arXiv:2205.03862v5 [econ.GN] 10 Nov 2023

Inventories, Demand Shocks Propagation and Amplification in Supply Chains*

Alessandro Ferrari†

University of Zurich & CEPR

First Version: February 2019
This version: July 2023

Abstract

I study the role of industries' position in supply chains in shaping the transmission of final demand shocks. First, I use a shift-share design based on destination-specific final demand shocks and destination exposure shares to show that shocks amplify upstream. Quantitatively, upstream industries respond to final demand shocks up to three times as much as final goods producers. To organize the reduced form results, I develop a tractable production network model with inventories and study how the properties of the network and the cyclicality of inventories interact to determine whether final demand shocks amplify or dissipate upstream. I test the mechanism by directly estimating the model-implied relationship between output growth and demand shocks, mediated by network position and inventories. I find evidence of the role of inventories in explaining heterogeneous output elasticities. Finally, I use the model to quantitatively study how inventories and network properties shape the volatility of the economy.

Keywords: production networks, supply chains, inventories, shock amplification.
JEL Codes: C67, E23, E32, F14, F44, L14, L16

*This paper supersedes a previously circulated version under the title "Global Value Chains and the Business Cycle". I thank Daron Acemoglu, George Alessandria, Pol Antràs, David Baqaee, Giacomo Calzolari, Vasco Carvalho, Russell Cooper, Rafael Dix-Carneiro, Juan Dolado, David Dorn, Matt Elliott, Matteo Escudé, Dalila Figueiredo, Mishel Ghassibe, David Hémous, Nir Jaimovich, Philipp Kircher, Damian Kozbur, Andrei Levchenko, Michele Mancini, Ramon Marimon, Isabelle Méjean, Konuray Mutluer, Ralph Ossa, Nitya Pandalai-Nayar, Mathieu Parenti, Armin Schmutzler, Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi and Mathieu Taschereau-Dumouchel for their feedback. This paper also benefited from comments in the seminars at EUI, Collegio Carlo Alberto, Paris School of Economics, CERGE-EI Prague, CSEF Naples, University of Zurich, Queen Mary University London, HEC Montreal, ECB Research Department, EIEF, World Trade Institute and presentations at ASSET, RIEF AMSE, WIEM, the EEA 2019 meeting, ETSG 2019, Econometric Society European Winter Meeting, GVC Conference of Bank of Italy, Large Firms Conference at Bank of France, T2M King's College, and the GEN Workshop. Lorenzo Arcà, Elie Gerschel and Lorenzo Pesaresi provided excellent research assistance. All the remaining errors are mine.

†alessandro.ferrari@econ.uzh.ch

1 Introduction

In modern economies, the production of goods and services is organized along complex supply chains, with goods crossing borders multiple times before reaching final consumers. A natural question is whether the rise of such modes of production has affected economic volatility, as shocks can be absorbed at multiple nodes of the chain and diversified away. On the other hand, they could travel longer distances and snowball across firms and countries. This question has recently gained even more salience as governments try to understand the causes and consequences of the recent supply chain crisis and whether a policy response is necessary. Part of the policy discussion has considered reshoring and inventory management as options to shorten supply chains and reduce the propagation of shocks.[1]

In this paper, I address this question by studying how shocks travel in production networks. I investigate two fundamental forces. First, as supply chains become more complex, firms can become exposed to a wider array of destinations, allowing them to partially diversify risk away. As a consequence, for a given set of shocks, more complex chains can be less volatile. Second, a force somewhat overlooked by economists often called the *bullwhip effect*, according to which, in the presence of inventories, shocks can magnify as they travel across firms. The role of inventories as shock amplifiers or absorbers is of particular interest, as it is often discussed as a possible strategy to avoid prolonged disruptions in supply chains. If firms respond to uncertainty in demand and supply by building up larger stocks, they might contribute to higher volatility and shock propagation.

I start by providing five empirical observations that motivate this paper: in the last decades, i) production chains have significantly increased in length, measured by the number of production steps goods undergo before reaching consumers; and ii) the spatial concentration of demand, measured by the Herfindal-Hirschman Index of destination sales shares, has significantly declined. These two empirical facts suggest that the rise of complex supply chains may better insulate from final demand shocks as they are absorbed in multiple steps and diversified away. However, I also show that iii) inventories are procylically adjusted, and, as a consequence, iv) output is more volatile than sales. In the context of a production network, these two observations imply upstream amplification, which may be strengthened by longer and more complex chains. Finally, I confirm a recent finding by Carreras-Valle (2021): v) that US manufacturing firms' inventory-to-sales ratios have been increasing since 2005. This observation suggests that facts iii), iv), and, therefore, upstream amplification may have become even more salient.

Motivated by these empirical observations, in Section 4, I ask whether industries at different positions in supply chains display heterogeneous output responses to final demand shocks. I use a novel shift-share design based on destination-specific foreign demand shifters and a measure

[1] In June 2021, the Biden-Harris Administration instituted the *Supply Chain Disruption Task Force* "to provide a whole-of-government response to address near-term supply chain challenges to the economic recovery", see White House (2021). For the European context, see Raza et al. (2021), a study commissioned by the International Trade Committee of the European Parliament considering reshoring options and the European Parliament resolution calling for "smart reshoring [to] relocate industrial production in sectors of strategic importance for the Union" and the creation of a program that "helps make our supply chains more resilient and less dependent by reshoring, diversifying and strengthening them", see European Parliament (2020).

of destination exposure. Importantly, I use the full network structure to account for direct and indirect linkages and exposure to each foreign country. The shift-share structure allows me to estimate the causal effect of changes in final demand on output. With this design, I estimate a model in which I allow the elasticity of output to the exogenous change in final demand to vary by upstreamness, which measures the network distance between an industry and final consumers. The first empirical result is that industries at different points of the value chains have significantly different responses. Quantitatively, an industry very close to consumption increases output growth rate by about .5pp for every 1pp increase in the growth rate of final demand. At the same time, industries very far from consumption (6 or more steps of production away) respond 1.2pp for every 1pp increase in the growth rate of final demand. Importantly, I also find that more upstream industries have a significantly larger positive response of inventories when demand grows, with an up to 6-fold increase going from one to six production steps away from consumption. This result is suggestive that inventories can drive the upstream amplification of shocks.

These empirical findings are hard to rationalize in the context of current models of shock propagation in production networks. For this reason, I study a production network model where firms hold inventories. I build this framework for two reasons. First, formalizing the problem allows me to shed light on the key features of the network and of the inventory problem that leads to upstream amplification vs. dissipation of final demand shocks. Second, the model provides an estimating equation, which allows me to test the key mechanism directly and compute counterfactuals.

I establish a general result in vertically integrated supply chains: procyclical inventory adjustment is a sufficient condition for upstream amplification of final demand shocks. Secondly, in the empirically relevant case in which more upstream firms have more procyclical inventory policies, the extent of amplification increases in upstreamness. While this result is rather general in terms of the inventory policy implemented by firms, it is derived in the context of a very specific network structure, and it is hard to establish its quantitative implications. To make further headway in the analysis of amplification in a general network, I extend the model by including labour, allowing for a more general production structure and specifying the inventory problem.

I consider an economy populated by firms producing in a general production network. In each sector, there are two types of firms that share the same technology, as in Acemoglu and Tahbaz-Salehi (2020). Type C firms operate competitively. Type I firms are subject to an inventory management problem and have market power in their output markets. The two types of firms compete within each industry, and their outputs are perfect substitutes. I firms optimally target future sales when deciding how much inventory stock to hold.

I start with the special case in which there is only one foreign destination country whose demand fluctuates. In this context, the first result is that output growth responds more than one-for-one with changes in final demand and that this amplification scales with an inventory-weighted measure of upstreamness. This result stems from the combination of two properties

of the model: i) when there is a single consumption destination, no diversification forces are in action, and ii) when firms have an inventory target rule, they amplify shocks upstream. The presence of inventories implies that the network structure matters even at the first order. As a direct consequence, the second result characterizes the behaviour of output growth volatility. It shows that an industry is more volatile than another if and only if it is more upstream. The inventory-based measure of upstreamness has intuitive comparative statics: it increases if firms hold more inventories, if demand shocks are more persistent and if supply chains are longer. Then, I show that in this economy fragmenting production vertically always increases output volatility simply because it makes all industries weakly more upstream.

Next, I consider the multiple destination version of the model to allow for diversification forces to play a role, as motivated by fact ii) above. The first result characterizes the behaviour of output growth. It highlights two important features: a) the model-consistent way of aggregating final demand shocks across destinations is given exactly by the shift-share structure used in Section 4 and b) upstream amplification is governed by a horse-race between industry position and spatial dispersion of demand. I then establish that all else equal, i) more upstream industries are more volatile and ii) comparing two industries with similar supply chain positions, an industry features less volatile output if and only if its sales share distribution second-order stochastically dominates the other's.

Next, estimating the structural relationships in the model between output changes to demand shocks through the position in the network and inventories, I find that the data rejects a model without inventories. Quantitatively, I estimate that the presence of inventories increases the output elasticity to final demand by approximately 20%.

Finally, I study a quantitative version of the model using the actual Input-Output data as the network structure. First, the model can replicate salient patterns of the data. In particular, it generates i) a negative relationship between the volatility of demand and upstreamness, highlighting diversification forces; ii) a positive relation between output growth and upstreamness, driven by the upstream propagation of shocks through inventories; and iii) the increasing output growth elasticity in upstreamness I estimate in Section 4. With the calibrated model, I can disentangle the role of increasing supply chain length, diversification and rising inventories through counterfactuals. Comparing the network structure in 2000 to the one in 2014, I find that increasing supply chain length induces a 2.6% increase in output volatility, while the rise of inventories generates a 4.3% increase. When these two are combined, output volatility increases by 6.9%. In contrast, the increasing spatial diversification of demand implies a reduction in demand volatility of 4%. Combining all these forces, I find that, despite the smaller fluctuations in demand, output volatility increases by 2.3%.

More broadly, these results highlight a further trade-off element to the debate on how to make supply chains more resilient. The results suggest that the fragmentation of production has brought about significant benefits in terms of diversification of demand risk. At the same time, more fragmented supply chains generate more scope for upstream amplification of shocks via inventories. If firms increase their inventory buffer to prevent prolonged disruption, this

might come at the cost of permanently higher volatility in the economy.

Related Literature This paper relates, first, to the growing literature on shocks in production networks. From the theoretical standpoint, this line of research, which stems from Carvalho (2010), Acemoglu et al. (2012), and more recently Baqaee and Farhi (2019), studies the role of network structure in the propagation of idiosyncratic industry-level shocks. This paper builds a similar model, explicitly allowing for forces generating potential amplification in the network. This extension allows me to characterize theoretically the amplification patterns in the data and reconcile them with more aggregate empirical results on the relative volatility of final and intermediate goods sales. From an empirical standpoint, I build on Acemoglu et al. (2016); Barrot and Sauvagnat (2016); Boehm et al. (2019); Huneeus (2019); Carvalho et al. (2020); Dhyne et al. (2021); Korovkin and Makarin (2021), who study how shocks propagate in a production network. Relative to these contributions, I build industry-level exogenous variation in the spirit of Shea (1993) by exploiting destination and time-specific shocks to consumption. This approach enables me to estimate the heterogeneous response to final demand shocks across industries at different points of the supply chain, holding fixed the size of the shock itself. Further, I include the role of inventories as an additional channel contributing to the patterns of shock propagation.

Secondly, it relates to the literature on the role of inventories as a source of amplification and the *bullwhip effect*. This literature, building on Forrester (1961) and more recently Kahn (1987); Blinder and Maccini (1991); Metters (1997); Chen et al. (1999); Ramey and West (1999); Bils and Kahn (2000); Lee et al. (2004); Alessandria et al. (2010, 2011, 2023) suggest that when inventories are procyclically adjusted, they can amplify shocks upstream. I embed this mechanism in the network context to study the horse race between the role of inventories and the network dissipation effect. Lastly, from an empirical standpoint, the effect of inventories as an amplification device has been studied at several levels of aggregation by Alessandria et al. (2010), Altomonte et al. (2012) and Zavacka (2012). These papers all consider exogenous variation given by the 2008 crisis to study the responsiveness of different sectors or firms to the shock, depending on whether they produce intermediate or final goods. Using an indicator for exposure to the shock creates an identification problem, as it is not possible to separate whether different sectors responded differently to the same shock or were hit by different shocks altogether. Relative to these works, the approach based on the shift-share design allows me to isolate the heterogeneity in response to the same change in final demand depending on an industry's position in the supply chain.

Roadmap The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides the key empirical observations that motivate this paper. Section 3 provides the details on the data and the empirical strategy. Section 4 presents the reduced form results on upstream shock propagation. Section 5 describes the model and provides the key comparative statics results and counterfactual exercises. Finally, Section 6 concludes.

2 Motivating Evidence

In this section, I provide empirical observations on supply chains and inventories, which are critical in motivating the empirical analysis and disciplining the paper's theoretical framework.

Fact 1: Production chains have increased in length

In the past few decades, modes of production have changed markedly. As highlighted by the World Bank Development Report (2020), a growing share of production occurs in many stages and crosses borders multiple times before reaching consumers. Figure OA.1 shows, on average, how many production steps goods undergo before they are finally consumed. The sector-sales weighted average of upstreamness, which I define formally in the next section, steadily increased in the period covered by the World Input-Output Database (WIOD 2016 release, see Timmer et al., 2015), from 2.6 in 2000 to 3.3 in 2014.[2] This change is driven in equal measure by an increase in the weight of already long chains (between component) and the increase in the length of chains with large weights (within component).[3]

Fact 2: The spatial distribution of sales has become less concentrated

A second element related to the increasing role of international linkages in production is that of diversification. Using the WIOD data, it is possible to build the Herfindal-Hirschman Index of destination exposure shares of each industry, which measures the concentration of demand across destinations. Figure OA.4 shows the behaviour of this measure. The key observation is that the HHI has declined significantly between 2000 and 2014, whether I use a simple or a sales-weighted average to aggregate across industries. The unweighted HHI went from .51 in 2000 to .44 in 2014, while the sales-weighted HHI went from .7 to .6 in the same period. As industries are now exposed to a wider array of destinations, they could be less affected by idiosyncratic shocks. In turn, this should reduce output volatility.[4]

Facts 1 and 2 are likely driven by the rise of global value chains and cross-border production, inducing longer chains and a more diversified portfolio of customers across space. Furthermore, these trends, taken at face value, would suggest that output volatility should have declined since industries are generally less exposed to idiosyncratic demand shocks.

Fact 3: Inventories are adjusted procyclically

Inventories can, in principle, both amplify or absorb shocks propagating in production chains. Their effect depends fundamentally on whether they are adjusted procyclically or countercyclically. As the literature has noted, inventory investment is procyclical. I use the monthly data

[2] I define upstreamness formally in Section 3.2. In short, it measures the average length of a supply chain.

[3] This observation also holds true when looking at supply chains that never cross borders (purely domestic), as shown in Figure OA.2 and when using a measure of supply chains length which sums both the average distance of an industry from final consumers and the distance of the industry from pure value added (Figure OA.3). The average number of steps in purely domestic chains increased by 14% while the total length of supply chains increased by 22% between 2000 and 2014.

[4] If the demand of all country-pairs has the same correlation, then a decrease in HHI of the shares implies a reduction of volatility. However, this does not have to be the case generally. Nonetheless, I show in Section 5 that the demand volatility faced by these industries decreased due to higher diversification, see Table 2.

from the US Census Manufacturing & Trade Inventories & Sales data from January 1992 to August 2021 covering NAICS 3-digit industries and the yearly data in the NBER CES Manufacturing Industries Database from 1958 to 2018 for NAICS 6-digit industries. I find an inventory-to-sales ratio of approximately 130% for monthly sales and .15% for annual sales. To study inventory cyclicality, I estimate non-parametrically the mapping between inventories I_t and sales Q_t (after applying the Hodrick-Prescott filter). I obtain an average derivative $\frac{\partial I_t}{\partial Q_t}$ of .1 for annual data and 1.35 for monthly data, as reported in Table OA.1. These estimates suggest that end-of-period inventories are an increasing function of sales. Figure OA.5 provides the distribution of the sector-specific estimated derivative of inventories with respect to sales for both samples. The graph shows that the whole distribution lies above zero, which suggests that all the available sectors feature procyclical inventories over the sample period. The observed procyclicality is robust to the filtering and the inclusion of sector and time-fixed effects, as shown in Table OA.1.[5]

Fact 4: Output is more volatile than sales

The procyclical adjustment of inventories can make output more volatile than sales. In Figure OA.7, I plot the distribution of the ratio between the standard deviation of the value of output (σ_y) and sales (σ_q). Both series are HP-filtered; output is computed by summing sales and inventory changes. The graphs show the distribution of σ_y/σ_q across sectors. I plot these distributions for monthly data from the US Census data. I also provide the same statistic after aggregating the data into quarters and years. Lastly, the same distribution is reported for the NBER CES data. In all cases, the distributions highlight how, for most industries, particularly at the quarterly and yearly frequency, the ratio lies above 1, suggesting that output is more volatile than sales. Importantly, if output responds to shocks more than one-for-one because inventories are updated procyclically, changes in demand can amplify upstream.

Facts 3 and 4, taken together, suggest that when a chain experiences a demand shock from final consumers, the response of industries increases as the shock travels upstream. I find a positive and significant correlation of .21 between the log of the volatility of sales growth rates and the log of upstreamness, which measures the distance of an industry from final consumers. Hence, a more upstream position in the production chains is associated with higher output volatility.

Fact 5: Inventories-to-sales ratios are increasing

I conclude by reporting an empirical observation first uncovered by Carreras-Valle (2021): inventories-to-sales ratios have been increasing since 2005 for US manufacturing industries. I replicate this finding in Figure OA.8 for the annual data in the NBER CES database and the monthly data from the Census. The author suggests that this is largely driven by the

[5]The Census data provides breakdowns of inventories by finished products and materials. These broken-down series have a significantly more missing data than the total inventories series. For this reason, I use the total inventory to measure inventories for a given industry. In Figure OA.6, I provide the same distribution of estimates separating inventories of final products and materials. The main conclusion that inventories are procyclically adjusted remains.

substitution of domestic with foreign inputs, which are cheaper but entail higher delivery lags, to which firms optimally respond by holding more inventories.[6] This observation would suggest that the same forces strengthening Facts 1 and 2 can endogenously lead to larger inventories, reinforcing Facts 3 and 4.

Combining these empirical observations paints an inconclusive picture of whether the rise of value chains should imply more or less volatile production. The goal of the rest of the paper is to focus on demand shocks and ask whether we observe their effects amplify or attenuate as they travel upstream in a production chain. Testing this formally requires measuring where a given industry is positioned relative to final demand and exogenous demand shocks. In the next section, I outline the approach to address these measurement problems and the data used in the estimation.

3 Data and Methodology

3.1 Data

Input-Output Data This paper's primary data source is the World Input-Output Database (WIOD) 2016 release, see Timmer et al. (2015). It contains the Input-Output structure of sector-to-sector flows for 44 countries from 2000 to 2014 yearly. The data is available at the 2-digit ISIC rev-4 level. The number of sectors in WIOD is 56, which amounts to 6,071,296 industry-to-industry flows and 108,416 industry-to-country flows for every year in the sample. The data coverage of countries and industries is shown in Tables OA.2 and OA.3 in the Appendix B. The structure of WIOD is presented in Figure OA.9.

The World Input-Output Table represents a world economy with J countries and S industries per country. The $(S \times J)$ by $(S \times J)$ matrix whose entries are denoted by Z represents flows of output used by other industries as intermediate inputs. Specifically, Z_{ij}^{rs} denotes the value of output of industry r in country i sold to industry s in country j for intermediate input use. In addition to the square matrix of input use, the table provides the flows of output used for final consumption. These are denoted by F_{ij}^{r}, representing the value of output of industry r in country i sold to and consumed by households, government, and non-profit organizations in country j. Following the literature, I denote $F_{i}^{r} = \sum_{j} F_{ij}^{r}$, namely the value of output of sector r in country i consumed in any country in the world. The total value of sold output is $Y_{i}^{r} = F_{i}^{r} + \sum_{s} \sum_{j} Z_{ij}^{rs}$.

In all the analyses, I drop country-industry-year triplets whose year-on-year output growth rate is lower than -90% or larger than 57%, which is the 99^{th} percentile of the industry growth distribution. The results are consistent with different cuts of the data and without dropping any entry. Unless stated otherwise, the analysis in this section includes all industry-country-year combinations in the WIOD data.

[6] A similar argument is also underlying the results in Alessandria et al. (2010, 2013) suggesting that firms more involved in international activity tend to hold more inventories.

For a subset of results, I use the 2002 I-O Tables from the BEA, following Antràs et al. (2012). These are a one-year snapshot of the US production network and cover 426 industries.

Inventory Data I complement the Input-Output data with information about sectoral inventories from the NBER-CES Manufacturing Industry Database. This dataset contains sales and end-of-the-period inventories for 473 6-digit 1997 NAICS US manufacturing industries from 1958 to 2011. I concord the inventory data to the level of WIOD.

The second source of inventory data is the US Census Manufacturing & Trade Inventories & Sales. This dataset covers NAICS 3-digit industries monthly since January 1992. The data includes information for finished products, materials, and work-in-progress inventories, which I sum into a single inventory measure. I use the seasonally adjusted version of the data.

3.2 Measurement and Methodology

This section describes the empirical methodology used. I start by reviewing the existing measure of upstreamness as distance from final consumption proposed by Antràs et al. (2012). Next, I discuss the identification strategy based on the shift-share design. I show how to compute the sales share in the industry portfolio accounting for indirect linkages. This allows me to back out the exposure of industry sales to each destination country's demand fluctuations, even when goods reach their final destination by passing through third countries. Then, I discuss the fixed-effect model used to extract and aggregate country and time-specific demand shocks from the final consumption data.

3.2.1 Measuring the Position in Production Chains

The measure of the upstreamness of each sector counts how many stages of production exist between the industry and final consumers, as proposed by Antràs et al. (2012). The measure is bounded below by 1, which indicates that the entire sectoral output is used directly for final consumption. The index is constructed by assigning value 1 to the share of sales directly sold to final consumers, value 2 to the share sold to consumers after it is used as an intermediate good by another industry, and so on. Formally:

$$U_i^r = 1 \times \frac{F_i^r}{Y_i^r} + 2 \times \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{S}\sum_{j=1}^{J} a_{ij}^{rs} F_j^s}{Y_i^r} + 3 \times \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{S}\sum_{j=1}^{J}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{k=1}^{K} a_{ij}^{rs} a_{jk}^{st} F_k^t}{Y_i^r} + ... \qquad (1)$$

where F_i^r is the value of output of sector r in country i consumed anywhere in the world and Y_i^r is the total value of output of sector r in country i. a_{ij}^{rs} is dollar amount of output of sector r from country i needed to produce one dollar of output of sector s in country j, defined as $a_{ij}^{rs} = Z_{ij}^{rs}/Y_j^s$. This formulation of the measure is effectively a weighted average of distance, where the weights are the distance-specific share of sales and final consumption.[7]

[7]This discussion implicitly assumes that a sector's input mix is independent of the output use or destination. De Gortari (2019), using customs data from Mexico, shows that this can lead to mismeasurement. These concerns cannot be fully addressed in this paper due to the limitation imposed by the WIOD aggregation level.

Provided that $\sum_i \sum_r a_{ij}^{rs} < 1$, which is a natural assumption given the definition of a_{ij}^{rs} as input requirement, this measure can be computed by rewriting it in matrix form: $U = \hat{Y}^{-1}[I - \mathcal{A}]^{-2}F$, where U is a $(J \times S)$-by-1 vector whose entries are the upstreamness measures of every industry in every country.[8] $\hat{Y}$ denotes the $(J \times S)$-by-$(J \times S)$ diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are the output values of all industries. The term $[I - \mathcal{A}]^{-2}$ is the square of the Leontief inverse, in which $\mathcal{A}$ is the $(J \times S)$-by-$(J \times S)$ matrix whose entries are all a_{ij}^{rs} and finally the vector F is an $(J \times S)$-by-1 whose entries are the values of the part of industry output that is directly consumed. Equation 1 shows the value of upstreamness of a specific industry r in country i is 1 if and only if all its output is sold to final consumers directly. Formally, this occurs if and only if $Z_{ij}^{rs} = 0, \forall s, j$, which immediately implies that $a_{ij}^{rs} = 0, \forall s, j$.

Table OA.4 lists the most and least upstream industries in the WIOD sample. Predictably, services are very close to consumption, while raw materials tend to be distant.

3.2.2 Identification Strategy

The goal is to evaluate the responsiveness of output to changes in demand for industries at different positions in the supply chain. To estimate this effect, the ideal setting would be one where I observe exogenous changes in final demand for each producing industry in the sample. As this is not possible, I approximate this setting using a shift-share instrument approach. In this paper, the shift-share design is a weighted average of destination-specific aggregate changes in final demand, where the weights measure how exposed an industry is to that destination. If either the shares (industry exposure) or the shocks (destination-specific aggregate changes) are exogenous, this method allows me to estimate the causal effect of demand on output (Adão et al., 2019; Goldsmith-Pinkham et al., 2020; Borusyak et al., 2022). In the present case, it is implausible to assume that the destination shares are exogenous as firms choose the destinations they serve. Identification can be obtained by plausibly as good as randomly assigned shifters (destination-specific shocks).

Formally, define the shift-share changes in final demand for industry r in country i at time t as

$$\eta_{it}^{r} = \sum_{j} \xi_{ij}^{r} \eta_{jt}. \tag{2}$$

Where ξ_{ij}^{r} represents the fraction of the value of output of industry r in country i consumed directly or indirectly in destination j in the first sample period. This includes direct sales from the industry to consumers in j and output sold to other industries, which eventually sell to consumers in j.[9] The input-output structure of the data allows for a full accounting of these

[8] For the assumption $\sum_i \sum_r a_{ij}^{rs} < 1$ to be violated, some industry would need to have negative value added since $\sum_i \sum_r a_{ij}^{rs} > 1 \Leftrightarrow \sum_i \sum_r Z_{ij}^{rs}/Y_j^s > 1$, meaning that the sum of all inputs used by industry s in country j is larger than the value of its total output. To compute the measure of upstreamness, I apply the inventory correction suggested by Antràs et al. (2012), the discussion of the method is left to Appendix C.

[9] The standard measure of sales composition uses trade data to compute the relative shares in a firm's sales represented by different partner countries (see Kramarz et al., 2020). However, such a measure may overlook indirect dependencies through third countries. This is particularly important for countries highly interconnected

indirect links when analyzing sales portfolio composition. Formally, define the share of sales of industry r in country i that is consumed by country j as

$$\xi_{ij}^{r} = \frac{F_{ij}^{r} + \sum_s \sum_k a_{ik}^{rs} F_{kj}^{s} + \sum_s \sum_k \sum_q \sum_m a_{ik}^{rs} a_{km}^{sq} F_{mj}^{q} + ...}{Y_i^r}. \tag{3}$$

The first term in the numerator represents sales from sector r in country i directly consumed by j; the second term accounts for the fraction of sales of sector r in i sold to any producer in the world that is then sold to country j for consumption. The same logic applies to higher-order terms. By definition $\sum_j \xi_{ij}^{r} = 1$.

η_{jt} is the change in final consumption of country j at time t across all products from all origin countries.Contrary to the sales shares, exogenous changes in foreign aggregate demand cannot be directly observed in the data. Therefore, I estimate these exogenous changes to foreign demand via a fixed effects decomposition of final consumption.[10]

To build up intuition, define the value of output of industry r in country i consumed in country j at time t as F_{ijt}^{r} and denote f_{ijt}^{r} its natural logarithm. The simplest possible fixed effects model used to estimate demand changes then takes the following form

$$\Delta f_{ijt}^{r} = \eta_{jt} + \nu_{ijt}^{r}, \tag{4}$$

where ν_{ijt}^{r} is the error term. The country and time-specific demand changes would then be the series of $\hat{\eta}_{jt}$. This set of fixed effects extracts the change in consumption of destination market j at time t that is common to all sellers.

Note that the identification of the causal effect of interest depends on the exogeneity of these changes. A potential threat to identification through equation (4) would be if industry r is a sizeable fraction of j's consumption. In this case, there would be reverse causality between industry and destination, and one could not claim exogeneity of η_{jt} to industry r in country i.

Given that, in the WIOD sample, the median domestic sales share is 67%, I partially account for this threat by estimating a different model for every industry r in producing country i:

$$\Delta f_{kjt}^{s} = \eta_{jt}(i, r) + \nu_{kjt}^{s} \quad k \neq i, s \neq r. \tag{5}$$

For each industry r in country i, I estimate country j's fixed effect using all industries of all countries except those of country i. This is tantamount to identifying the variation of interest through the trade of all other countries k to the specific destination j. To exemplify the idea behind the identification strategy, suppose that I observe US, Indian and Chinese producers of cars, textiles, and furniture. When estimating the change in the final demand faced by the US car manufacturing industry, I exclude the US as a production country. In principle, this leaves me with identifying demand changes from sales of Indian and Chinese cars, textiles, and

through trade. Measuring sales portfolio composition only via direct flows may ignore a relevant share of final demand exposure. Dhyne et al. (2021), for example, show that firms respond to changes in foreign demand even when they are only indirectly exposed to them.

[10]Kramarz et al. (2020) and Alfaro et al. (2021) use a similar approach.

furniture producers to American, Indian, and Chinese consumers. However, if Chinese and American cars are very substitutable, then the observed sales of Chinese cars might be related to supply shocks to American car manufacturers. To avoid this type of reverse causality, I also restrict the analysis to sectors $s \neq r$, which, in this example, would be restricting to textile and furniture producers. In summary, when studying the observed change in final demand for US car manufacturers, I exploit variation from sales of Indian and Chinese textile and furniture manufacturers to US, Indian, and Chinese consumers. This logic extends to the 56 sectors and 44 countries so that destination-time-specific changes in final demand are estimated using (44-1)*(56-1) observations every year.[11] I provide robustness checks on this specification in the Online Appendix.

Using the shares measured from the data and the estimated exogenous changes in final demand, shifters can be aggregated to create industry r in country i effective demand shocks at time t

$$\hat{\eta}_{it}^{r} = \sum_{j} \xi_{ij}^{r} \hat{\eta}_{jt}(i, r), \tag{6}$$

Where the effective sales shares are evaluated at time $t = 0$ to eliminate the dependence of destination shares themselves on simultaneous demand changes. This procedure implies that sales shares from i do not affect $\hat{\eta}_{jt}(i, r)$ and, therefore, $\hat{\eta}_{it}^{r}$.[12]

As shown in Borusyak et al. (2022), the shift-share instrument estimator is consistent, provided that the destination-specific shocks are conditionally as good as randomly assigned and uncorrelated. The identification of demand shocks relies on the rationale that the fixed effect model in equation 5 captures the variation common to all industries selling to a specific partner country in a given year. When producing industries are small relative to the destination, the estimated demand shocks are exogenous to the producing industry, thereby providing the grounds for causal identification of their effects on the growth of sales.

Discussion Before delving into the empirical results, it is important to highlight the advantages and limitations of the data and methodology. The main downside of using WIOD is its coarseness in terms of sector aggregation, as it provides information on 56 sectors. On the other hand, it is the only dataset with a large country coverage (43 countries). This implies that measures of upstreamness will not account for within-sector-country trade between more disaggregated subsectors. To the extent that some sectors tend to have more fragmented within-sector trade than others, this might give rise to heterogeneous degrees of measurement error in computing upstreamness. The second disadvantage is the limited time series dimension, as the data at this level of disaggregation only covers 15 years. This constrains my ability to identify a richer set of parameters for the quantitative model, as I discuss in Section 5.5.

[11] Excluding all domestic flows does not change the results qualitatively or quantitatively. Formally, it would imply additionally imposing $k \neq j$ in equation 5.

[12] In an alternative aggregation strategy in which I use time-varying sales shares, I follow Borusyak et al. (2022) and test pre-trends, namely that the sales shares are conditionally uncorrelated to the destination shifters. The results are reported in Table OA.7 in Appendix E. I find no evidence of pre-trends.

The key advantages, which enable the identification strategy, are twofold. First, WIOD has a large country coverage, which allows me to use changes in foreign consumers' expenditure to generate exogenous variation. For example, this empirical strategy would not be feasible if I focused on the US BEA I-O tables. Second, WIOD is a *closed economy* I-O table since it includes a rest of the world aggregate in the I-O matrix.[13] As a consequence, it is possible to measure upstreamness of each industry to each consumption point, which cannot be done in single-country IO tables.

Next, it is important to remark that all the results are presented using within country-sector variation only so that permanent differences between sectors, for example, the durability of their products, are controlled for.

Lastly, while the WIOD data covers agriculture, manufacturing, and services and, therefore, both tradeable and non-tradeable goods, the identification strategy naturally accounts for the fact that some sectors are not exposed to foreign demand directly (e.g., a non-traded service sector) but might be indirectly through their domestic customers. Consider, for example, the domestic construction sector. While its direct demand comes exclusively from domestic industries, it is indirectly affected by shifts in foreign demand. For example, if the domestic construction industry serves a manufacturing sector that sells to a foreign destination, which, whenever foreign demand increases, demands domestically more construction. This indirect exposure is accounted for since the shift-share is built using linkages from the full network through the matrix of ξ_{ij}^r.

4 Empirical Results

This section provides the results from the empirical analysis of how demand shocks propagate along the supply chain to industry output.

4.1 Demand Shock Amplification and Supply Chain Positioning

The goal of this section is to estimate if and how output responses to changes in final demand vary with industries' positions in the supply chain. To this end, I use the shift-share demand shocks aggregated according to equation (6).

I start by showing that output responds to these shocks with the expected sign and that they have explanatory power. I regress the growth rate of industry output on the shocks and country-industry fixed effects. The estimated industry shocks generate a positive industry output growth response and explain 43% of the variance, as shown in columns 1-2 of Table OA.8. The estimation suggests that a 1 percentage point increase in the growth rate of final demand produces a .6pp increase in the growth rate of industry output. Secondly, I check the effect of the demand shocks on the industry price index. Theory would suggest that positive demand

[13]Note that single country I-O tables such as the BEA I-O Table are not closed economy tables. They typically include exports and imports as a residual, which are typically not broken down by producing sector or purchasing country. Due to this data limitation, such tables are not well suited for computing how distant industries are from consumers in other countries.

shocks would increase the price index.[14] Columns 3-4 in Table OA.8 show that increases in the measured shock generate increases in the sectoral price index, suggesting that they are picking up shifts in final demand, as intended.

Having established that the estimated final demand shocks induce an increase in the growth rate of output, I study their heterogeneous effects depending on the industry's position in the supply chain. To do so, I estimate an econometric model in which the exogenous demand shocks can be considered a treatment and study the heterogeneity of the treatment effect along the upstreamness distribution.

Before discussing the results, it is important to remark that, given the shift-share structure, which embodies direct and indirect linkages, the construction of the demand shocks naturally accounts for diversification forces. As a consequence, as shown in Figure OA.12 in the Online Appendix D, the standard deviation of measured demand shocks falls with upstreamness, suggesting that more upstream industries tend to be exposed to lower demand volatility. The advantage of the empirical approach in this paper is that it allows me to isolate the differential output response, fixing the size of demand shocks. To do so, I split the upstreamness distribution in bins through dummies taking values equal to 1 if $U^r_{it-1} \in [1,2]$ and $[2,3]$, and so on.[15] I use the lagged version of the upstreamness measure as the contemporaneous one might be affected by the shock and represent a bad control. I estimate

$$\Delta \log Y^r_{it} = \sum_{j=1}^{6} \beta_j \mathbb{1}\{U^r_{it-1} \in [j, j+1]\} \hat{\eta}^r_{it} + \delta^r_i + \nu^r_{it}. \tag{7}$$


The resulting coefficients are plotted in Figure 1, while the regression output is displayed in the first column of Table A.1 in the Appendix. I discuss the problem of inference in light of Adão et al. (2019) in Appendix F. The results show that the same shock to the growth rate of final demand produces strongly heterogeneous responses in the growth rate of industry output. In particular, industries between one and two steps removed from consumers respond approximately 60% less than industries six or more steps away. These novel results, which are robust across different fixed effects specifications, highlight how amplification along the production chain can generate sizable heterogeneity in output responses. Quantitatively, each additional unit of distance from consumption raises the responsiveness of industry output to demand shocks by approximately .1, approximately 17% of the average response.

It is important to note that these results are based on within-producing-industry variation since fixed effects at the country $\times$ industry level are always included. This rules out alternative explanations, such as that industries located more upstream tend to produce more durable goods and, therefore, be exposed to different intertemporal elasticity of substitution in household purchases. Secondly, given the construction of $\hat{\eta}^r_{it}$, these shocks include indirect exposure to other sectors' changes in demand. For example, insofar as computers are a key input in the financial services production function, and microprocessors an input in computers, the

[14] I compute the sectoral price index by combining the baseline Input-Output data with the same dataset at previous year's prices. I then compute the ratio of output in the two to obtain the change in the price index.

[15] Since only 0.1% of the observations are above 7, I include them in the last bin, $\mathbb{1}\{U^r_{it-1} \in [6, \infty)\}$.

Figure 1: Effect of Demand Shocks on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level



Note: The figure shows the marginal effect of demand shocks on industry output changes by industry upstreamness level. The dashed horizontal line represents the average coefficient, as estimated in Table OA.8. The vertical bands illustrate the 95% confidence intervals around the estimates. The regression includes country-industry fixed effects, and the standard errors are cluster-bootstrapped at the country-industry level. Note that due to relatively few observations above 7, all values above 7 have been included in the $U \in [6, 7]$ category. The full regression results are reported in the first column of Table A.1.

microprocessor industry is exposed to changes in the demand for both computers and financial services, despite computers being more durable than financial services.

To better understand how the result of these strongly increasing output elasticities to final demand changes comes about, I study the relation between demand volatility, output volatility and upstreamness. I uncover two novel observations shown in Figure OA.12: i) the volatility of the measured demand shocks $\hat{\eta}^r_{it}$ negatively correlates with upstreamness, and ii) the volatility of output growth positively correlates with upstreamness. The first observation is intuitive: more upstream firms are indirectly connected to a larger number of destination countries, and therefore, destination-specific fluctuations are partly diversified away. If shocks dissipate as they travel along the supply chain, we should find an even stronger negative correlation between output growth volatility and upstreamness. The second result, therefore, requires a new mechanism underlying how shocks amplify upstream. In what follows, I study the role of inventories in explaining this puzzle.

In summary, more upstream industries face smaller fluctuations in their effective demand yet feature higher volatility in their output growth. These differences are quantitatively important as the elasticity of output growth to changes in demand more than doubles along the

upstreamness distribution.

Robustness and Inference I confirm these results using alternative definitions of the final demand shocks. In particular, I propose an alternative instrument based on foreign government consumption, which I discuss in detail in Appendix F. The results are confirmed both qualitatively and qualitatively. Finally, I use the China Syndrome shocks from Autor et al. (2013) and the federal spending shocks from Acemoglu et al. (2016) applied to the US data only and broadly confirm the pattern of upstream amplification of shocks in Appendix F.

To assess the robustness of these results, I run an extensive set of additional checks, which I discuss in detail and report in Appendix G. These include using the re-centred instrument proposed by Borusyak and Hull (2020) to solve potential omitted variable bias; using an ordinal, rather than a cardinal, split of the upstreamness distribution; a more general model to estimate the demand shifters, allowing for supply side effects; using downstreamness as a potential source of heterogeneous effects; using deflated data to avoid confounding prices variation; using time-varying rather than time-invariant aggregation in the shift-share design; and controlling for past output following Acemoglu et al. (2012).

Lastly, note that absent any correction, the standard errors estimated in equation (7) tend to be overestimated, as pointed out by Adão et al. (2019). To circumvent this issue, I use the permutation inference suggested by Adão et al. (2019). Formally, I re-assign the shifters η_{jt} 10000 times with replacement. For each permutation I estimate both equation (7) and its continuous interaction version: $\Delta \log Y_{it}^r = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \hat{\eta}_{it}^r + \beta_2 U_{it-1}^r \hat{\eta}_{it}^r + \delta_i^r + \nu_{it}^r$. When testing the significantly positive slope of the curve in Figure 1, I find that the permutation p-value is 0.0004 (see Figures OA.17 and OA.18). I extensively discuss the problem of inference in Appendix F, including the exact standard error correction provided by Adão et al. (2019).


4.2 Inventories Amplification

These reduced-form results paint a consistent picture in which firms located further away from consumers respond significantly more to the same changes in demand. The operations literature on the *bullwhip effect* has suggested that procyclical inventory adjustment can lead to upstream amplification of shocks. To test the plausibility of this mechanism, I start by checking whether changes in final demand affect inventory changes differentially by upstreamness.

WIOD provides information on the change in inventories of a producing industry computed as the row residual in the I-O matrix. Intuitively, given the accounting identity that output equals sales plus the change in inventory stock, the tables provide the net change in inventories as residual between output and sales to other industries or final good consumers. I standardise the change in inventories by dividing it by total output to account for scale effects. I then estimate equation (7) with $\Delta I_{it}^r / Y_{it}^r$ on the left hand side.[16] I drop units for which $\Delta I_{it}^r / Y_{it}^r$ is the first and last percentiles. The results are plotted in Figure 2 and reported in Table A.2.

[16]The WIOD data does not include the values of the stocks I_{it}^r, I, therefore, divide by the value of output in a given period to avoid mechanical scale effects.

Figure 2: Effect of Demand Shocks on Inventory Changes by Upstreamness Level



Note: The figure shows the marginal effect of demand shocks on industry inventory changes by industry upstreamness level. The dashed horizontal line represents the average coefficient. The vertical bands illustrate the 95% confidence intervals around the estimates. The regression includes country-industry fixed effects, and the standard errors are cluster-bootstrapped at the country-industry level. Note that due to relatively few observations above 7, all values above 7 have been included in the $U \in [6, 7]$ category. The full regression results are reported in the first column of Table A.2.

The estimation shows three important results. First, changes in final demand induce changes in inventories of the same sign, independently of the industry position in the supply chain. Second, recalling that the average inventory-to-sales ratio in the data is approximately 10%, the inventory response is quantitatively sizeable, ranging between 1% and 14% of annual output. Finally and most importantly, the response of inventories, consistently with the one of output, increases along the upstreamness distribution. Quantitatively, a 1pp increase in the growth of demand generates a .02pp increase in the change in inventories over output for industries closest to final consumers. The same figure for industries at 6 or more steps of production away is .12pp. The baseline estimation results are confirmed when using government consumption as an instrument for final demand, as shown in Appendix F.

These findings suggest that inventories can act as a force of upstream amplification in supply chains. Following the insights of the operations literature on the *bullwhip effect*, in the next section, I build a novel model of production networks, which includes inventories. I do so with the twofold goal of i) characterising under which condition on the network and the inventory problem we would observe upstream amplification of shocks and ii) studying counterfactuals that can help shed light on the aggregate effects of the trends discussed in Section 2.

5 Model

I start by studying the problem of demand shock propagation in vertically integrated economies with inventories. I do so in the context of a general inventory policy based on expectations over future demand. In the context of this economy, I characterize the sufficient condition for upstream amplification of final demand shocks. Next, I specify an inventory problem and embed it in a production network model (see Acemoglu et al., 2012; Carvalho and Tahbaz-Salehi, 2019; Acemoglu and Tahbaz-Salehi, 2020) to evaluate the conditions under which amplification or dissipation is observed, depending on the features of the network and the inventory response. Next, I provide a series of comparative statics to highlight how more or less fragmented economies compare in terms of output volatility. I conclude the section by directly estimating the model and providing counterfactual scenarios.

5.1 Vertically Integrated Economy

Consider an economy with one final good whose demand is stochastic, and $N-1$ stages sequentially used to produce the final good. Throughout, I use industry and sector interchangeably. The structure of this production network is a line, where stage N provides inputs to stage $N-1$ and so on until stage 0, where goods are consumed.[17]

The demand for each stage n in period t is D_t^n with $n \in \mathcal{N}$. Stage 0 demand, the final consumption stage, is stochastic and follows an AR(1) with persistence $\rho \in (-1, 1)$ and a positive drift $\bar{D}$. The error terms are distributed according to some finite variance distribution F on a bounded support. $\bar{D}$ is assumed to be large enough relative to the variance of the error so that demand is never negative.[18] Formally, final demand in period t is $D_t^0 = (1-\rho)\bar{D} + \rho D_{t-1}^0 + \epsilon_t$, $\epsilon_t \sim F(0, \sigma^2)$. The production function is linear: for any stage n, if production is Y_t^n, it also represents the demand for stage $n+1$, D_t^{n+1}. This implies $Y_t^n = D_t^{n+1}$.

Stage 0 production is the sum of the final good demand and the change in inventories. Inventories at time t for stage n are denoted by I_t^n.

Firms at stage n form expectations on future demand $\mathbb{E}_t D_{t+1}^n$ and produce to end the period with target inventories $I_t^n = I_n(\mathbb{E}_t D_{t+1}^n)$. Where $I_n(\cdot)$ is some non-negative differentiable function that maps expectations on future demand into end-of-period inventories. Denote I_n' its derivative.

Given this setup, it is possible to derive how output behaves at every step of production n by solving the economy upward from final demand. At stage n, output is given by

$$Y_t^n = D_t^n + I_n(\mathbb{E}_t D_{t+1}^n) - I_n(\mathbb{E}_{t-1} D_t^n), \tag{8}$$

Where D_t^n is the demand for sector n's products. By market clearing, this is also the total

[17] I use the indexation of industries running from 0, final consumption, upward in the supply chain because, in this vertically integrated economy, industry n has upstreamness equal to n.

[18] Including the positive drift does not change the inventory problem since, for storage, the relevant statistic is the first differenced demand.

production of sector $n-1$. To provide a characterization of output at each stage of production, define the operator $\mathcal{F}_t^n[x_t] = I_n\left(\mathbb{E}_t\left[x_{t+1} + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{F}_{t+1}^i[x_{t+1}] - \mathcal{F}_t^i[x_t]\right]\right)$ with the initial condition $\mathcal{F}_t^0[x_t] = I_0(\mathbb{E}_t[x_{t+1}])$, for some argument x_t. Further, define $\Delta\mathcal{F}_t^n[x_t] = \mathcal{F}_t^n[x_t] - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^n[x_{t-1}]$. Then, the following holds.

Proposition 1 (Sectoral Output)
Sectoral output at production stage n satisfies

$$Y_t^n = D_t^0 + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \Delta\mathcal{F}_t^i[D_t^0]. \tag{9}$$

Where $\mathcal{F}_t^i$ denotes the operator defined above.

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

In the context of this model, asking whether exogenous changes in final demand amplify upstream is effectively comparing $\frac{\partial \log Y_t^n}{\partial \log D_t^0}$ and $\frac{\partial \log Y_t^{n+1}}{\partial \log D_t^0}$: amplification occurs if $\frac{\partial \log Y_t^n}{\partial \log D_t^0} < \frac{\partial \log Y_t^{n+1}}{\partial \log D_t^0}$. Proposition 2 formalizes the sufficient condition for amplification in this economy.

Proposition 2 (Amplification in Vertically Integrated Economies)
The following holds

a) A change in final demand, to a first-order approximation around the non-stochastic steady state, implies the following change in sectoral output

$$\Delta \log Y_t^n = \Delta \log D_t^0 \left[1 + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \rho I_i' \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} [1 + (\rho - 1) I_j']\right]. \tag{10}$$

b) The economy features upstream amplification of positively autocorrelated final demand shocks if the inventory function satisfies

$$0 \leq I_i' < \frac{1}{1-\rho}, \ \forall i, \text{ strictly for some } i. \tag{11}$$

c) Furthermore, if equation (11) holds and I_n' is not too decreasing in n, amplification is larger for firms in more upstream sectors: $\Delta \log Y_t^n - \Delta \log Y_t^{n-1}$ increases in n.

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

Proposition 2 provides three important results. The first is a characterization of how a change in final demand affects output. In this vertically integrated economy, absent inventories, output would move 1-for-1 with demand. The presence of inventories implies that demand fluctuations can be absorbed or amplified as they travel through the network. Next, the proposition provides a sufficient condition for amplification in equation 11. The first inequality requires that the inventory function is increasing. This ensures that, as demand rises, so do inventories. If inventories increase when demand rises, output increases more than one-to-one

with demand. This, in turn, implies that the demand change faced by the upstream firm is amplified relative to the one faced by the downstream firm. In other words, the demand shock amplifies upstream. The second inequality requires that the function is not "too increasing" relative to the persistence of the process. The second inequality arises because a positive change in demand today implies that the conditional expectation of demand tomorrow is lower than demand today due to mean reversion. This condition ensures that the first effect dominates the second one. Intuitively, as shocks become arbitrarily close to permanent, the second condition is trivially satisfied, and it is enough for inventories to be increasing in expected demand. The last result in Proposition 2 is that if all firms have procyclical inventories and such procyclicality is not smaller for more upstream firms, amplification magnifies upstream. Intuitively, every step of production amplifies demand fluctuations; therefore, more upstream firms have a larger output response for any given change in final demand.

An alternative way of summarizing the intuition is the following. In vertically integrated economies without labour and inventories, changes in final demand transmit one-to-one upstream, as no substitution is allowed across varieties. When such an economy features inventories, this result need not hold. If inventories are used to smooth production, meaning that $I(\cdot)$ is a decreasing function, shocks can be transmitted less than one-to-one as inventories partially absorb them. On the other hand, when inventories are adjusted procyclically, the economy features upstream amplification. Importantly, note that, in this setting, due to production taking place on a line with only one endpoint, the network structure induces the largest possible extent of amplification. To make further headway in the analysis of amplification in a general network, I extend the model by including labour, allowing for a more general production structure and specifying the inventory problem.

5.2 Network Structure and Amplification

In this section, I embed the inventory problem in a production network framework to study how the network structure interplays with the inventory amplification mechanism. Relative to the standard network model in Acemoglu et al. (2012), I introduce three main changes: i) stochastic foreign demand, ii) two types of firms as in Acemoglu and Tahbaz-Salehi (2020), and iii) the inventories.

At the heart of the model is the horse race between the network's ability to dissipate final demand shocks and the potential amplification from inventories. As highlighted in Proposition 2, the sufficient condition for amplification is that inventories are adjusted procylically. I show in Appendix I that a simple dynamic model of production and inventory choices in the presence of stochastic demand naturally generates an optimally procyclical inventory policy. In this section, to retain the tractability of the model despite the general network structure, I specify the inventory choice of firms such that it replicates the procyclical behaviour observed in the data while still allowing me to fully characterize the equilibrium in closed form.

Households Suppose the economy is populated by domestic and foreign consumers. Domestic consumers have Golosov and Lucas (2007) preferences over a differentiated bundle C and leisure. The utility is given by $U_t = \log C_t - L_t$, where L is the amount of labour supplied. They maximize utility subject to the budget constraint $w_t L_t = P_t C_t + \Pi_t$, where P_t is the optimal price index of the differentiated bundle and Π_t represents rebated firm profits. The wage is the numeraire so that $w_t = 1$, $\forall t$. The household maximization yields a constant expenditure on the differentiated bundle equal to 1. Foreign consumers have a stochastic demand X_t, which follows an $AR(1)$ process with some mean $\bar{X}$. The total final demand faced by a firm is then given by $D_t = (1-\rho)(1+\bar{X}) + \rho D_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$, $\epsilon_t \sim F(0, \sigma^2)$. Note that total demand inherits the stochasticity from foreign demand. I assume that the composition of the domestic and foreign consumption baskets is identical and generated through a Cobb-Douglas aggregator over varieties $C_t = \prod_{s \in S} C_{s,t}^{\beta_s}$, where S is a finite number of available products, β_s the consumption weight of good s and $\sum_s \beta_s = 1$. This formulation implies that the expenditure on good s is $E_{s,t} = \beta_s D_t$ for $E_{s,t}$ solving the consumer expenditure minimization problem.

Production The network is characterized by an input requirement matrix $\mathcal{A}$, in which cycles and self-loops are possible.[19] I denote elements of $\mathcal{A}$ as $a_{rs} = [\mathcal{A}]_{rs}$. The network has a terminal node given by final consumption.

In each sector s, there are two types of firms: a fringe of competitive firms, denoted C firms, and a set of firms with market power, denoted I firms. Goods produced by C and I firms within the same sector s are perfect substitutes.[20] All firms produce using labour and a bundle of other sectors' output. Inputs are combined through Cobb-Douglas production functions $Y_{s,t} = Z_s l_{s,t}^{1-\gamma_s} M_{s,t}^{\gamma_s}$, where $l_{s,t}$ is the labor used by industry s, $M_{s,t}$ is the input bundle and γ_s is the input share for sector s. Z_s is an industry-specific normalization constant. The input bundle is aggregated as $M_{s,t} = \left(\sum_{r \in R} {a_{rs}}^{1/\nu} Y_{rs,t}^{\frac{\nu-1}{\nu}} \right)^{\frac{\nu}{\nu-1}}$, where $Y_{s,t}$ is the output of sector s, $Y_{rs,t}$ is the output of industry r used in sector s production, and $\gamma_s = \sum_{r \in R} a_{rs}$ so that the production function has constant returns to scale. ν is the elasticity of substitution, and a_{rs} is an input requirement, in equilibrium this will also coincide with the expenditure amount $Y_{rs,t}$ needed for every dollar of $Y_{s,t}$. R is the set of industries supplying inputs to sector s.[21]

The fringe of competitive C firms is not subject to inventory management problems. They choose output $Y_{s,t}$ and inputs $l_{s,t}$, $\{Y_{rs,t}\}_r$ to maximize profits $\pi_{s,t} = p_{s,t} Y_{s,t} - l_{s,t} - \sum_r p_{r,t} Y_{rs,t}$ subject to the production technology. The set of I firms produces the same varieties with a

[19] An example of a cycle is: if tires are used to produce trucks and trucks are used to produce tires. Formally, $\exists r : [\mathcal{A}^n]_{rr} > 0, n > 1$. An example of a self-loop is if trucks are used in the production of trucks. Technically, such is the case if some diagonal elements of the input requirement matrix are positive, i.e., $\exists r : [\mathcal{A}]_{rr} > 0$.

[20] See Acemoglu and Tahbaz-Salehi (2020) for a similar setup.

[21] In this paper, I focus on a setting where the production network is given by technology, namely the input requirement matrix $\mathcal{A}$ and study comparative statics and counterfactuals on the network structure. For recent contributions studying the role of endogenous network formation for the transmission of shocks, see Lim (2018); Huneeus (2019); Acemoglu and Azar (2020); Acemoglu and Tahbaz-Salehi (2020); Taschereau-Dumouchel (2020); Kopytov et al. (2021).

productivity shifter $Z_s^I > Z_s$ taking input prices as given and solves

$$\max_{Y_{s,t},I_{s,t},Q_{s,t}} \mathbb{E}_t \sum_t \beta^t \left[p_{s,t}Q_{s,t} - c_{s,t}Y_{s,t} - \frac{\delta}{2}(I_{s,t} - \alpha Q_{s,t+1})^2 \right] \quad st \quad I_{s,t} = I_{s,t-1} + Y_{s,t} - Q_{s,t},$$

where $Q_{s,t}$ is the quantity sold, $Y_{s,t}$ is the quantity produced, and $c_{s,t}$ is the marginal cost of the expenditure minimizing input mix: $\arg\min_{l_{s,t},\{Y_{rs,t}\}_r} l_{s,t} + \sum_r p_{r,t}Y_{rs,t}$ subject to $\bar{Y}_{s,t} = Z_s^I l_{s,t}^{1-\gamma_s} \left(\sum_{r \in R} {a_{rs}}^{1/\nu} Y_{rs,t}^{\frac{\nu-1}{\nu}} \right)^{\gamma_s \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}}$. Note that the model abstracts from productivity shocks. I introduce them in an extension discussed later on. δ and $\alpha > 0$ govern the costs of holding inventories or facing stock-outs and backlogs.[22] The optimal inventory policy is a function of the expected demand:

$$I_{s,t} = \max\{\mathcal{I}_{s,t} + \alpha \mathbb{E}_t Q_{s,t+1}, 0\}, \tag{12}$$

with $\mathcal{I}_{s,t} \coloneqq (\beta - 1)c_{s,t}/\delta$.[23] This optimal rule, known in the operations literature as *days-worth of supply (DOS)*, implies that inventories are procyclically adjusted, as is corroborated by the inventory data (see Figure OA.5). This formulation of the problem, where the presence of inventories is motivated directly by the structure of the firm's payoff function, is a reduced form stand-in for stock-out avoidance motives. In Appendix I, I provide a simple dynamic model in which firms face stochastic demand to show that the optimal dynamic policy implies procyclical inventory changes. Secondly, note that, in this setup, procyclicality follows from the optimal target rule adopted by firms. An alternative motive for holding inventories could be production smoothing, whereby a firm holds a stock of goods to avoid swings in the value of production between periods. In Appendix I, I introduce a production smoothing motive in the form of a convex cost function and show that the firm optimally chooses procyclical inventories if the smoothing motive is not too strong. Furthermore, if the production smoothing motive were to dominate, inventories would have to be countercyclical, which is counterfactual based on the evidence in Section 2. This version of the model abstracts from both productivity shocks and inventory depreciation. I introduce stochastic productivity in Appendix I and show that they reinforce the procyclical nature of inventories. I abstract from depreciation as it does not affect the results qualitatively.

The present formulation of the problem has two important advantages. First, the linear affine mapping between inventory holdings and future sales (as given by a constant target rule) matches the data extremely well, as shown in Figure OA.14 in the Online Appendix. Second, it allows for a full closed-form characterization of the equilibrium that would not be possible otherwise. I provide the equilibrium definition and characterization in Appendix H.

I set the vector of normalizing constants for C firms $Z_s \coloneqq (1 - \gamma_s)^{\gamma_s - 1} {\gamma_s}^{-\gamma_s \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}}$ so that,

[22] This model of inventory choice is a simplified version of the linear-quadratic inventory model proposed by Ramey and West (1999) following Holt et al. (1960) as a second-order approximation of the full inventory problem. I discuss a fully dynamic model in which firms face breakdowns and stochastic demand in Appendix I. Proposition OA.1 shows that inventories are optimally procyclical.

[23] Note that $\mathcal{I}_{s,t} < 0$ since, in the presence of time discounting or depreciation of inventories, the firm would ideally like to borrow output from the future and realize the sales today.

together with the normalization $w_t = p_{0,t} = 1$, they imply that the expenditure minimizing input bundles have a marginal cost $c_{s,t} = 1$, $\forall s$, t (see Carvalho and Tahbaz-Salehi, 2019). The competitive C firms then set prices $p_{s,t} = 1$, $\forall s$, t. The set of I firms price at the marginal cost of the competitive fringe and obtain a markup μ_s^I over their marginal cost. As a consequence, I firms make profits that are rebated to households. C firms do not produce in equilibrium. I firms then optimally choose an inventory policy $I_{s,t} = \max\{\mathcal{I}_{s,t} + \alpha \mathbb{E}_t Q_{s,t+1}, 0\}$.[24] Note that in equilibrium, there is no difference between the value and quantity of output in this economy, as all prices are equal to 1.

Given these policies, it is possible to solve for equilibrium quantities. The linearity of the policies implies that I can solve the problem separately at each step of production: consider a firm selling some of its output directly to consumers and the complementary output to other firms. The part of output sold to consumers, denoted by the superscript 0, is $Y_{s,t}^0 = \beta_s[D_t + \alpha\rho\Delta_t]$, with $\Delta_t = D_t - D_{t-1}$. $Y_{s,t}^0$ also represents the input expenditure of sector s to its generic supplier r once it is rescaled by the input requirement $\gamma_s a_{rs}$. Hence, output of producers one step of production removed from consumption obtains by summing over all final good producers s. Market clearing and the inventory policy imply $Y_{r,t}^1 = \sum_s \gamma_s a_{rs} Y_{s,t}^0 + \Delta I_{r,t}^1$ and, denoting $\omega = 1 + \alpha(\rho - 1)$, therefore $Y_{r,t}^1 = \sum_s \gamma_s a_{rs} \left[D_t + \alpha\rho \sum_{i=0}^1 \omega^i \Delta_t\right]$. Denote $\gamma_s a_{rs} = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{rs}$, so that $\sum_s \gamma_s a_{rs} = \sum_s \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{rs}$ is the weighted outdegree of a node r, namely the sum of the shares of expenditure of all industries s coming from input r. Iterating forward to generic stage n, and noting that $\sum_v \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{kv} \sum_q \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{vq} \dots \sum_r \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{or} \sum_s \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{rs} \beta_s = \left[\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n\right]_k B$, we can write the value of production of industry k at stage n as

$$Y_{k,t}^n = \left[\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n\right]_k B \left[D_t + \alpha\rho \sum_{i=0}^n \omega^i \Delta_t\right]. \tag{13}$$

In equation 13, the network structure is summarized by $\left[\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n\right]_k B$. The first term $\left[\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n\right]_k B D_t$ incorporates both the direct and indirect exposure to contemporaneous demand, while the rest of the equation represents the inventory effect both directly and indirectly through network connections.

Finally, as firms operate at multiple stages of production, total output of firm k is $Y_{k,t} = \sum_{n=0}^\infty Y_{k,t}^n$. I can now characterize the value of sectoral output as a function of the inventory channel and the features of the network.

Proposition 3 (Sectoral Output)
The value of sectoral output for a generic industry k is given by

$$Y_{k,t} = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \left[\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n\right]_k B \left[D_t + \alpha\rho \sum_{i=0}^n \omega^i \Delta_t\right]. \tag{14}$$

[24] In what follows I disregard the possibility that the optimal inventory level is 0 since there always exists an average foreign demand $\bar{X}$ such that it is never optimal to hold no inventory.

This can be written in matrix form as

$$Y_{k,t} = \tilde{L}_k B D_t + \alpha\rho \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \sum_{i=0}^{n} \omega^i \right]_k B\Delta_t, \tag{15}$$

where B is the $S \times 1$ vector of consumers' expenditure shares β_s and $\tilde{L}_k$ is the k^{th} row of the Leontief inverse, defined as $\tilde{L} = [I + \tilde{\mathcal{A}} + \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^2 + ...] = [I - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}]^{-1}$. Where $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \coloneqq \mathcal{A}\hat{\Gamma}$ and $\hat{\Gamma} = \text{diag}\{\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_R\}$. Sectoral output exists non-negative for any α, ρ such that $\alpha(\rho - 1) \in [-1, 0]$.

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

Several features of Proposition 3 are worth discussing. The first observation is that the model collapses to the standard characterization of output in production networks when there is no inventory adjustment, as the second term in equation (15) vanishes to recover $Y_{k,t} = \tilde{L}_k B D_t$. This occurs whenever there are no inventories ($\alpha = 0$) or when current shocks do not change expectations on future demand ($\rho = 0$). A second implication is that output might diverge as $n \to \infty$ if $\alpha(\rho - 1) > 0$. However, by the assumptions made on $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$,[25] and the maintained assumption that $\omega \in (0, 1)$, additional distance from consumption implies ever decreasing additional output, so output converges.[26] Importantly, the model also collapses to the standard network definition of output in the non-stochastic steady state where $\Delta_t = 0$, $\forall t$.

Next, I characterize the behaviour of the growth rate of sectoral output in response to changes in demand. To do so, denote $\mathcal{U}_k = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1-\omega^{n+1}}{1-\omega} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n B_k \bar{D} / Y_k$ the inventory-based distance from final consumers of industry k. This statistic, combining properties of the network and of inventories along the supply chain, is bounded below by 1 and bounded above by the industry's upstreamness. With this definition, I have the following result.

Proposition 4 (Sectoral Output Changes)
The growth rate of sectoral output, to a first-order approximation around the non-stochastic steady state, satisfies

$$\frac{\Delta Y_{k,t}}{Y_k} \approx \frac{\Delta_t}{\bar{D}} + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_k \frac{\Delta_t}{\bar{D}}, \tag{16}$$

where ψ is some constant in (0,1) independent of the network structure.

Therefore, the inventory-based upstreamness is a sufficient statistic for the network effect on amplification. Formally, comparing the output elasticity of industry k, $\varepsilon_{Y_k} \equiv \frac{\Delta Y_{k,t}}{Y_k} \frac{\bar{D}}{\Delta}$, to that of industry j

$$\varepsilon_{Y_k} > \varepsilon_{Y_j} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{U}_k > \mathcal{U}_j. \tag{17}$$

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

[25] In particular the fact that $\sum_k \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^{kv} < 1$, i.e., the assumption that the firm labour share is positive.

[26] In Proposition OA.3 in Appendix I, I show that restricting the network to a Directed Acyclic Graph allows existence and non-negativity even if $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \sum_{i=0}^{n} \omega^i$ has a spectral radius outside the unit circle which is the sufficient condition used in Proposition 3.

Proposition 4 establishes two important results. First, it characterizes how the growth rate of sectoral output depends on the growth rate of final demand. This dependence comes in two forms, a first term, common across sectors, linking directly demand and output. This term equals 1 if the economy features no inventories ($\alpha = 0$) or shocks are not autocorrelated ($\rho = 0$). In these special cases, the growth rate of output is the same as the growth rate of demand. This is a well-known property of network models without reallocation effects (see Baqaee and Farhi, 2019). Importantly, this term also shows that the network structure does not matter absent inventories. The second term introduces heterogeneity across sectors, entirely governed by their upstreamness. More upstream sectors face higher inventory amplification along the supply chain and, as a consequence, feature higher output changes for a given change in final demand. The second part of the proposition highlights that differences in inventory-based upstreamness are a necessary and sufficient condition for differences in changes in output.

As a further consequence of this result, Proposition 5 relates differences in the position of industries in their supply chain to differences in output growth volatility.

Proposition 5 (Sectoral Output Growth Volatility)
The volatility of sectoral output growth $\sigma_{\Delta \log Y_{k,t}}$ satisfies

$$\sigma_{\Delta \log Y_{k,t}} = (1 + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_k)\, \sigma_{\Delta \log D_t}, \tag{18}$$

Hence, industry k is more volatile than industry j if and only if it is more upstream:

$$\sigma_{\Delta \log Y_{k,t}} > \sigma_{\Delta \log Y_{j,t}} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{U}_k > \mathcal{U}_j. \tag{19}$$

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

The intuition behind this result is straightforward. For a given level of volatility in final demand, more upstream industries experience larger fluctuations in output and, therefore, higher output growth volatility.

Comparative Statics Propositions propgrowthrates and 5 establish that the inventory-weighted measure of upstreamness is a sufficient statistic to understand the cross-sectional heterogeneity in output growth fluctuations. In what follows, I present comparative statics to understand how this relates to fundamental features of the network economy. In particular, I establish that, all else equal, i) higher inventories and ii) more persistence shocks induce larger fluctuations, iii) industries with a lower weight in consumption baskets are more volatile and iv) that fragmenting production increases the volatility of the economy.

To best understand the result in Proposition 4, note the following comparative statics

Proposition 6 (Output Growth increases in Inventories and Persistence of Shocks)
The following holds:

a) If firms hold larger inventories ($\alpha \uparrow$), ω increases and, therefore, so does $\mathcal{U}_k$, $\forall k$. Hence, $\frac{\Delta Y_{k,t}}{Y_k}$ increases for all k.

b) If shocks become more persistent ($\rho \uparrow$), ω increases and, therefore, so does $\mathcal{U}_k$, $\forall k$. Hence, $\frac{\Delta Y_{k,t}}{Y_k}$ increases for all k.

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

Furthermore, the following special case can be characterized.

Proposition 7 (Permanent Final Demand Shocks)
Consider the special case where demand shocks are permanent. As $\rho \to 1$, we have that $\mathcal{U}_k \to U_k$. Therefore, output growth increases linearly in upstreamness: $\frac{\Delta Y_{k,t}}{Y_k} \approx \frac{\Delta_t}{D} + \alpha U_k \frac{\Delta_t}{D}$.

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

Propositions 6 and 7 provide two simple insights. First, intuitively, as firms hold larger inventory stocks, as governed by α, the elasticity of output to changes in final demand increases. Second, more persistence in the stochastic demand process also induces larger responses. After a change in final demand, the presence of inventories generates two forces: the most direct effect is that, if shocks are persistent, changes in demand today induce changes in the conditional expectation of future demand. Firms respond to this by increasing their output elasticity from 1 to $1 + \alpha\rho$. At the same time, due to mean-reversion, the conditional expectation decays at rate ρ. When $\rho < 1$ firms do not want to increase inventories of the full $\alpha\rho$ amount but rather of $\alpha\rho(1 + \alpha(\rho - 1))$. As shocks become more persistent, the latter effect is weakened, and the procyclical adjustment of inventories generates larger output elasticities. This effect compounds through the network at every step of the production process. In the limit case of permanent shocks, $\rho \to 1$, this effect is eliminated altogether and all that matters is the number of production steps between a given industry and consumers as measured by upstreamness. Formally, this implies that $\mathcal{U}_k \to U_k$, as highlighted in Proposition 7.

Next, to study the role of the network structure, I start with a useful definition, adapted from La'O and Tahbaz-Salehi (2022).

Definition 1 (Upstream, Downstream and Consumption Symmetry)
Industries i and j are upstream symmetric if $a_{ki} = a_{kj}$ for all industries k. They are downstream symmetric if $a_{ik} = a_{jk}$, $\forall k$, and they are consumption symmetric if $\beta_i = \beta_j$.

Upstream symmetry means that two sectors share the same production technology, and, as a consequence, the network upstream from them is identical. Downstream symmetry implies that two industries have the same role as input suppliers to other firms. When downstream symmetry is combined with consumption symmetry, it implies that they also have identical roles as suppliers of households. Given this definition, I can establish the following result.

Proposition 8 (Output Growth Volatility and Demand Composition)
Suppose sectors r and s are downstream symmetric and that sector r has a smaller consumption weight than sector s, $\beta_r < \beta_s$. Then sector r is more volatile than sector s: $\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_{rt}) > \text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_{st})$.

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

The intuition behind this result is immediate. If two industries have the same role as suppliers in the production network (downstream symmetry), they are equally upstream to other sectors. Their total position in the network will only differ if they have different roles as suppliers to consumers. If a sector is more important in consumption baskets, a larger fraction of its output is sold directly to households. Therefore, a smaller fraction of the sector's production is subjected to amplification through inventories along the supply chain. As a consequence, the sector is less volatile.

By assuming downstream symmetry, Proposition 8 excludes all possible differences in upstreamness stemming from different linkages with other sectors in the network. To clarify the role of sector-to-sector linkages for the level of volatility of the economy, Proposition 9 considers the case of production fragmentation.

Proposition 9 (Output Growth Volatility and Vertical Fragmentation)
Consider the fragmentation of a sector i, such that all network paths from i to any other sector k go through an extended path $i \to j \to k$, $\forall k$. Then, output growth volatility weakly increases for every sector in the economy. Strictly $\forall r$ such that $\ell_{ri} > 0$ before the fragmentation.

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

Proposition 9 studies how pure vertical fragmentation alters the network structure and, as a consequence, the volatility of the economy. First, note that the case considered is one in which the only change in the network is the splitting of a sector i into two new industries j and k without any change upstream or downstream. The direct consequence of this shift is that any sector connected as a direct or indirect supplier to industry i ($\ell_{ri} > 0$) is subject to an additional step of upstream inventory amplification, while all the rest of the network is unchanged. All these sectors will, therefore, experience higher output volatility.

In summary, this economy features upstream amplification driven by firms' procyclical inventory policy. Fragmenting production, in this context, unequivocally increases the volatility of the economy. To highlight the second potential consequence of more complex supply chains, the next section considers an extended model with multiple consumption destinations.

5.3 Multiple Destinations

In this section, I study a simple extension of the model where there are J destinations whose demand evolves according to AR(1) processes with mean $\bar{D}_j$ and variance σ_j^2. Demand is iid across space. Denote $\mathcal{U}_j^r$ the inventory-weighted upstreamness of sector r relative to consumption destination j. Keeping the rest of the model unchanged, the following result holds.

Proposition 10 (Sectoral Output Growth)
The growth rate of sectoral output, to a first-order approximation around the non-stochastic

steady state, satisfies

$$\Delta \log Y_t^r \approx \eta_t^r + \alpha\rho \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r \eta_{j,t}, \tag{20}$$

with $\eta_t^r = \sum_j \xi_j^r \eta_{j,t}$*, where* ξ_j^r *is the fraction of output of sector* r *consumed in country* j*, directly or indirectly, as defined in Section 3.2.*

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

Proposition 10 characterizes the behaviour of sectoral output growth. First, note that in the first term, shocks to different final destination countries are aggregated via the shift-share structure used in Section 3. The shares are given by the network exposure of industry r to each destination j, ξ_j^r. Secondly, the intensity of upstream amplification is governed by a shift-share, which includes bilateral inventory-weighted upstreamness $\mathcal{U}_j^r$. This measure, defined as the bilateral version of the upstreamness index discussed above, computes the average number of production steps between sector r and consumers of country j appropriately accounting for the intensity of the inventory effects. The intuition underlying Proposition 10 is as follows. Starting from a special case, suppose that industry r sells only to consumers from country j, then $\xi_j^r = 1$, and (20) collapses to (16). Suppose instead that sector r sells to two destinations j and k in equal proportions, but the length of the supply chains to these destinations differ. Then, changes in demand in country j are subjected to upstream inventory amplification governed by the distance of sector r to country j, as measured by the bilateral inventory-weighted upstreamness $\mathcal{U}_j^r$. Equivalently for country k. The total amount of amplification is a weighted average where the weights are given by the fraction of output sold in each destination, collected in the vector Ξ^r, such that $\xi_j^r = [\Xi^r]_j$. In summary, an industry will have a higher responsiveness to changes in demand if a large share of its output is eventually consumed in destinations that are far, in the upstreamness sense.

Next, Proposition 11 characterizes the behaviour of output growth volatility.

Proposition 11 (Volatility of Output Growth Rate)
The volatility of sectoral output growth satisfies

$$\mathrm{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) = \sum_j 1 + \alpha\rho \mathcal{U}_j^{r\,2} \xi_j^{r\,2} \mathrm{Var}(\eta_{jt})$$

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

The result above provides an important insight. When demand shocks are uncorrelated across consumption destinations, the variance of sectoral output growth is a weighted average of the variances of demand growth rates, with weights given by the squared destination shares. These volatilities are magnified by upstream amplification, governed by $\Psi_j^r > 1$. To understand the behaviour of the economy, consider the inventory-less benchmark where $\alpha = 0$ and suppose that all demand shocks have the same variance σ^2. In this case, the volatility of output

$\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) = \sigma^2 \sum_j \xi_j^{r\,2}$ is smaller than that of demand, σ^2, since $\sum_j \xi_j^{r\,2} \leq 1$, strictly if the industry sells to more than one destination. Exposure to many destinations provides a diversification force that allows output to fluctuate less than final demand. However, if the economy features inventories, this needs not be the case, as upstream amplification can dominate. In general, comparing industries at different points of the supply chain yields inconclusive results as they may differ in their position with respect to each destination U_j^r and in the weight of that destination ξ_j^r. To clarify the separate roles of supply chain position and diversification forces, I study them one at a time in the following comparative statics results.

Comparative Statics First, I consider the role of industries' position in supply chains in Proposition 12, then isolate the effect of diversification forces in Proposition 13.

Proposition 12 (Output Growth Volatility and Supply Chains Position)
Suppose sector r and sector s are downstream symmetric. Then, if $\mathcal{U}_j^r \geq \mathcal{U}_j^s$, $\forall j$, and $\exists j : \mathcal{U}_j^r > \mathcal{U}_j^s$ then $\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) > \text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^s)$.

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

Proposition 12 spells out an intuitive special case. Suppose two sectors have similar network structures, but the composition of demand is such that one industry is weakly more upstream than the other vis á vis all destinations (for example, it has a smaller weight in the consumption basket). In this case, such an industry will have a higher output growth volatility since all destination shock variances amplify at a higher rate. Importantly, this result holds under the assumption of downstream symmetry, which implies the two industries' exposure to each destination is identical. Effectively, if the two industries are downstream symmetric, their potential for diversification is the same. As a consequence, higher upstreamness is a sufficient condition for higher output volatility. [27] Proposition 13 provides the opposite thought experiment, highlighting the role of diversification.

Proposition 13 (Output Growth Volatility and Diversification)
Suppose all destinations have the same demand volatility such that $\text{Var}(\eta_{jt}) = \sigma$, $\forall j$. *Comparing sectors r and s such that $\mathcal{U}^r = \mathcal{U}^s$,*

a) $\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) > \text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^s)$ *if and only if* $(1 + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}^s) \cdot \Xi^s$ *second-order stochastically dominates* $(1 + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}^r) \cdot \Xi^r$*;*

b) if further $\mathcal{U}_j^r = \mathcal{U}_j^s = \mathcal{U}$, $\forall j$, then $\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) > \text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^s)$ *if and only if the distribution Ξ^s second-order stochastically dominates Ξ^r.*

Proof. See Appendix H. ■

[27] Note that in this more general context, it is neither necessary nor sufficient that industry r is more upstream than industry s for it to have higher output growth volatility. As a counterexample, suppose $U^r > U^s$ but the composition of bilateral upstreamness is different and such that r is more upstream relative to destinations with low demand volatility, while s is more upstream relative to destinations with large $\text{Var}(\eta_{jt})$, then it is possible that $\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) < \text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^s)$.

This result shows the effect of a more diversified sales exposure by considering the special case where each country has the same demand volatility and studying two equidistant industries from each destination. To understand this result, note that since the two industries have the same position relative to each destination market, they face the same degree of upstream amplification. As a consequence, any difference in output growth volatility is driven by different effective demand volatility. Since each destination has the same volatility of demand, differences in variance of the shift-share shocks are generated by differences in the composition of exposure. If industry r has a more dispersed set of destination exposure shares, it faces lower demand volatility thanks to higher diversification across destinations.

Taken together, the results presented in Propositions 8 and 9 establish that absent diversification possibilities, more upstream firms are more volatile, and, as a consequence, economies with more fragmented production structures experience larger output fluctuations. Propositions 12 and 13 study the case in which diversification forces are active and show that all else equal, more bilaterally upstream industries are more volatile and that sectors with a more spread out sales distribution experience smaller fluctuations.

The model can, therefore, provide a rationale for the empirical results in Section 4. In the remainder of the section, I test the proposed mechanism directly and provide quantitative counterfactuals.

Discussion and Extensions The model in this section can qualitatively rationalize the evidence on the cross-sectional distribution of output and inventories elasticities discussed in Section 4. However, it does so under a set of strong assumptions worth discussing.

Specifically, the linear-quadratic inventory problem is key to delivering the closed-form result. This assumption allows me to embed the inventory problem into the complex structure of the network economy. Absent this assumption, it is hard to find a recursion to solve the model without assuming specific network structures, as in Section 5.1. The linear-quadratic inventory problem can be seen as an approximation of a dynamic model in which firms face stochastic demand and stock-out risk. In Proposition OA.1 in Appendix I, I show that, in such a model, firms optimally adjust inventories procyclically. While embedding such a model in a production network would provide interesting dynamics, it would also require restricting the space of possible networks. Another important assumption, which partially drives the optimally procyclical nature of the inventory policy, is the absence of production smoothing motives, which could arise if the firm had a convex cost function. In Proposition OA.2 in Appendix I, I extend the model to consider this case, which, on its own, would imply optimally countercyclical inventories. When both target-rule and production smoothing motives are present, if the latter were to dominate, we would observe inventories moving countercyclical, which, as discussed in Section 2, is counterfactual. Finally, as shown in Figure OA.14, the linear policy of inventories in sales, implied by the quadratic formulation, fits the data extremely well.[28]

Another strong assumption is that the theoretical framework is that the inventory effect is

[28]The linear regression of inventories on sales explains 50% of the variance alone. This increases to 80% once industry fixed effects are included to purge permanent differences.

symmetric across sectors and governed by α. This assumption allows the characterization of the recursive definition of output and the comparative statics. Clearly, this is at odds with the data, as shown in Figure OA.5. To mitigate this problem, I do two things: on the empirical side, I report all results with industry fixed effects so that permanent differences are absorbed. On the theory side, in Appendix I, I extend the general model to allow for different inventory policies. While I cannot generalize the results with industry-specific αs, I can characterize similar comparative statics in special cases of the network, as in Proposition OA.4.

The model also abstracts from productivity shocks. Suppose otherwise that I firms have a stochastic process for their productivity. As the competitive fringe anchors the price, fluctuations in productivity would be solely reflected in markup changes. As a consequence, firms would adjust their inventories even more procyclically. At high productivity, the firm would find it optimal to produce more. If the productivity shocks are mean-reverting, as productivity increases today, the conditional expectation of productivity tomorrow is lower than the current level. Consequently, the firm optimally increases today's inventories to save on marginal costs. In Proposition OA.5 in Appendix I, I analyze this case and show that the procyclical nature of inventories is reinforced.

Lastly, the framework abstracts from modelling trade separately from domestic transactions. This choice is motivated by the observation that introducing trade costs to ship goods to different countries would not change any of the results in this section. The intuition is simple: introducing destination-specific cost shifters, such as iceberg trade costs, changes the steady-state size of each sector but, in this model, does not affect the response of the economy to shocks.

In summary, this theoretical framework encompasses a richer pattern of propagation of final demand shocks in the network and highlights the key interplay between network features and inventories. We can now read the empirical patterns discussed in section 2 through the lens of the model. The higher fragmentation of production over time should, all else equal, increase output growth volatility. On the other hand, the decrease in the concentration of exposure shares should reduce the volatility of demand. Combining these, we should observe that, over time, output elasticities increase, yet we cannot conclude anything about overall volatility in the economy. The rest of the section tests the key mechanism directly and provides quantitative counterfactuals to disentangle the role of longer and more complex chains from the one of higher diversification and quantify the total effect of these trends on economic fluctuations.

5.4 Testing the Mechanism

The reduced form empirical results in Section 4 show that firms further away from consumption have larger output responses to the same change in final demand. Furthermore, I find a similar behaviour for inventories. These findings motivated the model, which explains these cross-sectional patterns via the amplification generated by procyclical inventories. In this section, I test this mechanism directly.

The framework in Section 5.2 provides an estimating equation linking output growth to

changes in demand through inventories and upstreamness. Proposition 10 provides the key equation to bring to the data:

$$\Delta \log Y_t^r \approx \eta_t^r + \alpha\rho \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r \eta_{j,t}$$

The key difficulty in estimating this equation is the computation of the matrix of $\mathcal{U}_j^r$. As discussed in the previous section, this sufficient statistic is governed by the structure of the network and the intensity of the inventory channel along supply chains. I show in Appendix J, that with assumptions on α and ρ, this metric can be straigthforwardly computed from the input-output data. I detail in the next section how I calibrate the model and recover estimates of α and ρ. Under these assumptions I can estimate this relationship directly through input-output and inventory data as

$$\Delta \log Y_{it}^r = \delta_1 \hat{\eta}_{it}^r + \delta_2 \alpha_i^r \hat{\upsilon}_{it}^r + \epsilon_{it}^r, \tag{21}$$

Upstreamness U_j^r is computed from the I-O data, α from the inventory data, and $\hat{\eta}_{it}^r \equiv \sum_j \xi_{ij}^r \hat{\eta}_{j,t}$ is the estimated demand shock discussed in Section 3.2, and $\hat{\upsilon}_{it}^r \equiv \sum_j \mathcal{U}_{ij}^r \xi_{ij}^r \hat{\eta}_{j,t}$ is the bilateral upstreamness-weighted shocks. In this estimating equation $\delta_1 = 1$ and $\delta_2 > 0$.

To directly measure the inventory-to-sales ratio, I use the NBER CES Manufacturing.[29] This data only covers the US and a subset of the industries in the WIOD data. Therefore, I maintain throughout the assumption that $\alpha_i^r = \alpha_{US}^r$, $\forall i$, namely that within an industry, all countries have the same inventory-to-sales ratios.[30] With this assumption, I can estimate this regression on a sample with all manufacturing industries in the WIOD data.

Before discussing the results, note that if the model was misspecified and inventories played no role, we should expect $\hat{\delta}_2 = 0$ and $\hat{\delta}_1 = 1$. If inventories smoothed fluctuations upstream, we should have $\hat{\delta}_2 < 0$. Finally, if the network dissipation role were to dominate, we should also expect $\hat{\delta}_2 < 0$ as it would capture differential responses based on the position relative to consumers, as measured by $\mathcal{U}$.

Table 1 reports the estimation results, including industry and time fixed effects, to control for permanent differences and common trends. I use time 0 versions of inventories and I-O measures to avoid their contemporaneous response to the shocks. The results are consistent using either set of fixed effects. Using the most parsimonious specification in column 1, the model suggests that, ceteris paribus, increasing all $\mathcal{U}$ by from its 25th to its 75th percentile to a sector with average inventories implies a .09pp increase in the output elasticity to demand shocks. When using industry and time fixed effects, the estimate drops to .06pp. These are respectively 17.9% and 22.1% of the elasticity absent inventories. Conversely, raising inventories-to-sales ratios by

[29] As discussed earlier in the paper, WIOD contains information on the changes in the inventory stocks, which are computed as a residual in the I-O table. To recover the inventory-to-sales ratio, I need the level of inventory stock as well as the correct allocation of the industries that use these inventories. For these reasons, I use the NBER CES data, which provides reliable values for the inventory stock for US manufacturing industries.

[30] Note that if inventories increase in the level of frictions and these decrease with the level of a country's development, then the US represents a lower bound in terms of inventory-to-sales ratios.

Table 1: Model-Consistent Estimation of the Role of Inventories and Upstreamness

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(2) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(3) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$
$\hat{\eta}_{it}^r$	0.492***	0.464***	0.256***
	(0.0268)	(0.0288)	(0.0251)
$\alpha_i^r \times \hat{v}_{it}^r$	0.720***	0.762***	0.462***
	(0.0991)	(0.110)	(0.0893)
Constant	0.0784***	0.0783***	0.0748***
	(0.00153)	(0.00148)	(0.00158)
Industry FE	No	Yes	Yes
Time FE	No	No	Yes
N	11957	11957	11957
R^2	0.364	0.439	0.529

Cluster bootstrapped standard errors in brackets.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: This table shows the results of the regressions in 21. Specifications in columns 2 and 3 include country-industry fixed effects. Column 3 also includes time fixed effects. Standard errors are cluster-bootstrapped at the country-industry pair.

its interquartile range to industries at the average $\mathcal{U}$ yields a higher elasticity by .08pp or .05pp with time fixed effects, respectively 15.2% and 18.7% of the elasticity absent inventories. In all cases, consistently with the model predictions, I estimate $\hat{\delta}_2 > 0$. Quantitatively, the interplay between inventories and the industry's position in supply chains increases the average output elasticity by approximately 20%.

5.5 Model Performance and Counterfactuals

I conclude by using a simulated version of the model to study the trends discussed in Section 2. In particular, I am interested in separately understanding the role of i) longer and more complex supply chains, ii) more dispersed demand composition, and iii) larger inventories. To do so, I study counterfactuals on the structure of the network and the firms' inventory policy.


Calibration To take the model to the data, I use the actual WIOD input-requirement matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ as the I-O matrix in the model. I do so using the data from 2000 and 2014. I simulate 24000 cross-sections of demand shocks for the J countries, assuming that they follow AR(1) processes with volatility σ_j, persistence ρ and average cross-country correlation ϱ. For each country in the dataset, I compute $\hat{\sigma}_j$ as the time series standard deviation of the destination-specific shocks η_{jt} and use it directly in the data generating process. I use $\rho = .7$ as estimated in an AR(1) on the empirical demand shocks. For the parameter ϱ, governing the average cross-country correlation, I use indirect inference based on the empirical relation between the shift-share volatility and

upstreamness.[31] Underlying this calibration strategy is the idea that when shocks are perfectly correlated across countries, all industries should have the same shift-share shock volatility, independently of their position in the network. If, instead, shocks were iid at the destination level, further upstream industries would have lower shift-share shock volatility as the shifters are diversified away. Finally, for the parameter governing inventories, I use the relative volatility of output growth to that of the shift-share shocks in 2001. Using an inventory-to-sales ratio of 0.4, I can match the empirical relative volatility of 1.26. These moments are reported in Table OA.19.

Following the discussion in Section 5, I report the results for two versions of the model. The first one features a unique consumption destination, such that, in every period, there is only one change in final demand. The second version instead allows for multiple destinations. In the latter case, I draw J changes in final demand from the joint distribution and apply them to actual final demand data in the I-O table. For both cases, I also report the results for a model without inventories, $\alpha = 0$, for comparison.

First, the model can replicate the reduced form evidence. In particular, estimating the main specification in equation 7 on the generated data, I obtain Figure 3. I find that, despite

Figure 3: Model Data Regression



(a) Single Destination

(b) Multiple Destinations

Note: The figures show the model equivalent of Figure 1. Panel (a) shows the result of regression 7 for a model with a single consumer. Panel (b) shows the same estimation for economies with multiple destinations. In the latter case, the propagation pattern is not deterministic as it matters which destination receives which shock. Therefore, I build confidence intervals by simulating the economy 24000 times and the average coefficient as well as plus and minus one standard deviation (shaded area). In both plots, the blue line represents the result in an economy with inventories, while the red line is for economies without inventories (i.e., with α set to 0 for all industries).

both models failing to match the scale of the coefficient, the inventory model can replicate the slope. Namely the increasing response across different upstreamness bins. The model without

[31] If I had a longer time series, I could estimate the entire variance-covariance matrix of the J-dimensional stochastic process. The covariances are not identified since the time series length is $T < J$. Therefore, I use a single average correlation ϱ across countries as the target while using the estimated country-specific volatilities $\hat{\sigma}_j$ directly. Online Appendix I provides additional details on the procedure.

inventories cannot generate the positive gradient found in Figure 1.

As discussed in the previous section, the single destination model has no uncertainty around the effect of a demand shock by upstreamness. On the other hand, allowing for shocks in multiple destinations implies residual uncertainty depending on which country suffers which shock and, given the I-O matrix, which sector is then affected. Therefore, this setting has the additional important feature of allowing diversification forces to operate. Quantitatively, the model matches the slope found in the empirical analysis.

While the model correctly generates the higher output growth elasticity for more upstream industries, it could do so by generating the wrong relationship between upstreamness, demand volatility and output volatility. As discussed in Section 4, in the data, demand volatility decreases in upstreamness while output volatility increases. While I target the relation between upstreamness and demand volatility, the relation with output volatility is left unconstrained. The model correctly generates a positive slope of output growth volatility against upstreamness, suggesting that quantitatively, the interplay between industry position and inventories is sufficient to generate the rising output volatility for more upstream sectors. I report these results in Figure 4. The model can, therefore, rationalize both qualitatively and quantitatively the observations that i) more upstream firms, all else equal, face a lower volatility of demand but also ii) display a higher volatility of output growth.

Counterfactuals


I use the model to study three distinct counterfactuals related to the trends discussed in Section 2. As discussed in the introduction, I am interested in understanding how the interplay between a changing production network and increasing inventories shapes output volatility. These results speak directly to the policy debate on supply chain fragility and the potential need for reshoring.

First, I am interested in isolating the effect of having longer supply chains for a given level of inventories. To do so, I replace the network in 2000 with the one in 2014. As discussed in Section 2, these networks have two salient differences: i) the concentration of sales shares decreased; ii) the average distance from consumers increased. Consequently, one should expect that, fixing the variance of destination-specific shocks η_j, lower sales share concentration implies more diversification and, therefore, lower variance in the demand shocks η_i^r that each industry faces. Secondly, the higher distance from consumption should reinforce the inventory amplification channel, thereby increasing the relative volatility of output to demand. I exploit the structure of the model to separate these effects. In a single destination model, there is no notion of heterogeneous demand exposure; hence, in such a context, changing the network from the 2000 to the 2014 I-O matrix only increases the length of production chains. Instead, the same counterfactual in the multiple destination model has both forces operating simultaneously.


The second counterfactual, motivated by the recent trends in the inventory-to-sales ratio discussed in Section 2, consists of a 25% increase in inventories, holding fixed supply chain structure. Intuitively, this should increase the output response for a given change in demand.

Finally, I combine these experiments and allow for both the 25% increase in the inventory-


Figure 4: Volatility and Upstreamness - Data vs. Model




(a) Demand Shock Volatility - Data



(b) Demand Shock Volatility - Model



(c) Output Growth Volatility - Data



(d) Output Growth Volatility - Model

Note: The figures show the relations between demand shocks volatility $\sigma(\eta_{it}^r) = \left(\sum_t \left(\eta_{it}^r - \frac{1}{T}\sum_t \eta_{it}^r\right)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and Upstreamness and between output growth volatility and Upstreamness. The left panels show the relation in the data, while the right panels show the estimates on the model-generated data.

to-sales ratio and a change in the global input-output network from the 2000 to the 2014 WIOD. This should bring about two opposing forces: i) the higher diversification should reduce changes in demand each sector is exposed to; ii) for a given level of changes in demand, we should observe increased output responses as both inventories and upstreamness increase.

I report the results of these counterfactual exercises in Table 2. The first two columns in the baseline section report targeted moments for the multiple destination model. The statistics of interest are reported in the counterfactual columns.

The Table reports three key moments of the model economy, which I compute as follows. The standard deviation of demand $\sigma_\eta = (\sum_t(\eta_{it}^r - \bar{\eta}_i^r)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with $\eta_{it}^r = \sum_j \xi_{ij}^r \eta_{jt}$, where r is the industry, i the origin country, j a destination country and $\eta_j = \Delta \log D_{jt}$. Output dispersion σ_y is computed the same way on the growth rate of output. Finally, $\frac{\Delta \log Y_{it}^r}{\Delta \log \eta_{it}^r}$ is the ratio between the output growth of industry i and the change in final demand industry i is exposed to. For each simulation, I compute the dispersion measures and the median elasticity $\frac{\Delta \log Y_{it}^r}{\Delta \log \eta_{it}^r}$ and then

average across simulations.[32]

Table 2: Counterfactual Moments

	Baseline			Counterfactual		
	σ_η	σ_y	$\frac{\Delta \log Y_{it}^r}{\Delta \log \eta_{it}^r}$	σ_η	σ_y	$\frac{\Delta \log Y_{it}^r}{\Delta \log \eta_{it}^r}$
$[A]$ - Single Destination Model						
$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{2000} \to \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{2014}$	0.169	0.231	1.39	0.169	0.237	1.43
$\alpha \to 1.25\alpha$	0.169	0.231	1.39	0.169	0.241	1.45
$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{2000} \to \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{2014}$, $\alpha \to 1.25\alpha$	0.169	0.231	1.39	0.169	0.247	1.49
$[B]$ - Multiple Destinations Model						
$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{2000} \to \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{2014}$	0.13	0.173	1.34	0.125	.17	1.37
$\alpha \to 1.25\alpha$	0.13	0.173	1.34	0.13	0.18	1.40
$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{2000} \to \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{2014}$, $\alpha \to 1.25\alpha$	0.13	0.173	1.34	0.125	0.177	1.43

Note: The Table presents the results of baseline and counterfactual estimation. The first 3 columns refer to the baseline model calibrated to 2000, while the last 3 show the counterfactual results. Panel [A] shows the results for the single destination setting while Panel [B] for the multiple destination model. In each model, I perform 3 counterfactuals: i) keeping inventories constant, I use the I-O matrix of 2014 instead of the one of 2000; ii) keeping the I-O matrix constant, I increase inventories by 25%; iii) 25% increase of inventories and changing the I-O matrix from the one in 2000 to the one of 2014. Each counterfactual is simulated 4800 times.

To isolate the effect of changes in network position, consider the single destination economy. In this setting, there is no scope for diversification forces as there is only one demand shock. As a consequence, shifting the production network from the 2000 I-O matrix to the 2014 one implies changes in upstreamness, which are not coupled with changes in the ability to diversify away the shocks. The increase in the average distance from consumers induces a higher output volatility holding fixed the volatility of demand, as shown in the first row of Table 2. Output growth volatility increases by 2.6% relative to baseline. This change is generated solely by the changes in industry position relative to consumers. As a consequence, the median output growth response to changes in demand moves from 1.39 to 1.43. Similarly, in the second counterfactual, increasing the inventory-to-sales ratio predictably generates a significant increase in the change in output triggered by a change in demand from 1.39 to 1.45 and a 4.3% increase in output growth volatility. Combining these two changes, the model predicts a reinforcing effect of the two forces as increasing chain length and inventories are complementary in generating upstream amplification. Consequently, the output response to changes in demand moves from 1.39 to 1.49, and a 6.9% increase in output growth volatility. Note that, by construction, when changing the network in the single destination economy, we only account for the role of increased supply chain lengths, not for the increased diversification.

To account for the increased diversification which accompanies the reshaping of the network, I turn to the multiple-destination model. The first observation is that when moving from 2000 to the 2014 network, the model predicts a decline in industries' effective demand shocks. As the destination exposure becomes less concentrated, for a given level of volatility of destination

[32]I take the median of $\frac{\Delta \log Y_{it}^r}{\Delta \log \eta_{it}^r}$ rather than the average because, as the denominator is at times very close to zero, the ratio can take extreme values and therefore significantly affect the average response.

shocks, the volatility of η_r^i declines by 4% from 0.13 to 0.125. Absent other changes, this should translate directly into a 4% decline in output growth volatility. However, the network changes between 2000 and 2014 also increase supply chain length so that the output response to changes in demand increases from 1.34 to 1.37 and output growth volatility only drops by 1.8%. Intuitively, while reshaping the network induces a higher diversification of demand shocks, whose volatility declines, it also increases the average distance from consumers and, therefore, upstream amplification. The latter effect mitigates the volatility gains from higher diversification. In the second counterfactual, increasing inventories while fixing the network structure implies no change in demand exposure and a significant increase in output volatility as firms respond to demand shocks significantly more, from 1.34 to 1.40, for a 1pp increase in the growth rate of demand. As a consequence, output growth volatility increases by 4.1%. The last counterfactual, allowing for both changes in the network and increasing inventories, suggests that the reduction in effective demand volatility is more than offset by the increases in supply chain length and inventories so that the volatility of output growth rises by 2.3%. This is driven by a significant increase in the output change triggered by a change in demand, from 1.34 to 1.43, driven by the rise in inventories and the longer supply chains.

These counterfactual experiments suggest that the reshaping of the network is generating opposing forces in terms of output volatility. First, the decreasing exposure to a specific destination reduces the effective volatility of final demand for each industry. At the same time, the increase in chain length would imply a higher responsiveness of output to changes in final demand. When combining these network changes with an increase in inventories from an inventory-to-sales ratio of 40% to 50%, the benefits of the changes in the network are fully undone. In particular, output dispersion rises when inventories are allowed to increase.

To conclude, while bearing in mind that the network in this economy is efficient, we can still interpret these counterfactuals as induced by policy interventions.[33] These results suggest that policy proposals aimed at shortening supply chains might be able to partially curb the propagation of demand shocks, provided that they do not reduce the dispersion of final demand. These counterfactuals also highlight that interventions targeted at reducing disruptions by increasing inventory buffers may come at the cost of higher volatility and that this effect is stronger when supply chains are long and complex.

6 Conclusions

Recent decades have been characterized by a significant change in how goods are produced due to the rise of global value chains. In this paper, I ask whether these trends trigger stronger or weaker propagation of final demand shocks. To answer this question, I start by asking whether we observe a higher output response to demand shocks by firms further away from consumption.

[33]Recall that the distribution of resources across sectors is driven by relative prices. In this economy, these are undistorted and induce the optimal allocation implied by the production function and preferences. The only policy that could improve the allocation is within sectors: a planner could subsidize I firms to induce marginal cost pricing.

Using a shift-share design based on global Input-Output data, I find that upstream firms respond up to three times more strongly than their downstream counterparts to the same final demand shock.

I build a theoretical framework embedding procyclical inventories in a network model to study the key features determining upstream amplification vs. dissipation patterns. I then estimate the model, and, in counterfactual exercises, I find that in the absence of the inventory amplification channel, we would observe significantly lower output responses to demand shocks. This last result becomes particularly salient in light of the recent trends of increasing inventories and lengthening production chains.

To conclude, this paper represents a first attempt at studying the interactions between the rise of global supply chains and the role of inventories in propagating shocks. As such, it ignores several elements. Two examples are the role of re-pricing as an absorption mechanism and the dependence of inventory policies on supply chain positions. This topic represents a promising avenue for both empirical and theoretical research, given the recent supply chain disruptions in the Covid-19 crisis.

References

Acemoglu, Daron and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi, "Firms, failures, and fluctuations: the macroeconomics of supply chain disruptions," Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2020.

__ **and Pablo D Azar**, "Endogenous production networks," *Econometrica*, 2020, *88* (1), 33–82.

__ **, Ufuk Akcigit, and William Kerr**, "Networks and the Macroeconomy: An Empirical Exploration," *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 2016, *30* (1), 273–335.

__ **, Vasco M. Carvalho, Asuman Ozdaglar, and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi**, "The Network Origins of Aggregate Fluctuations," *Econometrica*, 2012, *80* (5), 1977–2016.

Adão, Rodrigo, Michal Kolesár, and Eduardo Morales, "Shift-Share Designs: Theory and Inference," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2019, *134* (4), 1949–2010.

Alessandria, George, Joseph Kaboski, and Virgiliu Midrigan, "Trade wedges, inventories, and international business cycles," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2013, *60* (1), 1–20.

__ **, Joseph P Kaboski, and Virgiliu Midrigan**, "The Great Trade Collapse of 2008-09: An Inventory Adjustment?," *IMF Economic Review*, December 2010, *58* (2), 254–294.

__ **,** __ **, and** __ , "US trade and inventory dynamics," *American Economic Review*, 2011, *101* (3), 303–307.

__ **, Shafaat Yar Khan, Armen Khederlarian, Carter Mix, and Kim J Ruhl**, "The aggregate effects of global and local supply chain disruptions: 2020–2022," *Journal of International Economics*, 2023, p. 103788.

Alfaro, Laura, Manuel García-Santana, and Enrique Moral-Benito, "On the direct and indirect real effects of credit supply shocks," *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2021, *139* (3), 895–921.

Altomonte, Carlo, Filippo Di Mauro, Gianmarco I. P. Ottaviano, Armando Rungi, and Vincent Vicard, "Global Value Chains During the Great Trade Collapse: A Bullwhip Effect?," CEP Discussion Papers dp1131, Centre for Economic Performance, LSE February 2012.

Antràs, Pol and Davin Chor, "On the Measurement of Upstreamness and Downstreamness in Global Value Chains," NBER Working Papers 24185, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc January 2018.

_ , _ , Thibault Fally, and Russell Hillberry, "Measuring the Upstreamness of Production and Trade Flows," *American Economic Review*, May 2012, *102* (3), 412–416.

Autor, David, David Dorn, and Gordon H Hanson, "The China syndrome: Local labor market effects of import competition in the United States," *American Economic Review*, 2013, *103* (6), 2121–68.

Baqaee, David Rezza and Emmanuel Farhi, "The macroeconomic impact of microeconomic shocks: beyond Hulten's Theorem," *Econometrica*, 2019, *87* (4), 1155–1203.

Barrot, Jean-Noël and Julien Sauvagnat, "Input specificity and the propagation of idiosyncratic shocks in production networks," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2016, *131* (3), 1543–1592.

Bils, Mark and James A Kahn, "What inventory behavior tells us about business cycles," *American Economic Review*, 2000, *90* (3), 458–481.

Blinder, Alan S and Louis J Maccini, "The resurgence of inventory research: what have we learned?," *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 1991, *5* (4), 291–328.

Boehm, Christoph E, Aaron Flaaen, and Nitya Pandalai-Nayar, "Input linkages and the transmission of shocks: Firm-level evidence from the 2011 Tōhoku earthquake," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2019, *101* (1), 60–75.

Borusyak, Kirill and Peter Hull, "Non-random exposure to exogenous shocks: Theory and applications," Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2020.

_ , _ , and Xavier Jaravel, "Quasi-experimental shift-share research designs," *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2022, *89* (1), 181–213.

Carreras-Valle, Maria-Jose, "Increasing Inventories: the Role of Delivery Times," Technical Report, Working Paper 2021.

Carvalho, Vasco M, "Aggregate Fluctuations and the Network Structure oF Intersectoral Trade," *mimeo*, 2010.

_ and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi, "Production networks: A primer," *Annual Review of Economics*, 2019, *11*, 635–663.

_ , Makoto Nirei, Yukiko Saito, and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi, "Supply chain disruptions: Evidence from the great east Japan earthquake," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2020.

Chen, Frank, Zvi Drezner, Jennifer Ryan, and David Simchi-levi, "Quantifying the Bullwhip Effect in a Simple Supply Chain: The Impact of Forecasting, Lead Times, and Information," *Management Science*, 07 1999, *46.*

Dhyne, Emmanuel, Ayumu Ken Kikkawa, Magne Mogstad, and Felix Tintelnot, "Trade and domestic production networks," *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2021, *88* (2), 643–668.

European Parliament, "A New Industrial Strategy for Europe," Technical Report November 2020.

Fally, Thibault, "Production Staging: Measurement and Facts," *mimeo*, 01 2012.

Forrester, Jay W, "Industrial dynamics. 1961," *MT Press*, 1961.

Goldsmith-Pinkham, Paul, Isaac Sorkin, and Henry Swift, "Bartik instruments: What, when, why, and how," *American Economic Review*, 2020, *110* (8), 2586–2624.

Golosov, Mikhail and Robert E Lucas, "Menu costs and Phillips curves," *Journal of Political Economy*, 2007, *115* (2), 171–199.

Gortari, Alonso De, "Disentangling global value chains," Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2019.

Holt, Charles C, Franco Modigliani, John Muth, and Herbert Simon, *Planning Production, Inventories, and Work Force.* 1960.

Huneeus, Federico, "Production Network Dynamics and the Propagation of Shocks," *mimeo*, February 2019.

Kahn, James A, "Inventories and the volatility of production," *The American Economic Review*, 1987, pp. 667–679.

Kopytov, Alexandr, Bineet Mishra, Kristoffer Nimark, and Mathieu Taschereau-Dumouchel, "Endogenous production networks under supply chain uncertainty," *Available at SSRN 3936969*, 2021.

Korovkin, Vasily and Alexey Makarin, "Production Networks and War," *Available at SSRN*, 2021.

Kramarz, Francis, Julien Martin, and Isabelle Mejean, "Volatility in the small and in the large: The lack of diversification in international trade," *Journal of International Economics*, 2020, *122*, 103276.

La'O, Jennifer and Alireza Tahbaz-Salehi, "Optimal monetary policy in production networks," *Econometrica*, 2022, *90* (3), 1295–1336.

Lee, L. Hau, V Padmanabhan, and Seungjin Whang, "Information Distortion in a Supply Chain: The Bullwhip Effect," *Management Science*, 12 2004, *43*, 546–558.

Lim, Kevin, "Endogenous production networks and the business cycle," *Work. Pap*, 2018.

Los, Bart, Reitze Gouma, Marcel Timmer, and Pieter IJtsma, "Note on the construction of wiots in previous years prices," Technical Report 2014.

Metters, Richard, "Quantifying the Bullwhip Effect in Supply Chains," *Journal of Operations Management*, 05 1997, *15*, 89–100.

Ramey, Valerie A and Kenneth D West, "Inventories," *Handbook of macroeconomics*, 1999, *1*, 863–923.

Raza, W, J Grumiller, H Grohs, J Essletzbichler, and N Pintar, "Post Covid-19 value chain: options for reshoring production back to Europe in a globalised economy," *Brussels: European Union–Directorate General for External Policies of the Union*, 2021.

Shea, John, "The input-output approach to instrument selection," *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 1993, *11* (2), 145–155.

Taschereau-Dumouchel, Mathieu, "Cascades and fluctuations in an economy with an endogenous production network," *Available at SSRN 3115854*, 2020.

Timmer, Marcel P, Erik Dietzenbacher, Bart Los, Robert Stehrer, and Gaaitzen J De Vries, "An illustrated user guide to the world input–output database: the case of global automotive production," *Review of International Economics*, 2015, *23* (3), 575–605.

White House, "Biden-Harris Administration Announces Supply Chain Disruptions Task Force to Address Short-Term Supply Chain Discontinuities," Technical Report June 2021.

World Bank, *World Development Report 2020* number 32437. In 'World Bank Publications.', The World Bank, 12-2019 2020.

Zavacka, Veronika, "The bullwhip effect and the Great Trade Collapse," 2012.

Appendix

Table A.1: Effect of Demand Shocks on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(2) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(3) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$
Upstreamness in [1,2]	0.473***	0.263***	0.262***
	(0.0116)	(0.0115)	(0.0122)
Upstreamness in [2,3]	0.544***	0.319***	0.319***
	(0.0125)	(0.0130)	(0.0127)
Upstreamness in [3,4]	0.663***	0.396***	0.395***
	(0.0108)	(0.0130)	(0.0136)
Upstreamness in [4,5]	0.763***	0.454***	0.456***
	(0.0201)	(0.0207)	(0.0217)
Upstreamness in [5,6]	0.911***	0.591***	0.606***
	(0.0630)	(0.0517)	(0.0496)
Upstreamness in [6,∞)	1.146***	0.749***	0.783***
	(0.210)	(0.188)	(0.213)
Constant	0.0852***	0.0829***	0.0830***
	(0.000838)	(0.000901)	(0.000887)
Time FE	No	Yes	Yes
Level FE	No	No	Yes
Country-Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	32371	32371	32371
R^2	0.439	0.497	0.497

Cluster bootstrapped standard errors in brackets.

Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry $\times$ country level.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: The Table shows the results of the regression in equation 7. In particular, I regress the growth rate of output on the estimated demand shocks interacted with dummies taking value 1 if upstreamness is in the $[1, 2]$ bin, $[2, 3]$ bin, and so on. Observations with upstreamness above 7 are included in the $[6, \infty)$ bin. All regressions include producing industry-country fixed effects and columns 2 and 3 progressively add time fixed effects and upstreamness bin fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry-country level.

Table A.2: Effect of Demand Shocks on Inventory Changes by Upstreamness Level

	(1) $\frac{\Delta I^r_{it}}{Y^r_{it}}$	(2) $\frac{\Delta I^r_{it}}{Y^r_{it}}$	(3) $\frac{\Delta I^r_{it}}{Y^r_{it}}$	(4) $\frac{\Delta I^r_{it}}{Y^r_{it}}$
Uptreamness in [1,2]	0.0115***	0.00748*	0.00887**	0.00111
	(0.00412)	(0.00417)	(0.00406)	(0.00553)
Uptreamness in [2,3]	0.0135***	0.00976**	0.00869*	-0.00216
	(0.00488)	(0.00471)	(0.00493)	(0.00651)
Uptreamness in [3,4]	0.0256***	0.0199***	0.0183***	0.0126*
	(0.00552)	(0.00528)	(0.00545)	(0.00717)
Uptreamness in [4,5]	0.0518***	0.0430***	0.0370***	0.0432***
	(0.00865)	(0.00893)	(0.00861)	(0.0100)
Uptreamness in [5,6]	0.0780***	0.0670***	0.0596***	0.0666***
	(0.0154)	(0.0157)	(0.0141)	(0.0173)
Uptreamness in [6,∞)	0.146*	0.123	0.0972	0.0840
	(0.0872)	(0.0846)	(0.0743)	(0.0582)
First Stage Residual				0.0189***
				(0.00451)
Constant	0.0791***	0.0791***	0.0790***	0.0789***
	(0.00286)	(0.00290)	(0.00290)	(0.00294)
Time FE	No	Yes	Yes	No
Level FE	No	No	Yes	No
Country-Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	31955	31955	31955	30826
R^2	0.917	0.918	0.919	0.918

Cluster bootstrapped standard errors in brackets.

Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry $\times$ country level.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: The Table shows the results of the regression in equation 7 with inventory changes as the dependent variable. In particular, I regress the inventory changes over output on the estimated demand shocks interacted with dummies taking value 1 if upstreamness is in the $[1, 2]$ bin, $[2, 3]$ bin, and so on. Observations with upstreamness above 7 are included in the $[6, \infty)$ bin. All regressions include producing industry-country fixed effects and columns 2 and 3 progressively add time fixed effects and upstreamness bin fixed effects. Column 4 shows the result instrumenting demand shocks with government consumption. Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry-country level.

Online Appendix

Table of Contents

Appendix A Motivating Evidence **3**

Fact 1: Production chains have increased in length . . . 3

Global vs Purely Domestic Supply Chains . . . 3

Total Length of Supply Chains . . . 3

Fact 2: Sales shares are becoming less concentrated . . . 4

Fact 3: Inventories are adjusted procyclically . . . 5

Inventory Procyclicality by Inventory Type . . . 5

Fact 4: Output is more volatile than sales . . . 7

Fact 5: : Inventories-to-sales ratios are increasing . . . 8

Appendix B WIOD Coverage **8**

Appendix C Inventory Adjustment **9**

Appendix D Descriptive Statistics **11**

Upstreamness . . . 11

Destination Shares . . . 11

Degree Distributions . . . 12

Demand Shocks and Output Growth Volatility by Upstreamness . . . 13

Inventories . . . 13

Appendix E Test of Uncorrelatedness of Instruments **15**

Appendix F Additional Results - Section 4 **16**

Adão et al. (2019) Inference . . . 16

Permutation Inference . . . 18

Government Consumption Shocks . . . 19

China Syndrome Shocks . . . 22

Federal Spending Shocks . . . 23

Inventory Response - Government Consumption Shocks . . . 25

Appendix G Robustness Checks **25**

Re-centered Instrument . . . 25
Discrete Network . . . 26
Downstreamness . . . 28
Ordinal Effects of Upstreamness . . . 29
Alternative Shifter Estimation . . . 30
Deflated Data . . . 31
Time Varying Sales Share Aggregation . . . 32
Past Output . . . 33

Appendix H Omitted Proofs **34**

Appendix I Model Extensions and Additional Theoretical Results **44**
A Dynamic Model of Optimal Procyclical Inventories . . . 44
Production Smoothing Motive . . . 46
Directed Acyclic Graphs Economies . . . 47
Heterogeneous Inventory Policy in a General Network . . . 48
Productivity Shocks . . . 49

Appendix J Model to Data **50**


Appendix K Quantitative Model **51**

A Motivating Evidence


Fact 1: Production chains have increased in length

Figure OA.1: Upstreamness Dynamics

(a) Upstreamness Dynamics




(b) Dynamics Decomposition



Note: The figure shows the dynamics of the weighted upstreamness measure computed as $U_t = \frac{\sum_i \sum_r y^r_{it} U^r_{it}}{\sum_i \sum_r y^r_{it}}$. The left panel shows the average over time and it includes the estimated linear trend and the 95% confidence interval around the estimate. The right panel shows the decomposition of these changes into the stacked contributions (in levels) of the different components of the changes in the weighted average upstreamness measure. The components are given by $\Delta U_t = \sum_i \sum_r \underbrace{\Delta U^r_{it} w^r_{it-1}}_{Within} + \underbrace{U^r_{it-1} \Delta w^r_{it}}_{Between} + \underbrace{\Delta U^r_{it} \Delta w^r_{it}}_{Covariance}$.

Global vs Purely Domestic Supply Chains


Figure OA.2: Dynamics of Supply Chains Length - Global vs Pure Domestic



Note: Note: The figure shows the dynamics of the weighted upstreamness measure computed as $U_t = \frac{\sum_i \sum_r y^r_{it} U^r_{it}}{\sum_i \sum_r y^r_{it}}$ broken down by chains that cross borders and purely domestic chains. Upstreamness of purely domestic chains is computed as $U^{rD}_{it} = \text{diag}[[I - \mathcal{A}^D]^{-1} F_{it}]^{-1} [I - \mathcal{A}^D]^{-2} F_{it}$, where $\mathcal{A}^D$ is the Input-Output matrix with $a^r s_{ij} = 0 \, \forall i \neq j$, namely eliminating all cross-border links. This measure is then averaged across countries and industries using sales weights. In the sample period, the average number of steps in global supply chains grew 29.7%, while the number of steps in purely domestic supply chains grew 13.5%.

Total Length of Supply Chains

Figure OA.3: Dynamics of Supply Chains Length




Note: Note: The figure shows the dynamics of the weighted length of chains measure computed as $L_t = \frac{\sum_i \sum_r y^r_{it} L^r_{it}}{\sum_i \sum_r y^r_{it}}$, here $L^r_{it} := U^r_{it} + D^r_{it}$, namely the sum of upstreamness and downstreamness to count the total amount of steps embodied in a chain from pure value added to final consumption. The figure shows the average over time and it includes the estimated linear trend and the 95% confidence interval around the estimate.


Fact 2: Sales shares are becoming less concentrated

Figure OA.4: Herfindahl Index of Sales Shares

(a) Simple Average HHI



(b) Weighted Average HHI




Note: The figure shows the behavior of the Herfindahl Index of destination shares over time. Destination shares are described as in equation 3 in Section 3.2. The Herfindahl Index is computed at the industry level as $HHI^r_t = \sum_j {\xi^r_{ij}}^2$. The left panel shows the simple average across industry, i.e. $HHI_t = R^{-1} \sum_r HHI^r_t$. The right panel shows the weighted average using industry shares as weights: $HHI_t = \sum_r \frac{Y^r_t}{Y_t} HHI^r_t$. The plots include the estimated linear trend and the 95% confidence interval around the estimate.


Fact 3: Inventories are adjusted procyclically

Figure OA.5: Distribution of estimated I'

(a) NBER



(b) Census




Note: The graph shows the distribution of estimated $I'(\cdot)$, namely the derivative of the empirical inventory function with respect to sales. The sample is the full NBER CES sample of 473 manufacturing industries. The estimation is carried out sector by sector using time variation. The graph shows the sector-specific estimated coefficient. The left panel shows the same statistics based on the monthly data from the Manufacturing & Trade Inventories & Sales data of the US Census.


Inventory Procyclicality by Inventory Type

Figure OA.6: Distribution of estimated I' by inventory type

(a) Final Goods Inventories



(b) Materials Inventories



Note: The graph shows the distribution of estimated $I'(\cdot)$, namely the derivative of the empirical inventory function with respect to sales. The left panel shows the same statistics based on the final goods monthly inventories data from the Manufacturing & Trade Inventories & Sales data of the US Census while the right panel shows the estimates using materials inventories.

Table OA.1: Estimation of $I'(\cdot)$

y_t^i	(1) $\tilde{I}_t^i$	(2) $\tilde{\alpha}_t^i$	(3) $\tilde{I}_t^i$	(4) $\tilde{\alpha}_t^i$	(5) I_t^i	(6) α_t^i	(7) I_t^i	(8) α_t^i
NBER CES Sample - Annual Data								
Mean of y_t^i	-11.36*	-0.00000270	-11.20***	-0.0000200	966.8***	0.127***	982.4***	0.127***
	(5.939)	(0.000170)	(4.154)	(0.000409)	(33.34)	(0.000891)	(16.43)	(0.000570)
$\frac{\partial y_t^i}{\partial Sales_t^i}$	0.0815***	-0.00000218***	0.0745***	-0.00000251***	0.106***	-0.00000129***	0.101***	-0.000000641***
	(0.0107)	(0.000000412)	(0.00994)	(0.000000205)	(.0013713)	(6.53e-08)	(0.00555)	(9.71e-08)
Industry FE	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
N	5658	5658	5659	5659	5664	5676	5676	5676
R^2	0.395	0.0239	0.307	0.0163	0.759	0.140	0.551	0.0617
US Census Sample - Monthly Data								
Mean of y_t^i	-11.53	0.00123	-3.475	0.00128	52760.8***	1.598***	52731.2***	1.620***
	(20.83)	(0.00135)	(34.10)	(0.00144)	(682.3)	(0.00515)	(764.1)	(0.00481)
$\frac{\partial y_t^i}{\partial Sales_t^i}$	0.337***	-0.00000139***	0.341***	-0.00000139***	1.353***	-0.00000218***	1.344***	-0.00000111***
	(0.0143)	(0.000000104)	(0.00841)	(0.000000118)	(0.00702)	(7.94e-08)	(0.00998)	(3.34e-08)
Industry FE	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
N	30479	30479	30479	30479	30479	30479	30479	30479
R^2	0.325	0.0120	0.313	0.00661	0.975	0.769	0.961	0.0678


Bootstrapped standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: This table displays the results of the non-parametric kernel estimations of $I'(\cdot)$ and $\alpha'(\cdot)$, the derivative of the inventory function and the inventory to sales ratio function with respect to current sales. The estimation is based on the data of the NBER CES Manufacturing Industries Dataset for 2000-11 for the top Panels and on the US Census Manufacturing & Trade Inventories & Sales data for the bottom Panels. Standard errors are bootstrapped. Variables with $\sim$ denote HP-filtered data. Columns (1), (2), (5), and (6) include industry fixed effects.

Fact 4: Output is more volatile than sales

Figure OA.7: Relative Volatility of Output and Sales



(a) Monthly

(b) Quarterly

(c) Yearly


(d) Yearly NBER

Note: The graphs show the distribution of the ratio of the volatility of HP-filtered output to HP-filtered sales across sectors. Panels (a), (b) and (c) represent data from the Manufacturing & Trade Inventories & Sales data of the US Census, while Panel (d) shows data from the NBER CES Manufacturing data. Both sources are described in the data Section. Panels (a) and (d) have no aggregation, while for Panels (b) and (c) I sum monthly output and sales to get quarterly and yearly output and sales.


Fact 5: : Inventories-to-sales ratios are increasing

Figure OA.8: Trends in Inventory-to-Sales ratios

(a) Yearly NBER



(b) Monthly Census



Note: The graphs replicate the key finding in Carreras-Valle (2021). Panel (a) shows the inventory-to-sales ratio from 1958 to 2018 from the NBER CES Manufacturing Database. Panel (b) reports the same statistic from the Census data from Jan-1992 to Dec-2018. Both graphs include non-linear trends before and after 2005. I estimate separate trends as Carreras-Valle (2021) suggests that 2005 is when the trend reversal occurs.

B WIOD Coverage

Figure OA.9: World Input Output Table

			Input use & value added							Final use			Total use
			Country 1			⋯	Country J			Country 1	⋯	Country J	
			Industry 1	⋯	Industry S	⋯	Industry 1	⋯	Industry S				
Intermediate inputs supplied	Country 1	Industry 1	Z_{11}^{11}	⋯	Z_{11}^{1S}	⋯	Z_{1J}^{11}	⋯	Z_{1J}^{1S}	F_{11}^{1}	⋯	F_{1J}^{1}	Y_1^1
		⋯	⋯	Z_{11}^{rs}	⋯	⋯	⋯	Z_{1J}^{rs}	⋯	⋯	⋯	⋯	⋯
		Industry S	Z_{11}^{S1}	⋯	Z_{11}^{SS}	⋯	Z_{1J}^{S1}	⋯	Z_{1J}^{SS}	F_{11}^{S}	⋯	F_{1J}^{S}	Y_1^S
	⋯	⋯	⋯	⋯	⋯	Z_{ij}^{rs}	⋯	⋯	⋯	⋯	F_{ij}^{r}	⋯	Y_i^r
	Country J	Industry 1	Z_{J1}^{11}	⋯	Z_{J1}^{1S}	⋯	Z_{JJ}^{11}	⋯	Z_{JJ}^{1S}	F_{J1}^{1}	⋯	F_{JJ}^{1}	Y_J^1
		⋯	⋯	Z_{J1}^{rs}	⋯	⋯	⋯	Z_{JJ}^{rs}	⋯	⋯	⋯	⋯	⋯
		Industry S	Z_{J1}^{S1}	⋯	Z_{J1}^{SS}	⋯	Z_{JJ}^{S1}	⋯	Z_{JJ}^{SS}	F_{J1}^{S}	⋯	F_{JJ}^{S}	Y_J^S
Value added			VA_1^1	⋯	VA_1^S	VA_j^s	VA_J^1	⋯	VA_J^S				
Gross output			Y_1^1	⋯	Y_1^S	Y_j^s	Y_J^1	⋯	Y_J^S	⋯			

Note: The figure shows a schematic of the structure of the World Input-Output Database.

Table OA.2: Countries

Country			
Australia	Denmark	Ireland	Poland
Austria	Spain	Italy	Portugal
Belgium	Estonia	Japan	Romania
Bulgaria	Finland	Republic of Korea	Russian Federation
Brazil	France	Lithuania	Slovakia
Canada	United Kingdom	Luxembourg	Slovenia
Switzerland	Greece	Latvia	Sweden
China	Croatia	Mexico	Turkey
Cyprus	Hungary	Malta	Taiwan
Czech Republic	Indonesia	Netherlands	United States
Germany	India	Norway	Rest of the World

Table OA.3: Industries

Industry	Industry
Crop and animal production	Wholesale trade
Forestry and logging	Retail trade
Fishing and aquaculture	Land transport and transport via pipelines
Mining and quarrying	Water transport
Manufacture of food products	Air transport
Manufacture of textiles	Warehousing and support activities for transportation
Manufacture of wood and of products of wood and cork	Postal and courier activities
Manufacture of paper and paper products	Accommodation and food service activities
Printing and reproduction of recorded media	Publishing activities
Manufacture of coke and refined petroleum products	Motion picture
Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products	Telecommunications
Manufacture of basic pharmaceutical products and pharmaceutical preparations	Computer programming
Manufacture of rubber and plastic products	Financial service activities
Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products	Insurance
Manufacture of basic metals	Activities auxiliary to financial services and insurance activities
Manufacture of fabricated metal products	Real estate activities
Manufacture of computer	Legal and accounting activities
Manufacture of electrical equipment	Architectural and engineering activities
Manufacture of machinery and equipment n.e.c.	Scientific research and development
Manufacture of motor vehicles	Advertising and market research
Manufacture of other transport equipment	Other professiona activities
Manufacture of furniture	Administrative and support service activities
Repair and installation of machinery and equipment	Public administration and defence
Electricity	Education
Water collection	Human health and social work activities
Sewerage	Other service activities
Construction	Activities of households as employers
Wholesale and retail trade and repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies

C Inventory Adjustment

Antràs et al. (2012) define the measure of upstreamness based on the Input-Output tables. This measure implicitly assumes the contemporaneity between production and use of output. This is often not the case in empirical applications since firms may buy inputs and store them to use them in subsequent periods. This implies that, before computing the upstreamness measure, one has to correct for this possible time mismatch.

The WIOD data provides two categories of use for these instances: net changes in capital and net changes in inventories. These categories are treated like final consumption, meaning

that the data reports which country but not which industry within that country absorbs this share of output.

The WIOD data reports as Z_{ijt}^{rs} the set of inputs used in t by sector s in country j from sector r in country i, independently of whether they were bought at t or in previous periods. Furthermore, output in the WIOD data includes the part that is stored, namely

$$Y_{it}^{r} = \sum_{s}\sum_{j} Z_{ijt}^{rs} + \sum_{j} F_{ijt}^{r} + \sum_{j} \Delta N_{ijt}^{r}. \tag{OA.1}$$

As discussed above the variables reporting net changes in inventories and capital are not broken down by industry, i.e. the data contains ΔN_{ijt}^{r}, not ΔN_{ijt}^{rs}.

This characteristic of the data poses a set of problems, particularly when computing bilateral upstreamness. First and foremost, including net changes in inventories in the final consumption variables may result in negative final consumption whenever the net change is negative and large. This cannot happen since it would imply that there are negative elements of the F vector when computing

$$U = \hat{Y}^{-1}[I - \mathcal{A}]^{-2}F.$$

However, simply removing the net changes from the F vector implies that the tables are no longer balanced, which is also problematic. By the definition of output in equation OA.1, it may be the case that the sum of inputs is larger than output. When this is the case $\sum_i \sum_r a_{ij}^{rs} > 1$, which is a necessary condition for the convergence result, as discussed in the Methodology section.

To solve these problems I apply the inventory adjustment suggested by Antràs et al. (2012). It boils down to reducing output by the change of inventories. This procedure, however, assumes inventory use. In particular, as stated above, the data reports ΔN_{ijt}^{r} but not ΔN_{ijt}^{rs}. For this reason, the latter is imputed via a proportionality assumption. Namely, if sector s in country j uses half of the output that industry r in country i sells to country j for input usages, then half of the net changes in inventories will be assumed to have been used by industry s. Formally:

$$\Delta N_{ijt}^{rs} = \frac{Z_{ijt}^{rs}}{\sum_s Z_{ijt}^{rs}} \Delta N_{ijt}^{r}.$$

Given the inputed vector of ΔN_{ijt}^{rs}, the output of industries is corrected as

$$\tilde{Y}_{ijt}^{rs} = Y_{ijt}^{rs} - \Delta N_{ijt}^{rs}.$$

Finally, whenever necessary, Value Added is also adjusted so that the columns of the I-O tables still sum to the corrected gross output.

These corrections ensure that the necessary conditions for the matrix convergence are always satisfied. I apply these corrections to compute network measures while I use output as reported when used as an outcome.

D Descriptive Statistics

This section provides additional descriptive statistics on the World Input-Output Database (WIOD) data.

Upstreamness

Table OA.4: Highest and Lowest Upstreamness Industries

Industry	Upstreamness
Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies	1
Human health and social work activities	1.14
Activities of households as employers	1.16
Education	1.22
Public administration and defence	1.22
Accommodation and food service activities	1.66
⋮	⋮
Construction	3.96
Manufacture of wood and of products of wood and cork, except furniture	4.22
Manufacture of fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment	4.27
Manufacture of machinery and equipment n.e.c.	4.28
Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products	4.39
Mining and quarrying	4.52
Manufacture of basic metals	5.13

Note: The table displays the top and bottom of the upstreamness distribution. This is computed by averaging within industry, across country, and time: $U^r = \frac{1}{T}\frac{1}{I}\sum_t^T \sum_i^I U_{it}^r$.

Destination Shares The distribution of destination shares is computed as described in the methodology section. Table OA.5 reports the summary statistics of the destination shares for all industries and all periods. Importantly, the distribution is very skewed and dominated by the domestic share. On average 61% of sales are consumed locally. Importantly, the median export share is .16% and the 99^{th} percentile is 12%. These statistics suggest that there is limited scope for diversification across destinations.

Table OA.5: Destination Shares Summary Statistics

	count	mean	sd	min	max	p25	p50	p90	p95	p99
destination share	1522475	.0227	.1029	3.33e-13	.9999	.0004	.0017	.026	.0659	.7143
domestic share	34632	.6146	.2744	.0001	.9999	.4176	.6674	.9442	.9793	.9974
foreign destination share	1487843	.0089	.0273	3.33e-13	.962	.0003	.0016	.0199	.0418	.1224

Note: The table displays the summary statistics of the sales destination shares. Shares equal to 0 and 1 have been excluded. The latter have been excluded because they arise whenever an industry has 0 output. No industry has an actual share of 1.


Degree Distributions After calculating the input requirement matrix $\mathcal{A}$, whose elements are $a_{ij}^{rs} = Z_{ij}^{rs}/Y_j^s$. One can compute the industry level in and outdegree

$$indegree_i^r = \sum_i \sum_r a_{ij}^{rs}, \tag{OA.2}$$

$$outdegree_i^r = \sum_j \sum_s a_{ij}^{rs}. \tag{OA.3}$$

The indegree measures the fraction of gross output attributed to inputs (note that $indegree_i^r = 1 - va_i^r$ where va_i^r is the value added share).
The weighted outdegree is defined as the sum over all using industries of the fraction of gross output of industry r in country i customers that can be attributed to industry r in country i. This measure ranges between 0, if the sector does not supply any inputs to other industries, and $S * J$, which is the total number of industries in the economy if industry r in country i is the sole supplier of all industries. In the data, the average weighted outdegree is .52.
The distributions of these two measures are in Figure OA.10.

Figure OA.10: Degree Distributions




(a) Indegree (b) Outdegree

Note: The figure depicts the distributions of the indegree and outdegree across all sectors and years in the WIOD data.

In the WIOD sample, industries' outdegree positively correlates with upstreamness, which suggests that industries higher in production chains serve a larger number (or a higher fraction) of downstream sectors. This relationship is shown in Figure OA.11.

Figure OA.11: Outdegree and Sales HHI




(a) Outdegree and Upstreamness

(b) HHI of sales and Upstreamness

Note: the figure plots the binscatter of industries' outdegree and upstreamness and of the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index of sales and upstreamness, controlling for country-industry fixed effects.

Demand Shocks and Output Growth Volatility by Upstreamness Figure OA.12 plots the binscatter of the standard deviation of demand shocks and output growth against the average upstreamness of each sector. The standard deviation is computed within country-sector across time. Similarly, Upstreamness is average within country-sector over time.

Figure OA.12: Demand Shocks and Output Growth Volatility by Upstreamness



(a) Demand Shocks Volatility

(b) Output Growth Volatility


Note: The graph shows the binscatter of the standard deviation of demand shocks and output growth within country-industry across time versus the industry average upstreamness across time.

Inventories In the model presented in this paper, the potential amplification is driven by procyclical inventory adjustment. The WIOD data does not provide industry-specific inventory stock or change, eliminating the possibility of a direct test of the mechanism.

To provide partial evidence of the behavior of inventories, I use NBER CES Manufacturing Industry and the US Census data. I compute the parameter $\alpha = I_t/\mathbb{E}_t D_{t+1}$ as $\alpha_t = I_t/D_{t+1}$, which produces the distributions shown in Figure OA.13. [34]

[34] I drop outliers of the α distribution, specifically observation with an annual $\alpha > 3$ and a monthly $\alpha > 5$,

Figure OA.13: Distribution of α




(a) Distribution of α - NBER CES

(b) Distribution of α - US Census

Note: The graph shows the distribution of $\alpha_t = I_t/Y_{t+1}$ across the 54 years and 473 industries in the NBER CES Manufacturing Industry data in the left panel and across the Naics 3-digit industries since January 1992 from the US Census.

The definition of the I firms problem in the model implies a constant inventory-to-future sales ratio governed by α. This suggests that inventories are a linear function of sales. Figure OA.14 shows the augmented component-plus-residual plot of the end-of-period stock of inventories as a function of current sales (the same picture arises for next-period sales). The underlying regression includes time and sector fixed effects. The graph is useful for detecting deviations from linearity in the relationship.

Figure OA.14: Inventories and Sales



(a) Inventories and Sales - NBER CES

(b) Inventories and Sales - US Census

Note: The figure depicts the augmented component-plus-residual plot of the regression of inventories over sales, including time and industry fixed effects. The black line represents the linear fit of the model. The grey line is a locally weighed smoothing fit. If the data presented significant deviations from linearity the two lines would be very different.

Figure OA.14 suggests that the linearity assumption is very close to the data. The function

which are both in the 99th percentile of the distribution.

deviates from linearity only at high sales deviations (recall the estimated model has two-way fixed effects). This suggests that the inventory-to-sales ratio is mostly constant, other than in particularly high sales periods when it starts to decline.

Table OA.6 provides the correlation between sector position and inventory sales ratios. The two measures are positively correlated, which suggests that, in the data, more-upstream sectors tend to hold a larger fraction of future sales as inventories.

Table OA.6: Inventories and Upstreamness

	(1) $\alpha^r_{i,t}$	(2) $\alpha^r_{i,t}$
$U^r_{i,t}$	0.0121***	0.0241**
	(0.00355)	(0.0106)
Constant	0.0783***	0.0428
	(0.0108)	(0.0313)
Industry FE	No	Yes
N	210	210
R^2	0.0524	0.863

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: This table shows the results of the estimation of α against upstreamness. Column (1) reports the result of the OLS estimate while Column (2) includes industry fixed effects. change in sales.

E Test of Uncorrelatedness of Instruments

As discussed in the main text, the identifying assumption for the validity of the shift share design is conditional independence of shocks and potential outcomes. Since this assumption cannot be tested, I provide evidence that the shares and the shocks are uncorrelated to alleviate endogeneity concerns. I test the conditional correlation by regressing the shares on future shocks and industry fixed effects. Formally

$$\xi^r_{ijt} = \beta \hat{\eta}_{jt+1} + \gamma^r_{it} + \epsilon^r_{ijt}.$$

The estimation results reported in Table OA.7 suggest that the two are uncorrelated.

Table OA.7: Test of Uncorrelatedness of Instruments

	ξ^r_{ijt}
$\hat{\eta}_{jt+1}(i)$	-0.0121
	(0.00762)
N	1517824
R^2	0.00284

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

F Additional Results - Section 4

Table OA.8: Industry Output Growth, Price Indices, and Demand Shocks

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y^r_{it}$	(2) $\Delta \ln Y^r_{it}$	(3) $\Delta \ln P^r_{it}$	(4) $\Delta \ln P^r_{it}$
$\hat{\eta}^r_{it}$	0.598***	0.332***	0.433***	0.231***
	(0.00673)	(0.00977)	(0.00535)	(0.00769)
Constant	0.0841***	0.0820***	0.0846***	0.0833***
	(0.000874)	(0.000861)	(0.00126)	(0.00125)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	Yes	No	Yes
N	32371	32371	31911	31911
R^2	0.428	0.492	0.554	0.617

Cluster bootstrapped standard errors in brackets.

Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry × country level.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: The table shows the regressions of the growth rate of industry output and the changes in the sectoral price index on the weighted demand shocks that the industry receives. Columns 1 and 2 regress output growth rates on demand shocks with industry and time fixed effects. Columns 3 and 4 show the same regression with the change in the deflator as the outcome. This is computed by taking the ratio of the I-O tables at current and previous year's prices to obtain the growth rate of the deflator from year to year.

Adão et al. (2019) Inference

I follow Adão et al. (2019) (AKM) to compute the standard errors in the main regression 7. The practical difficulty in doing so in this context is that I am interested in interaction coefficients between dummies that split the sample and the shift-share regressor. I solve this problem by estimating the regression separately for each upstreamness bin. Since the main specification contains country×industry fixed effects, I first filter the whole sample through the fixed effects


$$\Delta \log Y^r_{it} = \delta^r_i + \varepsilon^r_{it}.$$

In the second step I regress $\mathbb{1}\{U^r_{it-1} \in [j, j+1]\}\hat{\eta}^r_{it}$ on the set of fixed effects δ^r_i and the other shocks $\mathbb{1}\{U^r_{it-1} \notin [j, j+1]\}\hat{\eta}^r_{it}$ to obtain the residuals $\hat{v}^r_{it}$. Finally, I estimate the following regression of the residualized data for each upstreamness bin

$$\hat{\varepsilon}^r_{it} = \beta_j \sum_{j=1}^{6} \mathbb{1}\{U^r_{it-1} \in [j, j+1]\}\hat{v}^r_{it} + \epsilon^r_{it}.$$

This allows the use of the routine provided by AKM to compute the standard errors of the coefficient of interest. When estimating these empirical models I obtain standard errors which are effectively 0 for all estimates. This is a relatively well-known problem with the routine whenever the standard errors are high dimensional and potentially collinear. If I do not include the demeaning step above, I obtain non-zero standard errors albeit still very small. I show the results in Figure OA.15 together with the results of regression 7 for the same sample period, with and without fixed effects.

Figure OA.15: AKM estimates



Note: the figure shows the AKM estimates for the main result.

If instead, I estimate the last step separately by bin I obtain similar estimates but the standard errors for bin 6 are now larger. The different estimates of each bin are statistically different from one another. These are summarized in Table OA.9.


Table OA.9: AKM Estimates

Upstreamness bin	1	2	3	4	5	6
Main estimate	0.4682	0.5347	0.6441	0.75	0.8941	1.188
	(0.0116)	(0.0119)	(0.0108)	(0.0204)	(0.0625)	(0.1989)
AKM	0.4691	0.5437	0.6576	0.7831	0.9308	1.1321
	(0.0003)	(0.0024)	(0.0013)	(0.0092)	(0.0099)	(0.7938)

Lastly, the fundamental issue highlighted by AKM is that the structure of the instrument

is such that industries with correlated sales shares experience similar shocks, which implies standard errors that are smaller than the correct ones. The closest clustering approach to solve this problem is to cluster at the origin-country level. The median domestic share in the portfolio composition is 67%, so clustering by origin country is tantamount to clustering at the level of the main source of variation. This is displayed in Figure OA.16, the results are unchanged.


Figure OA.16: Main Result with Producing-Country Clustering



Note: the figure shows the result of regression 7 when using producing country clustering, in the spirit of AKM.


Permutation Inference I further study the sensitivity of this result via the permutation inference suggested by AKM. Formally I re-assign with replacement the shifters η_{jt} 10000 times. For each permutation I estimate both equation 7 and its continuous interaction version: $\Delta \log Y_{it}^r = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \hat{\eta}_{it}^r + \beta_2 U_{it-1}^r \hat{\eta}_{it}^r + \nu_{it}^r$. Note, importantly that since these permutations maintain the share distribution structure they are free of the mechanical overrejection highlighted by AKM. Figures OA.17 and OA.18 show the results. Figures OA.17 is the equivalent of Figure 1 where the box plots show the distribution of β_j for each upstreamness bin. The point denoted with T shows the estimated effect under the true assignment, as reported in Figure 1. Figure OA.17 plots the distribution of $\hat{\beta}_2$ together with the value under the true assignment process. The permutation p-value is 0.0004.

Figure OA.17: Permutation Tests - Binned Regression



Note: the figure shows the results of the permutation inference. Formally, I generate permutation of $\hat{\eta}_{it}^r$ by re-assigning with replacement the destination shifters $\hat{\eta}_{jt}$ 10000 times. For each permutation, I estimate equation 7 and plot the distribution of estimated coefficients for each upstreamness bin. The points marked by T show the estimated effects under the true assignment, as shown in Figure 1.

Figure OA.18: Permutation Tests - Continuous Interaction Regression



Note: the figure shows the results of the permutation inference. Formally, I generate permutation of $\hat{\eta}_{it}^r$ by re-assigning with replacement the destination shifters $\hat{\eta}_{jt}$ 10000 times. For each permutation I estimate $\Delta \log Y_{it}^r = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \hat{\eta}_{it}^r + \beta_2 U_{it-1}^r \hat{\eta}_{it}^r + \nu_{it}^r$ and plot the distribution of the estimated $\hat{\beta}_2$. The treatment line shows the estimated $\hat{\beta}_2$ under the true assignment. The p-value is computed as the mass to the right of the true assignment $\hat{\beta}_2$.

Alternative Demand Shocks

Instrumenting Demand Shocks with Government Consumption In the empirical specification in Section 4.1, I use the variation arising from destination-time specific changes in foreign aggregate demand. One might worry that if two countries i and j trade intensely,

this measure could be plagued by reverse causality, such that if large sectors grow in country i they could affect demand in country j. To further alleviate these concerns, in this section, I use foreign government consumption as an instrument.


More specifically, the WIOD data contains information about the value of purchases of the government of country j of goods of industry r from country i in period t. Denote this G^r_{ijt}. I apply the same steps as in Section 3.2, replacing consumer purchases with government ones. This procedure allows me to create a measure $\hat{\eta}^{rG}_{it} = \sum_j \xi^r_{ij}\hat{\eta}^G_{jt}$. With the understanding that, as in the main results, the estimated destination-time shifter $\hat{\eta}^G_{jt}$ is estimated by excluding all purchases of goods from country i or industry r.

I use this instrument in a control function approach. Formally, I estimate $\eta^r_{it} = \beta\hat{\eta}^{rG}_{it} + \epsilon^r_{it}$ and predict the residual $\hat{\epsilon}^r_{it}$. I then estimate equation 7, including the interactions with the estimated residuals.

$$\Delta \log(Y^r_{it}) = \sum_j \beta_j \mathbb{1}\{U^r_{it-1} \in [j, j+1]\}\hat{\eta}^r_{it} + \gamma_j \mathbb{1}\{U^r_{it-1} \in [j, j+1]\}\hat{\epsilon}^r_{it} + \nu^r_{it}, \qquad j = \{1, \ldots, 6\}.$$

As a further check, I allow for heterogeneity in the relationship between the consumer and government shocks. In particular, I estimate separately for each upstreamness bin $\hat{\varepsilon}^{rn}_{it}$ as the residual of the regression $\eta^r_{it} = \beta^n\hat{\eta}^{rG}_{it} + \varepsilon^{rn}_{it}$ if $U^r_{it-1} \in [n, n+1]$. I then estimate again equation 7, controlling for all $\hat{\varepsilon}^{rn}_{it}$. Figure OA.19 shows the estimated coefficient of interest in the two models.

Figure OA.19: Effect of Demand Shocks on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level - Government Consumption



(a) Single First Stage

(b) Heterogeneous First Stage

Note: The figure shows the marginal effect of demand shocks on industry output changes by industry upstreamness level in the control function models. Panel (a) shows the single first stage result, while panel (b) shows the results when the first stage is heterogeneous by upstreamness bin. The vertical bands illustrate the 95% confidence intervals around the estimates. The regression includes country-industry fixed effects, and the standard errors are cluster bootstrapped at the country-industry level. The dotted horizontal line represents the average coefficient. Note that due to relatively few observations above 6, all values above it have been included in the $U \in [6, 7]$ category. The regression results are reported in Table OA.10.

Both approaches confirm the main results qualitatively and quantitatively. Allowing for heterogeneous dependence of demand shocks to government purchase shocks delivers estimates

almost identical to the main result in their shape.

Table OA.10: Effect of Demand Shocks on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level - Government Consumption Instrument

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(2) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$
Upstreamness in [1,2]	0.455***	0.345***
	(0.0179)	(0.0141)
Upstreamness in [2,3]	0.462***	0.423***
	(0.0195)	(0.0143)
Upstreamness in [3,4]	0.520***	0.528***
	(0.0176)	(0.0133)
Upstreamness in [4,5]	0.551***	0.616***
	(0.0277)	(0.0219)
Upstreamness in [5,6]	0.640***	0.778***
	(0.0745)	(0.0643)
Upstreamness in [6,∞)	0.883***	1.079***
	(0.193)	(0.193)
First Stage Residual U in [1,2]	0.0461***	
	(0.0174)	
First Stage Residual U in [2,3]	0.157***	
	(0.0236)	
First Stage Residual U in [3,4]	0.230***	
	(0.0217)	
First Stage Residual U in [4,5]	0.326***	
	(0.0310)	
First Stage Residual U in [5,6]	0.463***	
	(0.0908)	
First Stage Residual U in [6,∞)	0.503**	
	(0.208)	
First Stage Residual		0.233***
		(0.0120)
Constant	0.0814***	0.0816***
	(0.0000958)	(0.0000900)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes
N	31653	31441
R^2	0.433	0.438

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: This table displays the results of the regression of the growth rate of industry output on instrumented demand shocks interacted with dummies taking value 1 if the upstreamness level of the industry is in a given interval, e.g. [1,2]. Column 1 shows the results for the case with a single first stage. Column 2 displays the result when using multiple first stages, in other words allowing for a different relationship between instrument and demand shocks by upstreamness bin. Both columns including country-industry pair fixed effects and standard errors are clustered at the country-industry pair level.

China Syndrome Shocks


The two approaches used so far have the same structure of final demand shocks generated through the I-O exposure and destination-specific aggregate changes. One might worry that the finding described above could be due to using potentially related statistics of the network (upstreamness and exposure). To test this, I use the China shock in Acemoglu et al. (2016) as a proxy for changes in US demand. The idea is that some US sectors suffered a drop in their domestic demand as Chinese import competition intensified. Note that this is an imperfect proxy for final demand as it confounds demand from consumers and other firms.

Following Autor et al. (2013), I instrument the change in export from China to the US with the change from China to 8 other large economies. As I am using only US data, I can employ the NBER CES Manufacturing dataset, where I directly observe sales, inventories, and value added, allowing me to build output as sales plus the change in inventories. The merged sample consists of 312 NAICS industries for 21 years from 1991 to 2011. I estimate the regression in eq. 7 with two key differences. First, I estimate it with the growth rate of both value added (as in Acemoglu et al. (2016)) and output. Second, the US data has less than 1% of industries with upstreamness above 4, hence I aggregate all industries with upstreamness above 3 in the last group so that β_3 is for all industries r such that $U^r \in (3, \infty)$. Lastly, I apply the network transformation to the China shock to account for indirect exposure. As in the previous section, I use the control function approach to instrument the endogenous shock. The main results are plotted in the Online Appendix in Figure OA.20 and reported in Table OA.11.


As in the previous analysis, I find a positive gradient in the output growth response to the shock, meaning that output elasticities are increasing in upstreamness. These estimates are much noisier than the ones on the WIOD data, but the slope is still statistically significant. Quantitatively, for a given one standard deviation increase in the shock, increasing upstreamness by 1 implies a 4.7% increase in the growth rate of output and a 4.4% increase in the growth rate of value added. These magnitudes are comparable to the ones obtained by Acemoglu et al. (2016). They report that direct exposure to a one std. dev. increase of the shock to generate a 3.4% drop in value added while indirect exposure implies a 7.6% drop. I find that for the 3 upstreamness bins, the same figures are 0.5%, 6.7%, and 16.6%. These findings suggest that, underlying the large indirect effect, is strong heterogeneity in the output elasticities, depending on industries' positions in the supply chain.[35]

[35] In Figure OA.21 in Online Appendix F, I report the results of the same procedure using Acemoglu et al. (2016) federal spending shocks as the metric of changes in demand. This exercise confirms a positive gradient over upstreamness in the output response to changes in demand.

Figure OA.20: Effect of China Shock on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level



(a) Output Growth




(b) Value Added Growth


Note: The figure shows the marginal effect of the China shock on industry output changes by industry upstreamness level by the control function models. I apply the network transformation of the original shock to account for indirect exposure. Following Autor et al. (2013) I instrument the change in US imports from China with the change in other advanced economies. The vertical bands illustrate the 95% confidence intervals around the estimates. The regression includes country-industry fixed effects and the standard errors are cluster bootstrapped at the country-industry level. The dotted horizontal line represents the average coefficient. Note that due to relatively few observations above 4, all values above it have been included in the $U \in (3, 4)$ category. These estimates report the output and value added growth changes in response to a 1 standard deviation change in the networked China shock. The regression results are reported in Table OA.11.

Federal Spending Shocks

Figure OA.21: Effect of Federal Spending Shock on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level



(a) Output Growth



(b) Value Added Growth

Note: The figure shows the marginal effect of the federal spending shock on industry output changes by industry upstreamness level by the control function models. I use the changes in federal spending from Acemoglu et al. (2016) and apply the network transformation through the Leontief inverse so that changes in federal spending are accounted for both directly and indirectly. The vertical bands illustrate the 95% confidence intervals around the estimates. The regression includes country-industry fixed effects and the standard errors are cluster bootstrapped at the country-industry level. The dotted horizontal line represents the average coefficient. Note that due to relatively few observations above 4, all values above it have been included in the $U \in (3, 4)$ category. The regression results are reported in Table OA.11.

Table OA.11: Effect of China Shock on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y_t^r$	(2) $\Delta \ln VA_t^r$	(3) $\Delta \ln Y_t^r$	(4) $\Delta \ln VA_t^r$
Upstreamness in [1,2]	0.000300	0.000216		
	(0.00176)	(0.00172)		
Upstreamness in [2,3]	0.00782	0.0122		
	(0.00599)	(0.00806)		
Upstreamness in (3,∞)	0.0257***	0.0306**		
	(0.00979)	(0.0124)		
First Stage Residual U in [1,2]	0.000656	0.000206		
	(0.00180)	(0.00161)		
First Stage Residual U in [2,3]	-0.00161	-0.00752		
	(0.00553)	(0.00770)		
First Stage Residual U in (3, ∞)	-0.0255***	-0.0308**		
	(0.00830)	(0.0128)		
Upstreamness in [1,2]			0.205***	0.210***
			(0.0572)	(0.0645)
Upstreamness in [2,3]			0.309*	0.367**
			(0.160)	(0.170)
Upstreamness in (3,∞)			3.604**	3.200***
			(1.430)	(1.042)
Constant	0.0331***	0.0355***	0.0299***	0.0332***
	(0.00207)	(0.00236)	(0.00223)	(0.00242)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Time FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	5871	6180	5871	6180
R^2	0.266	0.182	0.261	0.176

Cluster bootstrapped standard errors in brackets.


Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry level.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: The Table reports the results of estimating equation 7 using the China shock IV in Autor et al. (2013). I instrument the change in US imports from China with the change in other advanced economies. I apply the network transformation to the shocks to account for indirect linkages and standardize them so that the coefficients are responses to a 1 standard deviation of the shocks. I estimate the model with the control function approach, first estimating the endogenous variable on the instrument and fixed effects and controlling for the residual in the second stage. Both columns include producing industry and time fixed effects. Column 1 estimates the model using as an outcome the growth rate of output while column 2 uses the growth rate of value added. Columns 3 and 4 report similar regressions using the federal spending shock in Acemoglu et al. (2016).

Inventory Response - Government Consumption Shocks

Figure OA.22: Effect of Demand Shocks on Inventory Changes by Upstreamness Level - Government Consumption Instrument



Note: The figure shows the marginal effect of demand shocks on industry inventory changes by industry upstreamness level. The dashed horizontal line represents the average coefficient. The vertical bands illustrate the 95% confidence intervals around the estimates. The regression includes country-industry fixed effects, and the standard errors are cluster-bootstrapped at the country-industry level. Note that due to relatively few observations above 7, all values above 7 have been included in the $U \in [6, 7]$ category. The full regression results are reported in the first column of Table A.2.

G Robustness Checks

In this section, I provide a set of robustness checks. First, I apply the correction proposed by Borusyak and Hull (2020) to correct for potential omitted variable bias. To compare my estimates with existing ones in the recent literature I re-estimate the reduced form result after discretizing the network data. I also reproduce the main result in the ordinal, rather than cardinal, binning, and under alternative fixed effects models to estimate the final demand shifters. I conclude by showing that the results are robust to estimation on deflated data, to account for potential price effects, using time-varying aggregation shares and controlling for past output as suggested by Acemoglu et al. (2016).

Re-centered Instrument

In a recent paper Borusyak and Hull (2020) show that when using shift-share design, there is a risk of omitted variable bias arising from potentially non-random shares. They also suggest to re-center the instrument to prevent such bias by using the average counterfactual shock.

I apply this methodology by permuting N=1000 times, within year, the distribution of destination shocks $\hat{\eta}_{jt}$. After the permutation, I compute the average for each treated unit and demean the original demand shock to create $\tilde{\eta}^r_{it} = \hat{\eta}^r_{it} - \mu^r_{it}$. Where $\mu^r_{it} \equiv \frac{1}{N}\sum_n \sum_j \xi^r_{ij}\tilde{\eta}_{jt}$ and $\tilde{\eta}^r_{it}$ is the permuted shock. I then re-estimate the main specification in equation 7 with the

re-centered shocks. The results, shown in Table OA.12 are unchanged both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Table OA.12: Re-centered Instrument Estimation

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(2) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$
Upstreamness in [1,2]	0.475***	0.473***
	(0.0125)	(0.0125)
Upstreamness in [2,3]	0.527***	0.525***
	(0.0127)	(0.0126)
Upstreamness in [3,4]	0.637***	0.635***
	(0.0115)	(0.0114)
Upstreamness in [4,5]	0.716***	0.714***
	(0.0209)	(0.0209)
Upstreamness in [5,6]	0.869***	0.868***
	(0.0635)	(0.0633)
Upstreamness in [6, ∞)	1.201***	1.204***
	(0.173)	(0.174)
Constant	0.0673***	0.0674***
	(0.0000819)	(0.0000824)
Country-Industry FE	Yes	Yes
N	31921	31921
R^2	0.364	0.364

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: The Table shows the results of the regression in equation 7 in column 1 and the re-centered instrument approach in Borusyak and Hull (2020). The latter is done by computing permutations of the shocks to demean the shift-share shock. Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry-country level.

Discrete Network

The empirical analysis in this paper is applied to a network in which the graph is weighted and directed. This is possible because I use aggregate data from Input-Output tables. More granular production network data often only allows the construction of unweighted graphs. To compare my empirical results to previous work I, therefore, discretize my network so that I only observe connections to be ones or zeros and re-estimate my analysis.

Discretizing the network requires the choice of a cutoff $\tilde{a}$ such that, if the connection between industries i and j is given by the element a_{ij} of the input requirement matrix, the discrete connection is encoded as a 1 only if $a_{ij} \geq \tilde{a}$. Similarly, to fully compare my results to the ones of Carvalho et al. (2020), I also discretize the shock by transforming the destination-specific


changes as follows

$$\tilde{\eta}_{jt} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } \eta_{jt} \leq \eta^* \\ 0 & \text{if } \eta_{jt} \in (\eta^*, \eta^{**}) \\ missing & \text{if } \eta_{jt} \geq \eta^{**} \end{cases} \tag{OA.4}$$

with $\eta^* < 0 < \eta^{**}$. I do so because Carvalho et al. (2020) have a large negative shock, therefore this encoding allows me to consider as treated the destinations receiving a large negative shock. I use as control destinations with a shock around zero and I drop the ones with a large positive shock. The negative encoding is to preserve the sign of the shock so that the result is directly comparable with the ones in Figure 1. I provide extensive robustness checks on both $\tilde{a}$ and the thresholds η^* and η^{**}. As shown in Figure OA.23 I recover the result in Carvalho et al. (2020) such that these shocks have ever smaller effects when moving upstream in the production chain. Throughout I maintain $\eta^{**} = 0.05$.

A result consistent with the one in Section 4 would be a positive coefficient, increasing in upstreamness. Conversely, if dissipation forces were to dominate, we would expect a positive effect which is decreasing (towards zero) in upstreamness. As shown in Figure OA.23 most of the discrete network estimates are decreasing in upstreamness. The takeaway from this robustness test is that discretizing (or observing only an unweighted version of) the network can significantly alter the conclusions on how shocks propagate along production chains. I attribute the difference between the results in the weighted and unweighted graphs to the way measurement error moves with upstreamness.

Figure OA.23: Effect of Demand Shocks on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level - Discrete Network




Note: The figure shows the marginal effect of demand shocks on industry output changes by industry upstreamness level in the control function models. Every line represents the result of a regression with thresholds $\tilde{\alpha} = \{.01, .05, .1, .2\}, \eta^* = \{-0.2, -.15, -0.1, -0.05, 0\}, \eta^{**} = .05$. Note that due to relatively few observations above 6, all values above it have been included in the $U \in [6, 7]$ category.

Downstreamness

The conceptual framework built in Section 5 suggests that upstreamness is the key determinant of the inventory amplification across industries. A natural test is to check that alternative measures of positions do not have the same ability to explain the observed variation. Following Antràs and Chor (2018) I compute the measure of downstreamness which counts the average number of production stages embodied in a sector's output. Formally, following Fally (2012) this is defined recursively as $D_i^r = 1 \sum_j \sum_s a_{ji}^{sr} D_j^s$. Intuitively the sum of upstreamness and downstreamness measures the full length of a supply chain from pure value added to final consumption. As a consequence, this is not necessarily negatively correlated with upstreamness since more complex goods might feature high upstreamness and high downstreamness. To estimate whether downstreamness can account for part of the cross-sectional variation in output responses I split the distribution following the same steps leading to equation 7 and estimate the regression with both interactions of shocks, upstreamness, and downstreamness. The result is displayed in Figure OA.24. I use industries with downstreamness between 1 and 2 as the reference category. The estimation suggests that the inclusion of downstreamness does not change the conclusion on the positive gradient of output responses with upstreamness and that along the downstreamness distribution, there is no significant difference in the estimated responses to demand shocks. The same conclusion holds when using the WIOD inventory change as the outcome.

Figure OA.24: Effect of Demand Shocks on Output Growth and Inventory Changes by Upstreamness and Downstreamness Levels



(a) Output Growth

(b) Changes in Inventories

Note: The figure shows the marginal effect of demand shocks on industry output growth and inventory changes by industry upstreamness and downstreamness levels. The left panel shows the estimation using the demand shocks described in section 3 on output growth while the right panel uses inventory changes as the outcome. The dashed horizontal line represents the average coefficient. The vertical bands illustrate the 95% confidence intervals around the estimates. The regression includes country-industry fixed effects and the standard errors are cluster bootstrapped at the country-industry level. Note that due to relatively few observations above 7, all values above 7 have been included in the $U \in [6, 7]$ category and similarly for the category $D \in [3, 4]$.

Ordinal Effects of Upstreamness

The results presented in section 4 are based on a split of the sample into industries whose upstreamness is between 1 and 2, 2 and 3, and so forth. To confirm that this sample split is not driving the results, I estimate a similar model to the main specification in section 4.1 using ordinal measures from the upstreamness distribution. Namely, I interact the industry-level shocks with dummies taking value 1 if an industry belongs to an upstreamness decile. Formally the estimated model is

$$\Delta \log(Y_{it}^r) = \sum_j \beta_j \mathbb{1}\{U_{it-1}^r \in Q_j\} \hat{\eta}_{it}^r + \nu_{it}^r \quad , j = \{1...10\}, \tag{OA.5}$$

where Q_j denotes the j^{th} deciles of the upstreamness distribution. The results are shown in Table OA.13 in the Appendix. The estimation suggests that moving upstream in production chains increases the responsiveness of output to final demand shocks. The effect increases by 80% when moving from the first to the last decile. This corresponds to moving from 1.17 to 4.37 production stages away from final demand.

As in the main specification, the results suggest that the output response to demand shocks increases with distance from consumption. Ordinally the estimation states that moving from the first to the last decile of the distribution implies an increase in the output response from .47 to .81 of a percentage point. Note that all the results in this section are robust to the inclusion of industry, country, and upstreamness decile fixed effects.

Table OA.13: Effect of Demand Shocks on Output Growth by Upstreamness Decile

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(2) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$
decile 1	0.461***	0.209***
	(0.0303)	(0.0260)
decile 2	0.504***	0.233***
	(0.0178)	(0.0181)
decile 3	0.534***	0.238***
	(0.0202)	(0.0201)
decile 4	0.551***	0.263***
	(0.0203)	(0.0200)
decile 5	0.559***	0.267***
	(0.0209)	(0.0203)
decile 6	0.633***	0.314***
	(0.0193)	(0.0200)
decile 7	0.649***	0.301***
	(0.0212)	(0.0221)
decile 8	0.689***	0.330***
	(0.0213)	(0.0231)
decile 9	0.710***	0.323***
	(0.0239)	(0.0231)
decile 10	0.830***	0.416***
	(0.0301)	(0.0284)
Constant	0.0708***	0.0679***
	(0.000108)	(0.000124)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes
Time FE	No	Yes
N	31921	31921
R^2	0.391	0.442

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: The Table shows the results of the ordinal version of the regression in equation 7. In particular, I estimate a different coefficient for each decile of the upstreamness distribution. Both regressions include producing industry-country fixed effects and column 2 adds time fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry-country level.

Alternative Shifter Estimation

In section 3, I used the fixed effect model to gauge the idiosyncratic demand shocks. Such a model may confound other sources of variation such as supply shocks, along with the object of interest. To investigate this possibility I use an alternative econometric model to extract the demand shocks. Following Kramarz et al. (2020) more closely, I include producer fixed effects:

γ_{it}^{r} is the fixed effect for the producing industry r in country i at time t, namely

$$\Delta f_{kjt}^{s} = \eta_{jt}(i,r) + \gamma_{jt}^{s} + \nu_{kjt}^{s} \quad k \neq i, s \neq r. \tag{OA.6}$$

Where the conditions $k \neq i, s \neq r$ ensure that domestically produced goods used for final consumption are not included in the estimation and neither are the goods within the same sector. The result for the main specification (equation 7) is presented in Table OA.14. The findings confirm the main results in Section 4.1 both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Table OA.14: Effect of Demand shocks by level of Upstreamness - Alternative Shifter Estimation

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^{r}$	(2) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^{r}$	(3) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^{r}$
Upstreamness in [1,2]	0.476***	0.135***	0.192***
	(0.0126)	(0.0151)	(0.0141)
Upstreamness in [2,3]	0.528***	0.160***	0.221***
	(0.0127)	(0.0165)	(0.0151)
Upstreamness in [3,4]	0.638***	0.209***	0.282***
	(0.0116)	(0.0174)	(0.0157)
Upstreamness in [4,5]	0.715***	0.231***	0.329***
	(0.0212)	(0.0237)	(0.0221)
Upstreamness in [5,6]	0.865***	0.363***	0.480***
	(0.0636)	(0.0512)	(0.0537)
Upstreamness in [6,∞)	1.213***	0.568***	0.786***
	(0.169)	(0.167)	(0.178)
Constant	0.0673***	0.0661***	0.0664***
	(0.0000816)	(0.0000788)	(0.0000781)
Time FE	No	Yes	Yes
Level FE	No	No	Yes
Country-Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	31921	31921	31921
R^2	0.364	0.434	0.481

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: The Table shows the results of the regression in equation 7 under the alternative shifter estimation. All regressions include producing industry-country fixed effects and columns 2 and 3 progressively add time fixed effects and upstreamness bin fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry-country level.

Deflated Data

As an additional robustness check, I use the deflated version of the WIOD dataset (see Los et al., 2014) and replicate the entire industry-level empirical analysis to test whether price movements could possibly be responsible for the results discussed above. The results of this check are displayed in Table OA.15 in the Appendix. The findings in section 4.1 are confirmed both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Table OA.15: Effect of Demand Shocks on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level - Deflated Data

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(2) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(3) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$
Upstreamness in [1,2]	0.606***	0.269***	0.264***
	(0.0191)	(0.0205)	(0.0205)
Upstreamness in [2,3]	0.717***	0.339***	0.332***
	(0.0229)	(0.0254)	(0.0253)
Upstreamness in [3,4]	0.852***	0.412***	0.404***
	(0.0198)	(0.0234)	(0.0234)
Upstreamness in [4,5]	0.960***	0.490***	0.486***
	(0.0308)	(0.0314)	(0.0315)
Upstreamness in [5,6]	1.114***	0.633***	0.635***
	(0.0794)	(0.0741)	(0.0757)
Upstreamness in [6,∞)	1.113***	0.846***	0.847***
	(0.285)	(0.253)	(0.256)
Constant	0.0733***	0.0763***	0.0764***
	(0.0000872)	(0.000132)	(0.000131)
Time FE	No	Yes	Yes
Level FE	No	No	Yes
Country-Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	29809	29809	29809
R^2	0.281	0.336	0.351

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: The Table shows the results of the regression in equation 7 on the deflated version of the WIOD Data. All regressions include producing industry-country fixed effects and columns 2 and 3 progressively add time fixed effects and upstreamness bin fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry-country level.

Time Varying Sales Share Aggregation

In the main specification, I use a shift-share instrument in which the shares are fixed using the base year of the sample network data. Here I report the results of estimating equation 7 using the following shocks: $\hat{\eta}_{it}^r = \sum_j \xi_{ijt-1}^r \hat{\eta}_{jt}(i,r)$, where I aggregate using lagged sales share. The results are reported in Table OA.16 and confirm the main results both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Table OA.16: Effect of Demand Shocks on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level - Time Varying Sales Shares

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(2) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(3) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$
Upstreamness in [1,2]	0.478***	0.134***	0.196***
	(0.0127)	(0.0156)	(0.0143)
Upstreamness in [2,3]	0.536***	0.160***	0.229***
	(0.0129)	(0.0171)	(0.0154)
Upstreamness in [3,5]	0.655***	0.210***	0.291***
	(0.0117)	(0.0186)	(0.0165)
Upstreamness in [4,6]	0.736***	0.234***	0.343***
	(0.0215)	(0.0250)	(0.0230)
Upstreamness in [5,6]	0.887***	0.360***	0.491***
	(0.0650)	(0.0543)	(0.0565)
Upstreamness in [6,∞)	1.204***	0.535***	0.802***
	(0.173)	(0.164)	(0.180)
Constant	0.0673***	0.0661***	0.0664***
	(0.0000836)	(0.0000837)	(0.0000823)
Time FE	No	Yes	Yes
Level FE	No	No	Yes
Country-Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	31921	31921	31921
R^2	0.365	0.434	0.481

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: The Table shows the results of the regression in equation 7 using time-varying aggregation via sales share. All regressions include producing industry-country fixed effects and columns 2 and 3 progressively add time fixed effects and upstreamness bin fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the producing industry-country level.

Past Output

Finally, as discussed in previous work studying the effect of demand shocks and their propagation in the network (see Acemoglu et al., 2016), I include lags of the output growth rate. The results of the estimation are shown in Table OA.17. This robustness check confirms the results of the main estimation both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Table OA.17: Effect of Demand Shocks on Output Growth by Upstreamness Level - Output Growth Lags

	(1) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(2) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(3) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(4) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$	(5) $\Delta \ln Y_{it}^r$
Upstreamness in [1,2]	0.475***	0.488***	0.482***	0.456***	0.489***
	(0.0147)	(0.0156)	(0.0154)	(0.0175)	(0.0192)
Upstreamness in [2,3]	0.527***	0.544***	0.555***	0.550***	0.592***
	(0.0168)	(0.0174)	(0.0172)	(0.0212)	(0.0238)
Upstreamness in [3,4]	0.637***	0.653***	0.670***	0.671***	0.739***
	(0.0151)	(0.0154)	(0.0168)	(0.0213)	(0.0238)
Upstreamness in [4,5]	0.716***	0.748***	0.775***	0.813***	0.886***
	(0.0279)	(0.0282)	(0.0287)	(0.0345)	(0.0414)
Upstreamness in [5,6]	0.869***	0.934***	0.949***	0.975***	1.079***
	(0.114)	(0.123)	(0.121)	(0.130)	(0.115)
Upstreamness in [6,∞)	1.201***	1.335***	1.413***	1.392***	1.415***
	(0.128)	(0.144)	(0.145)	(0.148)	(0.148)
$\Delta \ln Y_{it-1}^r$		-0.0637***	-0.0856***	-0.0431**	-0.0616***
		(0.00986)	(0.0122)	(0.0173)	(0.0199)
$\Delta \ln Y_{it-2}^r$			-0.0248**	-0.0422***	-0.0422***
			(0.0118)	(0.0106)	(0.0111)
$\Delta \ln Y_{it-3}^r$				0.00932	-0.00143
				(0.0100)	(0.0103)
$\Delta \ln Y_{it-4}^r$					-0.0298***
					(0.00904)
Constant	0.0673***	0.0860***	0.0963***	0.0969***	0.106***
	(0.000128)	(0.000803)	(0.00181)	(0.00304)	(0.00343)
Country-Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	31921	29077	26390	23843	21503
R^2	0.364	0.415	0.459	0.446	0.451

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: This table contains the results of the regression of industry output growth rates on demand shocks interacted with dummies taking value 1 if the upstreamness level of the industry is in a given interval, e.g. [1,2]. The first column of the table includes the first lag of the dependent variable, and the other columns progressively add lags up $t-4$.

H Omitted Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1. Define the operator $\mathcal{F}_t^n[x_t] = I_n(\mathbb{E}_t[x_{t+1} + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{F}_{t+1}^i[x_{t+1}] - \mathcal{F}_t^i[x_t]])$ with the initial condition $\mathcal{F}_t^0[x_t] = I_0(\mathbb{E}_t[x_{t+1}])$. Further, define $\Delta\mathcal{F}_t^n[x_t] \equiv \mathcal{F}_t^n[x_t] - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^n[x_{t-1}]$.

Then, sectoral output at each stage is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y_t^0 &= D_t^0 + \mathcal{F}_t^0[D_t^0] - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^0[D_t^0] \\
Y_t^1 &= D_t^0 + \mathcal{F}_t^0[D_t^0] - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^0[D_t^0] + \mathcal{F}_t^1[D_t^0] - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^1[D_t^0] \\
Y_t^2 &= D_t^0 + \mathcal{F}_t^0[D_t^0] - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^0[D_t^0] + \mathcal{F}_t^1[D_t^0] - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^1[D_t^0] + \mathcal{F}_t^2[D_t^0] - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^2[D_t^0] \\
&\vdots \\
Y_t^n &= D_t^0 + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \mathcal{F}_t^i[D_t^0] - \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^i[D_t^0] = \\
Y_t^n &= D_t^0 + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \Delta\mathcal{F}_t^i[D_t^0].
\end{aligned}
$$

■

Proof of Proposition 2. I prove the proposition in three steps

a) From Proposition 1, evaluating the derivative at stage 0

$$\frac{\partial Y_t^0}{\partial D_t^0} = 1 + \rho I_0'.$$

At stage 1

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial Y_t^1}{\partial D_t^0} &= 1 + \rho I_0' + \frac{\partial}{\partial D_t^0}\left[\mathcal{F}_t^1\right] = \\
&= 1 + \rho I_0' + \frac{\partial}{\partial D_t^0}\left[I_1(\mathbb{E}_t[D_{t+1}^0 + \mathcal{F}_{t+1}^0 - \mathcal{F}_t^0])\right] = \\
&= 1 + \rho I_0' + I_1'(\rho + \rho^2 I_0' - \rho I_0') = \\
&= 1 + \rho I_0' + \rho I_1'(1 + \rho I_0' - I_0') = 1 + \rho I_0' + \rho I_1'(1 + (\rho - 1) I_0').
\end{aligned}
$$

At stage 2

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial Y_t^2}{\partial D_t^0} &= 1 + \rho I_0' + \rho I_1'(1 + \rho I_0' - I_0') + \frac{\partial}{\partial D_t^0}\left[\mathcal{F}_t^2\right] = \\
&= 1 + \rho I_0' + \rho I_1'(1 + \rho I_0' - I_0') + \frac{\partial}{\partial D_t^0}\left\{I_2\left(\mathbb{E}_t\left[D_{t+1}^0 + \mathcal{F}_{t+1}^1 - \mathcal{F}_t^1 + \mathcal{F}_{t+1}^0 - \mathcal{F}_t^0\right]\right)\right\} = \\
&= 1 + \rho I_0' + \rho I_1'(1 + \rho I_0' - I_0') + I_2'\left[\rho + \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_t \mathcal{F}_{t+1}^1}{\partial D_t^0} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_t^1}{\partial D_t^0} + \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_t \mathcal{F}_{t+1}^0}{\partial D_t^0} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_{t+1}^0}{\partial D_t^0}\right] = \\
&= 1 + \rho I_0' + \rho I_1'(1 + \rho I_0' - I_0') + I_2'\left[\rho + \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_t \mathcal{F}_{t+1}^1}{\partial D_t^0} - \rho I_1'(1 + (\rho - 1) I_0') + \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_t \mathcal{F}_{t+1}^0}{\partial D_t^0} - \rho I_0'\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

Focusing on $\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_t \mathcal{F}^0_{t+1}}{\partial D^0_t}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_t \mathcal{F}^0_{t+1}}{\partial D^0_t} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial D^0_t}\mathbb{E}_t[I_0(\mathbb{E}_{t+1}D^0_{t+2}] = \frac{\partial}{\partial D^0_t}\mathbb{E}_t[I_0\left(\bar{D}(1-\rho)+\rho D^0_{t+1}\right)] = \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial D^0_t}\int I_0\left((1-\rho)\bar{D}+\rho D^0_{t+1}\right) f(\epsilon_{t+1})d\epsilon_{t+1} = \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial D^0_t}\int I_0\left((1-\rho)\bar{D}+\rho((1-\rho)\bar{D}+\rho D^0_t+\epsilon_{t+1})\right) f(\epsilon_{t+1})d\epsilon_{t+1} = \\
&= \int \frac{\partial}{\partial D^0_t} I_0\left((1-\rho)\bar{D}+\rho((1-\rho)\bar{D}+\rho D^0_t+\epsilon_{t+1})\right) f(\epsilon_{t+1})d\epsilon_{t+1} = \\
&= \int I'_0\rho^2 f(\epsilon_{t+1})d\epsilon_{t+1} = I'_0\rho^2\int f(\epsilon_{t+1})d\epsilon_{t+1} = I'_0\rho^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Where in the fourth step I make use of the bounded support assumption and the Leibniz rule. Identical steps yield $\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_t \mathcal{F}^1_{t+1}}{\partial D^0_t} = \rho^2 I'_1(1+\rho I'_0(\rho-1))$. Plugging in and rearranging

$$\frac{\partial Y^2_t}{\partial D^0_t} = 1+\rho I'_0+\rho I'_1(1+(\rho-1)I'_0)+I'_2(1+(\rho-1)I'_0)(1+(\rho-1)I'_0)$$

Similarly at higher stage. By forward induction this can be compactly written as

$$1+\sum_{i=0}^{n}\rho I'_i\prod_{j=0}^{i-1}[1+(\rho-1)I'_j].$$

Hence, dividing through by D^0, to a first order approximation

$$\frac{\Delta Y^n_t}{D^0} = \frac{\Delta^0_t}{D^0}\left[1+\sum_{i=0}^{n}\rho I'_i\prod_{j=0}^{i-1}[1+(\rho-1)I'_j]\right],$$

Where $\Delta^0_t = D_t - D_t - 1$. Noting that, in the non-stochastic steady state $D^0 = Y^n$, $\forall n$ and replacing with log changes

$$\Delta\log Y^n_t = \Delta\log D^0_t\left[1+\sum_{i=0}^{n}\rho I'_i\prod_{j=0}^{i-1}[1+(\rho-1)I'_j]\right].$$

b) Given point a), if $0 < I'_i < \frac{1}{1-\rho}$, $\forall\, i$, every term in the product is positive, hence $\Delta\log Y^n_t > \Delta\log Y^{n-1}_t$, $\forall n, t$.

c) Finally, note that to a first order $\frac{\Delta\log Y^n_t}{\Delta\log D^0_t} - \frac{\Delta\log Y^{n-1}_t}{\Delta\log D^0_t} = \rho I'_n\prod_{j=0}^{n-1}[1+(\rho-1)I'_j$. I want to show under which condition this increases in n. Hence, when $\frac{\Delta\log Y^n_t}{\Delta\log D^0_t} - \frac{\Delta\log Y^{n-1}_t}{\Delta\log D^0_t} -$

$\frac{\Delta \log Y_t^{n-1}}{\Delta \log D_t^0} + \frac{\Delta \log Y_t^{n-2}}{\Delta \log D_t^0} > 0$. This is equal to

$$\rho I'_n \prod_{j=0}^{n-1}[1+(\rho-1)I'_j] - \rho I'_{n-1}\prod_{j=0}^{n-2}[1+(\rho-1)I'_j] =$$

$$\rho(I'_n - I'_{n-1})\prod_{j=0}^{n-2}[1+(\rho-1)I'_j] + \rho I'_n(1+(\rho-1)I'_{n-1}).$$

If the condition in equation (11) is satisfied, then the second term is positive, while the first depends on the sign of $I'_n - I'_{n-1}$. Hence if I'_n is not too decreasing in n, the second term dominates, the expression is positive and, therefore, $\frac{\Delta \log Y_t^n}{\Delta \log D_t^0} - \frac{\Delta \log Y_t^{n-1}}{\Delta \log D_t^0}$ increases in n.

■

Equilibrium Definition and Characterization

Definition OA.1 (Equilibrium)
An equilibrium in this economy is given by a sequence of i) household consumption and labor policies $L_t, C_{s,t}, \forall s$ that, given prices, maximize their utility; ii) a sourcing policy of C firms $Y_{sr,t}, \forall s, r$ that, given input prices, maximize their profits; iii) pricing, inventory and output policies of I firms so that, given input prices, they maximize their profits and iv) market clearing conditions for all differentiated varieties and labor.

Households The household expenditure problem is given by

$$\max_{C,L} U = \log C - L \quad \text{st} \quad wL = PC + \Pi$$

defining λ the multiplier on the budget constraint, this implies

$$\lambda w = 1,$$
$$C^{-1} = \lambda P.$$

With the numeraire condition $w = 1$, this implies $PC = 1$.

The expenditure minimization on differentiated varieties is given by

$$\min_{C_s} \sum_{s\in S} C_s p_s \quad \text{st} \quad \bar{U} = \Pi_{s\in S} C_s^{\beta_s}$$

which implies the optimal domestic expenditure on variety s, denoted $E_s^D = \beta_s$. The total expenditure, given by the sum of domestic and foreign expenditures, is $D_t = PC + X_t = 1 + X_t$. Given the stochasatic process for $X_t = (1-\rho)\bar{X} + \rho X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$, the total expenditure evolves according to $D_t = \rho D_{t-1} + (1-\rho)\bar{D} + \epsilon_t$, where $\bar{D} \coloneqq 1 + \bar{X}$.

Production C firms operate like in the standard network model without productivity shocks. Formally, taking prices as given, they solve

$$\max_{l_s, Y_{rs,t}} p_{s,t} Z_s l_{s,t}^{1-\gamma_s} \left(\sum_{r \in R} {a_{rs}}^{1/\nu} Y_{rs,t}^{\frac{\nu-1}{\nu}} \right)^{\gamma_s \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}} - w l_{s,t} - \sum_{r \in R} p_r Y_{rs,t}.$$

With $Z_s = (1-\gamma_s)^{\gamma_s - 1} \gamma_s^{-\gamma_s \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}}$. Given $w = 1$, the optimal amount of labor costs is $l_{s,t} = (1-\gamma_s) p_{s,t} Y_{s,t}$, while the total expenditure on intermediates is the $\gamma_s p_{s,t} Y_{s,t}$. Within intermediate expenditure, firms in sector s spend on input r $p_{r,t} Y_{rs,t} = (p_{r,t}/\mathcal{C}_{s,t})^{\nu-1} a_{rs} \gamma_s p_{s,t} Y_{s,t}$, where $\mathcal{C}_{s,t}$ is the ideal intermediate goods cost index of the firm.

At the optimum the firm therefore uses

$$Y_{rs,t} = \gamma_s (1-\gamma_s) a_{rs} p_{s,t} Y_{s,t} p_{r,t}^{-\nu} \left(\sum_{q \in R} a_{qs} p_{q,t}^{1-\nu} \right)^{-1},$$

units of input r. Plugging back into the production function and using the normalization constant Z_s implies the pricing equation

$$p_{s,t} = w^{1-\gamma_s} \left(\gamma_s^{-1} \sum_{q \in R} a_{qs} p_{q,t}^{1-\nu} \right)^{\frac{\gamma_s}{1-\nu}}.$$

Taking logs and noting that $\log w = 0$ given the numeraire condition

$$\log(p_{s,t}) = \frac{\gamma_s}{1-\nu} \log \left(\gamma_s^{-1} \sum_{q \in R} a_{qs} p_{q,t}^{1-\nu} \right).$$

This condition implies a system of equations solved by $p_s = 1$, $\forall s$. To see this, conjecture the solution and note that $\sum_q a_{qs} = \gamma_s$ by constant returns to scale.[36]

I firms have the same expenditure minimization problem, meaning that their optimal expenditure shares will be identical to the ones of C firms. However, they have a different pricing and inventory problem.

I assume that I firms compete à la Bertrand and therefore price at the marginal cost of the C firms. As a consequence, the pricing problem of I firms is solved by a vector $p_s^I = 1$, $\forall s$. Note that this is an equilibrium since $Z_s^I > Z_s$ so that I firms charge a markup $\mu_s^I > 1$ and obtain positive profits. The quantity problem is then given by solving the dynamic problem

$$\max_{Y_{s,t}, I_{s,t}, Q_{s,t}} \mathbb{E}_t \sum_t \beta^t \left[p_{s,t} Q_{s,t} - c_{s,t} Y_{s,t} - \frac{\delta}{2} (I_{s,t} - \alpha Q_{s,t+1})^2 \right] \quad st \quad I_{s,t} = I_{s,t-1} + Y_{s,t} - Q_{s,t},$$

noting that $p_s = 1$ and therefore $Q_{s,t}$ is equal to the demanded quantity at $p_s = 1$, which is given the expenditure on good s is given by consumer expenditure $D_{s,t} = \beta_s D_t$ and the expenditure

[36] An alternative way to obtain this result is to write the system in relative prices $\log(p_s/w)$, this is solved by $p_s = w$, $\forall s$ and then imposing the numeraire condition $w = 1$.

from other firms. Denote total demand on good s by final consumers and other firms $\mathcal{D}_{s,t}$. Note that, as the vector of prices is a constant and, given the absence of productivity shocks, the marginal cost of all firms is also constant. To fix ideas, suppose I firms in sector s have productivity $Z_s^I = Z_s/\zeta_s$, with $\zeta_s < 1$, then their marginal cost given by ζ_s. Then the problem becomes

$$\max_{Y_{s,t},I_{s,t}} \mathbb{E}_t \sum_t \beta^t \left[\mathcal{D}_{s,t} - \zeta_s Y_{s,t} - \frac{\delta}{2}(I_{s,t} - \alpha\mathcal{D}_{s,t+1})^2\right] \quad st \quad I_{s,t} = I_{s,t-1} + Y_{s,t} - \mathcal{D}_{s,t},$$

This implies the optimal inventory rule $I_{s,t} = \frac{(\beta-1)\zeta_s}{\delta} + \alpha\mathbb{E}_t\mathcal{D}_{s,t+1}$. I disregard the case in which $I_{s,t} < 0$ at the optimum since I can always choose $\bar{X}$ large enough so that $\alpha\mathbb{E}_t\mathcal{D}_{s,t+1} > \frac{(\beta-1)\zeta_s}{\delta}$ and therefore $I_{s,t} > 0$.

At this point, the remaining problem is the definition of $\mathcal{D}_{s,t}$. Towards a resolution, note that in this production network model firms sell part of their output directly to consumers. Denote this output $Y_{s,t}^0$ as it is at 0 distance from consumption. The linearity of the inventory policy implies that I can characterize the stage-specific problem and aggregate ex-post. For the part of output sold directly to final consumers, $\mathcal{D}_{s,t}^0 = D_{s,t} = \beta_s D_t$. Production at this stage is defined as sales plus the change in inventories. As discussed above, sales are given by the total demand for good s at $p_s = 1$, which is equal to $\beta_s D_t$. The change in inventories $\Delta I_{s,t}^0 = I_{s,t}^0 - I_{s,t-1}^0 = \alpha(\mathbb{E}_t\mathcal{D}_{s,t+1}^0 - \mathbb{E}_t\mathcal{D}_{s,t}^0)$. Using $\mathcal{D}_{s,t}^0 = \beta_s D_t$ and the properties of the stochastic process of D_t discussed above, $\Delta I_{s,t}^0 = \alpha\beta_s\rho\Delta_t$, where $\Delta_t = D_t - D_{t-1}$. Hence output of I firms in sector s at distance 0 is $Y_{s,t}^0 = \beta_s[D_t + \alpha\rho\Delta_t]$.

Next note that to produce output $Y_{s,t}^0$ firms demand from input suppliers in sector r an amount $\mathcal{D}_{rs,t}^1 = a_{rs}\gamma_s Y_{s,t}^0$. I denote these with 1 since for this part of their production they operate at distance 1 from consumers. Given this demand, the implied production is $Y_{rs,t}^1 = a_{rs}\gamma_s Y_{s,t}^0 + \Delta I_{rs,t}^1$. Summing over all possible final producers s, implies a total production of I firms in sector r at distance 1 equal to $Y_{r,t}^1 = \sum_s a_{rs}\gamma_s Y_{s,t}^0 + \Delta I_{rs,t}^1$. I can solve the rest of the model by forward induction and finally aggregating at the firm level over all possible distances from consumers so that output of I firms in sector k is $Y_{k,t} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Y_{k,t}^n$. Proposition 3 provides the exact closed-form solution for production in the network.

Proof of Proposition 3. The first part of the Proposition follows immediately from the definition of output at a specific stage n and total sectoral output as the sum over stage-specific output. The proof of the second part requires the following steps: first, using the definition of $\left[\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n\right]_k B$ and denoting $\omega = 1 + \alpha(\rho - 1)$, rewrite total output as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{k,t} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left[\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n\right]_k B\left[D_t + \alpha\rho\sum_{i=0}^{n}\omega^i\Delta_t\right] = \left[\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0 + \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^1 + \ldots\right]_k BD_t + \alpha\rho\left[\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0\omega^0 + \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega^0+\omega^1) + \ldots\right]_k B\Delta_t \\ &= \tilde{L}_k BD_t + \alpha\rho\left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n\sum_{i=0}^{n}\omega^i\right]_k B\Delta_t. \end{aligned}$$

The equality between the two lines follows from the convergence of a Neumann series of matrices

satisfying the Brauer-Solow condition. To show that $Y_{k,t}$ exists non-negative for $\omega - 1 = \alpha(\rho - 1) \in [-1, 0]$, I characterize the problem at the bounds $\omega - 1 = -1$ and $\omega - 1 = 0$ and exploit monotonicity inbetwee. Note that if $\omega - 1 = -1$ then $\omega = 0$, the second term collapses to $\tilde{L}$, and existence and non-negativity follow from $\tilde{L}$ finite and non-negative. If $\omega - 1 = 0$, then $\omega = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{k,t} &= \tilde{L}_k B D_t + \alpha\rho \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(n+1)\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n\right]_k B\Delta_t = \tilde{L}_k B D_t + \alpha\rho \left[\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0 + 2\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^1 + 3\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^2 + \ldots\right]_k B\Delta_t \\ &= \tilde{L}_k B D_t + \alpha\rho \tilde{L}_k^2 B\Delta_t, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}(i+1)\mathcal{A}^i = [I - \mathcal{A}]^{-2}$ if $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies the Brauer-Solow condition. Existence and non-negativity follow from the existence and non-negativity of $[I - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}]^{-2}$.

If $\omega - 1 \in (-1, 0)$, then $\omega \in (0, 1)$. As this term is powered up in the second summation and as it is strictly smaller than 1, it is bounded above by $n + 1$. This implies that the whole second term $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \sum_{i=0}^{n}\omega^i < \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(n+1)\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n = \tilde{L}^2 < \infty$. Alternatively, note that the second summation is strictly increasing in ω, as $\omega \leq 1$ the summation is bounded above by $n + 1$. Which completes the proof. ■

Proof of Proposition 4. From Proposition 3 we have that, differentiating sectoral output with respect to final demand

$$\frac{\partial Y_{k,t}}{\partial D_t} = \tilde{L}_k B + \alpha\rho \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \sum_{i=0}^{n}\omega^i\right]_k B$$

Dividing by steady-state sales $\tilde{L}_k B\bar{D}$ and using $\delta D_t = \Delta_t$ and the definition of $\mathcal{U}_k$, the first order change is given by

$$\frac{\Delta Y_{k,t}}{\tilde{L}_k B\bar{D}} \approx \tilde{L}_k B\frac{\Delta_t}{\tilde{L}_k B\bar{D}} + \alpha\rho \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(n+1)\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n\right]_k B\frac{\Delta_t}{\tilde{L}_k B\bar{D}} = \frac{\Delta_t}{\bar{D}} + \alpha\rho\, \mathcal{U}_k\frac{\Delta}{\bar{D}}.$$

Finally, noting that around the non-stochastic steady state $Y_k = \tilde{L}_k B\bar{D}$, the following holds

$$\frac{\Delta Y_{k,t}}{Y_k} = \frac{\Delta_t}{\bar{D}} + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_k\frac{\Delta_t}{\bar{D}}.$$

■

Proof of Proposition 5. Immediate from Proposition 4 since all the terms multiplying $\Delta_t/\bar{D}$ are constant. The proof of the second part of the Proposition follows from the fact that there is a single demand destination, therefore $\sigma_{\Delta \log D_t}$ is common across industries. Hence the volatility of output growth can only be larger for more upstream industries ■

Proof of Proposition 6. Immediate from Proposition 4 and the observation that output growth is increasing in ω, which itself is increasing in α and ρ, under the maintained assumption that

$\omega \in (0,1)$. ■

Proof of Proposition 7. From Proposition 4, note that if $\rho \to 1$, then $\omega = 1 + \alpha(\rho - 1) \to 1$. Hence, $\mathcal{U}_k = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1-\omega^{n+1}}{1-\omega} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n B_k \bar{D}/Y_k = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(n+1)\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n/Y_k$. The Nuemann series converges to $[I - \mathcal{A}]^{-2}$ and therefore $\mathcal{U}_k \to U_k$. ■

Proof of Proposition 8. I show that if two industries r and s are downstream symmetric and $\beta_r < \beta_s$ then $\mathcal{U}_r > \mathcal{U}_s$ and, therefore, by Proposition 5, $\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_{rt}) > \text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_{st})$.

The fraction of output sold directly to households is $\beta_r D/Y_r$. This share is increasing in β_r since

$$\frac{\partial \beta_r D/Y_r}{\partial \beta_r} \propto Y_r - \ell_{rr}\beta_r \geq 0. \tag{OA.7}$$

If two industries are downstream symmetric, all the higher-order terms are identical since $a_{ri} = a_{si}, \forall i$. Since the fraction of output sold to consumers is higher for s than for r the complement fraction sold indirectly is smaller for s than for r. As a consequence, $\mathcal{U}_s < \mathcal{U}_r$ and, therefore, $\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_{rt}) > \text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_{st})$. ■

Proof of Proposition 9. First, note that the case studied in the proposition is one of pure vertical fragmentation: a sector s splits into two sectors i and j. This split implies that i) i remains upstream symmetric to itself; ii) k remains downstream symmetric to itself. The consequence of this split is that the network upstream of the fragmented sector i is unchanged the network downstream of the fragmented sector j is unchanged. Consequently, any network path going through i now remains unchanged but has to go through j as well, adding a step in the supply chain. Therefore, any sector r connected to consumers through i, ($\ell_{ri} > 0$), becomes more upstream and therefore volatile, all else equal. ■

Proof of Proposition 10 . Sectoral output is

$$Y_t^r = \sum_j \tilde{L}_r B_j D_{jt} + \alpha\rho \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \frac{1-\omega^{n+1}}{1-\omega}\right]_r B_j \Delta_{jt}.$$

To a first order, the change in output is given by

$$\Delta Y_t^r \approx \sum_j \tilde{L}_r B_j \Delta_{jt} + \alpha\rho \sum_j \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \frac{1-\omega^{n+1}}{1-\omega}\right]_r B_j \Delta_{jt}.$$

Dividing by steady-state sales

$$\frac{\Delta Y_t^r}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} \approx \frac{\sum_j \tilde{L}_r B_j \Delta_{jt}}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} + \alpha\rho \sum_j \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \frac{1-\omega^{n+1}}{1-\omega}\right]_r \frac{B_j \Delta_{jt}}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}}.$$

Dividing and multiplying by $\bar{D}_j$ inside the summations

$$\frac{\Delta Y_t^r}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} \approx \frac{\sum_j \tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} \frac{\Delta_{jt}}{\bar{D}_j} + \alpha\rho \sum_j \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \frac{1-\omega^{n+1}}{1-\omega} \right]_r \frac{B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} \frac{\Delta_{jt}}{\bar{D}_j}.$$

Using the definition of $\mathcal{U}_j^r$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Delta Y_t^r}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} &\approx \sum_j \underbrace{\frac{\tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}}}_{\xi_j^r} \underbrace{\frac{\Delta_{jt}}{\bar{D}_j}}_{\eta_{jt}} + \alpha\rho \sum_j \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \frac{1-\omega^{n+1}}{1-\omega} B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} \frac{\Delta_{jt}}{\bar{D}_j} \\
&= \sum_j \xi_j^r \eta_{jt} + \alpha\rho \sum_j \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \frac{1-\omega^{n+1}}{1-\omega} B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} \frac{\Delta_{jt}}{\bar{D}_j}
\end{aligned}$$

Dividing and multiplying the second term inside the summation by $\frac{\tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}_j}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Delta Y_t^r}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} &\approx \sum_j \xi_j^r \eta_{jt} + \alpha\rho \sum_j \underbrace{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \frac{1-\omega^{n+1}}{1-\omega} B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}_j}}_{\mathcal{U}_j^r} \underbrace{\frac{\tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}}}_{\xi_j^r} \underbrace{\frac{\Delta_{jt}}{\bar{D}_j}}_{\eta_{jt}} \\
&= \sum_j \xi_j^r \eta_{jt} + \alpha\rho \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r \eta_{jt} \\
&= \eta_t^r + \alpha\rho \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r \eta_{jt}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, noting that, in steady state, output and sales coincide

$$\frac{\Delta Y_t^r}{Y^r} = \eta_t^r + \alpha\rho \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r \eta_{jt}.$$

■

Proof of Proposition 11. Starting from Proposition 10

$$\frac{\Delta Y_t^r}{Y^r} = \eta_{it}^r + \alpha\rho \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r \eta_{jt}$$

To simplify notation, denote $\upsilon_{it}^r \equiv \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r \eta_{jt}$. Then the variance of output growth is given by

$$\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) = \text{Var}(\eta_t^r) + (\alpha\rho)^2 \text{Var}(\upsilon_t^r) + 2\alpha\rho \text{Cov}(\eta_t^r, \upsilon_t^r).$$

Next, I study each term in turn. Using the definition of η_t^r and iid-ness of η_{jt} across j, the

variance of η_t^r is

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(\eta_t^r) &= \sum_t \left(\eta_t^r - \frac{1}{T}\sum_t \eta_t^r\right)^2 = \sum_t \left(\sum_j \xi_j^r \eta_{jt} - \frac{1}{T}\sum_t\sum_j \xi_j^r \eta_{jt}\right)^2 \\ &= \sum_t \left(\sum_j \xi_j^r(\eta_{jt} - \bar{\eta}_j)\right)^2 \overset{iid}{=} \sum_j \xi_j^{r2}\text{Var}(\eta_{jt}).\end{aligned}$$

Next, note that the variance of υ_{it}^r, by the same arguments, is

$$\text{Var}(\upsilon_t^r) = \sum_j U_j^{r2}\xi_j^{r2}\text{Var}(\eta_{jt}).$$

Finally, the covariance term is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Cov}(\eta_t^r, \upsilon_t^r) &= \text{Cov}\left(\sum_j \xi_j^r \eta_{jt}, \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r \eta_{jt}\right) \\ &= \sum_j\sum_k \xi_j^r \mathcal{U}_k^r \xi_k^r \text{Cov}(\eta_{jt}, \eta_{kt}) \overset{iid}{=} \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^{r2}\text{Var}(\eta_{jt}).\end{aligned}$$

Where the last equality follows by iid-ness. Combining the three terms

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) &= \sum_j U_j^{r2}\xi_j^{r2}\text{Var}(\eta_{jt}) + (\alpha\rho)^2\sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^{r2}\xi_j^{r2}\text{Var}(\eta_{jt}) + \\ &\quad + 2\alpha\rho\sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r\xi_j^{r2}\text{Var}(\eta_{jt}) = \\ &= \sum_j \xi_j^{r2}\text{Var}(\eta_{jt})\left[1 + (\alpha\rho)^2\mathcal{U}_j^{r2} + 2\alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_j^r\right] \\ &= \sum_j \xi_j^{r2}\text{Var}(\eta_{jt})\left[1 + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_j^r\right]^2.\end{aligned}$$

■

Proof of Proposition 12. The difference in variances is

$$\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) - \text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^s) = \sigma_\eta \sum_j \xi_j^r(\mathcal{U}_j^r - \mathcal{U}_j^s)$$

which is positive since $\exists j$ such that $\mathcal{U}_j^r > \mathcal{U}_j^s$ and $\nexists j$ such that $\mathcal{U}_j^r < \mathcal{U}_j^s$. ■

Proof of Proposition 13. First, note that in the special case $\text{Var}(\eta_{jt}) = \sigma_\eta$, $\forall j$, the variance of output is given by

$$\text{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) = \sigma_\eta \sum_j \xi_j^{r2}(1 + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_j^r)^2,$$

By assumption $\mathcal{U}^r = \mathcal{U}^s$. First note that

$$\sum_j \xi_j^r (1 + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_j^r) = 1 + \alpha\rho \sum_j \xi_j^r U_j^r = 1 + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}^r,$$

Where the second equality follows from $\sum_j \xi_j^r = 1$ and the third from the observation that $\mathcal{U}^r = \sum_j \xi_j^r \mathcal{U}_j^r$. Hence the assumption that $\mathcal{U}^r = \mathcal{U}^s$ implies that $\sum_j \xi_j^r (1+\alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_j^r) = \sum_j \xi_j^s (1+\alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_j^s)$. Next, note that the difference in output growth volatility between the two industries is given by

$$\mathrm{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) - \mathrm{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^s) = \sigma_\eta \left[\sum_j (1 + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_j^r)^2 \xi_j^{r2} - \sum_j (1 + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U}_j^s)^2 \xi_j^{s2} \right]$$

The statement in part *a*) follows immediately by the observation that, since the two distributions have the same mean, the expression is positive if and only if $\mathrm{Var}((1 + \alpha\rho\underline{\mathcal{U}}^r)\Xi^r) > \mathrm{Var}((1 + \alpha\rho\underline{\mathcal{U}}^s)\Xi^s)$. Since the two distributions have the same means, this is equivalent to $\Psi^s\Xi^s$ second-order stochastic dominating $\Psi^r\Xi^r$.

The proof of point *b*) follows from the observation that, in the special case $\mathcal{U}_j^r = \mathcal{U}_j^s = \mathcal{U}\ \forall j$

$$\mathrm{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^r) - \mathrm{Var}(\Delta \log Y_t^s) = \sigma_\eta (1 + \alpha\rho\mathcal{U})^2 \left[\sum_j \xi_j^{r2} - \sum_j \xi_j^{s2} \right].$$

Further, since $\sum_j \xi_j^r = \sum_j \xi_j^s = 1$, the expression is positive if and only if Ξ^r has a higher variance than Ξ^s. Which, in the case of equal means, is equivalent to Ξ^s second-order stochastic dominating Ξ^r. ■

I Model Extensions and Additional Theoretical Results

A Dynamic Model of Optimal Procyclical Inventories

In this section, I show that optimally procyclical inventory policy obtains as the policy for a firm subject to production breakdowns. Consider a price-taking firm facing some stochastic demand $q(A)$ where A follows some cdf Φ. The firm produces at marginal cost c and, with probability $\chi > 0$, is unable to produce in a given period. The problem of the firm is described by the value functions for the "good" state where it can produce, and the "bad" state where production is halted. The firm can store inventories I between periods. Inventories follow the law of motion $I' = I + y - q(A)$, where y is output and $q(A)$ is, by market clearing, total sales. Suppose further that firms do not face consecutive periods of halted production.

$$V^G(I, A) = \max_{I'} pq(A) - cy + \beta \mathbb{E}_{A'|A} \left[\chi V^B(I', A') + (1 - \chi) V^G(I', A') \right],$$
$$V^B(I, A) = p \min\{q(A), I\} + \beta \mathbb{E}_{A'|A} V^G(I', A').$$

The first order condition for next period inventories is then given by

$$\frac{1-\beta(1-\chi)}{\beta\chi}c = \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_{A'|A} V^B(I', A')}{\partial I'}.$$

Note that the LHS is a positive constant and represents the marginal cost of producing more today relative to tomorrow. This is given by time discounting of the marginal cost payments, which the firm would prefer to backload. Note trivially that if the probability of halted production goes to zero, the firm has no reason to hold inventories. The marginal benefit of holding inventories is given by relaxing the sales constraint in the bad state. Denote $P(A, I')$ the probability that the realization of A' implies a level of demand larger than the firm's inventories, which implies that the firm stocks out. This probability depends on the current state since demand realizations are not independent. Denote $P_{I'}(A, I') = \partial P(A, I')/\partial I'$. Then, the following holds

$$\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_{A'|A} V^B(I', A')}{\partial I'} =$$
$$pP(A, I') + \beta P_{I'}(A, I')\mathbb{E}_{A''|A}\left[V^G(0, A') - V^G(I' - q(A'), A')\right] + \beta(1 - P(A, I'))c > 0.$$

This states that extra inventories in the bad state imply marginal revenues equal to the price in the event of a stockout. The last two terms state that it makes it less likely that the firm will have to start the next period without inventories and that it will be able to save on marginal cost for production if it does not stock out.

Note that it is immediate that the value of both problems is increasing in the level of inventories the firm starts the period with. It is also straightforward to see that if $\partial \mathbb{E}_{A'|A}/\partial A > 0$, namely if shocks are positively autocorrelated, then the expected value in the bad state is non-decreasing in A.

Proposition OA.1 (Procyclical Inventories)
Consider two realizations of the demand shifter $A_1 > A_2$, then at the optimum $I'^{\star}(I, A_1) > I'^{\star}(I, A_2)$.

The optimality condition for inventories shows that the LHS is constant while the RHS increases in inventory holdings and decreases in the level of demand. Evaluating the first order condition at different levels of A, it has to be that $I'^{\star}(I, A_1) > I'^{\star}(I, A_2)$, $\forall A_1 > A_2$. In other words, the firm will respond to a positive demand shock by increasing output more than 1-to-1 as it updates inventories procyclically. The reason is that a positive shock today increases the conditional expectation on demand tomorrow. As a consequence, the likelihood of a stock-out for a given level of inventories increases, which implies that the RHS of the first order condition increases as the benefit of an additional unit of inventories rises.

Production Smoothing Motive

In the main body of the paper, I assume the inventory problem is defined by a quadratic loss function $(I_t - \alpha D_{t+1})^2$. This assumption is a stand-in for the costs of holding inventories or stocking out. However, it imposes two possibly unrealistic restrictions: i) it implies a symmetry between the cost of holding excess inventories and the cost of stocking out; ii) it excludes any production smoothing motive as it implies an optimal constant target rule on expected future sales. In this section, I extend the problem to eliminate these restrictions following Ramey and West (1999) more closely. Formally, consider the problem of a firm solving

$$\max_{I_t, Y_t} \mathbb{E}_t \sum_t \beta^t \left[D_t - Y_t \left(c + \frac{\theta}{2} Y_t \right) - \frac{\delta}{2} (I_t - \alpha D_{t+1})^2 - \tau I_t \right] \quad st$$
$$I_t = I_{t-1} + Y_t - D_t,$$

Where the term $Y_t \left(c + \frac{\theta}{2} Y_t \right)$ includes a convex cost of production, which in turn generates a motive to smooth production across periods. The term τI_t implies a cost of holding inventories which breaks the symmetry between holding excessive or too little inventories. In what follows, I drop the stage and time indices and denote future periods by $\prime$. The first order condition with respect to end-of-the-period inventories implies

$$I = (\theta(1+\beta) + \delta)^{-1} \left[c(\beta - 1) - \tau + \delta\alpha \mathbb{E} D' - \theta(D - I_{-1}) + \theta\beta \mathbb{E}(D' + I') \right],$$

Define $\mathcal{B} \coloneqq (\theta(1+\beta) + \delta)^{-1}$, taking a derivative with respect to current demand implies

$$\frac{\partial I}{\partial D} = \mathcal{B} \left(\delta\alpha\rho - \theta(1 - \beta\rho) + \theta\beta \frac{\partial \mathbb{E} I'}{\partial D} \right).$$

Define $\mathcal{X} \coloneqq \delta\alpha\rho + \theta(1 - \beta\rho)$ then

$$\frac{\partial \mathbb{E} I'}{\partial D} = \mathcal{B} \left(\rho\mathcal{X} + \theta \frac{\partial I}{\partial D} + \theta\beta \frac{\partial \mathbb{E} I''}{\partial D} \right).$$

Iterating forward and substituting the following obtains.

Proposition OA.2 (Cyclicality of Inventories)
A change in demand implies the following change in the optimal inventory level:

$$\frac{\partial I}{\partial D} = \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\mathcal{B}^2 \theta^2 \beta \right)^i \right)^{-1} \mathcal{B}\mathcal{X} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\mathcal{B}\theta\rho\beta)^j .$$

If both $\mathcal{B}^2\theta^2\beta$ and $\mathcal{B}\theta\rho\beta$ are in the unit circle then

$$\frac{\partial I}{\partial D} = \frac{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{X}}{1 - \mathcal{B}\theta\beta\rho} \frac{1 - 2\mathcal{B}^2\theta^2\beta}{1 - \mathcal{B}^2\theta^2\beta} \lesseqgtr 0.$$

This states intuitively that if the production smoothing motive is strong enough, then

inventories respond countercyclically to changes in demand. This is immediate upon noting that when $\theta = 0$ then $\mathcal{B} = \delta^{-1}$, $\mathcal{X} = \delta\alpha\rho$ and therefore $\frac{\partial I}{\partial D} = \alpha\rho > 0$, while if $\theta > \mathcal{B}(\beta/2)^{1/2}$ then $\frac{\partial I}{\partial D} < 0$. Had the latter effect dominated, then the empirical estimates of the response of inventories to changes in sales would be negative, which is counterfactual given the findings discussed in Section 2.

Directed Acyclic Graphs Economies

The model derived in the section 5.2 applies to economies with general networks defined by the input requirement matrix A, a vector of input shares Γ and a vector of demand weights B. As discussed in the main body this economy features finite output under some regularity condition on the intensity of the inventory channel. I now restrict the set of possible networks to Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs) by making specific assumptions on A and Γ. This subset of networks features no cycle between nodes.

Definition OA.2 (Directed Acyclic Graph)
A Directed Acyclic Graph is a directed graph such that $[A^n]_{rr} = 0, \forall r, n$.

The next trivial lemma provides a bound for the maximal length of a path in such a graph.

Lemma OA.1 (Longest Path in Directed Acyclic Graph)
In an economy with a finite number of sectors R, whose production network is a Directed Acyclic Graph, there exists an $N \leq R$ *such that* ${}^n\tilde{A}^n = [0]_{R\times R}, \forall n \geq N \wedge {}^n\tilde{A}^n \neq [0]_{R\times R}, \forall n < N$. *Such N is the longest path in the network and is finite.*

Proof. A path in a graph is a product of the form $\tilde{a}^{rs} \dots \tilde{a}^{uv} > 0$. A cycle in such a graph is a path of the form $\tilde{a}^{rs} \dots \tilde{a}^{ur}$ (starts and ends in r). The assumption that there are no cycles in this graph implies that all sequences of the form $\tilde{a}^{rs} \dots \tilde{a}^{ur} = 0$ for any length of such sequence. Suppose that there is a finite number of industries R such that the matrix A is $R \times R$. Take a path of length $R+1$ of the form $\tilde{a}^{rs} \dots \tilde{a}^{uv} > 0$, it must be that there exists a subpath taking the form $\tilde{a}^{rs} \dots \tilde{a}^{ur}$, which contradicts the assumption of no cycles. Hence, the longest path in such a graph can be at most of length R. ■

With this result, it is straightforward to show that output is finite even if $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \sum_{i=0}^{n} \omega^i$ has a spectral radius outside the unit circle.

Proposition OA.3 (Output in a DAG Economy)
If the network is a DAG with R sectors, then output is given by

$$Y_k = \tilde{L}_k B D_t + \alpha\rho \left[\sum_{n=0}^{R} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^n \sum_{i=0}^{n} \omega^i \right]_k B\Delta_t,$$

Which is naturally bounded since the second term is a bounded Neumann series of matrices.

Proof of Proposition OA.3. Immediate from the bounded Neumann Series. Since $R < \infty$, the bracket in the second term converges to a positive constant. ■

Heterogeneous Inventory Policy in a General Network

Consider an extension of the model in section 5 in which I firms have heterogeneous losses from inventories indexed by $0 \leq \alpha_s < (1-\rho)^{-1}$ for I firms in sector s. Note that I now allow for I firms in some sectors to have no inventory problem as α_s can be equal to 0. Solving the same control problem as in the main model, broken down by distance from consumption, their optimal policy is given by $I^n_{s,t} = \mathcal{I}^n_s + \alpha_s \rho \mathcal{D}^n_{s,t}$.

In turn this implies that the n output of I firms in sector r is $Y^n_{r,t} = \sum_s a_{rs}\gamma_s[Y^{n-1}_{s,t} + \mathfrak{I}^n_{rs}\rho\Delta_t]$, with $\mathfrak{I}^n_{rs} = \alpha_r(1 + \mathfrak{I}^{n-1}_s(\rho - 1))$ with boundary conditions $\mathfrak{I}^0_r = \alpha_r$ and $\mathfrak{I}^{-1}_r = 0$ and $\mathfrak{I}^n_r = \sum_s \tilde{a}_{rs}\mathfrak{I}^n_{rs}$. With these definitions, I can write the recursive definition

$$Y^n_{rt} = \sum_s \tilde{a}_{rs}[Y^{n-1}_{st} + \mathfrak{I}^n_{rs}\beta_s\rho\Delta_t],$$

which, in matrix form, implies

$$Y_t = \tilde{L}BD_t + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mathfrak{I}}^n B\rho\Delta_t,$$

with $\hat{\mathfrak{I}}^n = \text{diag}\{\hat{\mathfrak{I}}^{n-1}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\underline{1} + \mathfrak{I}^0(\rho - 1))\}$.

In this model, it is considerably harder to generalize the results in Section 5.2 as the inventory effect does not monotonically move with the distance from consumers. Under the assumption that $\alpha_r = \alpha, \forall r$, as in the main text, it is immediate to establish that if $\omega = 1 + \alpha(\rho - 1) \in (0, 1)$ then $\frac{\partial Y^n_t}{\partial Y^{n-1}_t}$ increases in n in vertically integrated economies that this effect carries through in general networks. This is not true with heterogeneous inventories. As an immediate counterexample, consider a firm in sector r at distance 2, such that it sells to sectors s at distance 1 and sectors k at distance 0 with $\alpha_s = \alpha_k = 0, \forall s, k$. This firm has no inventory amplification downstream. Consider now a different path of a firm in sector r such that at distance 1 it sells to sector q with $\alpha_q > 0$. It is immediate that the branch at distance 1 from r to consumers through q has more amplification than the distance 2 branch to consumers through s and k.

It is possible to characterize a special case under the definition of *pure direct upstreamness*, which is a stronger version of the *pure upstreamness* definition from Carvalho et al. (2020).

Definition OA.3 (Pure Direct Upstreamness)
Sector r is pure direct upstream to sector s if i) $a_{rs} > 0$, ii) $a_{rk} = 0, \forall k \neq r$ and iii) $a_{sr} = 0$.

These conditions ensure that firms in sector r sell uniquely to sector s and that there is no feedback look from sector s to r. With this definition, I provide the necessary and sufficient condition for upstream amplification under heterogeneous inventories.

Lemma OA.2 (Heterogenous Inventories in General Network)

If sector s is pure direct upstream to sector r, then its output is given by

$$Y_{s,t} = a_{sr}\gamma_r \left[Y_{r,t} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{I}_{sr}^{n-1} \rho \Delta_t \right].$$

Then the following holds

Proposition OA.4 (Amplification under Heterogeneous Inventories)
If sector s is pure direct upstream to sector r, then upstream amplification occurs if and only if

$$\rho \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{I}_{sr}^{n-1} > \frac{1 - a_{sr}\gamma_r}{a_{sr}\gamma_r} \frac{\partial Y_{r,t}}{\partial D_t}.$$

Proof of Proposition OA.4. Differentiating with respect to D_t, the definition of output implies

$$\frac{\partial Y_{st}}{\partial D_t} = a_{sr}\gamma_r \left[\frac{\partial Y_{rt}}{\partial D_t} + \rho \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{I}_{sr}^{n-1} \right],$$

Using the definition of upstream amplification as $\frac{\partial Y_{st}}{\partial D_t} > \frac{\partial Y_{rt}}{\partial D_t}$, the statement follows. ■

The proposition characterizes the condition for upstream amplification. Note that while it looks like this condition is defined in terms of endogenous objects, it is actually recursively defined in terms of primitives and shocks through the definition of $Y_{r,t}$. The convenience of the pure direct upstreamness assumption is that it allows a simple comparative statics over a_{sr} and γ_r. Suppose that $\gamma_r = a_{sr} = 1$, then sector s is the sole supplier of sector r and the sufficient condition for upstream amplification is that there is a positive inventory effect along the chain that connects final consumers to s through r. This is necessarily the case, provided that $0 \leq \alpha_r < (1-\rho)^{-1}$, $\forall r$.

Productivity Shocks

Consider an extension of the model in section 5 in which I firms are subject to productivity shocks so that their marginal cost follows an AR(1). Specifically for sector s, assume that $\zeta_{s,t} = (1-\rho^{\zeta})\bar{\zeta}_s + \rho^{\zeta}\zeta_{s,t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, with average marginal cost $\bar{\zeta}_s$, persitence $\rho^{\zeta} < 1$ and innovations $\varepsilon_t \sim F(\cdot)$. The control problem becomes

$$\max_{Y_{s,t}, I_{s,t}} \mathbb{E}_t \sum_t \beta^t \left[\mathcal{D}_{s,t} - \zeta_{s,t} Y_{s,t} - \frac{\delta}{2}(I_{s,t} - \alpha \mathcal{D}_{s,t+1})^2 \right] \quad st \quad I_{s,t} = I_{s,t-1} + Y_{s,t} - \mathcal{D}_{s,t},$$

The solution to this problem is given in the next Proposition.

Proposition OA.5 (Inventories with Productivity Shocks)
The optimal inventory policy is given by

$$I_{st} = \alpha \mathbb{E}_t \mathcal{D}_{s,t+1} + \frac{\beta \mathbb{E}_t \zeta_{s,t+1} - \zeta_s}{\delta}.$$

An increase in the firm's marginal cost then implies lower inventories since

$$\frac{\partial I_{s,t}}{\partial \zeta_{s,t}} = \beta\rho^{\zeta} - 1 < 0.$$

Hence, when the firm's productivity increases ($\zeta_{s,t} \downarrow$), so does the optimal amount of inventories. Since $Y_{s,t} = I_{s,t} - I_{s,t-1} + \mathcal{D}_{s,t}$, $\partial Y_{s,t}/\partial \zeta_{s,t} = \partial I_{s,t}/\partial \zeta_{s,t} = \beta\rho^{\zeta} - 1$. Note that higher productivity is reflected in higher output $Y_{s,t}$ but not in higher sales $\mathcal{D}_{s,t}$, as the latter are driven by the pricing of C firms. The presence of productivity shocks for I firms generates a positive comovement between output and inventories.

J Model to Data

The key difficulty in taking the model back to the data is the calculation of the appropriately weighted shocks. Here I show that, under the assumption of common inventories, this can be readily computed.

I start from the result of Proposition 10 about the growth rate of output

$$\Delta \log Y_t^r \approx \eta_t^r + \alpha\rho \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r \eta_{j,t}.$$

To compute $\mathcal{U}_j^r$, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_j^r &= \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}^n \frac{1-\omega^{n+1}}{1-\omega}|_r B_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j} \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\omega}\frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}^n|_r B_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j} - \frac{\omega}{1-\omega}\frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \omega^n A^n|_r B_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j} \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\omega}\frac{\tilde{L}_r B_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j} - \frac{\omega}{1-\omega}\frac{[I-\omega\tilde{A}]_r^{-1} B_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j} \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\omega} - \frac{\omega}{1-\omega}\frac{[I-\omega\tilde{A}]_r^{-1} B_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of ω

$$\mathcal{U}_j^r = \frac{1}{\alpha(\rho-1)} - \frac{1+\alpha(\rho-1)}{\alpha(\rho-1)}\frac{[I-(1+\alpha(\rho-1))\tilde{A}]_r^{-1} B_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j}.$$

Further, note that $\mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r$ simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r &= \left[\frac{1}{\alpha(\rho-1)}\frac{\tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}} - \frac{1+\alpha(\rho-1)}{\alpha(\rho-1)}\frac{[I-(1+\alpha(\rho-1))\tilde{A}]_r^{-1} B_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j}\right]\frac{\tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha(\rho-1)} - \frac{1+\alpha(\rho-1)}{\alpha(\rho-1)}\frac{[I-(1+\alpha(\rho-1))\tilde{A}]_r^{-1} B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, multiplying by the destination shocks η_{jt} and summing over j I have $\hat{v}_t^r = \sum_j \mathcal{U}_j^r \xi_j^r \eta_{jt}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{v}_t^r &= \sum_j \frac{1}{\alpha(\rho-1)} \frac{\tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B_j \bar{D}} \eta_{jt} - \sum_j \frac{1+\alpha(\rho-1)}{\alpha(\rho-1)} \frac{[I-(1+\alpha(\rho-1))\tilde{A}]_r^{-1} B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} \eta_{jt} \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha(\rho-1)} \sum_j \xi_j^r \eta_{jt} - \frac{1+\alpha(\rho-1)}{\alpha(\rho-1)} \sum_j \frac{[I-(1+\alpha(\rho-1))\tilde{A}]_r^{-1} B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} \eta_{jt} \\
&= \frac{\eta_t^r}{\alpha(\rho-1)} - \frac{1+\alpha(\rho-1)}{\alpha(\rho-1)} \sum_j \frac{[I-(1+\alpha(\rho-1))\tilde{A}]_r^{-1} B_j \bar{D}_j}{\tilde{L}_r B \bar{D}} \eta_{jt}.
\end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption of common inventory rule, everything on the right hand side can be computed given estimates for α and ρ.

K Quantitative Model

I solve the model exactly using the closed-form solutions derived in Section 5. I use the full WIOD input requirement matrix as input for $\mathcal{A}_{2000}$ and the vector of final consumptions $F_{ij,2000}^r$ to back out the vector B such that $\beta_{ij}^r = F_{ij,2000}^r / \sum_{r,i,j} F_{ij,2000}^r$. I set $\rho = .7$ which is similar to the estimated $AR(1)$ coefficient of the destination shocks $\hat{\eta}_{jt}$. The remaining parameters are the inventory-to-sales ratio α and the stochastic process for the shocks. To obtain an empirically plausible distribution of shocks I estimate the country-specific variances σ_j^2 and use them directly. The lack of a long enough time series prevents me from estimating the full covariance matrix. I circumvent this problem by generating a covariance matrix such that the variances are given by the vector of σ_j^2 and the average correlation is ϱ. I calibrate ϱ to match the coefficient of the regression $\sigma(\eta_{it}^r) = \beta U_i^r + \varepsilon_i^r$, where $\sigma(\eta_{it}^r) = \left(\sum_t \left(\eta_{it}^r - \frac{1}{T}\sum_t \eta_{it}^r\right)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Table OA.18 reports the regression output for both the actual data and the model-generated data. I use α to match the average relative volatility of output and demand across industries. The moments are targeted for the year 2001 (the first year in which shocks are identified in the data) in the multiple destination model. I keep the parameters constant for the single destination model.

The counterfactuals are implemented by replacing either the input requirement matrix $\mathcal{A}_{2000}$, α, or both.

Table OA.18: Calibration of Covariance Parameter

	Data	Model
	(1)	(2)
	std. dev. Demand Shocks	std. dev. Demand Shocks
Upstreamness	-0.00837***	-0.00824***
	(0.000704)	(0.000506)
Constant	0.168***	0.155***
	(0.00226)	(0.00162)
N	2308	2308
R^2	0.0578	0.103

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: The table reports the results of the regression of demand shock volatility on average upstreamness across industries for both the actual data and the model-generated data. The model-generated data is simulated across 4800 iterations.

Table OA.19: Targeted moments and model counterparts

	Data	Model
$\hat{\beta}$	-.0084	-.0082
σ_y/σ_η	1.26	1.26

Note: The Table reports the targeted moments in the data and in the model. $\hat{\beta}$ is the estimated coefficient of the regression $\sigma(\eta_{it}^r) = \beta U_i^r + \varepsilon_i^r$, while σ_y/σ_η is the ratio between the cross-sectional dispersion of output growth rates and demand in 2000.