a ceiling of 20 percent for domestic debt, and an external debt limit of 5 percent of GDP.

As argued by Kidochukwu (2015), the debt sustainability limit under the International Monetary Fund (IMF) debt sustainability threshold of 45% for Nigeria and other low-middle income countries does not promote growth in Nigeria. The author's calculation indicates that adhering to this threshold leads to a negative growth of (-19.5%) and (-27.9%) respectively. The study found the sustainability threshold at 14.5% which corresponds with the highest and optimal growth rate of 6.3%. The study discoursed that sustainability aligns with the country's growth goals, unlike traditional debt sustainability analyses that focus on solvency as prescribed in SDF and proposed a new definition of debt sustainability as the threshold that maximizes the debt-output ratio while maintaining optimal growth in an economy.

Empirical Literature

Ramos and Sosvilla (2017) has examined the effect of government debt on per capita GDP across eurozone countries using 40 years' time series data to 2010. The study has found nonlinear relationship between debt and economic growth and revealed that high government debt to GDP beyond critical threshold has adverse effect on long-run economic growth.

Kharusi and Ada (2018) have found negative impact of external debt on economic growth and prescribed for the use of such external debt in productive sector for higher economic growth. The study has employed time series data for 16 years to 2015.

The study by Rathnayake, Perera and Vaas (2022) has shown that Sri Lanka's economic growth is negatively and significantly correlated with public debt, including both public domestic debt, and public external debt. Due to the negative consequences on economic growth, they recommended that the government of Sri Lanka set some borrowing limits.

Nepal has a narrow base for domestic resource mobilization and exports. Considering this fact, continuous monitoring of the sustainability of public debt is important. Nepal needs a convergence of favorable conditions to maintain sustainable GDP growth rates beyond the current level. Key indicators imply that Nepal's external debt burden is manageable, but caution is necessary to prevent unforeseen entrapment in debt (Alamgir & Ra, 2005).

Bhatta & Mishra (2020) have verified that exceeding the threshold ratio of 33 percent in debt accumulation may have adverse effects on the economic growth of Nepal. Sapkota (2023) has evaluated the impact of public debt on economic growth in Nepal and found consistent long and short term relationships between external debt and economic growth while using ARDL approach.

Mobilization of borrowing amounts should not be restrained only to the payment of interest and existing principal amounts but should also be mobilized for investment in the productive sector. Eventually, returns from such investment can enable repayment capacity. Therefore, the use of public debt in meaningful areas is crucial. (NRB, 2005).

A review of above literatures has shown that there is both positive and negative relationship between public debt and its components and economic growth. However, most of these studies have highlighted the need to set limit on public debt to reduce the negative

consequences of excessive debt levels. This paper attempts to fill the gap by prescribing the optimal public debt threshold for sustainable economic growth in Nepal. Given the recent trend of increasing volumes of public debt, both external and internal debt, poor revenue mobilization capacity of the government, and instability of the GDP growth rate of Nepal, area of the study is highly demanding and relatively new in terms of determining the optimal public debt using comprehensive controlling variables.

This paper has also included gross capital formation, which has a significant impact on the economic growth of a country, as suggested by prevailing economic growth theories and existing empirical studies such as in Denison (1980), Gill (1976), Moudatsou (2003) but not included in the paper written by Bhatta & Mishra (2020).

Methods and Materials

This section carries out the empirical estimation of the threshold public debt in Nepal. Based on the conceptual and theoretical foundations of the growth model, an econometric model is proposed first. Secondly, estimated techniques are spelled out using the time series analysis method and lastly, sources of data and sample period are discussed.

Econometric Model

In the context of Nepal, this paper has used an econometric model that establishes the relationship of public debt and various other factors to economic growth to identify the optimal public debt to GDP ratio for maximizing growth. The chosen dependent variable is the real gross domestic product (RGDP) growth rate, and public debt ratio is taken as an independent variable. This paper has used bivariate growth model in quadratic form to find the non-linear effect of public debt on GDP growth rate and results from the study are consistent with Checherita Westpal and Routher (2012).

The relationship between debt and growth is analyzed through an appropriate multivariate regression model, employing additional relevant control variables in the specifications with the time series data from 1974/75 to 2021/22. The basic regression model shown in equation 1 is obtained from the augmented model proposed in equation (2) to find the optimal public debt threshold applying the usual ceteris paribus condition hold in this causal empirical analysis as below:

The basic model used to estimate debt threshold is:

$$RGDP_t = \beta_1 PDR_t + \beta_2 Sq\_PDR_t \ldots\ldots(1)$$

The augmented econometric model used in this study is:

$$RGDP_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PDR_t + \beta_2 Sq\_PDR_t + \beta_3 TOR_t + \beta_4 GCFR_t + \beta_5 POPGR_t + \beta_6 GDSR_t + \varepsilon_t \ldots.(2)$$

where, RGDP is the percentage of real economic growth rate based on real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) at purchaser's price, PDR is the percentage of total public debt outstanding to nominal GDP with an expected positive coefficient for β_1, Sq_PDR is the square of public debt ratio with an expected positive coefficient for β_2 and subscript t is the time in years of the variables considered. Other controlling variables such as TOR is the Trade Openness and is calculated based on the percentage of the total volume of trade to nominal GDP of the year. GCFR is the percentage of gross capital formation on nominal GDP. POPGR is population growth rate in each year. The control variables used were statistically significant

factors of economic growth and similar variables used in other existing empirical studies including articles by Romer (2012), Checcherita-Westpal and Rother (2012), Wright and Grinade (2014), and Panizza & Presbitero (2014).

Estimation Technique

This paper employs both traditional threshold debt ratios and econometric models using time series data from the last 47 years to assess conditions of public debt optimality. The paper observes whether those conditions are embraced in the case of Nepal and identifies the reasons that ensure optimal public debt threshold. To deal with the problems in time series data, stationary test, cointegration test using bound test for long run relationships, and error correction model for short run dynamics among variables are applied. For residual diagnostics, LM serial correlation test and heteroskedasticity test, as well as Normality test are applied. The stability diagnostic test using recursive cusum squares residuals is used and plotted on a chart to test model stability.

The expected sign for public debt ratio (PDR) is positive and for the square of PDR is negative. Such opposite sign of these variables qualifies for a concave non-linear relationship between public debt and economic growth and signifies that public debt helps to increase economic growth rate to a certain level and then decreases the rate of change in economic growth.

Sources of Data and Sample Periods

The paper has used secondary time series data published by the Government of Nepal (GON), Ministry of Finance, Financial Controller General Office and Nepal Rastra Bank from fiscal years 1974/75 to 2021/22. The data were retrieved from the website of World Bank Group (https://databank.worldbank.org/databases), Ministry of Finance, GON, Economic Surveys published by the Ministry of Finance, GON, Quarterly Economic Bulletin, Nepal Rastra Bank etc.

<div align="center">

Results and Discussion

</div>

Details of public debt sustainability indicators of Nepal are presented in Annex 1. Annex 1 shows that that the public debt outstanding was Rs. 21.02 billion in the 1980s, which elevated sharply to Rs 155.91 billion in the 1990s and it continued to ascend in the decade of the 2000s. It further reached the level of Rs. 2010.13 billion in FY 2021/22. The average growth in public debt was 32.01 percent during the 1980s which sharply plunged down to 5.15 percent during the 2000s, and then began to increase again reaching 15.89 percent in FY 2021/22. Some of ratios of debt indicator to GDP in the last four decades are presented in the following Figure 1.

The Figure 1 shows that both total public debt to GDP and domestic debt to GDP ratio increased in 1990s from 1980s whereas such ratios decreased in both 2000s and 2010s.

The graph of public debt to GDP ratio, including all other controlling variables, are plotted in Figure 2 below to understand the trend behavior of those variables. The second Chart in Figure 2 shows that public debt to GDP ratio was increasing before the 1990s, whereas it was decreasing until FY 2014/15. From observation, there is no noticeable seasonal pattern or trend in all the variables in the graphical plot except for gross capital formation which has trend behaviour.

Figure 1

Debt Indicator on GDP (%)

Note. Based on Data from Nepal Rastra Bank and Ministry of Finance, Government of Nepal shown in Annex 1

Figure 2

Trend in Economic Growth, Public Debt and Other Variables of Nepal

Note. Based on Data from Nepal Rastra Bank and Ministry of Finance, Government of Nepal shown in Annex 1

The results regarding public debt sustainability using two different approaches: the threshold of debt indicators approach and the conditions of debt sustainability are highlighted below.

International Comparison of Debt Threshold

Some of the debt burden thresholds and benchmarks for Low-Income Countries (LIC) as per the guidance note prepared by IMF and World Bank staff are given in Table 1.

Table 1

Public Debt Burden Threshold and Benchmark

Variable	Capability to Utilize public debt	% Public Debt/GDP	% External debt to GDP[2]	% External Debt to Export
Thresholds[1] in (PV) for LIC	Weak	35.0	30.0	140.0
	Medium	55.0	40.0	180.0
	Strong	70.0	50.0	240.0
Nepal in Debt Sustainability Framework[2]				
Benchmark for Nepal, 2020		70.0	55	240
Actual Data (PV): Nepal	2019	25.1	12.4	142.7
Actual Data: Nepal	2021/22	41.43	21.14	512.84
	2023	38.3	13.4	158.1
Projection (PV): Nepal	2024	39.5	13.4	154.6
	2025	40.5	13.1	150.0

The IMF and the World Bank's Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) has classified countries' debt-carrying capacity into three categories strong, medium, and weak categories. According to Nepal's Debt Sustainability Analysis by IMF: 2020, Nepal's composite indicator score is 3.28, which indicates a strong debt-carrying capacity of the Nepal and falls under overall low risk of debt distress. The outcomes of various debt sustainability indicators, using the traditional threshold approach, distinctly reveal that the overall status of public debt in Nepal has consistently hovered around the critical level of 25 percent of GDP in 2010s, as indicated by the EU and the Commonwealth public debt threshold indicators. Additionally, it aligns with the World Bank's (2004) sustainable debt threshold indicator, which sets the limit for debt stock to GDP at 50 percent.

Based on the export of Nepal in FY2021/22, external debt is excessively higher (i.e. 512.85 percent) than the given threshold. Public debt to GDP reached 41.43 percent in FY 2021/22. Table 1 shows that Nepal falls under a strong debt-carrying capacity for debt serving as referred by IMF.

---

[1]   The Guidance Note on debt sustainability framework for low income countries prepared by IMF and World Bank staff and completed on December 26, 2017. Data source retrieved from Website: https://www.imf.org/en/About/Factsheets/Sheets/2023/imf-world-bank-debt-sustainability-framework-for-low-income-countries.

[2]   Nepal: Debt Sustainability Analysis; IMF Country Report No. 20/155; April 27, 2020. Data source retrieved from Website: https://www.imf.org/en/publications/dsa?country=NPL&fm=&fy=&tm=&ty=#search-section.

Econometric Results

After summarizing the data and variables through descriptive analysis and verifying them through simple correlational analysis and scatter plot to observe the relationship between the variable of interest (i.e., public debt ratio) and other controlling variables on real GDP growth rate, stationarity test is conducted on the time series data.

To check for the stationary on the time series data, unit root test for all relevant variables at the level and first difference before applying estimation technique are presented in the Annex 2 and Annex 3. All variables are not found to be stationary at the level and first difference individually. Real GDP growth rate, public debt to GDP ratio and gross domestic saving are found stationary at I (0) and all variable except public debt to GDP are found stationary at I(1) at 5 percent level of significance The results based on ADF test show that both level stationary I(0) and first difference stationary I(1) at a five percent level of significance are present.

Such a mixed level of stationary demands consideration for the possibility of a long-run equilibrium relationship among the variables of interest and controlling variables with real GDP growth rate (Pesaran, Shin and Smith, 2001 and Phillips, 1995).

A cointegration test is conducted to check whether variables are integrated of different orders using the Bounds test (where the Null Hypothesis: No levels relationship) for cointegration proposed by Pesaran, Shin and Smith (2001) using the autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) model. The co-integration test is conducted by using the autoregressive distributed lag 2 for annual data to avoid losing more degree of freedoms. Here, the unrestricted VAR is not chosen assuming that the variables are cointegrated and finding long run cointegration exists in the model estimation from the test.

The results of cointegration and bound test are shown in Annex 4. Since the F-statistic (calculated) is greater than the critical value for the upper bound I(1), the variables are found cointegrated and there exists a long run relationship based on the Bounds test.

When there is cointegration, both the long-run and short-run models are valid. The ARDL model is used to analyze the long-run relationships, and the ECM model is used to analyze the short-run relationships.

From Long-run estimation of the equation (2) using ARDL model is presented as below:

$$RGDP_t = \delta_0 + \delta_1 PDR_t + \delta_2 Sq\_PDR_t + \delta_3 TOR_t + \delta_4 GCFR_t + \delta_5 POPGR_t + \delta_6 GDSGR_t + \varepsilon_t \ldots (3)$$

Results of the estimation of long-run are presented in Annex 5.

The results for equation (3) after Long-run estimation are as follows:

$$RGDP_t = -1.42 + 0.19\, PDR_t - 0.00\, Sq\_PDR_t + 0.08\, TOR_t - 0.06\, GCFR_t + 0.19\, POPGR_t + 0.13\, GDSR_t \ldots (4)$$

The Table 5 shows that there is a statistically significant relationship between public debt to GDP ratio and real GDP growth at 5 percent level. One percent increase in public debt to GDP ratio increases real GDP growth by 0.19 percent in the long run. Similarly, significant long-run relationship is found between square of public debt to GDP ratio.

From the fit of the long-run cointegrating relationship with the dependent variable, i.e. real GDP growth rate, by extracting and subtracting the EC term from the dependent variable

to extract just the long-run relationship, the following graph in Figure 3 can be plotted, showing the long-run relationship with actual GDP ratio.

Figure 3

Long-run Relationship With Actual GDP Ratio

After confirming the long-run relationship, an error correction representation is developed and estimated from the following reduced form equation.

$$\Delta RGDP_t = -1.567 \ Cointegration \ equation_{t-1} + \Delta \ 0.173 \ RGDP_{t-1} - \Delta \ 0.335 \ PDR_t + \Delta \ 0.193 \ PDR_{t-1} + \Delta \ 0.003 \ Sq\_PDR_t + \Delta \ 0.626 \ GDSR_t + \Delta \ 0.390 \ GDSR_{t-1} \ \ldots\ldots\ldots(5)$$

Results of the estimation of short-run coefficients are presented in Annex 6. It shows that the lagged error correction term (ECM-1) is statistically significant and negative. This result indicates the cointegration among the variables: real GDP growth, public debt to GDP ratio and gross domestic saving. The absolute value of the coefficient of error correction term (i.e. 1.57) implies that the system is convergent, yet, has oscillatory adjustment process.

Diagnostic Test

The diagnostic test results for the model are detailed in Table 2. The Chi-square and F statistic using the Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test shows that there is no serial correlation in the residuals of the model at the 5 percent level of significance. A higher P value (21 percent and 35 percent) reveals a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_0 = no serial correlation exists in the estimation of the model) at the 5 percent level of significance.

The White test results indicate that the residuals exhibit homoscedasticity, suggesting consistent variance across the observations. A higher P-value (10 percent and 7 percent) reveals a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_0 = homoskedasticity exists in the estimation of the model) at the 5 percent level of significance. Additionally, the Jarque-Bera value and a higher P-value of 83 percent, tested at a 5 percent level of significance, affirm the normal distribution of the residuals in the model.

Table 2

Diagnostic Test Results

Diagnostic test	Chi-square	F Statistic	Jarque-Bera
Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM	3.17 (0.21)	1.10 (0.35)	
Heteroskedasticity: White test	19.86 (0.10)	1.88 (0.07)	
Normality test			0.37 (0.83)

Note. p-value is in parenthesis

To test model stability, this study has applied the stability diagnostic test using recursive cusum squares residuals. In Figure 4, the cusum squares falls within the band of 5 percent level of significance and shows the model is stable.

Figure 4

Plotting the Results of Recursive Residuals of Cusum-Squares

Relationship Between Public Debt and Economic Growth

The debt coefficients displayed in Annex 5 reveal a non-linear concave relationship in the debt-growth dynamic. In the long-run, specifications of the ARDL model, the positive coefficient of debt, coupled with the negative sign of the debt square, suggests that the relationship is characterized by diminishing returns. It also implies that up to certain point of the threshold, lower debt to GDP ratio has positive effect on GDP growth rate and after the point threshold, the square term of debt to GDP overshadows the initial positive contribution of debt in economic growth (Bhatta & Mishra, 2020).

This paper primarily concentrates on exploring the correlation between public debt and economic growth. A bivariate model has been employed to calculate the optimal threshold for public debt that maximizes growth. The plotted graph aids in discerning the presence of a relationship resembling a Laffer curve. Figure 5 illustrates a representation of the econometric results derived from the following estimated quadratic bivariate equation using the basic equation (1) derived from long run cointegrated equation (4) using partial derivative.

Real GDP Rate = 0.187546 PDR - 0.002646 Square of PDR

The concave curve in Figure 5 depicts an inverted U-shaped relationship between economic growth rates and the public debt to GDP ratio.

Figure 5

Optimal Level of Public Debt for Economic Growth of Nepal

The findings indicate that Nepal experienced higher growth rates when public debt-to-GDP ratio was at 35.43 percent. The benchmark, as indicated by Reinhart and Rogoff (2010) for high-income countries, is set at 90 percent. Butkus and Seputine (2018) discovered that debt turning points range from 46 percent to 229 percent of GDP in high-income countries and from 8 percent to 145 percent of GDP in low-income countries. Additionally, it has been recognized that nations exhibiting superior governance quality and lower trade deficits tend to have a higher threshold level for debt.

Excessive level of public debt has implication on fiscal and monitory policy as well as financial stability. Higher levels of debt constrain fiscal policy by limiting the ability of governments to implement expansionary policy during economic depressions. A significant budget allocation to pay interest offers less room for fiscal stimulus packages and the discretionary spending on critical areas such as infrastructure, education, and healthcare. This limitation reduces the capacity of government to stimulate economic, possibly delaying periods of recession.

Similarly, higher level of debt brings challenges for monetary policy due to upward pressure on interest rates since debt becomes riskier as the level of debt increases. It causes central bank to opt for tight monetary policy to stabilize financial markets, triggering to higher borrowing costs for businesses. Excessive debt level results for limited space of monetary policy to economic turmoil. It tenders for financial instability, reduce investor confidence, bond market volatility and exchange rate fluctuation. It consequently has negative effect on economic growth and macroeconomic stability.

Conclusion

The relationship between public debt and economic growth has been analyzed through a non-linear relationship, utilizing time series annual data spanning from fiscal year 1974/75 to fiscal year 2021/22. A quadratic bivariate model utilizing ARDL coefficients has been calculated to determine the optimal public debt threshold that facilitates economic growth. The ideal ratio of public debt to GDP for Nepal is found 35.43 percent.

The estimation of the threshold for the public debt ratio in Nepal found in this paper is similar to the level calibrated by Bhatta & Mishra, (2020). Joint IMF and Nepal Bank-Fund Debt Sustainability Analysis (DSA), 2020 shows that Nepal's composite indicator score is 3.28, which signals a strong debt-carrying capacity and low risk of external debt distress. The objective of DSF is to assist low-income countries in making borrowing decisions and it

typically focuses on solvency and do not ensure no growth deficit. As a result, IMF's sustainability threshold (which is higher than the optimal threshold derived in this study) suggested for Nepal may not be appropriate to facilitate economic growth and is suboptimal.

Due to non-availability of data relating to interest rate and maturity of debt for each deal and categories of internal debt and external debt, present value of debt is not calculated while using public debt threshold in this study. Therefore, use of present value of debt would have given true picture while determining appropriate debt threshold indicator.

Results based on indicators of the sustainable threshold depict that both public debt and external debt have been increasing in recent years. Therefore, expansion and diversification in exports from domestic production may largely be helpful in improving the external debt threshold by reducing the external debt burden and increasing domestic production. By ensuring the repayment of debt, use of borrowed capital should be in the productive sectors that supports economic growth.

Recently, the increase in expenditure has been higher than the rate of increase in revenue mobilization. As a result, public debt may increase rapidly in the future to meet the fiscal deficit and may lead to exceeding the threshold prescribed by the IMF/World bank and others.

The policy implication of the finding is to maintain optimal public debt and use public debt in a sustainable way that allows the government and central bank an adequate policy space that facilitates the effectiveness of fiscal and monetary tools to respond to economic shocks and achieve their policy objectives.

Excessive deficit in financing causes debt crisis, pressure to future generations for repayments, crowding out effect and higher interest payment burden. Therefore, this study suggests not to exceed the optimal level of public debt set with the growth maximizing debt threshold. Debt accumulation should closely correspond with the country's aims for sustainable economic development, emphasizing not just debt repayment but also the promotion of the highest possible level of growth attainable.

References

Akram, N. (2011). Impact of public debt on the economic growth of Pakistan. *The Pakistan Development Review*, *50*(4), 599–615.

Alamgir, M., & Ra, S. (2005). Nepal public debt sustainability analysis.

Bhatta, G. P., & Mishra, A. (2020). Estimating optimum growth-maximizing public debt threshold for Nepal. *NRB Economic Review*, *32*(2), 1-28.

Bhattarai, K. (2013). Public debt in Nepal: An assessment. *Economic Journal of Development Issues*, 15 & 16, 50-59.

Beddies, C. H., Le Manchec, M. H., & Barkbu, B. B. (2009). The debt sustainability framework for low-income countries. *The Debt Sustainability Framework for Low-Income Countries*. International Monetary Fund.

Butkus, M., & Seputiene J. (2018). Growth effect of public debt: The role of government effectiveness and trade balance. *Economies*, 6(4), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies6040062.

Checcherita-Westphal, C., & Rother P. (2012). The impact of high government debt on economic growth and its channels: An empirical investigation for the euro area. *European Economic Review*, 56(7), 1392-1405.

Cohen, D., (1995). Large external debt and slow domestic growth: A Theoretical analysis. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 19 (5): 1141-1163.

Denison, E. F. (1980). The contribution of capital to economic growth. *The American Economic Review*, *70*(2), 220–224.

Gill, K. S. (1976). Economic growth and fixed capital formation in the sixties. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *11*(45), 1763–1770.

Gray, S. (1998). *Debt sustainability and developing economies.* Available via Internet. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/24398815?seq=16

IMF and World Bank (2017). The guidance note prepared by IMF and World Bank staff and completed on December 26, 2017. Retrieved from *https://www.imf.org/en/About/Factsheets/Sheets/2023/imf-world-bank-debt-sustainability-framework-for-low-income-countries.*

IMF (2020). *Nepal: Debt sustainability analysis* (IMF Country Report No. 20/155). *https://www.imf.org/en/publications/dsa?country=NPL&fm=&fy=&tm=&ty=#search-section*.

Kharusi, S. A., & Ada, M. S. (2018). External debt and economic growth: The case of emerging economy. *Journal of Economic Integration*, *33*(1), 1141–1157.

Kidochukwu, O. (2015). IMF recommended debt sustainability threshold for Nigeria. Is it growth augmenting? An optimization algorithm approach. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*, Vol. 08, No. 11, pp. 81-90.

Krugman, P. (1988). Financing vs. forgiving a debt overhang. *Journal of development Economics*, 29(3): 253-268.

Moudatsou, A. (2003). foreign direct investment and economic growth in the European Union. *Journal of Economic Integration*, *18*(4), 689–707.

Mupunga, N., & P. Roux. (2015). Estimating the optimal growth-maximising public debt threshold for Zimbabwe. *Southern African Business Review*, 19(3), 102-128.

NRB. (2005). Nepal Rastra Bank in Fifty Years. Kathmandu.

Panizza, U., & Presbitero, A. F. (2014). Public debt and economic growth: is there a causal effect? *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 41, 21-41.

Pesaran, M. H., Shin, Y., & Smith, R. J. (2001). Bounds Testing Approaches to the Analysis of Level Relationships. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, *16*(3), 289–326.

Phillips, P. C. B. (1995). Nonstationary time series and cointegration. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, *10*(1), 87–94.

Ra, S., & Rhee, C. Y. (2005). Managing the debt: An Assessment of Nepal's public debt sustainability.

Ramos-Herrera, M. D. C., & Sosvilla-Rivero, S. (2017). An empirical characterization of the effects of public debt on economic growth. *Applied Economics*, *49*(35), 3495-3508.

Rathnayake, R. W. S. K., Perera, W. T. N. M., & Vaas, W. U. S. (2022). Public debt and economic growth: evidence from Sri Lanka. Conference: 12th ICME (International Conference on Management & Economics) 2023 - University of Ruhuna Matara, Sri Lanka.

Reinhart, C. M., Reinhart, V., & K. Rogoff. (2015). Dealing with debt. *Journal of International Economics*, 96(1), 43-55 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2014.11.001.

Romer, D. (2012). Advanced macroeconomics (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Sachs J (1989). The debt overhang of developing countries. In *Debt, stabilization and development: Essays in memory of Carlos Díaz Alejandro*. Basil Blackwell.

Sapkota, P. (2023). Effects of public debt on economic growth of Nepal. *The Lumbini Journal of Business and Economics*, 11(1), 343-362

Washington, H. (2015). *Demystifying sustainability: Towards real solutions.* Routledge.

World Bank (2018). Debt sustainability framework (DSF). https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/debt-toolkit/dsf

World Bank (2024). Data bank. https://databank.worldbank.org/databases

Wright, A., & K. Grenade. (2014). Determining optimal public debt and debt-growth dynamics in Caribbean countries. *Research in Applied Economics*, 2(2), 87-115.

Annex 1

*Indicators of Public Debt Sustainability (*Amount in Rs 10 Million)

Variable and Year	1980s	1990s	2000s	2010s	FY 2021/22
Domestic Outstanding	719.75	3448.01	9511.12	29690.01	98428.52
Foreign Debt Outstanding	1382.16	12143.14	23313.77	43290.43	102584.70
Total Debt Outstanding	2101.92	15591.16	32824.89	72980.43	201013.20
Public Debt Growth Rate	32.01	17.59	5.15	14.15	15.89
% Domestic Debt/GDP	11.47	14.59	14.19	10.82	20.29
% Foreign Debt/GDP	20.67	50.25	36.53	16.09	21.14
% Total Debt /GDP	32.14	64.84	50.72	26.91	41.43
Fiscal Deficit	-429.34	-1388.03	-2803.65	-14026.10	-20246.40
Fiscal Deficit % of Nominal GDP	-7.19	-6.13	-4.08	-4.61	-4.17
Revenue excluding grant	503.33	2549.26	8754.15	49441.05	106795.90
% of total debt to revenue	363.63	635.81	426.81	157.81	188.22
Revenue including Grant	624.20	2939.56	10407.46	52843.03	109387.50
Total Expenditure	1053.54	4327.59	13211.11	66869.13	129633.90
Recurrent Expenditure	349.17	2010.74	7783.75	44311.23	96156.42
Capital Expenditure	704.38	2218.30	4120.51	13412.81	21637.68
Financing expenditure	0.00	98.55	1306.85	9145.06	11839.77
Interest Repayment	65.61	342.02	666.84	1446.57	4502.88
% Interest Repayment to GDP	1.02	1.46	1.02	0.56	0.93
% Interest Repayment to Total Debt	3.18	2.26	2.02	2.07	2.24
% Interest Repayment to Revenue	9.29	12.48	7.23	3.08	4.12
Principal Payment	50.26	342.02	664.84	5037.29	7675.36
Debt Servicing	115.87	684.04	1331.67	6483.86	12178.24
% Debt Servicing on GDP	1.72	2.92	2.03	2.47	2.51
% Debt Servicing on Revenue	15.65	24.96	14.43	13.25	11.13

Variable and Year	1980s	1990s	2000s	2010s	FY 2021/22
Primary Balance	-363.73	-1046.01	-2136.82	-12579.50	-15743.50
Interest on Foreign Debt	16.97	114.50	210.24	347.35	744.20
Grants	120.87	390.30	1653.31	3401.98	2591.66
Current Account	-294.81	-1113.28	952.69	-957.82	-62332.50
Current Account as % of GDP	-4.41	-5.17	1.53	0.51	-12.85
GDP (Current Price)	5654.06	24115.91	68979.69	268154.30	485162.50

Note. Author's Calculation Based on Data from Nepal Rastra Bank and Ministry of Finance, Government of Nepal

Annex 2

Unit Root Test at Level

Method	Statistic	Probabilities [#]
ADF - Fisher Chi-square	38.51	0.00
ADF - Choi Z-stat	-2.33	0.01

Probabilities for Fisher tests are computed using an asymptotic Chi-square distribution.

Variables	Prob.	Lag	Max Lag	Observation
D(REAL GDP GROWTH)	0.00	2	9	44
PUBLIC DEBT TO GDP RATIO	0.05	4	9	43
SQUARE OF PDR	0.60	0	9	47
TRADE OPENNESS RATIO	0.14	0	9	47
GROSS CAPITAL FORMATION RATIO	0.98	8	9	39
POPULATION GROWTH	0.57	1	9	45
GROSS DOMESTIC SAVING RATIO	0.00	0	9	47

Annex 3

Unit Root Test at First Difference

Method	Statistic	Probabilities [#]
ADF - Fisher Chi-square	169.51	0.00
ADF - Choi Z-stat	-10.83	0.00

Probabilities for Fisher tests are computed using an asymptotic Chi-square distribution.

Variables	Prob.	Lag	Max Lag	Observation
D(REAL GDP GROWTH)	0.00	2	9	43
D(PUBLIC DEBT TO GDP RATIO (PDR))	0.07	1	9	45
D(SQUARE OF PDR)	0.03	1	9	45
D(TRADE OPENNESS RATIO)	0.00	0	9	46
D(GROSS CAPITAL FORMATION RATIO)	0.00	7	9	39
D(POPULATION GROWTH)	0.00	0	9	45
D(GROSS DOMESTIC SAVING RATIO)	0.00	2	9	44

Annex 4

Cointegration and Bounds Test

Test Statistic	Value	Significance	I(0)	I(1)
F-Bounds Test Selecting optimal lag 2	8.172476	10%	1.99	2.94
		5%	2.27	3.28
		2.5%	2.55	3.61
		1%	2.88	3.99

Annex 5

Long-run Estimation Results

Variables	Coefficients
PUBLIC DEBT TO GDP RATIO (PDR)	0.19 ** (0.07)
SQUARE OF PDR	-0.00 ** (0.00)
TRADE OPENNESS RATIO	0.08 (0.05)
GROSS CAPITAL FORMATION RATIO	-0.06 (0.06)
POPULATION GROWTH	0.19 (0.66)
GROSS DOMESTIC SAVING RATIO	0.13 (0.18)
R-squared 0.65 and Durbin-Watson stat 1.99	

Note. Dependent variable is Real GDP growth. Selected Model: ARDL(2, 2, 1, 0, 0, 0, 2). Values in parenthesis are standard errors. P-value of test refers to the probability of rejecting the null that beta coefficients are zero. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Annex 6

Short-run Estimation Results

Variables	Coefficients
D(RGDP (-1))	0.17 (0.11)
D(PUBLIC DEBT TO GDP RATIO)	-0.33 * (0.00)
D(PUBLIC DEBT TO GDP RATIO (-1))	0.19 *** (0.06)
D($sq\_$PDR)	0.00 (0.00)
D(GROSS DOMESTIC SAVING RATIO)	0.63 *** (0.10)
D(GROSS DOMESTIC SAVING RATIO (-1))	0.39 *** (0.11)
CointEq(-1)*	-1.57 *** (0.18)
R-squared 0.86 and Durbin-Watson stat 1.99	

Note. Dependent variable is Real GDP growth. Selected Model: ARDL(2, 2, 1, 0, 0, 0, 2). Values in parenthesis are standard errors. P-value of test refers to the probability of rejecting the null that beta coefficients are zero. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$