Estimating Production Functions in Differentiated-Product Industries with Quantity Information and External Instruments*

Nicolás de Roux

Marcela Eslava

Santiago Franco

Eric Verhoogen

Oct. 2024

Supplementary Unpublished Materials

These supplementary materials provide some additional details and results to accompany the main text and online appendix.

S1 Additional Details for Theoretical Framework and Econometric Strategy

S1.1 Regularity Conditions for Consumer's Minimization Problem

The second-order conditions for minimization (refer to (A1)) are satisfied without further assumptions if and only if $\sigma_i^y \in (0,1) \cup (1,\infty)$. To see this, note that a necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{L}^y$ to be convex is that all principal minors of order r of the Hessian matrix of $\mathcal{L}^y$ are non-negative, for $r = 1, \cdots, J$, where J is the number of products in Ω_{it}^y. (See e.g. Theorem 2.3.3 in Sydsaeter et al. (2005).) Chen (2012) shows (Theorem 5.1) that the determinant of the Hessian matrix of a CES function is always zero. This implies that the principal minor of order J of the Hessian for $\mathcal{L}^y$ is zero. Furthermore, every principal minor of degree $1 \le r < J-1$ corresponds to the determinant of the Hessian matrix of a CES aggregator with $J-r$ varieties and hence is also zero. (Note that the theorem still applies when replacing $p(x)$ by $p(x)+c$, where the additional constant arises due to the excluded varieties that now enter as constant terms within the sum.) We are left only with the principal minors of order one, which correspond to the elements of the diagonal of the Hessian matrix of $\mathcal{L}^y$, which are the second derivatives:

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}^y}{\partial^2 Y_{ijt}} = \frac{-\lambda^y}{\sigma_i^y}\left[\widetilde{Y}_{it}^{\frac{1}{\sigma_i^y}}\varphi_{ijt}^{\frac{\sigma_i^y-1}{\sigma_i^y}}Y_{ijt}^{\frac{-1-\sigma_i^y}{\sigma_i^y}}\right]\left[\left(\frac{\varphi_{ijt}Y_{ijt}}{\widetilde{Y}_{it}}\right)^{\frac{\sigma_i^y-1}{\sigma_i^y}}-1\right]$$

Given that the second term in brackets is always negative and $\lambda^y > 0$ (see the discussion following (A1)), all principal minors of order one are greater than zero if and only if $\sigma_i^y \in (0,1) \cup (1,\infty)$. Hence $\mathcal{L}^y$ is convex and the second-order conditions for minimization are satisfied for a critical point satisfying the Lagrangian first order conditions if and only if $\sigma_i^y \in (0,1)\cup(1,\infty)$. For the limiting case

$\sigma_i^y \to 1$, $\widetilde{Y}_{it}$ tends to a Cobb-Douglas function with exponents φ_{ijt}. In this case, $\widetilde{Y}_{it}$ is concave if and only if $\sum_{j\in\Omega_{it}^y} \varphi_{ijt} \le 1$.

In the terminology of Sun and Yang (2006), goods in the bundle Ω_{it}^y are *gross substitutes* when $\sigma_i^y > 1$ and *gross complements* when $0 < \sigma_i^y < 1$. That is, the demand for product j increases in response to an increase in the price of any other variety k, holding everything else constant, if and only if $\sigma_i^y > 1$; it decreases if and only if $0 < \sigma_i^y < 1$. Although our methodology can accommodate either case, we believe that in the sectors we consider in our empirical application it is reasonable to assume $\sigma_i^y > 1$, i.e. that goods are gross substitutes.

S1.2 Construction of CES Price/Quantity Indexes, Input Side

The derivations for the price and quantity indexes for the input side are analogous to the ones for the output side in Appendix A.1. We include them here for the sake of completeness.

S1.2.1 Firm's Problem

The Lagrangian corresponding to the first stage of the firm's problem is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}^m = \sum_{h\in\Omega_{it}^m} M_{iht} W_{iht}^m - \lambda^m \left(\left[\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it}^m} (\alpha_{iht} M_{iht})^{\frac{\sigma_i^m - 1}{\sigma_i^m}} \right]^{\frac{\sigma_i^m}{\sigma_i^m - 1}} - \widetilde{M}_{it} \right)$$

where λ^m is the Lagrange multiplier. The first order condition with respect to input h, $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^m}{\partial M_{iht}} = 0$, implies:

$$\frac{W_{iht}^m}{\alpha_{iht}} = \lambda^m (\alpha_{iht} M_{iht})^{-\frac{1}{\sigma_i^m}} \widetilde{M}_{it}^{\frac{1}{\sigma_i^m}} \tag{S1}$$

Raising both sides of this equation to the power $1-\sigma_i^m$, summing over the $h \in \Omega_{it}^m$, using the definition of $\widetilde{W}_{it}^m$ in (8) in the main text, and rearranging, we have:

$$\lambda^m = \widetilde{W}_{it}^m \tag{S2}$$

Analogously to the output case, it can be shown that (without further assumptions) any point satisfying the first order conditions constitutes an global minimum if and only if $\sigma_i^m \in (0,1) \cup (1,\infty)$. Therefore, our method allows material inputs to be *gross complements*, $0 < \sigma_i^m < 1$, or to be *gross substitutes*, $\sigma_i^m > 1$. Nevertheless, given the type of sectors we consider in our empirical analysis, we assume material inputs to be *gross substitutes*: $\sigma_i^m > 1$.

Plugging (S2) into (S1) and rearranging:

$$M_{iht} = \widetilde{M}_{it} \left(\frac{\widetilde{W}_{it}^m}{W_{iht}^m} \right)^{\sigma_i^m} {\alpha_{iht}}^{\sigma_i^m - 1} \tag{S3}$$

As for revenues,

$$E_{it} = \sum_{h\in\Omega_{it}^m} E_{iht} = \sum_{h\in\Omega_{it}^m} W_{iht}^m M_{iht} = \widetilde{W}_{it}^m \widetilde{M}_{it} \left(\widetilde{W}_{it}^m\right)^{\sigma_i^m - 1} \underbrace{\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it}^m} \left(\frac{W_{iht}^m}{\alpha_{iht}} \right)^{1-\sigma_i^m}}_{=(\widetilde{W}_{it}^m)^{1-\sigma_i^m}} = \widetilde{W}_{it}^m \widetilde{M}_{it} \tag{S4}$$

S1.2.2 Price Index Log Change

Using (S3),

$$S^m_{iht} = \frac{W^m_{iht} M_{iht}}{E_{it}} = \frac{W^m_{iht} M_{iht}}{\widetilde{W}^m_{it} \widetilde{M}_{it}} = \left(\frac{\left(\frac{W^m_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht}} \right)}{\widetilde{W}^m_{it}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i} \tag{S5}$$

Hence from the definitions in (10) in the main text:

$$\chi^m_{it,t-1} = \frac{\sum_{h \in \Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} S^m_{iht}}{\sum_{h \in \Omega^m_{it}} S^m_{iht}} = \frac{\sum_{h \in \Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} \left(\frac{W^m_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i}}{\sum_{h \in \Omega^m_{it}} \left(\frac{W^m_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i}}, \quad \chi^m_{it-1,t} = \frac{\sum_{h \in \Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} S^m_{iht-1}}{\sum_{h \in \Omega^m_{it-1}} S^m_{iht-1}} = \frac{\sum_{h \in \Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} \left(\frac{W^m_{iht-1}}{\alpha_{iht-1}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i}}{\sum_{h \in \Omega^m_{it-1}} \left(\frac{W^m_{iht-1}}{\alpha_{iht-1}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i}}$$

Then using the definition of $\widetilde{W}^m_{it}$, (8),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\widetilde{W}^m_{it}}{\widetilde{W}^m_{it-1}} &= \frac{\left[\sum_{h \in \Omega^m_{it}} \left(\frac{W^m_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma^m_i}}}{\left[\sum_{h \in \Omega^m_{it-1}} \left(\frac{W^m_{iht-1}}{\alpha_{iht-1}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma^m_i}}} \\ &= \left(\frac{\chi^m_{it-1,t}}{\chi^m_{it,t-1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma^m_i}} \frac{\left(\sum_{h \in \Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} \left(\frac{W^m_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma^m_i}}}{\left(\sum_{h \in \Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} \left(\frac{W^m_{iht-1}}{\alpha_{iht-1}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma^m_i}}} = \left(\frac{\chi^m_{it-1,t}}{\chi^m_{it,t-1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma^m_i}} \frac{\widetilde{W}^*_{it}}{\widetilde{W}^*_{it-1}} \end{aligned} \tag{S6}$$

where $\widetilde{W}^*_{it}$ is the common-inputs price index (the analogue to (8) using just common inputs).

To derive an expression for $\frac{\widetilde{W}^*_{it}}{\widetilde{W}^*_{it-1}}$, note that (S5) implies a similar expression for the expenditure share of common goods:

$$S^{m*}_{iht} = \frac{W^m_{iht} M_{iht}}{\widetilde{W}^*_{it} \widetilde{M}^*_{it}} = \frac{W^m_{iht} M_{iht}}{\widetilde{W}^m_{it} \widetilde{M}_{it}} \cdot \frac{\widetilde{W}^m_{it} \widetilde{M}_{it}}{\widetilde{W}^*_{it} \widetilde{M}^*_{it}} = \left(\frac{\left(\frac{W^m_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht}} \right)}{\widetilde{W}^m_{it}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i} \frac{\widetilde{W}^m_{it} \widetilde{M}_{it}}{\widetilde{W}^*_{it} \widetilde{M}^*_{it}}$$

Using (A2),

$$\frac{\widetilde{W}^m_{it} \widetilde{M}_{it}}{\widetilde{W}^*_{it} \widetilde{M}^*_{it}} = \frac{\widetilde{W}^m_{it} \widetilde{M}_{it}}{\sum_{h \in \Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht} M_{iht}} = \left(\frac{\widetilde{W}^m_{it}}{\widetilde{W}^*_{it}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i}$$

Hence:

$$S^{m*}_{iht} = \left(\frac{\left(\frac{W^m_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht}} \right)}{\widetilde{W}^*_{it}} \right)^{1-\sigma^m_i} \tag{S7}$$

Divide (S7) by the same equation for the previous year, take logs, and re-arrange:

$$\frac{\ln\left(\frac{\widetilde{W}_{it}^{m*}}{\widetilde{W}_{it-1}^{m*}}\right)-\ln\left(\frac{\frac{W_{iht}^{m}}{\alpha_{iht}}}{\frac{W_{iht-1}^{m}}{\alpha_{iht-1}}}\right)}{\ln\left(\frac{S_{iht}^{m*}}{S_{iht-1}^{m*}}\right)}=\frac{1}{\sigma_i^m-1}$$

Multiply both sides by $S_{iht}^{m*}-S_{iht-1}^{m*}$ and sum over the common goods:

$$\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it,t-1}^{m*}}\left(S_{iht}^{m*}-S_{iht-1}^{m*}\right)\frac{\ln\left(\frac{\widetilde{W}_{it}^{m*}}{\widetilde{W}_{it-1}^{m*}}\right)-\ln\left(\frac{\frac{W_{iht}^{m}}{\alpha_{iht}}}{\frac{W_{iht-1}^{m}}{\alpha_{iht-1}}}\right)}{\ln\left(\frac{S_{iht}^{m*}}{S_{iht-1}^{m*}}\right)}=\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_i^m-1}\right)\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it,t-1}^{m*}}\left(S_{iht}^{m*}-S_{iht-1}^{m*}\right)=0$$

where the second equality follows because $\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it,t-1}^{m*}}S_{iht}^{m*}=\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it,t-1}^{m*}}S_{iht-1}^{m*}=1$. This implies:

$$\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it,t-1}^{m*}}\left(\frac{S_{iht}^{m*}-S_{iht-1}^{m*}}{\ln S_{iht}^{m*}-\ln S_{iht-1}^{m*}}\right)\ln\left(\frac{\widetilde{W}_{it}^{m*}}{\widetilde{W}_{it-1}^{m*}}\right)=\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it,t-1}^{m*}}\left(\frac{S_{iht}^{m*}-S_{iht-1}^{m*}}{\ln S_{iht}^{m*}-\ln S_{iht-1}^{m*}}\right)\ln\left(\frac{\frac{W_{iht}^{m}}{\alpha_{iht}}}{\frac{W_{iht-1}^{m}}{\alpha_{iht-1}}}\right)$$

Since $\ln\left(\frac{\widetilde{W}_{it}^{m*}}{\widetilde{W}_{it-1}^{m*}}\right)$ does not vary with h, this can be re-written as:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\widetilde{W}_{it}^{m*}}{\widetilde{W}_{it-1}^{m*}}\right)=\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it,t-1}^{m*}}\psi_{iht}^{m}\ln\left(\frac{W_{iht}^{m}}{W_{iht-1}^{m}}\right)-\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it,t-1}^{m*}}\psi_{iht}^{m}\ln\left(\frac{\alpha_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht-1}}\right)\tag{S8}$$

where ψ_{iht}^{m} is as defined in (10) above. Combining (S6) and (S8), we have:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\widetilde{W}_{it}^{m}}{\widetilde{W}_{it-1}^{m}}\right)=\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it,t-1}^{m*}}\psi_{iht}^{m}\ln\left(\frac{W_{iht}^{m}}{W_{iht-1}^{m}}\right)-\sum_{h\in\Omega_{it,t-1}^{m*}}\psi_{iht}^{m}\ln\left(\frac{\alpha_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht-1}}\right)-\frac{1}{\sigma_i^m-1}\ln\left(\frac{\chi_{it-1,t}^{m}}{\chi_{it,t-1}^{m}}\right)\tag{S9}$$

which is (9) in the main text.

S1.2.3 Quantity Index Log Change

We start by noting that (S3) implies

$$W_{iht}^{m}=\widetilde{W}_{it}^{m}\left(\frac{\widetilde{M}_{it}}{M_{iht}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_i^m}}\alpha_{iht}^{\frac{\sigma_i^m-1}{\sigma_i^m}}$$

Hence:

$$\ln\left(\frac{W_{iht}^{m}}{W_{iht-1}^{m}}\right)=\ln\left(\frac{\widetilde{W}_{it}^{m}}{\widetilde{W}_{it-1}^{m}}\right)+\frac{1}{\sigma_i^y}\ln\left(\frac{\widetilde{M}_{it}}{\widetilde{M}_{it-1}}\right)-\frac{1}{\sigma_i^y}\ln\left(\frac{W_{iht}^{m}}{W_{iht-1}^{m}}\right)+\frac{\sigma_i^y}{\sigma_i^y-1}\ln\left(\frac{\alpha_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht-1}}\right)$$

Plugging this into (S9), re-arranging, and using the fact that $\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} \psi^m_{iht} = 1$ gives the log change in $\widetilde{M}_{it}$:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\widetilde{M}_{it}}{\widetilde{M}_{it-1}}\right) = \sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} \psi^m_{iht} \ln\left(\frac{M_{iht}}{M_{iht-1}}\right) + \sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} \psi^m_{iht} \ln \frac{\alpha_{iht}}{\alpha_{iht-1}} + \frac{\sigma^m_i}{\sigma^m_i - 1} \ln\left(\frac{\chi^m_{it-1,t}}{\chi^m_{it,t-1}}\right)$$

which is (11) in the main text. The fact that $\widetilde{W}^{m*}_{it}\widetilde{M}^*_{it} = E^*_{it}$ can be shown as in (S4), using just common goods.

S1.3 Construction of Alternative Quantity Indexes

On the input side, following standard formulations (see e.g. Dodge (2008)), we define the Laspeyres input quantity index for $t-1$ and t as:

$$\widetilde{M}^{Lasp}_{it,t-1} = \frac{\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht-1} M_{iht}}{\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht-1} M_{iht-1}} \tag{S10}$$

and the Paasche input quantity index as:

$$\widetilde{M}^{Paas}_{it,t-1} = \frac{\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht} M_{iht}}{\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht} M_{iht-1}}, \tag{S11}$$

The Tornqvist quantity index is defined as:

$$\widetilde{M}^{Torn}_{it,t-1} = \prod_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} \left(\frac{M_{iht}}{M_{iht-1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}(S^{m*}_{iht}+S^{m*}_{iht-1})} \tag{S12}$$

where S^{m*}_{iht} and S^{m*}_{iht-1} are as defined in footnote 22 of the main text.

Note that the Laspeyres quantity index is related to the Paasche price index, and vice-versa. If we define the Laspeyres price index as:

$$\widetilde{W}^{m,Lasp}_{it,t-1} = \frac{\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht} M_{iht-1}}{\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht-1} M_{iht-1}}. \tag{S13}$$

and the Paasche price index as:

$$\widetilde{W}^{m,Paas}_{it,t-1} = \frac{\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht} M_{iht}}{\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht-1} M_{iht}} \tag{S14}$$

then the common-input expenditure ratio between t and $t-1$ is the product of the Laspeyres price index and the Paasche quantity index and also the product of the Laspeyres quantity index and the Paasche price index:

$$\frac{E^*_{it}}{E^*_{it-1}} = \frac{\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht} M_{iht}}{\sum_{h\in\Omega^{m*}_{it,t-1}} W^m_{iht-1} M_{iht-1}} = \widetilde{M}^{Lasp}_{it,t-1} \times \widetilde{W}^{m,Paas}_{it,t-1} = \widetilde{M}^{Paas}_{it,t-1} \times \widetilde{W}^{m,Lasp}_{it,t-1}$$

The definition of the alternative output quantity indexes is analogous to the definition of the input quantity indexes (S10), (S11) and (S12).

S1.4 Variance Correction for β_k in Levels-Equation Estimation

Our sequential production function estimation belongs to a general class of two-step M-Estimators discussed for instance in Wooldridge (2002, Section 12.4) and previously in Newey (1984). The results there can be applied directly in our setting. Under our assumptions, our first-step estimates $\widehat{\beta}_m$ and $\widehat{\beta}_l$ and their standard errors are consistently estimated. The levels-equation estimate of β_k, call it $\widehat{\widehat{\beta}}_k$, can be calculated by solving:

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \triangle k_{it-1}\left(\left(\widetilde{y}_{it}^{SV} - \widehat{\beta}_m \widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV} - \widehat{\beta}_l l_{it}\right) - \widehat{\widehat{\beta}}_k k_{it}\right) = 0. \tag{S15}$$

As noted in the main text, the consistency of $\widehat{\beta}_m$ and $\widehat{\beta}_l$ is sufficient to guarantee the consistency of $\widehat{\widehat{\beta}}_k$. In the special case when $\mathbb{E}(\triangle k_{it-1}\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(\triangle k_{it-1}\ell_{it}) = 0$, the first step estimation can be ignored when computing the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\widehat{\beta}}_k$.[1] If those conditions do not hold, then we need to use a corrected expression for the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\beta}_k$, which takes into account that $\widehat{\beta}_m$ and $\widehat{\beta}_l$ were estimated in a previous step. A consistent estimate of the corrected asymptotic variance for $\widehat{\widehat{\beta}}_k$, call it $\widehat{V}_{\beta_k}$, is given by Newey and McFadden (1994):[2]

$$\widehat{V}_{\beta_k} = \frac{(T\times N)^{-1}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\widehat{s}_{it} + \widehat{F}\widehat{\psi}_{it}\right)^2\right)}{\widehat{G}^2} \tag{S16}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{G} &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\triangle k_{it-1}k_{it}\\
\widehat{F} &= -\frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\triangle k_{it-1}\left[\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}, l_{it}, 0\right]\\
\widehat{s}_{it} &= \triangle k_{it-1}\left(\widetilde{y}_{it}^{SV} - \widehat{\beta}_m\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV} - \widehat{\beta}_l l_{it} - \widehat{\widehat{\beta}}_k k_{it}\right)\\
\widehat{\psi}_{it} &= -\left(\widehat{H}'\widehat{W}\widehat{H}\right)^{-1}\widehat{H}'\widehat{W}\widehat{m}_{it}
\end{aligned}$$

and the terms in $\widehat{\psi}_{it}$ are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{H} &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\triangle\widehat{\widetilde{w}}_{it}^{imp}, \triangle z_{it}, k_{it-2}, \widetilde{m}_{it-2}^{SV}, l_{it-2}\right]\left[\triangle\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}, \triangle l_{it}, \triangle k_{it}\right]'\\
\widehat{W} &= \frac{1}{NT}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\triangle\widehat{\widetilde{w}}_{it}^{imp}, \triangle z_{it}, k_{it-2}, \widetilde{m}_{it-2}^{SV}, l_{it-2}\right]\left[\triangle\widehat{\widetilde{g}}_{it}, \triangle z_{it}, k_{it-2}, \widetilde{m}_{it-2}^{SV}, l_{it-2}\right]'\\
\widehat{m}_{it} &= \left[\triangle\widehat{\widetilde{g}}_{it}, \triangle z_{it}, k_{it-2}, \widetilde{m}_{it-2}^{SV}, l_{it-2}\right]'\left(\triangle\widetilde{y}_{it}^{SV} - \widehat{\beta}_m\triangle\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV} - \widehat{\beta}_l\triangle l_{it} - \widehat{\beta}_k\triangle k_{it}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

[1] The score function corresponding to the levels-equation IV estimation is $s(a_{it}, \beta_k; \beta_m, \beta_l) = \triangle k_{it-1}(\widetilde{y}_{it}^{SV} - \beta_m\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV} - \beta_l l_{it} - \beta_k k_{it})$, where $a_{it} = (\widetilde{y}_{it}^{SV}, \widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}, l_{it}, k_{it}, \triangle k_{it-1})$. If $\mathbb{E}(\triangle k_{it-1}\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(\triangle k_{it-1}\ell_{it}) = 0$ then the gradient of the score function with respect to β_m and β_ℓ is zero and equation 12.37 of Wooldridge (2002) holds, implying that we can ignore the first step in calculating the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\widehat{\beta}}_k$.

[2] See also Proposition 2 of Kripfganz and Schwarz (2019).

We report the corresponding corrected standard errors when we report $\widehat{\widehat{\widehat{\beta}}}_k$.

References

Andrews, Isaiah, "Valid Two-Step Identification-Robust Confidence Sets for GMM," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2018, *100* (2), 337–348.

Arellano, Manuel and Stephen Bond, "Some Tests of Specification for Panel Data: Monte Carlo Evidence and an Application to Employment Equations," *Review of Economic Studies*, 1991, *58* (2), 277 – 297.

Blundell, Richard and Stephen Bond, "GMM Estimation with Persistent Panel Data: An Application to Production Functions," *Econometric Reviews*, 2000, *19* (3), 321–340.

Chen, Bang-Chen, "An Explicit Formula of Hessian Determinants of Composite Functions and Its Applications," *Kragujevac Journal of Mathematics*, 2012, *17*, 27–39.

Dodge, Yadolah, *The Concise Encyclopedia of Statistics*, New York: Springer, 2008.

Doornik, Jurgen A, Manuel Arellano, and Stephen Bond, "Panel Data Estimation Using DPD for Ox," 2012. Available at https://www.doornik.com/download/oxmetrics7/Ox_Packages/dpd.pdf.

Kleibergen, Frank and Richard Paap, "Generalized Reduced Rank Tests using the Singular Value Decomposition," *Journal of Econometrics*, 2006, *133* (1), 97 – 126.

Kripfganz, Sebastian and Claudia Schwarz, "Estimation of Linear Dynamic Panel Data Models with Time-Invariant Regressors," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 2019, *34* (4), 526–546.

Newey, Whitney K, "A Method of Moments Interpretation of Sequential Estimators," *Economics Letters*, 1984, *14* (2-3), 201–206.

Newey, Whitney K. and Daniel L. McFadden, "Large Sample Estimation and Hypothesis Testing," in Robert F. Engle and Daniel L. McFadden, eds., *Handbook of Econometrics*, Vol. 4, Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, 1994, chapter 36, pp. 2111–2245.

Roodman, David, "How To Do xtabond2: An Introduction to Difference and System GMM in Stata," *Stata Journal*, 2009, *9* (1), 86–136.

Sanderson, Eleanor and Frank Windmeijer, "A Weak Instrument F-test in Linear IV models with Multiple Endogenous Variables," *Journal of Econometrics*, 2016, *190* (2), 212–221.

Sun, Ning and Zaifu Yang, "Equilibria and Indivisibilities: Gross Substitutes and Complements," *Econometrica*, 2006, *74* (5), 1385–1402.

Sydsaeter, Knut, Peter Hammond, Atle Seierstad, and Arne Strom, *Further Mathematics for Economic Analysis*, Prentice Hall, 2005.

Windmeijer, Frank, "A Finite Sample Correction for the Variance of Linear Efficient Two-Step GMM Estimators," *Journal of Econometrics*, 2005, *126* (1), 25 – 51.

Wooldridge, Jeffrey M., *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002.

Figure S1. Real Exchange Rate Variation, 1994-2009



Notes: Figure plots real exchange rate (RER), normalized to 100 in 1994, calculated as in equation (16) in text, for top six import origins for rubber and plastics sectors. An RER increase reflects a real appreciation in the trading partner.

Figure S1. Real Exchange Rate Variation, 1994-2009 (cont.)



Notes: Figure plots real exchange rate (RER), normalized to 100 in 1994, calculated as in equation (16) in text, for import origins ranked 7-12 for rubber and plastics sectors. (See Fig. S1 for ranks 1-6.) An RER increase reflects a real appreciation in the trading partner.

Figure S2. Coefficients from Import-Price Regressions



Notes: Average sector-specific coefficients from estimating equation (18) in main text. We generate 362 sets of leave-one-out coefficient estimates, then average estimates and standard errors across firms and years. All Harmonized System 2-digit categories except except petroleum products, machinery and equipment (HS2 categories 27, 84 and 85) included; see Section 3.4 for details. Import share calculated as imports in HS2 category over total imports for 1994-2009 period. After sector names at left, we list share of total imports (square brackets), the regression coefficient, and 95% confidence interval (parentheses).

Figure S2. Coefficients from Import-Price Regressions (cont.)



Notes: See notes on previous page.

Table S1. Primary Outputs and Inputs, Glass Products Producers

CPC code	Share of total revenues or expenditures	Export/Import share	CPC description
A. Outputs			
3719102	0.21	0.16	Glass bottles for soft drinks
3719103	0.18	0.19	Glass bottles of a capacity not exceeding 1 liter
3711502	0.18	0.53	Safety glass
3711201	0.12	0.17	Unworked flat glass
3719104	0.11	0.18	Glass bottles of a capacity exceeding 1 liter
3711503	0.06	0.28	Safety glass for motor cars, windshields, similar
3719101	0.03	0.22	Small glass jars for perfumery, pharmacy, laboratory
3712204	0.01	0.49	Glass wool sheet
3719309	0.01	0.58	Glass vases
2799704	0.01	0.01	Asphalt fabrics
4299942	0.01	0.11	Wire rods and rings, for brassieres
3719302	0.01	0.24	Glasswares of a kind used for table and kitchen
3712203	0.01	0.27	Fiberglass ducts
3719503	0.01	0.04	Glass ampoules
3712101	0.01	0.46	Fiberglass
3711601	0.01	0.06	Unframed mirror
3712907	0.01	0.38	Fiberglass bathtubs
3712908	0.01	0.09	Fiberglass tanks
3711501	0.00	0.00	Tempered glass
3719903	0.00	0.10	Glass screens
B. Inputs			
3711201	0.30	0.79	Unworked flat glass
3424501	0.22	0.44	Sodium carbonate
3711103	0.10	0.07	Waste and scrap of glass
3633019	0.07	0.93	Plastic fabric
3633007	0.05	0.98	Polyvinyl film
1531201	0.05	0.00	Siliceous sands and gravels
1639902	0.03	0.00	Feldspar
3219702	0.03	0.00	Printed labels
3474002	0.02	0.37	Polyester resins
1512004	0.02	0.00	Crushed or ground limestone
3215308	0.02	0.00	Partitions and dividers of cardboard for boxes
3215302	0.01	0.01	Corrugated cardboard boxes
4151203	0.01	0.36	Angles, shapes and sections of copper
3511104	0.01	0.37	Anticorrosive bases and paints
3712101	0.01	0.45	Fiberglass
3170101	0.01	0.00	Wooden packaging box
4299942	0.01	0.72	Wire rods and rings, for brassieres
3170105	0.01	0.00	Pallets
3424202	0.01	0.07	Sodium sulfate
3641002	0.01	0.00	Unprinted plastic film in tubular form

Notes: Table similar to Tables A1-A2 for producers of glass products (ISIC rev. 2 category 362). See notes for those tables.

Table S2. Summary Statistics, Glass Products

A. Period: 1996-2009	
Number of observations	410
Number of firms	34
Number of workers per firm	122.97
Share of firms that are single-product	0.15
Production value (billions 2000 pesos) per firm	16.41
Earnings per year per firm, permanent workers (millions 2000 pesos)	7.06
B. Period: 2000-2009	
Input variables	
No. inputs per firm	9.43
Share of firms that import	0.65
No. inputs per firm, conditional on importing	9.50
Share of expenditure on imported inputs	0.30
No. imported HS8 categories, conditional on importing	24.74
Output variables	
No. outputs per firm	2.89
Share of firms that export	0.53
No. outputs per firm, conditional on exporting	3.44
Fraction of revenues from exported outputs	0.11
No. exported HS8 categories, conditional on exporting	5.31

Notes: Sample is producers of glass products (ISIC rev. 2 category 362). Exports and imports available in EAM data only in 2000-2009. Average 2000 exchange rate is approximately 2,000 pesos/USD.

Table S3. Difference Equation, Quantity Indexes, GMM-Style Instruments

	Dep. var.: $\triangle\ \widetilde{y}_{it}^{SV}$		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
$\triangle\ \widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$	0.580***	0.523***	0.434***
	(0.129)	(0.094)	(0.077)
$\triangle$ log labor ($\triangle \ell_{it}$)	0.442***	0.466***	0.441***
	(0.166)	(0.134)	(0.099)
$\triangle$ log capital ($\triangle k_{it}$)	-0.015	0.005	0.044
	(0.111)	(0.070)	(0.050)
N	4,247	4,247	4,247
Lag Limit	2	3	all
Number of excluded instruments	42	81	315
Hansen test	41.59	71.73	306
Hansen p-value	0.358	0.678	0.584
F - SW $\triangle\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$	1.538	1.355	1.770
F - SW $\triangle$ log labor ($\triangle \ell_{it}$)l	2.186	1.797	1.814
F - SW $\triangle$ log capital ($\triangle k_{it}$)	3.324	3.100	2.328
KP LM statistic (underidentification)	50.78	104.4	387.9
KP LM p-value	0.118	0.030	0.003
KP Wald F-statistic (weak instruments)	1.266	1.411	1.775

Notes: Table reports GMM estimation of our difference equation, (14), where further lags have been added "GMM-style" (Roodman, 2009), using only available lags and allowing separate coefficients in each period. Lags are included to $t-2$ in Column 1, to $t-3$ in Column 2, and to the firm's initial year in Column 3. The first-stage coefficients are not reported, but number of instruments and the Sanderson-Windmeijer F-statistics corresponding to the first-stage regressions are reported in each column. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *10% level, **5% level, ***1% level.

Table S4. Differences (Step 1): First Stage, Alternative Samples

	plastics only			including glass		
	$\triangle \widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$	$\triangle \ell_{it}$	$\triangle k_{it}$	$\triangle \widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$	$\triangle \ell_{it}$	$\triangle k_{it}$
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$\widetilde{m}_{it-2}^{SV}$	-0.022***	0.010***	0.026***	-0.020***	0.014***	0.027***
	(0.007)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.005)
ℓ_{it-2}	0.011	-0.030***	0.046***	0.012	-0.031***	0.042***
	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.010)
k_{it-2}	0.011*	0.009**	-0.050***	0.010*	0.007**	-0.046***
	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.006)
$\triangle$ pred. import price index ($\triangle \widehat{\overline{w}}_{it}^{imp}$)	-0.298***	-0.106	0.101	-0.235***	-0.038	0.099
	(0.107)	(0.067)	(0.113)	(0.079)	(0.050)	(0.078)
$\triangle$ log min. wage x "bite" ($\triangle z_{it}$)	-1.122	-2.114***	-2.177***	-1.393	-1.987***	-1.743***
	(1.176)	(0.576)	(0.667)	(0.968)	(0.510)	(0.585)
Year effects	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Observations	3,693	3,693	3,693	4,657	4,657	4,657
R-squared	0.029	0.038	0.041	0.028	0.041	0.040
F - statistic	3.898	6.747	12.148	4.478	8.593	15.569
F - SW	4.760	10.602	8.242	5.661	13.653	11.729
KP LM test (underidentification)		12.486			15.577	
KP LM p-value		0.006			0.001	
KP Wald F-test (weak insts.)		2.605			3.208	

Notes: Table similar to Table 2, Columns 7-9, for alternative samples of (a) plastics producers only (Columns 1-3) and (b) rubber, plastic, and glass product producers (Columns 4-6). Robust standard errors in parentheses. *10% level, **5% level, ***1% level.

Table S5. Differences (Step 1): Second Stage, Alternative Samples

	Dep. var.: $\triangle$ log output index ($\triangle \widetilde{y}_{it}^{SV}$)	
	plastics only	including glass
	(1)	(2)
$\triangle$ log materials index ($\triangle \widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$)	0.409**	0.465**
	(0.180)	(0.184)
$\triangle$ log labor ($\triangle \ell_{it}$)	0.413**	0.495***
	(0.189)	(0.169)
$\triangle$ log capital ($\triangle k_{it}$)	-0.121	-0.164
	(0.132)	(0.133)
Observations	3,693	4,657
R-squared	0.280	0.214
Materials Robust CI 90%	[0.175 - 0.643]	[0.226 - 0.704]
Materials Robust CI 95%	[-0.056 - 0.874]	[0.181 - 0.940]
Labor Robust CI 90%	[0.167 - 0.658]	[0.233 - 0.757]
Labor Robust CI 90%	[0.120 - 0.705]	[0.276 - 0.715]
Arellano-Bond AR(1) statistic	-5.406	-4.243
Arellano-Bond AR(1) p-value	0.000	0.000
Arellano-Bond AR(2) statistic	0.402	0.787
Arellano-Bond AR(2) p-value	0.687	0.431

Notes: Table similar to Table 3, for alternative samples. Samples are (a) plastics producers only (Column 1) and (b) rubber, plastic, and glass product producers (Column 2). Corresponding first-stage estimates are in Table S4. Confidence intervals are weak-instrument-robust, based on LC test of Andrews (2018), implemented by Stata twostepweakiv command. Arellano-Bond statistic and p-value test for serial correlation in residual, based on Arellano and Bond (1991). *10% level, **5% level, ***1% level.

Table S6. Levels (Step 2): First & Second Stages, Alternative Samples

A. First stage

	Dep. var.: log capital (k_{it})	
	plastics only (1)	including glass (2)
$\triangle k_{it-1}$	0.616***	0.767***
	(0.110)	(0.110)
Year effects	Y	Y
N	3,693	4,657
R-squared	0.026	0.030
KP LM statistic (under-identification)	31.889	54.597
Kleibergen-Paap LM test p-value	0.000	0.000
KP Wald F-statistic (weak insts.)	31.409	48.427

B. Second stage

	Dep. var.: $\widetilde{y}_{it}^{SV} - \widehat{\beta}_m \widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV} - \widehat{\beta}_\ell \ell_{it}$	
	plastics only (1)	including glass (2)
log capital (k_{it})	0.133	0.130
	(0.208)	(0.192)
Year effects	Y	Y
N	3,693	4,657
R-squared	0.136	0.082

Notes: Table similar to Table 4 Column 1, for alternative samples. Samples are (a) plastics producers only (Column 1) and (b) rubber, plastic, and glass product producers (Column 2). Robust standard errors in parentheses in Panel A, corrected robust standard errors in parentheses in Panel B. *10% level, **5% level, ***1% level.

Table S7. Weak IV Diagnostics for System GMM, Using Quantity Indexes

Differences				Levels	
	Dep. var.: $\triangle$ log output index ($\triangle\widetilde{y}_{it}^{SV}$)				log output index ($\widetilde{y}_{it}^{SV}$)
	(1)	(2)	(3)		(4)
$\triangle$ log output index ($\triangle\widetilde{y}_{it-1}^{SV}$)	-0.052	-0.090	-0.085	log output index ($\widetilde{y}_{it-1}^{SV}$)	0.897***
	(0.082)	(0.074)	(0.053)		(0.030)
$\triangle$ log materials index ($\triangle\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$)	0.567***	0.551***	0.433***	log materials index ($\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$)	0.383***
	(0.098)	(0.087)	(0.072)		(0.143)
$\triangle$ log materials index ($\triangle\widetilde{m}_{it-1}^{SV}$)	-0.074	-0.061	0.021	log materials index ($\widetilde{m}_{it-1}^{SV}$)	-0.314**
	(0.069)	(0.062)	(0.052)		(0.129)
$\triangle$ log labor ($\triangle\ell_{it}$)	0.331**	0.424***	0.403***	log labor(ℓ_{it})	-0.259
	(0.145)	(0.136)	(0.093)		(0.244)
$\triangle$ log labor ($\triangle\ell_{it-1}$)	-0.115	-0.032	0.015	log labor(ℓ_{it-1})	0.273
	(0.112)	(0.097)	(0.069)		(0.221)
$\triangle$ log capital ($\triangle k_{it}$)	0.102	0.109	0.076	log capital(k_{it})	0.097
	(0.080)	(0.071)	(0.051)		(0.141)
$\triangle$ log capital ($\triangle k_{it-1}$)	-0.169**	-0.127**	-0.125***	log capital(k_{it-1})	-0.082
	(0.073)	(0.062)	(0.048)		(0.130)
N	4,247	4,247	4,247		4,247
R-squared	0.208	0.219	0.260		0.960
Lag Limit	3	4	All		NA
Number of excluded instruments	108	156	420		56
SW F-stat log output index$_{it-1}$	2.032	1.822	2.008		6.243
SW F-stat log materials index$_{it}$	1.284	1.324	1.986		1.762
SW F-stat log materials index$_{it-1}$	1.685	1.636	2.093		1.799
SW F-stat log labor (ℓ_{it})	1.578	1.412	2.222		1.903
SW F-stat log labor (ℓ_{it-1})	1.685	1.636	2.093		1.899
SW F-stat log capital (k_{it})	2.031	2.242	1.936		1.391
SW F-stat log capital (k_{it-1})	2.244	2.127	1.849		1.471
KP LM test (underidentification)	116.800	171.000	437.200		69.530
KP LM p-value	0.149	0.115	0.208		0.035
KP Wald test (weak instruments)	1.337	1.407	2.272		1.424

Notes: Table reports IV estimates corresponding to differences (Columns 1-3) and levels (Column 4) equations of System GMM with quantity indexes (Table 5), with weak-instrument diagnostic statistics. SW F-stats (Sanderson and Windmeijer, 2016) are for differences of indicated variables in Columns 1-3, levels in Column 4. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *10% level, **5% level, ***1% level.

Table S8. System GMM, Using Sales and Expenditures

	log sales$_{it}$		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
log sales$_{it-1}$	0.626***	0.549***	0.515***
	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.060)
log expenditures$_{it}$	0.548***	0.573***	0.490***
	(0.088)	(0.073)	(0.057)
log expenditures$_{it-1}$	-0.211**	-0.202***	-0.127**
	(0.086)	(0.067)	(0.049)
log labor$_{it}$ (ℓ_{it})	0.347**	0.339**	0.353***
	(0.140)	(0.148)	(0.075)
log labor$_{it-1}$ (ℓ_{it-1})	-0.326**	-0.269*	-0.236***
	(0.145)	(0.141)	(0.077)
log capital$_{it}$ (k_{it})	0.042	0.061	0.014
	(0.071)	(0.074)	(0.063)
log capital$_{it-1}$ (k_{it-1})	-0.025	-0.030	0.022
	(0.061)	(0.063)	(0.055)
Observations	4,247	4,247	4,247
Lag limit	3	4	All
Hansen test	120.700	171.000	347.600
Hansen p-value	0.141	0.279	1.000

Notes: Table presents estimates of standard System GMM model (Blundell and Bond, 2000), using sales and expenditures for output and inputs, and using the "two-step" procedure described in Roodman (2009), with initial weighting matrix defined in Doornik et al. (2012) and finite-sample correction from Windmeijer (2005). The Stata command is xtabond2 (Roodman, 2009), with options h(2), twostep, and robust. The difference equation includes lags to $t-3$ in Column 1, lags to $t-4$ in Column 2, and all available lags in Column 3. The numbers of instruments are as indicated in Appendix Table S9. The Hansen test of overidentifying restrictions is appropriate in the non-homoskedastic case, but should be interpreted with caution, as it is weakened by the presence of many instruments. See Section 6 for further details. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *10% level, **5% level, ***1% level.

Table S9. Weak IV Diagnostics for System GMM, Using Revenues and Expenditures

Differences				Levels	
	Dep. var.: $\triangle$log sales$_{it}$				Dep. var.: log sales$_{it}$
	(1)	(2)	(3)		(4)
$\triangle$log sales$_{it-1}$	0.277***	0.255***	0.183***	log sales$_{it-1}$	0.680***
	(0.091)	(0.078)	(0.060)		(0.108)
$\triangle$log expenditure$_{it}$	0.387***	0.401***	0.397***	log expenditure$_{it}$	0.556***
	(0.092)	(0.081)	(0.053)		(0.172)
$\triangle$log expenditure$_{it-1}$	-0.115*	-0.096*	-0.073	log expenditure$_{it-1}$	-0.274***
	(0.065)	(0.058)	(0.045)		(0.103)
$\triangle$ log labor ($\triangle\ell_{it}$)	0.339**	0.453***	0.341***	log labor(ℓ_{it})	-0.432*
	(0.144)	(0.123)	(0.070)		(0.239)
$\triangle$ log labor ($\triangle\ell_{it-1}$)	0.069	0.039	0.046	log labor(ℓ_{it-1})	0.481**
	(0.116)	(0.102)	(0.062)		(0.209)
$\triangle$ log capital ($\triangle k_{it}$)	-0.003	-0.017	-0.004	log capital(k_{it})	0.016
	(0.081)	(0.072)	(0.053)		(0.127)
$\triangle$ log capital ($\triangle k_{it-1}$)	-0.146*	-0.103	-0.084*	log capital(k_{it-1})	0.010
	(0.084)	(0.070)	(0.046)		(0.125)
N	4,247	4,247	4,247		4,247
R-squared	0.203	0.217	0.264		0.961
Lag Limit	3	4	All		NA
Number of excluded instruments	108	156	420		56
SW F-stat log sales$_{it-1}$	2.070	2.060	2.233		3.970
SW F-stat log expenditure$_{it}$	2.034	2.161	2.473		1.845
SW F-stat log expenditure$_{it-1}$	2.334	2.499	3.869		2.094
SW F-stat log labor (ℓ_{it})	1.643	1.504	1.985		1.238
SW F-stat log labor (ℓ_{it-1})	2.334	2.499	3.869		1.392
SW F-stat log capital (k_{it})	2.120	2.227	1.970		1.339
SW F-stat log capital (k_{it-1})	2.208	2.022	1.855		1.400
KP LM test (underidentification)	124.000	160.100	444.000		51.840
KP LM p-value	0.069	0.271	0.149		0.402
KP Wald test (weak instruments)	1.462	1.447	1.835		0.968

Notes: Table reports IV estimates corresponding to differences (Columns 1-3) and levels (Column 4) equations of System GMM using sales and expenditures (Table S8), with weak-instrument diagnostic statistics. SW F-stats (Sanderson and Windmeijer, 2016) are for differences of indicated variables in Columns 1-3, levels in Column 4. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *10% level, **5% level, ***1% level.

Table S10. Monte Carlo Simulation: TSIV, Differences (Step 1), First Stage

	DGP1		DGP2		DGP3		DGP4	
	$\triangle\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$	$\triangle k_{it}$	$\triangle\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$	$\triangle k_{it}$	$\triangle\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$	$\triangle k_{it}$	$\triangle\widetilde{m}_{it}^{SV}$	$\triangle k_{it}$
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Mean coefficient $\widetilde{m}_{it-2}^{SV}$	-0.060	0.011	-0.001	0.055	0.006	0.058	0.005	0.053
	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.004)	(0.007)
Mean std. error $\widetilde{m}_{it-2}^{SV}$	0.010	0.013	0.004	0.009	0.004	0.008	0.004	0.007
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mean coefficient k_{it-2}	0.031	-0.024	-0.019	-0.067	-0.021	-0.068	-0.021	-0.065
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mean std. error k_{it-2}	0.007	0.009	0.002	0.004	0.002	0.004	0.002	0.004
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mean coefficient $\triangle w_{it}^{m,imp}$	-0.552	0.012	-0.440	0.001	-0.440	0.003	-0.439	0.006
	(0.016)	(0.023)	(0.009)	(0.017)	(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.009)	(0.016)
Mean std. error $\triangle w_{it}^{m,imp}$	0.015	0.020	0.009	0.017	0.009	0.017	0.009	0.017
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mean R-squared	0.017	0.008	0.035	0.020	0.034	0.020	0.032	0.020
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Mean F - statistic	825.916	331.591	1696.157	782.826	1666.870	764.673	1600.931	785.921
	(40.973)	(23.978)	(117.879)	(98.884)	(92.968)	(79.621)	(115.495)	(94.661)
Mean F - SW	7531.230	923.302	9762.680	2383.894	9675.482	2349.130	5758.752	2266.248
	(251.731)	(67.149)	(275.331)	(185.442)	(237.532)	(173.708)	(165.833)	(162.234)
Mean KP LM test	958.825		2027.377		2028.577		2016.808	
	(31.833)		(45.277)		(43.100)		(46.426)	
Mean KP Wald - F test	331.165		782.515		764.202		785.833	
	(23.900)		(98.875)		(79.553)		(94.925)	

Notes: Table presents the first stage of step 1 of TSIV procedure for the four DGPs in our Monte Carlo simulation. See Section 6.2 and Appendix D for details. Table reports means of statistics across 100 simulated samples for each DGP. In parentheses are standard deviations of statistics across the 100 samples. N=150,000 for each sample. Dependent variables are indicated at the tops of columns. SW refers to Sanderson and Windmeijer (2016) and KP to Kleibergen and Paap (2006). The F-statistic is the standard F for a test that the coefficients on the excluded instruments (indicated at left) are zero. The KP statistics (LM test for under-identification and Wald F test for weak instruments) are not specific to a particular dependent variable.

Table S11. Monte Carlo Simulation: TSIV, Levels (Step 2), First Stage

	Dep. var.: log capital (k_{it})			
	DGP 1	DGP 2	DGP 3	DGP 4
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Mean coefficient $\triangle k_{it-2}$	0.500	0.488	0.489	0.488
	(0.012)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.007)
Mean standard error $\triangle k_{it-2}$	0.012	0.007	0.007	0.007
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mean R-squared	0.008	0.020	0.020	0.019
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Mean KP LM test	342.623	889.254	884.539	869.722
	(40.635)	(56.101)	(54.865)	(62.676)
Mean KP Wald - F test	1617.574	4562.249	4522.445	4429.604
	(196.413)	(368.292)	(352.478)	(385.598)

Notes: Table presents the first-stage of step 2 of TSIV procedure for the four DGPs in our Monte Carlo simulation. See Section 6.2 and Appendix D for details. Table reports means of statistics across 100 simulated samples for each DGP. In parentheses are standard deviations of statistics across the 100 samples. N=150,000 for each sample.

Table S12. Monte Carlo Simulation: TSIV, Steps 1 & 2, Second Stages

	Dep. var.: △ log output quantity (△y_{it})							
	DGP1		DGP2		DGP3		DGP4	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Materials:								
Mean elasticity	0.653	. . .	0.650	. . .	0.648	. . .	0.648	. . .
	(0.017)	. . .	(0.021)	. . .	(0.020)	. . .	(0.021)	. . .
Mean standard error	0.016	. . .	0.021	. . .	0.021	. . .	0.022	. . .
	(0.000)	. . .	(0.000)	. . .	(0.000)	. . .	(0.000)	. . .
Capital:								
Mean elasticity	0.248	0.248	0.249	0.249	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251
	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.009)
Mean standard error	0.012	0.012	0.010	0.009	0.010	0.009	0.010	0.009
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Mean R-squared	0.740	0.950	0.555	0.846	0.555	0.844	0.567	0.842
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.011)	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.005)	(0.010)

Notes: Table presents the second stages of steps 1 and 2 of TSIV procedure for the four DGPs in our Monte Carlo simulation. See Section 6.2 and Appendix D for details. Corresponding Monte Carlo first-stage estimates are in Tables S10 and S11. Table reports means of the statistics across 100 simulated samples for each DGP. In parentheses are standard deviations of statistics across the 100 samples. N=150,000 for each sample. The true values for the elasticities are 0.65 for materials and 0.25 for capital.