

INDIRECT TRANSACTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

HUSNA BETUL COSKUN

ABSTRACT. The indirect transactions between sectors of an economic system has been a long-standing open problem. There have been numerous attempts to define and mathematically formulate this concept in various other scientific fields in literature as well. The existing *indirect effects* formulations, however, cannot quantify the *indirect transactions* between any two sectors of an economic system. Consequently, although the direct and total requirement matrices are formulated and used for economic system analysis, the indirect requirements matrix has never been formulated before. Based on the system decomposition theory, the indirect transactions and the corresponding indirect requirements matrix are introduced in the present article for the first time. This novel concept of the indirect transactions is also compared with some existing indirect effect formulations, and the theoretical advancement brought by the proposed methodology is discussed. It is shown theoretically and through illustrative examples that the proposed indirect transactions accurately describe and quantify the indirect interactions and relationships, unlike the current indirect effects formulations. The indirect requirements matrices for the US economy using aggregated input-output tables for multiple years are also presented and briefly analyzed.

1. INTRODUCTION

The analysis of *direct transactions* is relatively straightforward even in the complex economic systems. The *indirect transactions*, however, is a complicated concept and long-standing open problem that has derived attention in many scientific fields, such as economics, ecology, graph theory, and network theory [6]. It is generally accepted that the input-output economics derive its significance largely from the fact that the total requirements coefficients measuring the combined effects of the direct and indirect repercussions of a change in final demand can easily be determined [18]. The existing *indirect effects* formulations, however, cannot quantify the indirect transactions and interactions between any two sectors in a multisectoral economic system.

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA 30602

E-mail address: BetulCoskun@uga.edu.

Key words and phrases. system decomposition theory, system partitioning, complex systems theory, compartmental systems, indirect flows, indirect distributions, direct flows and storages, input-output analysis, input-output economics, general equilibrium theory, theoretical economics, mathematical economics, econometrics, macroeconomics, ecological economics, socioeconomic systems, ecosystem ecology, quantitative finance, ecological networks, chemical and biological systems, epidemiology, pharmacokinetics, neural networks, social networks, control theory, multiplier theory, graph theory, information theory.

Modeling interactions among industries and their interconnectedness goes back to the concept of the “circular flow” in an economy [16]. This idea is related to Petty’s concept of the interdependence of industries. François Quesnay created the *Tableau Économique* (economic table) in which he depicted the idea of the economy as a circular flow of income and output among economic sectors. The table is known for its diagrammatic representation of how transactions can systematically be traced through an economic system [14, 19]. Achille-Nicholas Isnard is known to be the first person to represent the circular flow of income and expenditure as an algebraic system of equations [9, 15].

The *Tableau Économique* is considered the first method for the explicit conception of the nature of economic equilibrium. It is also hailed as a forerunner of general equilibrium theory pioneered by Léon Walras [23, 14, 19]. Walras used production coefficients that compared the required resources for a product and its total production [15]. Leontief’s empirical economic studies were based on Quesnay’s table and Walras’s formulations of general equilibrium, although his conclusion was that an economy is never in equilibrium. He made the circular flow transactions into a table which then led to the founding of the analytical tool called the input-output model [12]. The input-output analysis as we know today with contributions of many other economists analyzes intersectoral interactions in economic systems.

There have been numerous definitions and corresponding mathematical formulations of the indirect effects concept in the literature for about a century since the development of the input-output model, but none of them seem to be accurately describing and quantifying the indirect transactions [8, 15, 21, 17, 2, 10, 13, 1, 22, 11]. The current indirect effects formulations for an economic system represent the sum of the subsequent gross outputs of goods and services at each step of a production chain to supply the final demands, generally after the first gross outputs from each sector in the system. These formulations, however, cannot define, formulate, and quantify the indirect transactions pairwise between any two sectors.

A mathematical theory, known as the *system decomposition theory*, and associated methods for the analysis of dynamic nonlinear compartmental systems in the context of ecology was recently introduced by [3, 5, 4]. The static version of this theory has also been developed recently [6, 7]. This theory enables tracking the evolution of initial stocks, external inputs, and arbitrary intercompartmental flows of currency, goods, and services, as well as the associated storages derived from these stocks, inputs, and flows individually and separately within the system. The *transient* and the *direct*, *indirect*, *cycling*, *acyclic*, and *total* transfer of commodities along any given production chain or from one sector to another—along all possible paths—are also systematically formulated [3, 5, 6]. In this article, we use these *indirect distributions* and *flows* concepts developed through the system decomposition theory for ecosystem analysis to formulate the *indirect requirements* and *transactions* in the context of multisectoral economic systems.

Considering a hypothetical economics system, if the final demand for cars is cut in half, the implications not only directly for the output of the automotive industry, but indirectly for the outputs of all the other industries in the car production chain

can be determined individually and separately through the proposed methodology. The existing formulations, however, can quantify the cumulative direct and indirect effects of the decrease in the demand for cars, but not the indirect effects alone. More specifically, the alteration of the amount of steel to make the cars in the first step, coal to produce the steel in the second step, energy to extract the coal in the third step, and so on, can be calculated, based on the change in the demand. In the current formulations, the transaction between the steel and automotive industries in the first step is considered the *direct effect* of the change in the demand. On the other hand, when this production chain cycles back to steel at any later production step again, the current methodologies consider the amount of steel used to make cars at that step as an *indirect effect* (see Fig. 1). That is, the transactions between the same two sectors, steel and automotive industries, are inconsistently classified as the direct and indirect effects, solely based on the step number or order of propagation. Fundamentally different from this classification, the system decomposition theory defines and formulates the directness and indirectness based on the nature of the relationships and interactions. The immediate, pairwise transactions between the steel and automotive industries are defined as the *direct transactions* regardless of the step number in their interactions in a cycling production chain, and the transactions between them through other sectors are defined as the *indirect transactions*.

In more general terms, the indirect effects are formulated without actually defining the indirect transactions between any two sectors in an economic system. The indirect effects are considered to be the transactions carried by subsequent steps after the first entrance of goods and services into each sector in the current formulations. Therefore, even the immediate transactions between two sectors of interest after the first step in their interactions are considered as indirect in these approaches. The indirect effect formulations are, therefore, microscopic quantities and cannot quantify indirect interactions accurately. In contrast, the system decomposition theory defines and explicitly formulates the direct and indirect transactions between any two sectors in the system as measurable physical quantities. The direct transactions are defined as immediate pairwise transactions between two sectors in the system. The indirect transactions are then defined as the total flows of goods and services from a sector indirectly through other sectors to any other.

An immediate application of the indirect transactions concept would be the detailed analysis of input-output data for national and regional economic accounts. The United Nations and most of the governments of the industrialized countries including the United States are currently using the input-output model to measure and analyze their national economic systems. Since the current indirect effects formulations are incompetent to quantify the indirect transactions between any two sectors of the system, although there have been direct and total requirements matrices for economic system analysis, the *indirect requirements matrix* has never been formulated before. The indirect transactions between any two sectors of an economic system as well as the corresponding indirect requirements matrix are introduced in the present manuscript for the first time in the literature.

The requirement tables are mainly used for *impact analyses*—the impact of the specified change in final demands on the sectors of an economic system, their production, and other economic activities. The economic repercussions of the alteration of final demands is a critical information for policy analysis and business planning. Through the proposed methodology, the propagation of an external shock, such as a strike or a natural disaster, within the system and its indirect economic effects can be traced. Therefore, the indirect requirements tables can also be used in emergency planning, such as estimating the effects that petroleum shortages indirectly would have on the production in each sector. A standard policy analysis problem is to investigate the implications of a new governmental spending program or policy change that impacts final demands, such as new tariff or tax policies, for an economy in terms of interindustry production generated in response to the change. The indirect requirements matrix enables the analysis of the impact of such programs or changes directly targeting a specific sector indirectly on any other individual sector of interest. For example, the indirect impact of the government tax policy aimed at decreasing consumer demand for a particular product on another product can be determined using the indirect requirements tables. For a holistic analysis of an economy, the entries of a row in the indirect requirement matrix quantifies the relative importance of the corresponding sector to the economy in terms of indirect contributions.

The case studies at the end of the manuscript demonstrate that the proposed indirect transactions and requirements concepts capture the indirect interactions and relationships between sectors of economic systems accurately, unlike the current indirect effect formulations. These novel concepts are also applied to the aggregated US input-output data for multiple years. The numerical results and their graphical representations for these real data sets are also presented and briefly analyzed in the case studies.

2. METHODS

In this section, the fundamental relationships of input-output economics are summarized. Various existing indirect effects formulations in the literature are presented. The novel indirect transactions and requirements concepts are introduced through the system decomposition theory. The differences between the current indirect effects formulations and the proposed indirect transactions are compared theoretically. The potential uses of the proposed indirect requirements and transactions are discussed at the end of the section. The practical comparison of the current formulations and the proposed concepts are also presented through illustrative case studies in the next section.

The standard mathematical representation of the flow regime of a multi-sectoral economic system is

$$(2.1) \quad x = Z\mathbf{1} + f$$

where x is the vector of the *gross outputs*, f is the vector of the *final demands*, Z is the *transactions matrix* representing the flows of goods and services among the sectors, and $\mathbf{1}$ is the vector whose entries are all one.




FIGURE 1. Schematic representation for the different definitions of the indirect effects and the proposed indirect transactions. The sector or industry i is denoted by s_i in the figure. The numbers next to arrows represent the step numbers or order, n , in the geometric series expansion of the total requirements matrix, $L = I + A + A^2 + \dots + A^n + \dots$. In the current formulations, the flow segments labeled with the power, $n = 1$, of the first order term, Af , in both colors are generally considered as the direct effects, and with the powers of all higher orders terms, $A^n f$, $n > 1$, as the indirect effects. The unshaded flow segments represent the sum of the flow segments generated by all the remaining higher order terms of propagation ($n > 4$). In the context of the system decomposition theory, however, z_{ik} represents the direct transactions from sector i to k . In particular, both the blue-shaded flow segments labeled with 1 and 4 (cycling flow at s_3) within z_{43} represent direct transactions from s_4 to s_3 . A flow segment initiated at a sector and transmitted through other sectors to another is then defined as the indirect transaction. The red-shaded flow segments labeled with 2, 3, and 4 within z_{24} , z_{43} , and z_{32} , for example, are the portions of the indirect transactions from s_1 to s_4 , s_1 to s_3 , and s_1 to s_2 , respectively.

Let \hat{x} be the diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are the corresponding elements of vector x , and \hat{L} be the diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are the diagonal elements of matrix L . The *direct requirements* or *technical coefficient* matrix is then defined as

$$(2.2) \quad A = Z\hat{x}^{-1}$$

where $\hat{x} = \text{diag}(x)$. The direct requirements matrix shows the amount of inputs from industries in each row, an industry in a column needs in order to produce one dollar of its output. This matrix is called the *direct distribution matrix* in the context of the system decomposition theory [6].

The *total flow distribution* or *requirements matrix* can be formulated based on the direct requirements matrix as follows:

$$(2.3) \quad L = (1 - A)^{-1} = I + A + A^2 + A^3 + \dots + A^n + \dots$$

The derivation of L is detailed in [15] and [6]. The relationship between the total gross output vector and the final demand vector f can be expressed as

$$(2.4) \quad x = Lf.$$

The terms in the geometric series expansion of L defines step-by-step effects:

$$(2.5) \quad x = Lf = If + Af + A^2f + \dots + A^nf + \dots$$

The final demands, $f = If$, generate a need for inputs from the productive sectors. These inputs are satisfied by the outputs of the first step that is represented by the direct requirements matrix A ; Af . These outputs themselves, however, generate a need for additional inputs for the functioning of the economic system. The additional inputs are satisfied by the outputs of the second step that is represented by the second order term of Lf ; A^2f , and so on. The steps are ordered by the power of the direct requirements matrix, n . It is worth noting that, for static systems, all these steps are considered to be taking place simultaneously.

There are several indirect effects formulations proposed in the literature [17]. Some of the corresponding indirect requirements matrices are listed below:

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} E_1 &= L - I = A + A^2 + A^3 + \dots + A^n + \dots \\ E_2 &= L - A = I + A^2 + A^3 + \dots + A^n + \dots \\ E_3 &= L - I - A = A^2 + A^3 + \dots + A^n + \dots \\ E_4 &= L - \hat{L} = A - \text{diag}(A) + A^2 - \text{diag}(A^2) + \dots + A^n - \text{diag}(A^n) + \dots \end{aligned}$$

The right-multiplication of these indirect requirements matrices by f yields the corresponding indirect effects, $E_i f$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$. They represent the way in which final demands are transmitted as gross outputs through the productive sectors of the economic system, generally after the first transactions.

The first indirect effect formulation, $E_1 f$, represents the impact of the total effects, direct and indirect, less that of the final demands, f [17, 2]. This formulation excludes only the external outputs, and all intersectoral intermediate transactions are counted as indirect. It cannot distinguish the direct and indirect transactions and, consequently, cannot quantify indirect interactions. The second indirect effects formulation, $E_2 f$, removes only the impact of the first order propagation, Af , which is called the direct effects, from all production chains [15, 17, 21, 10, 22]. It is used by the US Department of Commerce and a variation of it by UK input-output analysts [17]. This formulation cannot quantify the indirect transactions either, as it includes direct transactions generated by the higher order terms of propagation due to cycling (see Fig. 1). Yet, the third formulation, E_3 , removes the impacts of both the final demands and the direct effects simultaneously [17, 1]. This indirect effects formulation is widely used also in ecological network analyses [8].

The last indirect effects formulation, E_4f , is reported by [17] referring to [11]. This formulation seems to be an attempt for removing the final demands and the cycling effects from the total effects (see Fig. 1). The cycling effects, however, cannot be determined by only the diagonal entries of L . This is because of the fact that each element of matrix L represents the total effects of one sector directly or indirectly on another. Since the cycling effects are a special case of the indirect effects—effects of a sector through other sectors reflexively back on itself—the cycling effects are included also in the off-diagonal entries of the total requirements matrix, L . A detailed derivation of the cycling flows through the system decomposition theory is introduced recently by [6].

Unlike the current methodologies, the system decomposition theory explicitly formulates indirect transactions between any two sectors in the system. The *indirect transactions* from sector k to i is defined as the total intersectoral flows of goods and services from sector k indirectly through other sectors to sector i . The *direct transactions* from sector k to i in this context are defined as the immediate, pairwise transactions from sector k to i , regardless of the propagation of goods and services within the system—that is, whether the goods and services are cycling at sector k and entering sector i multiple times through k (see Fig. 1).

The *indirect requirements* and *indirect transaction matrices*, Q and T^i , can accordingly be expressed as

$$(2.7) \quad Q = L - I - A\hat{L} \quad \text{and} \quad T^i = Q\hat{f}$$

after modifications of the formulations proposed by [6]. The critical difference in the formulation is that, although the indirect distribution matrix $Q^i = (L - I)\hat{L}^{-1} - A$ is defined for gross outputs, \hat{x} , by [6], that is $T^i = Q^i\hat{x}$, Eq. 2.7 formulates the indirect requirements matrix, Q , for final demands, \hat{f} , $T^i = Q\hat{f}$. This modification allows for the *impact analysis* of the alterations in final demands on economic systems. The k th column of Q can economically be interpreted as the goods and services required for industry k indirectly from each sectors in the rows to produce a dollar's worth of its product.

Graph theoretically, the sign of an indirect transaction or requirement coefficient shows the existence of an indirect path between the corresponding two sectors in the system. That is, if the (k, i) -element of T^i is positive, $\tau_{ki}^i > 0$, then there is a production chain from sector k indirectly to i . It is also worth emphasizing that the diagonal elements of indirect transactions matrix, T^i , are representing the *cycling transactions* from the corresponding sectors back into themselves indirectly through other sectors.

The *total throughflow matrix*, T , is defined as follows

$$(2.8) \quad T = L\hat{f} \quad \text{with} \quad x = T\mathbf{1} = Lf$$

in the context of the system decomposition theory [6]. Note that this subsectoral level system partitioning is not possible through the existing methodologies. The total *indirect gross outputs vector*, x^i , can then be expressed as follows:

$$(2.9) \quad T^i = Q\hat{f} \quad \Rightarrow \quad x^i = T^i\mathbf{1} = Qf$$

similar to the relationship between x and T in Eq. 2.8.




FIGURE 2. Schematic representation of the economic system. The gross outputs at the first two steps are $Af = [2, 6, 3]^T$ and $A^2f = [0.6, 0.6, 0.6]^T$, where the superscript T represents the matrix transpose (Case Study 3.1).

Although unrealistic, assuming that the distribution matrices are constant while the final demands are changing, the impact of a change in the final demand on the processing sectors can be approximated. This approach is sometimes called the *impact analysis*. The linearity of the relationships between T , x and f , as well as T^i , x^i and f given in Eqs. 2.8 and 2.9 imply that

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta T &= L\Delta\hat{f} \Rightarrow \Delta x = L\Delta f \\ \Delta T^i &= Q\Delta\hat{f} \Rightarrow \Delta x^i = Q\Delta f. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, a change in the final demands, Δf , enforces the corresponding changes in the total and indirect transactions, ΔT and ΔT^i , as well as the total gross outputs and total indirect gross outputs, Δx and Δx^i .

3. RESULTS

A hypothetical economics system is analyzed for illustrative purposes in this section to clarify the differences between the proposed indirect transactions and the existing indirect effect formulations. In the second case study, the US input-output data aggregated to seven sectors are analyzed for 15 years. Since the main focus of the present manuscript is to introduce the novel concept of the indirect transactions and requirements, the results are briefly interpreted to mainly demonstrate their validity and effectiveness.

3.1. Case study. In this case study, a simple hypothetical model is analyzed to illustrate the novel concept of indirect transactions proposed in the present manuscript and its difference from the indirect effects formulations in the input-output economics literature. The results demonstrate that the proposed concept accurately captures indirect relationships and transactions between sectors.

Let the sectors of a three-sector economic system model be agriculture (sector 1), manufacturing (sector 2), and services (sector 3). Let also the technical coefficient matrix be given as

$$(3.1) \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.2 \\ 0.3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using “from row to column” convention, this indicates that the production of a dollars worth of goods in the agriculture sector requires a *direct* input of \$0.30 from the service sector. Similarly, the production of a dollars worth of manufacturing requires a direct input of \$0.10 from the agriculture sector, and that of the service sector requires \$0.20 direct input from the manufacturing sector.

For the final demands of $f = [10, 20, 30]^T$, in million dollars, the total gross output from each sector needed to satisfy this demand becomes $x = Lf$. That is,

$$(3.2) \quad f = \begin{bmatrix} 10 \\ 20 \\ 30 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{then} \quad x = Lf = \begin{bmatrix} 12.6761 \\ 26.7606 \\ 33.8028 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The direct transactions between the sectors of the system can also be specified as follows:

$$(3.3) \quad Z = A\hat{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2.6761 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 6.7606 \\ 3.8028 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

using Eq. 2.2. That is, \$2.6761 millions worth of goods are transferred from the agriculture to the manufacturing sector, $z_{12} = 2.6761$, \$6.7606 millions from the manufacturing to the service sector, $z_{23} = 6.7606$, and \$3.8028 millions worth of service from the service to the agriculture sector, $z_{31} = 3.8028$.

The total requirements matrix becomes

$$(3.4) \quad L = (1 - A)^{-1} = I + A + \dots + A^n + \dots = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0060 & 0.1006 & 0.0201 \\ 0.0604 & 1.0060 & 0.2012 \\ 0.3018 & 0.0302 & 1.0060 \end{bmatrix}$$

using Eq. 2.3. A step-by-step computation shows that the terms in the series expansion of L diminishes quickly:

$$A^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0.02 \\ 0.06 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.03 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A^3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.006 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.006 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.006 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$A^4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.0006 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.0012 \\ 0.0018 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A^5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1.2 \cdot 10^{-4} \\ 3.6 \cdot 10^{-4} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1.8 \cdot 10^{-4} & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This is generally the case and L can be approximated accurate enough with just a few terms of the series. As an example, (2,3)–entry of L , $\ell_{23} = 0.2012$, indicates that the production of a dollars worth of the service sector requires a *total*, direct and indirect, input of \$0.2012 from the manufacturing sector. Similarly,

(2,3)–entries of A^n indicate the production of a dollars worth of the service sector requires directly from the manufacturing sector at step n . All the other entries of the matrices can be interpreted similarly.

The gross outputs for the first step then become:

$$(3.5) \quad A\hat{f} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 6 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow Af = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 6 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This computation indicates that to satisfy the final demands of \$10 million worth of goods from the agriculture sector, \$20 million from the manufacturing sector, and \$30 million worth of services from the service sector, the manufacturing sector needs \$2 million worth of goods from the agriculture sector, the service sector needs \$6 million from the manufacturing sector, and the agriculture sector needs \$3 million worth of service from the service sector. In order to satisfy this demand from the first step, the gross outputs for the second step should become:

$$(3.6) \quad A^2\hat{f} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0.6 \\ 0.6 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.6 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow A^2f = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6 \\ 0.6 \\ 0.6 \end{bmatrix}.$$

All the subsequent steps can be calculated and interpreted similarly (see Fig. 2).

The total flow distribution between the sectors of the system to supply the final demand can be calculated as follows:

$$(3.7) \quad T = L\hat{f} = \begin{bmatrix} 10.0604 & 2.0121 & 0.6036 \\ 0.6036 & 20.1207 & 6.0362 \\ 3.0181 & 0.6036 & 30.1811 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad x = T\mathbf{1} = \begin{bmatrix} 12.6761 \\ 26.7606 \\ 33.8028 \end{bmatrix}$$

based on the formulation given in Eq. 2.8. As an example, (2,3)–entry of T , $\tau_{23} = 6.0362$, indicates that \$6.0362 million worth of goods in the manufacturing sector is destined to contribute to the final demand of the service sector. All the other entries can be interpreted similarly.

There are several indirect requirements matrices proposed in the literature as listed in Eq. 2.6. For this hypothetical economic system, they become

$$(3.8) \quad E_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0060 & 0.1006 & 0.0201 \\ 0.0604 & 0.0060 & 0.2012 \\ 0.3018 & 0.0302 & 0.0060 \end{bmatrix}, \quad E_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0060 & 0.0006 & 0.0201 \\ 0.0604 & 1.0060 & 0.0012 \\ 0.0018 & 0.0302 & 1.0060 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$E_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0060 & 0.0006 & 0.0201 \\ 0.0604 & 0.0060 & 0.0012 \\ 0.0018 & 0.0302 & 0.0060 \end{bmatrix}, \quad E_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.1006 & 0.0201 \\ 0.0604 & 0 & 0.2012 \\ 0.3018 & 0.0302 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The proposed indirect requirements matrix for the system, however, is

$$(3.9) \quad Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0060 & 0 & 0.0201 \\ 0.0604 & 0.0060 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.0302 & 0.0060 \end{bmatrix}$$

as given in Eq. 2.7. As an example, $(1,3)$ -entry of Q , $q_{13} = 0.0201$, indicates that the production of a dollar worth of the service sector requires an indirect input of \$0.0201 from the agriculture sector. All the other entries can be interpreted similarly.

The diagonal entries of Q represent cycling transactions. Since there is one closed path in this system, $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow s_1$, the cycling flow at each sector along the path are the same (see Fig. 2). Consequently, the diagonal elements of Q are all equal to each other: $q_{11} = q_{22} = q_{33} = 0.0060$. As seen from Fig. 2, there is no indirect transactions from s_1 to s_2 , from s_2 to s_3 , from s_3 to s_1 . Therefore, the corresponding entries of Q are zero: $q_{12} = q_{23} = q_{31} = 0$. The relationship $q_{12} = 0$, for example, indicates that there is no goods and services in the agriculture sector that is destined to indirectly contribute to the final demand of the manufacturing sector. The existing indirect effects formulations E_1 to E_4 have nonzero values in these entries, since they cannot exclude the cycling effects at the sectors along the path (see Figs. 1 and 2).

The indirect transactions matrix and the indirect gross outputs vector then become

(3.10)

$$T^i = Q\hat{f} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0604 & 0 & 0.6036 \\ 0.6036 & 0.1207 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.6036 & 0.1811 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad x^i = T^i \mathbf{1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6640 \\ 0.7243 \\ 0.7847 \end{bmatrix}$$

as formulated in Eq. 2.7. The nonzero entries of T^i represent the dollar amount of indirect transactions between sectors to contribute to the corresponding final demands. For example, $\tau_{32}^i = 0.6036$ indicates that \$0.6036 million worth of services are purchased by the manufacturing sector indirectly through other sectors (the agriculture sector for this system) from the service sector. Three entries, however, are zero: $\tau_{12}^i = \tau_{23}^i = \tau_{31}^i = 0$. The relationship $\tau_{12}^i = 0$ indicates that there is no goods in the agriculture sector that is destined to indirectly contribute to the final demand of the manufacturing sector. The other matrix elements can be interpreted similarly.

3.2. Case study. In this case study, the US input-output data for 15 years (1919, 1929, 1939, 1947, 1958, 1963, 1967, 1972, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2006) are briefly and partially analyzed using the aggregated input-output direct requirements tables provided by [15]. The sectors in these aggregated data sets for the US economy are as follows: Agriculture (1), Mining (2), Construction (3), Manufacturing (4), Trade, Transport & Utilities (5), Services (6), and Other (7). The numerical results for the indirect requirements matrices are presented in Tables 1-15 and these results are visualized in Fig. 3 and 4.

As an example, an element in the indirect requirements matrix for the year 2006, $\tau_{ik}^i(2006)$, represents the value of goods and services bought by sector k for one dollar worth of its production indirectly through other sectors from sector i in 2006. There is only one zero element in all these indirect requirements matrices: $\tau_{37}^i(1919) = 0$ in 1919 table, which indicates that there is no indirect transactions from the construction sector to the other sector (sector 7).

Manufacturing seems to be the backbone of the US economy in terms of both direct and indirect transactions. Interestingly, however, although the manufacturing sector directly contributes more to itself, it indirectly contributes more to the construction sector.

The diagonal elements of the indirect requirements matrices measure the cycling transactions—the transactions initiated at and ends in the same sector after potentially being transmitted throughout the system. The diagonal elements of the indirect requirements matrices show that the cycling transactions are generally not significant for most years in the US economy, except for the manufacturing sector.

As seen from the graphs in Fig. 4, the US industries indirectly rely increasingly more on the service sector. The indirect contributions of the service sector to the US economy is even more than the manufacturing sector in recent years. Figure 3 indicates that the service sector also directly supplies the other industries increasingly more but at a lower scale relative to other direct transactions. The increasing tendency in the US economy towards being services-oriented is also observed in some Bureau of Economic Analysis' (BEA) reports as well [20]. Contrary to this observation, the indirect contributions of the trade, transportation, and utilities sector to the other industries are gradually decreasing, after an increase from 1919 to 1939.

The linearity of the relationship between T^i , x^i and f given in Eqs. 2.10 implies that a change in the final demands at the amount of $\Delta f = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 2, 0]^T$, in million dollars, in 2006 enforces the corresponding changes in the indirect transactions:

$$\Delta T^i = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0154 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0148 & 0 \\ 0.0444 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0311 & 0 \\ 0.0045 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0029 & 0 \\ 0.1792 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1238 & 0 \\ 0.0693 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0472 & 0 \\ 0.1871 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0850 & 0 \\ 0.0210 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.0122 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta x^i = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0302 \\ 0.0755 \\ 0.0074 \\ 0.3030 \\ 0.1164 \\ 0.2721 \\ 0.0332 \end{bmatrix}.$$

These results indicate that a change in the final demand at the amount of \$1 million of the agriculture sector and \$2 million of the service sector results in the changes in the indirect transactions of the whole system as specified by ΔT^i . For example, since $\Delta \tau_{31}^i = 0.0045$, $\Delta \tau_{36}^i = 0.0029$, and $\Delta x_3^i = 0.0074$, the agriculture and service sectors end up in respectively buying \$4500 and \$2900 (\$7400 in total) worth of products from the construction sector indirectly through products of the other sectors to supply the specified final demand. The maximum gross output to indirectly satisfy this demand is from the manufacturing sector at the amount of \$303,000 ($\Delta x_4^i = 0.3030$), which shows the value of goods purchased by the agriculture and service sectors from the manufacturing sector indirectly through other sectors.

A detailed analysis of these results might elucidate various other aspects of the US economy. The accuracy of the interpretations would increase with the disaggregation of the industries.

4. DISCUSSION

There have been numerous attempts in the literature to formulate the indirect transactions between the sectors of an economic system for about a century. None of these formulations, however, quantify the indirect transactions accurately. The system decomposition theory has recently defined and mathematically formulated the indirect flows between any two compartments in a compartmental system [6]. Based on this theory, the indirect transactions between the sectors in a multi-sectoral economic system and the associated indirect requirements matrix are explicitly formulated in the present manuscript for the first time in the literature.

The existing indirect effects are formulated by modifications of the total requirements matrix, L , at different levels. The idea has essentially been to remove some terms in the geometric series expansion of L to distinguish the direct and indirect effects. The methodological advancement brought by the concept of the indirect transactions is comparatively discussed with the indirect effects formulations. In a nutshell, the flow segments are classified as direct or indirect based on the order of propagation they contribute to the final demands in the production chain in the current formulations. In general, the flow segments contributing to the final demands in the first step are considered as direct effects, and all the subsequent steps as indirect. In the context of the system decomposition theory, however, the directness and indirectness are determined based on the nature of the interactions between the sectors. While an immediate pairwise transaction between any two sectors is considered as a direct transaction, their interactions through other sectors are considered as indirect transactions.

The direct and total requirements matrices are formulated and used for impact analysis in national and regional economic systems. For example, BEA provides these requirement tables together with the annual US input-output data. Since the proposed methodology formulates the indirect transactions between any two sectors, it also enables the formulation of the indirect requirements matrix, unlike the current techniques. The indirect requirements matrix serves as a quantitative tool to unravel the complexity of intersectoral relationships and for more rigorous and detailed analyses of economic systems.

The accuracy and efficiency of the proposed indirect transactions and requirements matrix in capturing the indirect interactions among the sectors of a hypothetical economic system is demonstrated in the first case study. We then calculated the indirect requirements matrices for the US economy, using the aggregated input-output data for 15 years separately. The numerical results for these real data sets and their graphical representations are presented in the second case study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Huseyin Coskun for introducing the system decomposition theory to the author and for useful comments.

REFERENCES

1. Jack Alterman, *Interindustry employment requirements*, Monthly Labor Review (pre-1986) **88** (1965), no. 7, 841.
2. Anne P. Carter, *Structural change in the american economy*, Harvard Studies in Technology and Society, Harvard University Press, 1970.
3. Huseyin Coskun, *Dynamic ecological system analysis*, Heliyon **5** (2019), no. 9.
4. ———, *Dynamic ecological system measures*, Results in Applied Mathematics **4** (2019), 100007.
5. Huseyin Coskun, *Nonlinear decomposition principle and fundamental matrix solutions for dynamic compartmental systems*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - B **24** (2019), no. 12, 6553–6605.
6. ———, *Static ecological system analysis*, Theoretical Ecology (2019).
7. ———, *Static ecological system measures*, Theoretical Ecology (2019).
8. Brian D. Fath and Ursula M. Scharler, *Systems ecology: Ecological network analysis*, Encyclopedia of Ecology (Second Edition) (Brian Fath, ed.), Elsevier, Oxford, second edition ed., 2019, pp. 643 – 652.
9. Heinz D. Kurz and Neri Salvadori, *'classical' roots of input-output analysis: A short account of its long prehistory*, Economic Systems Research **12** (2000), no. 2, 153–179.
10. Kelvin Lancaster, *Mathematical economics*, Macmillan, 1968.
11. Wassily Leontief, *The structure of american economy, 1919-1939; an empirical application of equilibrium analysis.*, [2d ed., enl.]. ed., Oxford University Press, New York, 1951 (eng).
12. Wassily W Leontief, *Quantitative input and output relations in the economic systems of the united states*, The review of economic statistics **18** (1936), no. 3, 105–125.
13. ———, *Input-output economics*, Oxford University Press on Demand, New York, 1986.
14. Ronald L. Meek, *The economics of physiocracy*, Harvard University Press, London :, 1962.
15. Ronald E. Miller and Peter D. Blair, *Input-output analysis: Foundations and extensions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.
16. Antoin E. Murphy, *John law and richard cantillon on the circular flow of income*, The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought **1** (1993), no. 1, 47–62.
17. A. Parikh, *Various definitions of direct and indirect requirements in input-output analysis*, The Review of Economics and Statistics **57** (1975), no. 3, 375.
18. Albert E. Steenge, *The commodity technology revisited: Theoretical basis and an application to error location in the make-use framework*, Economic Modelling **7** (1990), no. 4, 376 – 387.
19. Kenneth M Stokes, *Man and the biosphere : toward a coevolutionary political economy / kenneth m. stokes.*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, N.Y., 1992 (eng).
20. Mary Streitwieser, *Measuring the nation's economy: An industry perspective: A primer on BEA's industry accounts*, Working Paper, January 2010.
21. United Nations, *Standardized input-output tables of ece countries for years around 1959.*, United Nations, New York, 1972.
22. U.S. Bureau of Commerce, *Input-output structure of the us economy: 1963*, Survey of Current Business (1969).
23. Léon Walras, *Elements of pure economics, or the theory of social wealth*, Cambridge University Press, 1874.

APPENDIX A. THE US REQUIREMENT TABLES

The US indirect requirements tables (Q) for 15 years (1919, 1929, 1939, 1947, 1958, 1963, 1967, 1972, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2006) are calculated through the proposed methodology and presented in Tables 1-15 in this Appendix. These numerical results are visualized in Fig. 3 and 4. The aggregated input-output data sets (Z) and direct requirement matrices (A) for the US economy are obtained from the tables in [15]. The sectors in these aggregated data sets are: Agriculture (1), Mining (2), Construction (3), Manufacturing (4), Trade, Transport & Utilities (5), Services (6), and Other (7).

TABLE 1. The US Requirement Tables for 2006

| Direct Requirements (A) | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.2403 | 0 | 0.0014 | 0.0345 | 0.0001 | 0.0018 | 0.0007 |
| 2 | 0.0028 | 0.1307 | 0.0079 | 0.0756 | 0.031 | 0.0004 | 0.0066 |
| 3 | 0.0035 | 0.0002 | 0.001 | 0.0019 | 0.0039 | 0.0072 | 0.0242 |
| 4 | 0.1858 | 0.0959 | 0.2673 | 0.3311 | 0.0581 | 0.0558 | 0.1027 |
| 5 | 0.0774 | 0.0379 | 0.1063 | 0.1003 | 0.0698 | 0.0329 | 0.0439 |
| 6 | 0.0875 | 0.1298 | 0.1262 | 0.1239 | 0.1846 | 0.2889 | 0.2029 |
| 7 | 0.0102 | 0.0096 | 0.0095 | 0.0233 | 0.0223 | 0.0192 | 0.0225 |
| Indirect Requirements (Q) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0154 | 0.0101 | 0.0224 | 0.0184 | 0.0073 | 0.0074 | 0.0110 |
| 2 | 0.0444 | 0.0185 | 0.0486 | 0.0262 | 0.0181 | 0.0155 | 0.0236 |
| 3 | 0.0045 | 0.0033 | 0.0048 | 0.0051 | 0.0036 | 0.0014 | 0.0035 |
| 4 | 0.1792 | 0.0940 | 0.1961 | 0.0684 | 0.0780 | 0.0619 | 0.1106 |
| 5 | 0.0693 | 0.0379 | 0.0756 | 0.0411 | 0.0303 | 0.0236 | 0.0454 |
| 6 | 0.1871 | 0.1278 | 0.2024 | 0.1849 | 0.1300 | 0.0425 | 0.1592 |
| 7 | 0.0210 | 0.0127 | 0.0227 | 0.0153 | 0.0112 | 0.0061 | 0.0149 |

TABLE 2. The US Requirement Tables for 2002

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.2638 | 0.002 | 0.0027 | 0.0379 | 0.0004 | 0.0008 | 0.0008 |
| 2 | 0.0032 | 0.0468 | 0.0099 | 0.0381 | 0.0236 | 0.0004 | 0.0042 |
| 3 | 0.0043 | 0.0359 | 0.0007 | 0.0032 | 0.0058 | 0.0081 | 0.0204 |
| 4 | 0.1491 | 0.0934 | 0.245 | 0.351 | 0.05 | 0.0472 | 0.0959 |
| 5 | 0.0852 | 0.064 | 0.0968 | 0.0913 | 0.0794 | 0.0254 | 0.0452 |
| 6 | 0.1333 | 0.2457 | 0.144 | 0.1386 | 0.1844 | 0.2682 | 0.2026 |
| 7 | 0.0087 | 0.0138 | 0.0073 | 0.015 | 0.0267 | 0.0162 | 0.0193 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0146 | 0.0127 | 0.0238 | 0.0229 | 0.0072 | 0.0067 | 0.0111 |
| 2 | 0.0199 | 0.0118 | 0.0222 | 0.0085 | 0.0068 | 0.0064 | 0.0108 |
| 3 | 0.0068 | 0.0057 | 0.0069 | 0.0081 | 0.0051 | 0.0015 | 0.0046 |
| 4 | 0.1657 | 0.1192 | 0.1856 | 0.0548 | 0.0707 | 0.0521 | 0.1006 |
| 5 | 0.0621 | 0.0472 | 0.0667 | 0.0400 | 0.0255 | 0.0188 | 0.0385 |
| 6 | 0.2017 | 0.1854 | 0.1990 | 0.1824 | 0.1246 | 0.0367 | 0.1481 |
| 7 | 0.0176 | 0.0146 | 0.0176 | 0.0142 | 0.0086 | 0.0040 | 0.0116 |

TABLE 3. The US Requirement Tables for 1997

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.2618 | 0.0001 | 0.0015 | 0.0401 | 0.0013 | 0.002 | 0.0008 |
| 2 | 0.0017 | 0.115 | 0.0062 | 0.0306 | 0.0236 | 0.0003 | 0.0036 |
| 3 | 0.0039 | 0.0002 | 0.0011 | 0.002 | 0.0052 | 0.006 | 0.0101 |
| 4 | 0.174 | 0.1162 | 0.2372 | 0.3627 | 0.0758 | 0.0583 | 0.0424 |
| 5 | 0.0731 | 0.0643 | 0.0975 | 0.098 | 0.0847 | 0.0288 | 0.0267 |
| 6 | 0.111 | 0.257 | 0.1376 | 0.1232 | 0.2294 | 0.2146 | 0.0902 |
| 7 | 0.0063 | 0.0181 | 0.0086 | 0.0177 | 0.0212 | 0.0169 | 0.0167 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0184 | 0.0165 | 0.0254 | 0.0251 | 0.0117 | 0.0085 | 0.0060 |
| 2 | 0.0202 | 0.0117 | 0.0207 | 0.0126 | 0.0102 | 0.0066 | 0.0052 |
| 3 | 0.0040 | 0.0044 | 0.0040 | 0.0040 | 0.0031 | 0.0009 | 0.0014 |
| 4 | 0.1960 | 0.1417 | 0.1980 | 0.0635 | 0.0993 | 0.0603 | 0.0521 |
| 5 | 0.0696 | 0.0536 | 0.0703 | 0.0404 | 0.0342 | 0.0213 | 0.0199 |
| 6 | 0.1721 | 0.1679 | 0.1710 | 0.1557 | 0.1194 | 0.0372 | 0.0599 |
| 7 | 0.0178 | 0.0161 | 0.0176 | 0.0129 | 0.0111 | 0.0044 | 0.0056 |

TABLE 4. The US Requirement Tables for 1992

| Direct Requirements (A) | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.2339 | 0.0003 | 0.0061 | 0.0419 | 0.0005 | 0.0036 | 0.0004 |
| 2 | 0.0018 | 0.1654 | 0.009 | 0.0329 | 0.0274 | 0.0002 | 0.003 |
| 3 | 0.0122 | 0.017 | 0.0009 | 0.0061 | 0.0208 | 0.0187 | 0.023 |
| 4 | 0.1667 | 0.0787 | 0.2992 | 0.3454 | 0.056 | 0.0673 | 0.0135 |
| 5 | 0.0914 | 0.081 | 0.1061 | 0.1057 | 0.1048 | 0.0427 | 0.016 |
| 6 | 0.09 | 0.1514 | 0.1139 | 0.0712 | 0.1555 | 0.2039 | 0.0134 |
| 7 | 0.0038 | 0.0105 | 0.0048 | 0.0119 | 0.0201 | 0.0112 | 0.0034 |
| Indirect Requirements (Q) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0177 | 0.0131 | 0.0316 | 0.0220 | 0.0097 | 0.0104 | 0.0026 |
| 2 | 0.0230 | 0.0114 | 0.0291 | 0.0183 | 0.0126 | 0.0095 | 0.0033 |
| 3 | 0.0118 | 0.0105 | 0.0134 | 0.0115 | 0.0072 | 0.0036 | 0.0016 |
| 4 | 0.1741 | 0.1108 | 0.2169 | 0.0539 | 0.0830 | 0.0715 | 0.0255 |
| 5 | 0.0780 | 0.0549 | 0.0933 | 0.0487 | 0.0347 | 0.0313 | 0.0118 |
| 6 | 0.1141 | 0.1017 | 0.1272 | 0.0993 | 0.0738 | 0.0310 | 0.0175 |
| 7 | 0.0118 | 0.0090 | 0.0136 | 0.0081 | 0.0053 | 0.0040 | 0.0016 |

TABLE 5. The US Requirement Tables for 1987

| Direct Requirements (A) | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.3016 | 0.0002 | 0.0062 | 0.04 | 0.0003 | 0.004 | 0.0003 |
| 2 | 0.0023 | 0.0541 | 0.0093 | 0.0396 | 0.0204 | 0.0006 | 0.004 |
| 3 | 0.0076 | 0.0173 | 0.0006 | 0.0058 | 0.0206 | 0.0217 | 0.0292 |
| 4 | 0.1376 | 0.0715 | 0.2945 | 0.3419 | 0.0533 | 0.0836 | 0.0184 |
| 5 | 0.0834 | 0.0602 | 0.1029 | 0.095 | 0.1144 | 0.0461 | 0.0256 |
| 6 | 0.0933 | 0.1486 | 0.1118 | 0.0558 | 0.1446 | 0.2158 | 0.0123 |
| 7 | 0.0042 | 0.0095 | 0.0045 | 0.0143 | 0.0165 | 0.0124 | 0.0036 |
| Indirect Requirements (Q) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0157 | 0.0115 | 0.0334 | 0.0289 | 0.0101 | 0.0138 | 0.0036 |
| 2 | 0.0201 | 0.0095 | 0.0264 | 0.0085 | 0.0080 | 0.0108 | 0.0036 |
| 3 | 0.0123 | 0.0090 | 0.0133 | 0.0107 | 0.0074 | 0.0041 | 0.0020 |
| 4 | 0.1640 | 0.0941 | 0.2123 | 0.0497 | 0.0827 | 0.0854 | 0.0328 |
| 5 | 0.0722 | 0.0439 | 0.0868 | 0.0456 | 0.0313 | 0.0358 | 0.0151 |
| 6 | 0.1070 | 0.0813 | 0.1146 | 0.0888 | 0.0688 | 0.0323 | 0.0210 |
| 7 | 0.0118 | 0.0074 | 0.0139 | 0.0067 | 0.0056 | 0.0048 | 0.0021 |

TABLE 6. The US Requirement Tables for 1982

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.2853 | 0.0002 | 0.0019 | 0.0455 | 0.0005 | 0.0045 | 0.0047 |
| 2 | 0.0025 | 0.0467 | 0.0078 | 0.078 | 0.0486 | 0.0006 | 0.0041 |
| 3 | 0.0093 | 0.0247 | 0.001 | 0.005 | 0.0194 | 0.0238 | 0.0221 |
| 4 | 0.1806 | 0.0637 | 0.3201 | 0.3505 | 0.0764 | 0.0877 | 0.0194 |
| 5 | 0.0683 | 0.0414 | 0.0973 | 0.1042 | 0.1255 | 0.0454 | 0.0351 |
| 6 | 0.0816 | 0.1561 | 0.098 | 0.0542 | 0.121 | 0.17 | 0.0071 |
| 7 | 0.0035 | 0.0046 | 0.0043 | 0.015 | 0.0164 | 0.011 | 0.0043 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0224 | 0.0124 | 0.0386 | 0.0315 | 0.0142 | 0.0155 | 0.0057 |
| 2 | 0.0481 | 0.0178 | 0.0574 | 0.0185 | 0.0193 | 0.0221 | 0.0077 |
| 3 | 0.0126 | 0.0084 | 0.0139 | 0.0140 | 0.0085 | 0.0041 | 0.0023 |
| 4 | 0.2080 | 0.0991 | 0.2442 | 0.0694 | 0.1047 | 0.0954 | 0.0364 |
| 5 | 0.0866 | 0.0435 | 0.0995 | 0.0530 | 0.0378 | 0.0397 | 0.0172 |
| 6 | 0.0942 | 0.0633 | 0.1029 | 0.0920 | 0.0621 | 0.0314 | 0.0189 |
| 7 | 0.0128 | 0.0067 | 0.0145 | 0.0070 | 0.0058 | 0.0050 | 0.0022 |

TABLE 7. The US Requirement Tables for 1977

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.2463 | 0.0004 | 0.0035 | 0.047 | 0.0011 | 0.0052 | 0.0007 |
| 2 | 0.0022 | 0.0712 | 0.0093 | 0.0575 | 0.0288 | 0.0005 | 0.0048 |
| 3 | 0.0107 | 0.0375 | 0.0011 | 0.0064 | 0.019 | 0.0293 | 0.0193 |
| 4 | 0.2021 | 0.095 | 0.3722 | 0.3816 | 0.0645 | 0.0885 | 0.0126 |
| 5 | 0.0716 | 0.0478 | 0.1148 | 0.0855 | 0.1058 | 0.0498 | 0.0228 |
| 6 | 0.0864 | 0.0999 | 0.0724 | 0.0482 | 0.12 | 0.151 | 0.0083 |
| 7 | 0.0029 | 0.0049 | 0.0043 | 0.0141 | 0.0137 | 0.009 | 0.004 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0256 | 0.0164 | 0.0453 | 0.0281 | 0.0129 | 0.0160 | 0.0032 |
| 2 | 0.0381 | 0.0171 | 0.0500 | 0.0143 | 0.0141 | 0.0171 | 0.0043 |
| 3 | 0.0144 | 0.0086 | 0.0165 | 0.0141 | 0.0088 | 0.0045 | 0.0019 |
| 4 | 0.2407 | 0.1333 | 0.3055 | 0.0685 | 0.1029 | 0.1106 | 0.0298 |
| 5 | 0.0783 | 0.0460 | 0.0962 | 0.0448 | 0.0315 | 0.0362 | 0.0114 |
| 6 | 0.0825 | 0.0529 | 0.0942 | 0.0690 | 0.0445 | 0.0288 | 0.0120 |
| 7 | 0.0119 | 0.0065 | 0.0146 | 0.0051 | 0.0046 | 0.0048 | 0.0014 |

TABLE 8. The US Requirement Tables for 1972

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.3141 | 0.0003 | 0.0028 | 0.0542 | 0.001 | 0.0053 | 0.0012 |
| 2 | 0.0019 | 0.0542 | 0.0091 | 0.0296 | 0.016 | 0.0002 | 0.002 |
| 3 | 0.0069 | 0.0282 | 0.0003 | 0.0043 | 0.0156 | 0.0263 | 0.0166 |
| 4 | 0.1436 | 0.0943 | 0.3522 | 0.3771 | 0.0407 | 0.0892 | 0.0078 |
| 5 | 0.0616 | 0.0481 | 0.1043 | 0.0786 | 0.098 | 0.0442 | 0.0202 |
| 6 | 0.0865 | 0.1471 | 0.0686 | 0.0591 | 0.1157 | 0.1621 | 0.0105 |
| 7 | 0.0023 | 0.0063 | 0.0042 | 0.0117 | 0.0118 | 0.0096 | 0.0033 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0229 | 0.0200 | 0.0523 | 0.0436 | 0.0114 | 0.0198 | 0.0031 |
| 2 | 0.0154 | 0.0086 | 0.0234 | 0.0063 | 0.0051 | 0.0084 | 0.0017 |
| 3 | 0.0102 | 0.0086 | 0.0115 | 0.0100 | 0.0061 | 0.0029 | 0.0013 |
| 4 | 0.1838 | 0.1255 | 0.2692 | 0.0530 | 0.0726 | 0.0993 | 0.0214 |
| 5 | 0.0585 | 0.0423 | 0.0799 | 0.0375 | 0.0216 | 0.0308 | 0.0084 |
| 6 | 0.0788 | 0.0646 | 0.0948 | 0.0684 | 0.0412 | 0.0283 | 0.0106 |
| 7 | 0.0087 | 0.0061 | 0.0115 | 0.0044 | 0.0034 | 0.0038 | 0.0010 |

TABLE 9. The US Requirement Tables for 1967

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.3016 | 0 | 0.0025 | 0.0508 | 0.0061 | 0.0022 | 0.0177 |
| 2 | 0.0022 | 0.0515 | 0.009 | 0.028 | 0.0085 | 0.0001 | 0.0044 |
| 3 | 0.0095 | 0.0229 | 0.0003 | 0.0041 | 0.0248 | 0.0088 | 0.0534 |
| 4 | 0.136 | 0.0935 | 0.3634 | 0.3894 | 0.0418 | 0.1577 | 0.2452 |
| 5 | 0.1225 | 0.1726 | 0.1221 | 0.0834 | 0.1432 | 0.1438 | 0.2661 |
| 6 | 0.0278 | 0.0228 | 0.0526 | 0.0325 | 0.0548 | 0.0694 | 0.0703 |
| 7 | 0.0183 | 0.0962 | 0.0088 | 0.0408 | 0.0444 | 0.0286 | 0.0455 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0241 | 0.0274 | 0.0554 | 0.0439 | 0.0174 | 0.0304 | 0.0548 |
| 2 | 0.0155 | 0.0117 | 0.0236 | 0.0059 | 0.0061 | 0.0132 | 0.0221 |
| 3 | 0.0135 | 0.0170 | 0.0147 | 0.0148 | 0.0058 | 0.0116 | 0.0160 |
| 4 | 0.2132 | 0.1878 | 0.3215 | 0.0803 | 0.1128 | 0.1755 | 0.3035 |
| 5 | 0.1115 | 0.1225 | 0.1384 | 0.1039 | 0.0550 | 0.0904 | 0.1545 |
| 6 | 0.0414 | 0.0434 | 0.0505 | 0.0331 | 0.0192 | 0.0318 | 0.0593 |
| 7 | 0.0371 | 0.0344 | 0.0497 | 0.0262 | 0.0147 | 0.0303 | 0.0518 |

TABLE 10. The US Requirement Tables for 1963

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.31 | 0 | 0.0038 | 0.0574 | 0.0087 | 0.0006 | 0.0322 |
| 2 | 0.0022 | 0.0553 | 0.0086 | 0.0314 | 0.0085 | 0.0002 | 0.0077 |
| 3 | 0.0099 | 0.0202 | 0.0003 | 0.003 | 0.0315 | 0.0093 | 0.055 |
| 4 | 0.133 | 0.0812 | 0.37 | 0.3983 | 0.0401 | 0.1496 | 0.2574 |
| 5 | 0.1054 | 0.1935 | 0.133 | 0.0807 | 0.1415 | 0.1544 | 0.257 |
| 6 | 0.0246 | 0.0143 | 0.0429 | 0.0267 | 0.0473 | 0.0604 | 0.0662 |
| 7 | 0.0198 | 0.0982 | 0.0075 | 0.036 | 0.0439 | 0.034 | 0.038 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0281 | 0.0334 | 0.0668 | 0.0538 | 0.0221 | 0.0352 | 0.0721 |
| 2 | 0.0170 | 0.0128 | 0.0272 | 0.0068 | 0.0072 | 0.0146 | 0.0255 |
| 3 | 0.0140 | 0.0196 | 0.0160 | 0.0163 | 0.0056 | 0.0135 | 0.0186 |
| 4 | 0.2133 | 0.1842 | 0.3326 | 0.0786 | 0.1170 | 0.1783 | 0.3228 |
| 5 | 0.1050 | 0.1209 | 0.1377 | 0.1015 | 0.0551 | 0.0911 | 0.1582 |
| 6 | 0.0333 | 0.0377 | 0.0430 | 0.0279 | 0.0164 | 0.0279 | 0.0508 |
| 7 | 0.0333 | 0.0322 | 0.0474 | 0.0263 | 0.0138 | 0.0286 | 0.0513 |

TABLE 11. The US Requirement Tables for 1958

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.2954 | 0 | 0.0034 | 0.0703 | 0.0095 | 0.0003 | 0.0414 |
| 2 | 0.0019 | 0.0616 | 0.0109 | 0.0374 | 0.0077 | 0.0005 | 0.0084 |
| 3 | 0.0116 | 0.0006 | 0.0001 | 0.0021 | 0.0357 | 0.0124 | 0.068 |
| 4 | 0.1158 | 0.0794 | 0.3828 | 0.3802 | 0.0422 | 0.2247 | 0.2935 |
| 5 | 0.1122 | 0.1611 | 0.1368 | 0.0877 | 0.142 | 0.1387 | 0.2581 |
| 6 | 0.023 | 0.0232 | 0.0428 | 0.0245 | 0.0451 | 0.0662 | 0.0714 |
| 7 | 0.0207 | 0.1067 | 0.0055 | 0.0392 | 0.043 | 0.0292 | 0.0414 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0312 | 0.0399 | 0.0815 | 0.0615 | 0.0275 | 0.0561 | 0.0954 |
| 2 | 0.0180 | 0.0140 | 0.0329 | 0.0081 | 0.0093 | 0.0226 | 0.0336 |
| 3 | 0.0154 | 0.0223 | 0.0178 | 0.0192 | 0.0064 | 0.0159 | 0.0215 |
| 4 | 0.1985 | 0.1864 | 0.3392 | 0.0928 | 0.1318 | 0.2350 | 0.3710 |
| 5 | 0.1034 | 0.1198 | 0.1485 | 0.1090 | 0.0583 | 0.1120 | 0.1819 |
| 6 | 0.0318 | 0.0364 | 0.0437 | 0.0308 | 0.0177 | 0.0319 | 0.0554 |
| 7 | 0.0329 | 0.0322 | 0.0523 | 0.0294 | 0.0153 | 0.0370 | 0.0593 |

TABLE 12. The US Requirement Tables for 1947

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.3272 | 0 | 0.0031 | 0.1212 | 0.0146 | 0.0053 | 0.0141 |
| 2 | 0.001 | 0.0835 | 0.0094 | 0.0334 | 0.0098 | 0.0013 | 0.0032 |
| 3 | 0.0122 | 0.0015 | 0.0002 | 0.0026 | 0.044 | 0.0081 | 0.0639 |
| 4 | 0.0949 | 0.098 | 0.3795 | 0.3733 | 0.0522 | 0.1709 | 0.2733 |
| 5 | 0.108 | 0.1091 | 0.1462 | 0.0735 | 0.1212 | 0.1254 | 0.3043 |
| 6 | 0.0081 | 0.0088 | 0.0436 | 0.0161 | 0.0387 | 0.066 | 0.0433 |
| 7 | 0.0011 | 0.0046 | 0.007 | 0.0232 | 0.0389 | 0.0338 | 0.0145 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0392 | 0.0429 | 0.1356 | 0.1077 | 0.0442 | 0.0755 | 0.1267 |
| 2 | 0.0137 | 0.0091 | 0.0298 | 0.0084 | 0.0088 | 0.0165 | 0.0284 |
| 3 | 0.0125 | 0.0099 | 0.0186 | 0.0172 | 0.0052 | 0.0153 | 0.0244 |
| 4 | 0.1447 | 0.1061 | 0.3169 | 0.0780 | 0.1249 | 0.1833 | 0.3144 |
| 5 | 0.0654 | 0.0511 | 0.1249 | 0.0924 | 0.0551 | 0.0851 | 0.1430 |
| 6 | 0.0180 | 0.0132 | 0.0299 | 0.0178 | 0.0125 | 0.0188 | 0.0386 |
| 7 | 0.0174 | 0.0128 | 0.0304 | 0.0116 | 0.0077 | 0.0184 | 0.0357 |

TABLE 13. The US Requirement Tables for 1939

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.1074 | 0 | 0.0788 | 0.0802 | 0.0209 | 0.0146 | 0.0232 |
| 2 | 0.0032 | 0.2228 | 0.1804 | 0.0294 | 0.0247 | 0.002 | 0.0203 |
| 3 | 0.0214 | 0.0085 | 0 | 0.0115 | 0.0304 | 0.0636 | 0.1379 |
| 4 | 0.1593 | 0.0561 | 0.2187 | 0.2319 | 0.1837 | 0.1724 | 0.3142 |
| 5 | 0.2352 | 0.2575 | 0.0304 | 0.2653 | 0.1129 | 0.0017 | 0.046 |
| 6 | 0.0386 | 0.0029 | 0.0003 | 0.0123 | 0.0217 | 0.0217 | 0.0419 |
| 7 | 0.0594 | 0.1764 | 0.0083 | 0.1762 | 0.2443 | 0.1732 | 0.0426 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0743 | 0.0845 | 0.0753 | 0.0592 | 0.0864 | 0.0720 | 0.0990 |
| 2 | 0.0726 | 0.0611 | 0.0944 | 0.0806 | 0.0781 | 0.0660 | 0.0972 |
| 3 | 0.0763 | 0.1003 | 0.0615 | 0.1054 | 0.0864 | 0.0636 | 0.0286 |
| 4 | 0.3800 | 0.4388 | 0.3222 | 0.3724 | 0.3742 | 0.3118 | 0.3275 |
| 5 | 0.2508 | 0.2520 | 0.3090 | 0.1855 | 0.2523 | 0.2135 | 0.3078 |
| 6 | 0.0351 | 0.0454 | 0.0331 | 0.0470 | 0.0358 | 0.0292 | 0.0243 |
| 7 | 0.2744 | 0.2747 | 0.2581 | 0.2330 | 0.1731 | 0.1729 | 0.2661 |

TABLE 14. The US Requirement Tables for 1929

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.344 | 0.0057 | 0.0439 | 0.0882 | 0.0168 | 0.0067 | 0.0178 |
| 2 | 0.0009 | 0.0794 | 0.1693 | 0.0516 | 0.0514 | 0.0098 | 0.0169 |
| 3 | 0.0006 | 0.0045 | 0 | 0.0077 | 0.025 | 0 | 0.0718 |
| 4 | 0.0949 | 0.0755 | 0.2443 | 0.259 | 0.2188 | 0.063 | 0.2553 |
| 5 | 0.06 | 0.1971 | 0 | 0.028 | 0.0194 | 0.0143 | 0.0679 |
| 6 | 0.0022 | 0 | 0.0146 | 0.0007 | 0 | 0.0228 | 0.014 |
| 7 | 0.0676 | 0.2903 | 0.1179 | 0.2708 | 0.1991 | 0.5214 | 0 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0375 | 0.0830 | 0.1125 | 0.0975 | 0.0939 | 0.0815 | 0.0899 |
| 2 | 0.0353 | 0.0533 | 0.0587 | 0.0340 | 0.0521 | 0.0509 | 0.0546 |
| 3 | 0.0234 | 0.0473 | 0.0351 | 0.0416 | 0.0335 | 0.0554 | 0.0073 |
| 4 | 0.1867 | 0.3208 | 0.2943 | 0.2070 | 0.2689 | 0.3247 | 0.1985 |
| 5 | 0.0357 | 0.0574 | 0.0989 | 0.0761 | 0.0698 | 0.0771 | 0.0383 |
| 6 | 0.0041 | 0.0087 | 0.0065 | 0.0089 | 0.0073 | 0.0110 | 0.0024 |
| 7 | 0.1347 | 0.1833 | 0.2578 | 0.0864 | 0.1874 | 0.1541 | 0.2121 |

TABLE 15. The US Requirement Tables for 1919

| Direct Requirements (<i>A</i>) | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.4009 | 0.0091 | 0.0802 | 0.1469 | 0.0129 | 0.0079 | 0.0397 |
| 2 | 0.0006 | 0.0716 | 0.198 | 0.038 | 0.0811 | 0.0124 | 0.017 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0581 |
| 4 | 0.0746 | 0.0693 | 0.3189 | 0.2275 | 0.253 | 0.0034 | 0.3359 |
| 5 | 0.0441 | 0.1969 | 0 | 0.0158 | 0.0158 | 0.009 | 0.0622 |
| 6 | 0.0009 | 0 | 0.0274 | 0.0008 | 0 | 0 | 0.0108 |
| 7 | 0.035 | 0.401 | 0.105 | 0.2928 | 0.207 | 0.513 | 0 |
| Indirect Requirements (<i>Q</i>) | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0.0518 | 0.1961 | 0.2729 | 0.2061 | 0.1951 | 0.1445 | 0.2080 |
| 2 | 0.0262 | 0.0640 | 0.0649 | 0.0312 | 0.0463 | 0.0427 | 0.0549 |
| 3 | 0.0105 | 0.0403 | 0.0280 | 0.0326 | 0.0274 | 0.0388 | 0 |
| 4 | 0.1567 | 0.4566 | 0.4016 | 0.2640 | 0.3298 | 0.3520 | 0.2268 |
| 5 | 0.0228 | 0.0654 | 0.1121 | 0.0746 | 0.0747 | 0.0660 | 0.0388 |
| 6 | 0.0025 | 0.0092 | 0.0061 | 0.0074 | 0.0065 | 0.0087 | 0.0028 |
| 7 | 0.1191 | 0.2334 | 0.3744 | 0.0817 | 0.2451 | 0.1512 | 0.2719 |




FIGURE 3. The direct requirements (A) for the US economy in each year. The sectors are as follows: Agriculture (1), Mining (2), Construction (3), Manufacturing (4), Trade, Transport & Utilities (5), Services (6), and Other (7). (Case study 3.2).




FIGURE 4. The indirect requirements (Q) for the US economy in each year. The sectors are as follows: Agriculture (1), Mining (2), Construction (3), Manufacturing (4), Trade, Transport & Utilities (5), Services (6), and Other (7). (Case study 3.2).