Opportunity Costs in Healthcare Systems of Developing Nations: The Trade-off Between Basic Sanitation and Quantum Technology Research

Dr. William Santos Araújo Ramos*
Independent Researcher in Healthcare Technologies

October 17, 2025

Abstract

This study examines the fundamental economic dilemma facing developing nations regarding healthcare investment allocation between basic infrastructure and emerging quantum technologies. Through the lens of opportunity cost theory and resource scarcity principles, we analyze the trade-off between investing in essential sanitation systems versus allocating resources to quantum technology research for healthcare applications. Drawing from public health economics and development theory, the analysis reveals that despite the transformative potential of quantum computing in medical diagnostics and drug discovery, the immediate returns on basic infrastructure investments significantly outweigh long-term benefits from quantum research in resource-constrained settings. The study demonstrates that for nations struggling with preventable diseases linked to inadequate sanitation, the opportunity cost of diverting funds to quantum technology research represents a misallocation that exacerbates existing health inequities. While acknowledging the strategic importance of scientific advancement, the findings suggest that current fiscal constraints and urgent public health needs necessitate prioritizing foundational infrastructure investments. This conclusion derives from analyzing disease burden reduction, cost-effectiveness ratios, and the temporal dimension of health outcomes in developing economies.

Keywords: Opportunity cost; Healthcare infrastructure; Quantum technology; Developing economies; Resource allocation

JEL Codes: I15, I18, O32, O38

*Email: willsantosa.med@gmail.com

1 Introduction

The allocation of scarce resources in healthcare systems represents one of the most critical challenges for developing economies. As nations face the dual pressure of addressing immediate public health crises while pursuing technological advancement, policymakers must navigate complex trade-offs that shape population health outcomes for decades. The emergence of quantum technologies as a potential frontier in medical innovation has introduced a new dimension to this already complicated decision-making landscape (de Jong, 2022).

Developing nations currently face a paradox. On one hand, approximately 2.3 billion people globally lack access to basic sanitation facilities, with the majority residing in low and middle-income countries. This deficit directly contributes to preventable diseases that account for millions of deaths annually (Sumarto and Silva, 2014). On the other hand, quantum computing promises revolutionary advances in drug discovery, personalized medicine, and disease modeling that could theoretically leapfrog traditional development pathways (Wheatley Research Consultancy, 2024).

This study focuses specifically on the opportunity cost analysis of allocating public funds between basic sanitation infrastructure and quantum technology research in healthcare contexts. The choice is not arbitrary but represents a broader tension between addressing immediate, well-understood needs and investing in potentially transformative but uncertain future technologies (Anderson et al., 2006). While quantum computing applications in healthcare remain largely theoretical and require substantial capital investment with long development timelines, sanitation infrastructure delivers immediate, measurable health improvements with well-established cost-benefit ratios (Fan, 2008).

The economic rationale for this investigation stems from fundamental scarcity. Developing economies operate under severe budget constraints where every dollar allocated to one sector represents a dollar unavailable for another (Fan, 2009). Unlike wealthy nations that can pursue multiple objectives simultaneously, resource-poor countries must make stark choices. The question becomes whether scarce public health funds should address known, immediate problems with proven solutions or fund research into technologies that may yield benefits primarily in distant futures or in contexts far removed from current needs (Gorgulu et al., 2023).

Previous literature has extensively documented the health and economic returns from basic infrastructure investments in developing countries. Studies consistently demonstrate that sanitation improvements reduce child mortality, decrease disease burden, enhance educational outcomes through reduced illness, and generate positive spillover effects throughout local economies (Sennoga and Matovu, 2012). The causal pathways are well understood, implementation technologies are mature, and cost structures are predictable. This body of evidence provides a robust baseline for comparison (Devadas and Pennings, 2019).

Conversely, the literature on quantum technology applications in healthcare remains largely speculative when applied to developing nation contexts (Wolbring, 2022). While quantum computing shows promise for molecular simulation in drug development and optimization of complex medical logistics, these applications require extensive supporting infrastructure, highly trained personnel, and integration with existing healthcare systems that many developing nations lack. The temporal horizon for realizing benefits extends beyond typical planning cycles, and the risk of technological obsolescence or failure remains high.

This analysis employs opportunity cost theory as its primary analytical framework. Every investment decision in healthcare carries an implicit opportunity cost, the foregone benefits from alternative uses of those same resources. In contexts of absolute scarcity, these opportunity costs become explicit and measurable (Kombate, 2018). The study examines not only the direct costs and benefits of each investment category but also the distributional implications, temporal considerations, and the irreversibility of certain choices.

The research contributes to policy discourse by providing a structured framework for evaluating technology investment decisions in resource-constrained healthcare systems (Acharya and Nuriev, 2016). Rather than dismissing quantum technology as irrelevant to developing nations or advocating for basic infrastructure to the exclusion of all innovation, this study seeks to identify the conditions under which each investment category becomes economically rational. The analysis recognizes that optimal allocation likely varies across different developmental stages, institutional capacities, and specific national contexts.

The structure proceeds as follows. Section 2 establishes the theoretical foundations of opportunity cost analysis in public health investment, drawing from welfare economics and development theory. Section 3 examines the empirical evidence on returns from basic infrastructure versus emerging technology investments in developing country contexts. Section 4 analyzes the specific trade-offs between sanitation and quantum research, incorporating both quantitative metrics and qualitative considerations. Section 5 discusses policy implications and provides guidance for decision-makers facing these allocation dilemmas. Section 6 concludes with realistic assessments of how developing nations should prioritize healthcare investments given current constraints.

The ultimate conclusion, supported by both theoretical analysis and empirical evidence, suggests that while quantum technology research represents an important frontier for global science, developing nations facing urgent sanitation deficits should prioritize basic infrastructure investments (Reinikka and Svensson, 1999). This recommendation derives not from technological pessimism but from economic realism about opportunity costs, implementation capacity, and the moral imperative to address preventable suffering when effective interventions exist. The analysis acknowledges that this prioritization may delay entry into emerging technology fields but argues that premature investment in quantum research, before establishing fundamental healthcare infrastructure, risks widening rather than narrowing global health disparities.

2 Theoretical Framework of Opportunity Costs in Public Health

The concept of opportunity cost forms the cornerstone of economic analysis in resource allocation decisions. In public health contexts, opportunity cost represents the health benefits foregone when resources are directed toward one intervention rather than another. This principle becomes particularly acute in developing economies where budget constraints are binding and unmet health needs are substantial (Fan, 2009).

The standard formulation of opportunity cost in healthcare investment can be expressed through the concept of health production functions. Each investment option produces health outcomes through different mechanisms and at different rates. Basic sanitation infrastructure reduces disease transmission through environmental modification, while quantum research potentially enhances diagnostic and therapeutic capabilities through technological advancement. The opportunity cost of choosing quantum research over sanitation equals the health improvements that sanitation would have delivered but now remain unrealized (Yousuf Khan and Sasaki, 2001).

Traditional welfare economics provides the foundation for evaluating these trade-offs. Social welfare functions aggregate individual health outcomes into collective measures, but this aggregation becomes problematic when benefits accrue to different populations at different times. Sanitation investments primarily benefit current populations facing immediate disease risks, while quantum technology research may benefit future populations or populations in entirely different geographic contexts (Martins and Veiga, 2014).

The theory of public goods further complicates this analysis. Basic sanitation exhibits strong public good characteristics within local communities. When one household gains access to improved sanitation, neighboring households benefit through reduced disease transmission even without direct investment. These positive externalities justify public investment beyond what private markets would provide (Holahan and Lubell, 2016). Quantum research also exhibits public good characteristics, but the beneficiary population may be globally dispersed and temporally distant from the investing nation.

Capital theory offers insights into the irreversibility and path dependency of infrastructure investments. Once a nation commits resources to building sanitation systems, it creates durable assets that generate health benefits over decades (Devadas and Pennings, 2019). The capital stock accumulates, maintenance costs are relatively predictable, and the technology is well understood. Quantum research investments, by contrast, create knowledge capital that is non-rival and non-excludable. A developing nation that funds quantum research contributes to global knowledge but may struggle to appropriate the returns if it lacks the complementary assets needed to commercialize or implement resulting technologies.

The concept of absorptive capacity, drawn from innovation economics, helps explain why identical investments may yield different returns across countries (Saleem and Higuchi, 2014). Absorptive capacity refers to a nation's ability to recognize, assimilate, and apply new knowledge. Quantum technology research requires extensive supporting infrastructure including advanced computing facilities, specialized training programs, and integration with existing research ecosystems. Many developing nations lack this absorptive capacity, meaning that quantum research investments may yield minimal returns even if the underlying science proves successful.

Information economics highlights the role of uncertainty in investment decisions. Sanitation investments operate under conditions of relatively low uncertainty. The health impacts are well documented, implementation challenges are understood, and cost structures are predictable (Gorgulu et al., 2023). Quantum research operates under fundamental uncertainty. The timeline for practical applications remains unknown, the required complementary innovations cannot be fully anticipated, and the ultimate effectiveness of quantum approaches for specific health challenges remains unproven.

The theory of threshold effects suggests that certain health investments only become effective once they exceed minimum scales. This may apply to both sanitation and quantum research but in different ways. Sanitation systems require network effects to maximize disease reduction, partial coverage leaves communities vulnerable to continued transmission (Sennoga and Matovu, 2012). Similarly, quantum research requires critical mass in expertise, equipment, and supporting institutions before generating usable outputs.

Distributional considerations introduce equity concerns into efficiency analysis. Basic infrastructure investments directly improve conditions for the worst-off populations (Acharya and Nuriev, 2016). In developing nations, those suffering from sanitation-related diseases typically occupy the lowest socioeconomic positions. Quantum research, while potentially benefiting humanity broadly, may initially serve populations with access to advanced medical systems, potentially widening rather than narrowing health inequities during the research and early adoption phases.

The concept of option value provides a potential justification for quantum research even in resource-constrained settings. Option value represents the worth of maintaining future opportunities. By investing in quantum research today, a nation preserves the option to participate in future technological ecosystems that may become central to healthcare delivery. However, option value must be weighed against the certainty of current suffering that alternative investments could address (Kombate, 2018).

These theoretical frameworks collectively suggest that opportunity cost analysis in healthcare must account for multiple dimensions including temporal displacement of benefits, distributional effects, uncertainty, absorptive capacity constraints, and irreversibility of certain choices. The comparison between basic sanitation and quantum research involves trade-offs along each of these dimensions, with different frameworks pointing toward different conclusions depending on the weights assigned to various considerations.

3 Comparative Analysis of Investment Returns in Developing Economies

The empirical evidence on returns from healthcare infrastructure investments in developing nations provides crucial context for evaluating opportunity costs. Numerous studies have quantified the health, economic, and social benefits of sanitation improvements, while evidence on quantum technology applications in similar settings remains limited and largely speculative.

Basic sanitation infrastructure demonstrates consistent, measurable returns across diverse developing country contexts (Fan, 2008). Research in Sub-Saharan Africa shows that improved sanitation reduces diarrheal disease incidence by 30-40 percent in affected communities. Given that diarrheal diseases account for approximately 525,000 child deaths annually in low-income countries, even modest sanitation improvements generate substantial mortality reduction (Sumarto and Silva, 2014). The dose-response relationship is well established: incremental improvements in coverage produce proportional health gains until saturation coverage is achieved.

The economic returns from sanitation investment extend beyond direct health improvements (Gorgulu et al., 2023). Studies employing natural experiments and quasi-experimental designs estimate that every dollar invested in basic sanitation infrastructure generates between three and six dollars in economic benefits through reduced healthcare costs, increased labor productivity, and enhanced educational outcomes. These returns accrue relatively quickly, typically within five to seven years of infrastructure completion, making them accessible within policy-relevant time horizons (Sennoga and Matovu, 2012).

Labor market effects provide another dimension of returns (Terefe, 2012). Adults in communities with adequate sanitation report fewer sick days and higher labor force participation rates. Children experience improved school attendance and cognitive development outcomes, likely due to reduced disease burden and improved nutrition enabled by decreased intestinal parasite loads. These human capital improvements compound over time as healthier, better-educated cohorts enter the workforce.

The cost structure of sanitation infrastructure is well documented and relatively predictable (Anderson et al., 2006). Basic sanitation systems in low-income settings cost between 100 and 300 dollars per person to install, with annual maintenance costs of approximately 10 to 20 dollars per person. These costs vary by geography, population density, and existing infrastructure, but remain within ranges that developing nation budgets can meaningfully address. Importantly, sanitation investments are divisible, allowing phased implementation that matches available funding.

In contrast, quantum technology research for healthcare applications requires fundamentally different resource commitments. Building quantum computing capacity suitable for drug discovery applications requires initial investments exceeding 100 million dollars for hardware alone, before accounting for facilities, personnel, and operational costs (Wheatley Research Consultancy, 2024). These fixed costs do not scale linearly with population size, meaning that developing nations cannot implement quantum research programs incrementally or at scales proportionate to their budgets.

The personnel requirements for quantum research programs further distinguish them from sanitation infrastructure. Quantum computing requires highly specialized expertise in physics, computer science, and domain-specific applications (de Jong, 2022). Developing nations face severe shortages of personnel with these qualifications, and training programs require decade-long investments before generating capable researchers. Brain drain exacerbates this challenge, as trained quantum scientists often emigrate to institutions in developed nations offering superior research conditions and compensation (Saleem and Higuchi, 2014).

The timeline for realizing benefits differs dramatically between these investment categories (Devadas and Pennings, 2019). Sanitation infrastructure begins generating health benefits during construction as partial coverage reduces disease transmission. Full benefits materialize within months to years after completion. Quantum technology research follows a fundamentally different trajectory. Even well-funded programs in developed nations have not yet produced commercial healthcare applications, suggesting timelines extending decades into the future.

Risk profiles also diverge substantially. Sanitation infrastructure failures are typically local and addressable through engineering modifications or improved maintenance (Reinikka and Svensson, 1999). The core technology is mature, and implementation failures rarely result in total loss of investment. Quantum research operates under fundamental scientific uncertainty. Promising research directions may prove technologically infeasible, required breakthroughs may not materialize, or practical applications may require complementary innovations that developing nations cannot provide.

Spillover effects and externalities operate differently across these investment types (Eden and Kraay, 2014). Sanitation infrastructure generates strong local positive externalities through reduced disease transmission, environmental improvements, and enhanced community wellbeing. These benefits are largely captured by the investing community and nation. Quantum research generates knowledge spillovers that are globally accessible, meaning that much of the benefit from a developing nation's quantum research investment may accrue to other countries with superior capacity to commercialize and implement resulting technologies.

The scalability of impacts presents another contrast (Corong et al., 2012). Once sanitation infrastructure is established in one community, the model can be replicated in other communities with similar cost-benefit characteristics. This allows successful programs to scale geographically. Quantum research programs do not scale similarly. The fixed costs of establishing quantum computing capacity do not decrease significantly when serving larger populations, and the knowledge generated is non-rival, meaning that additional populations can benefit without proportional additional investment.

Importantly, these investment categories are not entirely substitutable (Kombate, 2018). Quantum research cannot address the immediate health crisis caused by inadequate sanitation, while sanitation infrastructure does not contribute to long-term scientific capacity. The question facing policymakers is not whether both investments have value but rather how to sequence and prioritize when resources allow only one or the other in the near term.

The absorptive capacity constraints mentioned in the theoretical section manifest empirically in developing nation experiences with advanced technology adoption (Raja and Christiaensen, 2017). Countries that have attempted to leapfrog developmental stages by investing in cutting-edge technologies without establishing foundational infrastructure often see limited returns. Examples from telecommunications and renewable energy sectors suggest that complementary investments in basic infrastructure, education, and institutional capacity are prerequisites for successfully deploying advanced technologies.

4 The Sanitation-Quantum Research Trade-off in Resource-Constrained Settings

The specific trade-off between sanitation infrastructure and quantum research investment crystallizes the broader tension between addressing immediate needs and pursuing long-term technological advancement. This section examines this trade-off through multiple lenses including public health outcomes, economic efficiency, distributional equity, and political economy considerations.

From a public health perspective, the comparison is stark (Sumarto and Silva, 2014). Inadequate sanitation currently causes approximately 432,000 preventable deaths annually in developing nations, predominantly among children under five years old. These deaths result from well-understood causal pathways: contaminated water sources lead to diarrheal diseases, which cause dehydration and malnutrition, ultimately resulting in mortality or long-term developmental impairment. The interventions to prevent these deaths exist, are proven effective, and can be implemented immediately with available technology.

Quantum technology's potential healthcare applications, while potentially revolutionary, address fundamentally different problems (Wolbring, 2022). Quantum computing may accelerate drug discovery by enabling molecular simulations impossible with classical computers. This could theoretically reduce the time required to develop new medications from 10-15 years to 5-7 years. However, these benefits remain speculative and, if realized, would primarily impact populations with access to advanced pharmaceutical interventions.

The economic efficiency analysis reinforces this disparity (Anderson et al., 2006). Cost-effectiveness studies measure health interventions in terms of cost per disability-adjusted life year (DALY) averted. Basic sanitation infrastructure in low-income settings costs between 50 and 150 dollars per DALY averted, placing it among the most cost-effective health interventions available. By comparison, the cost-effectiveness of quantum research for healthcare cannot be meaningfully calculated because the health outcomes remain uncertain, the timeline is undefined, and the probability of success is unknown.

Distributional analysis reveals additional concerns (Acharya and Nuriev, 2016). Sanitation investments directly benefit the populations most burdened by disease, typically poor rural and peri-urban communities. The distributional incidence is progressive, improving outcomes for those with the worst baseline conditions. Quantum research investment patterns suggest more ambiguous distributional effects. Research facilities and high-skilled employment concentrate in urban centers, often capital cities, benefiting relatively privileged populations.

The political economy of healthcare investment decisions introduces practical constraints beyond purely economic calculations (Martins and Veiga, 2014). Democratic accountability pressures policymakers to deliver visible results within electoral cycles. Sanitation infrastructure offers tangible, photographable progress that communities can observe and politicians can claim credit for. Quantum research facilities offer fewer such opportunities, particularly given the long timelines before producing practical applications.

Fiscal constraints in developing nations make these trade-offs particularly acute (Fan, 2009). Consider a hypothetical low-income nation with a total annual healthcare budget of 500 million dollars. Establishing a basic quantum computing research program might require 150 million dollars initially plus 20 million annually for operations and personnel. This 150 million dollar investment could alternatively provide basic sanitation infrastructure for approximately 1.5 million people, preventing thousands of deaths annually and generating immediate economic returns through reduced healthcare costs and increased productivity.

The opportunity cost calculation becomes even more stark when considering recurrent costs (Devadas and Pennings, 2019). The 20 million dollars in annual operational expenses for a quantum research program could alternatively provide sanitation access to an additional 200,000 people each year, compounding health benefits over time. After ten years, the cumulative health impact of choosing sanitation over quantum research would include prevented deaths numbering in the tens of thousands and economic benefits in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Proponents of quantum research investment might argue that developing nations should pursue both objectives rather than choosing between them. However, this argument ignores binding budget constraints (Dorosh et al., 2020). In contexts where millions lack access to basic sanitation and where healthcare budgets cannot fund even the most cost-effective interventions universally, claims that countries should pursue both sanitation and quantum research are economically incoherent. The scarcity that defines developing nation contexts makes trade-offs inescapable.

Another argument for quantum research suggests that developing nations should invest now to avoid being left behind as quantum technologies mature (de Jong, 2022). This fear of missing out ignores several realities. First, quantum technologies are being developed primarily in wealthy nations with robust research ecosystems. Developing nations' marginal contributions to this global effort are unlikely to determine whether quantum healthcare applications succeed or fail. Second, if quantum technologies do mature into practical healthcare tools, developing nations can adopt them once proven, avoiding the enormous sunk costs of failed research pathways.

The argument also assumes that quantum research capacity requires continuous investment from early stages. However, many technologies demonstrate that late adoption can be advantageous (Saleem and Higuchi, 2014). Countries that waited to invest in mobile telecommunications avoided the sunk costs of landline infrastructure. Nations that delayed renewable energy investments benefited from dramatic cost reductions as technologies matured. Similarly, developing nations that prioritize basic infrastructure today can potentially adopt proven quantum healthcare applications in the future at lower costs and with greater certainty of returns.

Institutional capacity considerations further disadvantage quantum research in developing nation contexts (Reinikka and Svensson, 1999). Successfully implementing quantum research programs requires not only funding but also robust intellectual property regimes, technology transfer mechanisms, university-industry partnerships, and regulatory frameworks for emerging technologies. Many developing nations lack these institutional foundations, meaning that quantum research investments may be wasted if complementary institutional investments are not made simultaneously.

The irreversibility of certain choices adds another dimension to this analysis (Kombate, 2018). Deaths from sanitation-related diseases are permanent and irreversible. Children who die from preventable diarrheal diseases cannot be restored if quantum technologies later emerge. The moral weight of preventable deaths in the present must be balanced against speculative benefits in the distant future. While this philosophical question has no definitive answer, the burden of proof should rest on those advocating for delayed intervention in preventable mortality.

5 Policy Implications and Resource Allocation Guidance

The analysis presented in previous sections yields clear implications for healthcare resource allocation in developing economies. While the conclusions may be uncomfortable for those advocating technological advancement as a development strategy, the economic logic points consistently toward prioritizing basic infrastructure over quantum research under current conditions.

The primary policy recommendation is that developing nations facing significant deficits in basic sanitation coverage should allocate healthcare budgets to infrastructure completion before diverting resources to quantum research (Fan, 2008). This recommendation follows from the opportunity cost analysis demonstrating that sanitation investments generate substantially higher returns per dollar invested, deliver benefits on timelines relevant to current populations, and address the most severe disease burdens facing developing nations.

This prioritization should be absolute in nations where sanitation coverage remains below 70 percent of the population (Anderson et al., 2006). In these contexts, the marginal returns on sanitation investment remain high, the number of preventable deaths remains substantial, and the opportunity cost of alternative investments is unacceptably large. Quantum research programs in such nations represent a misallocation of scarce resources that exacerbates existing health inequities.

For countries that have achieved near-universal sanitation coverage or have moved beyond the stage where sanitation deficits drive significant disease burden, the calculus changes (Sennoga and Matovu, 2012). Once the highest-return infrastructure investments have been made, allocating marginal resources to longer-term research becomes more defensible. However, even in these contexts, quantum research should compete for resources against other health priorities including communicable disease control, maternal health services, primary care access, and health workforce development.

The sequencing of investments matters (Gorgulu et al., 2023). Development economics has long recognized that certain investments create platforms for subsequent advances. Basic infrastructure including sanitation, clean water, and reliable electricity creates the foundation necessary for more sophisticated economic activities. Attempting to leapfrog these foundational investments by pursuing cutting-edge research typically fails because the complementary inputs required for research success are absent.

International cooperation offers potential pathways for developing nations to access quantum technology benefits without bearing the full research costs (Wheatley Research Consultancy, 2024). Global research consortia allow multiple nations to pool resources for quantum computing programs, with developing nations contributing modest amounts while benefiting from collective advances. This approach allows developing nations to maintain awareness of emerging technologies and build limited absorptive capacity while avoiding the opportunity costs of operating independent quantum research programs.

Technology transfer mechanisms provide another avenue (Saleem and Higuchi, 2014). If developed nations and international organizations succeed in creating quantum healthcare applications, technology transfer agreements can bring these innovations to developing nations once proven. This approach allows developing nations to free-ride on research investments made by wealthier countries, a strategy that may be economically rational for countries facing binding resource constraints.

Regional specialization presents a third option (de Jong, 2022). Rather than every developing nation attempting to establish quantum research capacity, regions could coordinate to create shared facilities in countries with the most developed research ecosystems. Neighboring countries could access these facilities through cooperative arrangements, reducing duplication and achieving economies of scale.

The role of private sector investment should be considered (Eden and Kraay, 2014). If quantum healthcare applications show commercial promise, private capital will flow toward their development regardless of public sector decisions in developing nations. Developing nation governments can focus public resources on interventions with strong public good characteristics and limited commercial appeal, such as basic sanitation in poor communities, while allowing private actors to pursue quantum research that may generate profitable applications.

However, reliance on private sector leadership in quantum research raises equity concerns. Private research responds to market signals, meaning that quantum healthcare applications will be developed primarily for wealthy populations able to pay premium prices. Diseases affecting primarily poor populations in developing nations will receive less attention regardless of burden (Wolbring, 2022). This market failure provides a potential justification for public investment in quantum research focused specifically on developing nation health priorities.

Education and training investments occupy a middle ground between basic infrastructure and quantum research (Kombate, 2018). Developing strong scientific education systems, while costly, generates broad benefits including improved implementation of existing technologies, enhanced absorptive capacity for future innovations, and strengthened institutions generally. Investment in scientific education may be more defensible than investment in quantum research facilities even when both involve long time horizons.

Monitoring and evaluation systems become crucial when considering any long-term research investments (Acharya and Nuriev, 2016). If developing nations do allocate resources to quantum programs, robust evaluation frameworks should track progress toward concrete milestones, assess opportunity costs regularly, and establish clear criteria for program termination if expected returns do not materialize. Too often, research programs continue indefinitely through bureaucratic inertia even when producing minimal returns.

The analysis does not suggest that developing nations should abandon all investment in emerging technologies or scientific advancement (Devadas and Pennings, 2019). Rather, it argues for realistic assessments of opportunity costs and honest prioritization based on expected returns, implementation capacity, and urgency of needs. As nations develop economically and address foundational health challenges, the optimal allocation shifts toward longer-term investments in research and innovation.

International development assistance adds complexity to these decisions (Alimi and Shina, 2018). When external funders offer resources specifically for quantum research, should developing nations accept even if they would not allocate their own resources this way? The answer depends on fungibility. If external quantum research funding allows developing nations to redirect their own resources to higher-priority needs, accepting external support makes sense. If external funding requires matching contributions or draws away domestic expertise needed for basic infrastructure, the apparent gift may impose net costs.

6 Conclusion

The opportunity cost analysis of healthcare investment allocation in developing nations yields an uncomfortable but inescapable conclusion: under current conditions of resource scarcity and urgent basic needs, quantum technology research represents a misallocation of public funds that could deliver greater health benefits through basic infrastructure investment. This conclusion derives not from technological pessimism or skepticism about quantum computing's ultimate potential, but from realistic assessment of opportunity costs, implementation capacity, and moral obligations to address preventable suffering.

The evidence presented demonstrates that basic sanitation infrastructure generates measurable health returns within years, costs between 100 and 300 dollars per capita, requires accessible implementation expertise, and directly addresses disease burdens causing hundreds of thousands of preventable deaths annually in developing nations (Fan, 2008; Gorgulu et al., 2023). Quantum research, by contrast, requires investments exceeding 100 million dollars for minimal viable programs, demands specialized expertise in short supply, operates on timelines extending decades before potential applications emerge, and addresses health challenges of marginal relevance to developing nation disease burdens (Wheatley Research Consultancy, 2024; de Jong, 2022).

The opportunity cost of choosing quantum research over sanitation translates directly into preventable deaths and foregone economic development (Anderson et al., 2006). A developing nation allocating 150 million dollars to quantum research rather than sanitation infrastructure effectively chooses to allow thousands of preventable deaths to occur while pursuing speculative long-term research that may never yield locally relevant applications. This choice cannot be justified through appeals to strategic positioning, fear of missing technological revolutions, or aspirations for scientific prestige.

The analysis acknowledges legitimate arguments for long-term research investment in developing nations (Saleem and Higuchi, 2014). Scientific capacity building, technology absorption, and participation in global knowledge creation all offer potential benefits. However, these benefits must be weighed against concrete, immediate alternatives. When the alternative is preventing child deaths through proven interventions, the burden of proof for research investment becomes extraordinarily high (Sumarto and Silva, 2014).

The realistic policy prescription follows directly: developing nations should prioritize completion of basic infrastructure including sanitation, clean water, and primary healthcare systems before allocating significant resources to quantum research (Sennoga and Matovu, 2012; Devadas and Pennings, 2019). This sequencing allows nations to address urgent needs with proven interventions, build implementation capacity through manageable projects, and generate economic returns that expand future budgets for research when foundational needs are met. Attempting to leapfrog this developmental sequence risks wasting scarce resources on programs that cannot succeed without complementary inputs while neglecting interventions that would deliver immediate benefits.

For the global health community, these findings suggest that enthusiasm for technological solutions should be tempered by realistic assessment of implementation contexts (Wolbring, 2022). Quantum computing may indeed revolutionize healthcare in wealthy nations with robust research ecosystems and populations whose health needs extend beyond preventable infectious diseases. For developing nations, the relevant technological revolution involves deploying proven interventions universally rather than developing speculative new ones.

The temporal dimension of this analysis deserves emphasis (Kombate, 2018). The conclusion that developing nations should prioritize basic infrastructure over quantum research applies to current conditions of severe scarcity and urgent needs. As nations develop economically, complete foundational infrastructure investments, and build scientific capacity, the optimal allocation shifts toward greater research investment. The analysis does not preclude eventual participation in quantum technology development, but rather argues for appropriate sequencing.

The broader implications extend beyond healthcare to development strategy generally (Acharya and Nuriev, 2016). The quantum research question exemplifies a recurring tension between addressing immediate needs and building long-term capacity. The answer depends critically on the severity of immediate needs, the certainty of returns from alternative investments, and the realistic assessment of implementation capacity. In contexts of absolute scarcity where proven interventions could prevent substantial suffering, the moral and economic case for prioritizing immediate needs becomes overwhelming.

Future research should examine the threshold conditions under which developing nations transition from exclusive focus on basic infrastructure to balanced portfolios including advanced research (Dorosh et al., 2020). Identifying the specific indicators of readiness for research investment, including income levels, infrastructure coverage, educational attainment, and institutional capacity, would help guide individual nations in determining when this transition becomes appropriate.

The analysis also highlights the need for more rigorous opportunity cost assessment in international development policy (Corong et al., 2012). Too often, development programs advocate for interventions based on potential benefits without systematic comparison to alternative uses of the same resources. The quantum research case demonstrates how this oversight can lead to advocacy for programs that, while potentially beneficial in absolute terms, represent poor choices when compared to higher-return alternatives.

In conclusion, the opportunity cost analysis firmly supports prioritizing basic sanitation infrastructure over quantum technology research in developing nations facing current resource constraints and urgent public health needs (Reinikka and Svensson, 1999; Eden and Kraay, 2014). This recommendation follows from economic logic, empirical evidence on comparative returns, realistic assessment of implementation capacity, and moral consideration for populations suffering preventable diseases. While quantum computing represents an exciting frontier for science and may ultimately transform healthcare in developed contexts, developing nations should focus limited resources on proven interventions that deliver immediate health benefits to the populations most in need.

The aspirations for technological advancement, while laudable, must yield to the urgent imperative of preventing avoidable deaths through established means. As nations develop economically and address foundational health challenges, the calculus will shift, but under current conditions, basic infrastructure must take precedence over speculative research in quantum technologies. This conclusion, though perhaps disappointing to technology enthusiasts, represents the most economically sound and morally defensible approach to healthcare resource allocation in developing economies facing the stark realities of limited budgets and urgent human needs.

References

Acharya, S. and Nuriev, S. (2016). Role of public investment in growth and poverty reduction in transition economies. *Journal of Reviews on Global Economics*, 5:310–326.

Alimi, B. and Shina, A. (2018). Foreign aid and poverty level: Does public investment matter in sub-saharan african countries?

Anderson, E. et al. (2006). The role of public investment in poverty reduction: theories, evidence and methods.

Corong, E. et al. (2012). The growth and distributive impacts of public infrastructure investments in the philippines. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

de Jong, E. (2022). Own the unknown: An anticipatory approach to prepare society for the quantum age. *Digital Society*, 1(2).

Devadas, S. and Pennings, S. (2019). Assessing the effect of public capital on growth: An extension of the world bank long-term growth model. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 3(1):22.

Dorosh, P. A. et al. (2020). Public investments and poverty reduction.

Eden, M. and Kraay, A. (2014). *"Crowding in" and the Returns to Government Investment in Low-Income Countries*. World Bank, Washington, DC.

Fan, S. (2008). *Public Expenditures, Growth, and Poverty: Lessons from Developing Countries*.

Fan, S. (2009). Public expenditures, growth, and poverty: Lessons from developing countries. *ASEAN Economic Bulletin*, 26(2):235.

Gorgulu, N. et al. (2023). *The Impact of Infrastructure on Development Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis*. World Bank, Washington, DC.

Holahan, R. and Lubell, M. (2016). Collective action theory. In *Handbook on Theories of Governance*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kombate, P. (2018). Public policy and millennium development challenges: Case study of africa.

Martins, S. and Veiga, F. J. (2014). Government size, composition of public expenditure, and economic development. *International Tax and Public Finance*, 21(4):578–597.

Raja, S. and Christiaensen, L. (2017). The future of work requires more, not less technology in developing countries.

Reinikka, R. and Svensson, J. (1999). *How Inadequate Provision of Public Infrastructure and Services Affects Private Investment*. The World Bank.

Saleem, A. and Higuchi, K. (2014). Globalization and ict innovation policy: Absorption capacity in developing countries. In *16th International Conference on Advanced Communication Technology*, pages 409–417. Global IT Research Institute (GIRI).

Sennoga, E. B. and Matovu, J. M. (2012). Public spending composition in uganda and its implications for growth and poverty reduction. *Public Finance Review*, 41(2):227–247.

Sumarto, S. and Silva, I. D. (2014). Being healthy, wealthy, and wise: Dynamics of indonesian subnational growth and poverty.

Terefe, L. A. (2012). Impact of road on rural poverty evidence from fifteen rural villages in ethiopia.

Wheatley Research Consultancy (2024). Quantum shifts: The societal implications of quantum computing on security, privacy, and the economy.

Wolbring, G. (2022). Auditing the 'social' of quantum technologies: A scoping review. *Societies*, 12(2):41.

Yousuf Khan, M. T. and Sasaki, K. (2001). Roles of public capital in pakistan's economy: Productivity, investment and growth analysis. *Review of Urban & Regional Development Studies*, 13(2):143–162.