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## 1 WWZ Decomposition

To measure value-added export data, we use World Input-output Dataset (WIOD) developed by Timmer et al. (2015) and updated by Timmer et al. (2016). Then, we decompose valueadded contributions into the country and sector level using Wang, Wei and Zhu (2018) (WWZ hereafter) method.

### 1.1 World Input-output Data

WIOD encompasses the sector-level input-output trade data of 43 major economies from 2000 to 2014. The dataset covers 56 industrial sectors including fishing, mining, manufacturing of machines, manufacturing of textiles and financial service activities. WIOD is a data matrix of dimension $2472 \times 2690$. The number of rows is the product of the number of countries (44) and the number of industries (56) plus 8 auxiliary categories. We removed the 8 auxiliary categories from the list and retain pairs of 43 countries and 56 industries. ${ }^{1}$ We removed "Rest of the World (ROW)" from the country list.

There are 5 final goods categories in the columns of WIOD. These 5 columns constitute $2408 \times 5$ final demands matrix. ${ }^{2}$ The rest of the data is the matrix of intermediate demands with dimension $2408 \times 2408$, which the total number of country-industry pair $(43 \times 56)$.

The Leontief decomposition (Leontief, 1936) writes that gross output matrix $(X)$ is the sum of intermediates $(A X)$ and final demand $(Y): X=A X+Y$. Here $A$ denotes inputoutput coefficient matrix that explains contributions of many intermediate outputs. We can rewrite this as $X=B Y$ where $B=(I-A)^{-1}$.

Let $V$ denote direct value-added coefficient vector, then we can represent the process of value-added with infinitely many suppliers as

$$
\begin{equation*}
V+V A+V A A+V A A A+\ldots=V\left(I+A+A^{2}+A^{3}+\ldots\right)=V(I-A)^{-1}=V B . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]When multiplied by final demands $Y, V B Y$ together contains information about sources of value added in each final demand $Y$. Each row of $V B Y$ summarizes how one intermediate input is used both directly and indirectly for the final demands in all countries and sectors. Each column of $V B Y$, on the other hand, represents the source countries and sectors for the final demand in one country and sector. VBY gives the value-added process for the final goods, and Wang, Wei and Zhu (2018) adds here a decomposition of intermediate goods according to where they are finally absorbed.

### 1.2 2 Country 2 Sector Example

In this note, we report WWZ decomposition of the 2 country 2 sector case as an illustration. Let superscript $s$ and $r$ represent (sender and receiver) countries and superscript 1 and 2 represent sectors. Then, the Leontief insight $X=(I-A)^{-1} Y=B Y$ can be expressed as

$$
\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{s}  \tag{2}\\
x_{2}^{s} \\
x_{1}^{r} \\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
b_{11}^{s s} & b_{11}^{s s} & b_{11}^{s r} & b_{12}^{s r} \\
b_{21}^{s s} & b_{22}^{s s} & b_{21}^{s r} & b_{22}^{s r} \\
b_{11}^{r s} & b_{12}^{r s} & b_{11}^{r r} & b_{12}^{r r} \\
b_{21}^{r s} & b_{22}^{r s} & b_{21}^{r r} & b_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s s}+y_{1}^{s r} \\
y_{2}^{r s}+y_{2}^{r r} \\
y_{1}^{s s}+y_{1}^{s r} \\
y_{2}^{r s}+y_{2}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Here, $b_{12}^{s r}$ is the inverse coefficient for goods of sector 1 produced in $s$ that are used in sector 2 in country $r$. The $V B Y$ matrix in 2 country 2 sector example is

$$
\begin{align*}
V B Y= & {\left[\begin{array}{llll}
v_{1}^{s} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & v_{2}^{s} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & v_{1}^{r} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & v_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{llll}
b_{11}^{s s} & b_{12}^{s s} & b_{11}^{s r} & b_{12}^{s r} \\
b_{21}^{s s} & b_{22}^{s s} & b_{21}^{s r} & b_{22}^{s r} \\
b_{11}^{r s} & b_{12}^{r s} & b_{11}^{r r} & b_{12}^{r r} \\
b_{21}^{r s} & b_{22}^{r s} & b_{21}^{r r} & b_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
y_{1}^{s} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & y_{2}^{s} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & y_{1}^{r} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & y_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right] }  \tag{3}\\
& =\left[\begin{array}{llll}
v_{1}^{s} b_{11}^{s s} y_{1}^{s} & v_{1}^{s} b_{12}^{s s} y_{2}^{s} & v_{1}^{s} b_{11}^{s r} y_{1}^{r} & v_{1}^{s} b_{12}^{s r} y_{2}^{r} \\
v_{2}^{s} b_{21}^{s s} y_{1}^{s} & v_{2}^{s} b_{22}^{s s} y_{2}^{s} & v_{2}^{s} b_{21}^{s r} y_{1}^{r} & v_{2}^{s} b_{22}^{s r} y_{2}^{r} \\
v_{1}^{r} b_{11}^{r s} y_{1}^{s} & v_{1}^{r} b_{12}^{r s} y_{2}^{s} & v_{1}^{r} b_{11}^{r r} y_{1}^{r} & v_{1}^{r} b_{12}^{r r} y_{2}^{r} \\
v_{2}^{r} b_{21}^{r s} y_{1}^{s} & v_{2}^{r} b_{22}^{r s} y_{2}^{s} & v_{2}^{r} b_{21}^{r r} y_{1}^{r} & v_{2}^{r} b_{22}^{r r} y_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right] \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that $V B$ is the value-added multiplier, and each row of $V B$ sums to 1 such that each column of $V B Y$ sums to corresponding $Y$ element. For example, $\left(v_{1}^{s} b_{11}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} b_{21}^{s s}+v_{1}^{r} b_{11}^{r s}+\right.$ $\left.v_{2}^{r} b_{21}^{r s}\right) y_{1}^{s}=y_{1}^{s}$.

The total exports of country $s$ consists of two parts: final goods exports and intermediate goods exports.

$$
E^{s r}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
e_{1}^{s r}  \tag{5}\\
e_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s r} \\
y_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r} \\
a_{21}^{s s} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r} \\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

Using the Leontief decomposition $X=B Y$,

$$
\begin{align*}
{\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r} \\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right] } & =\left[\begin{array}{ll}
b_{11}^{r s} & b_{12}^{r s} \\
b_{21}^{r s} & b_{22}^{r s}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s s}+y_{1}^{s r} \\
y_{2}^{s s}+y_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{ll}
b_{11}^{r r} & b_{12}^{r r} \\
b_{21}^{r r} & b_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{r r}+y_{1}^{r s} \\
y_{2}^{r r}+y_{2}^{r s}
\end{array}\right] \\
& =\left[\begin{array}{ll}
b_{11}^{r s} & b_{12}^{r s} \\
b_{21}^{r s} & b_{22}^{r s}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s s} \\
y_{2}^{s s}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{ll}
b_{11}^{r s} & b_{12}^{r s} \\
b_{21}^{r s} & b_{22}^{r s}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s r} \\
y_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{ll}
b_{11}^{r r} & b_{12}^{r r} \\
b_{21}^{r r} & b_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{r r} \\
y_{2}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{ll}
b_{11}^{r r} & b_{12}^{r r} \\
b_{21}^{r r} & b_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{r s} \\
y_{2}^{r s}
\end{array}\right] . \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

The gross intermediate goods exports from $s$ to $r$ can be represented as $A^{s r} X^{r}$. If we
multiply Equation (6) with $A^{s r}$ to get $A^{s r} X^{r}$, then we have

$$
A^{s r} X^{r}=A^{s r}\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r}  \tag{7}\\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]=A^{s r} B^{r s}\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s s} \\
y_{2}^{s s}
\end{array}\right]+A^{s r} B^{r s}\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s r} \\
y_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]+A^{s r} B^{r r}\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{r r} \\
y_{2}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]+A^{s r} B^{r r}\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{r s} \\
y_{2}^{r s}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where

$$
A^{s r}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r} \\
a_{21}^{s r} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right], B^{r s}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
b_{11}^{r s} & b_{12}^{r s} \\
b_{21}^{r s} & b_{22}^{r s}
\end{array}\right], B^{r r}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
b_{11}^{r r} & b_{12}^{r r} \\
b_{21}^{r r} & b_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

The above result is the decomposition of gross intermediate exports by $s$ into four parts according to where they are absorbed. The first term in the right hand side of Equation (7) $\left(A^{s r} B^{r s} y^{s s}\right)$ represents the part of $s$ 's intermediate goods exports used by $r$ to meet final demands in $s$.

From the relationship $X=A X+Y$, we can rewrite the gross output produced by $r$ as

$$
X^{r}=A^{r r} X^{r}+Y^{r r}+A^{r s} X^{s}+Y^{r s}
$$

The latter two parts are exports of intermediate and final goods from $r$ to $s$. We can use Equation (5) to get

$$
X^{r}=A^{r r} X^{r}+Y^{r r}+E^{r s}=\left(I-A^{r r}\right)^{-1}\left(Y^{r r}+E^{r s}\right),
$$

which can be written as follows:

$$
\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r}  \tag{8}\\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
1-a_{11}^{r r} & a_{12}^{r r} \\
a_{21}^{r r} & 1-a_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]^{-1}\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{y}_{1}^{r r} \\
\mathbf{y}_{2}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{cc}
1-a_{11}^{r r} & a_{12}^{r r} \\
a_{21}^{r r} & 1-a_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]^{-1}\left[\begin{array}{c}
e_{1}^{r s} \\
e_{2}^{r s}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

Now, we define the local Leontief inverse $L^{r r}$ as

$$
L^{r r}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
l_{11}^{r r} & l_{12}^{r r} \\
l_{21}^{r r} & l_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
1-a_{11}^{r r} & a_{12}^{r r} \\
a_{21}^{r r} & 1-a_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]^{-1}
$$

and plug it in Equation (8) to obtain

$$
\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r}  \tag{9}\\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
l_{11}^{r r} & l_{12}^{r r} \\
l_{21}^{r r} & l_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{r r} \\
y_{2}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{ll}
l_{11}^{r r} & l_{12}^{r r} \\
l_{21}^{r r} & l_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
e_{1}^{r s} \\
e_{2}^{r s}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Then, intermediate goods export from $s$ to $r$ can be decomposed as

$$
A^{s r} X^{r}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r}  \tag{10}\\
a_{21}^{s r} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r} \\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r} \\
a_{21}^{s r} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{ll}
l_{11}^{r r} & l_{12}^{r r} \\
l_{21}^{r r} & l_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{y}_{1}^{r r} \\
\mathbf{y}_{2}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r} \\
a_{21}^{s r} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{ll}
l_{11}^{r r} & l_{12}^{r r} \\
l_{21}^{r r} & l_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{e}_{1}^{r s} \\
\mathbf{e}_{2}^{r s}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Recall that each row of $V B Y$ summarizes how one intermediate input is used directly and indirectly to produce final goods in corresponding countries and sectors. Then, domestic and foreign value-added multipliers of country $s$ are

$$
\begin{align*}
V^{s} B^{s s} & =\left[\begin{array}{ll}
v_{1}^{s} b_{11}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} b_{21}^{s s} & v_{1}^{s} b_{12}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} b_{22}^{s s}
\end{array}\right]  \tag{11}\\
V^{r} B^{r s} & =\left[\begin{array}{ll}
v_{1}^{r} b_{11}^{r s}+v_{2}^{r} b_{21}^{r s} & v_{1}^{r} b_{12}^{r s}+v_{2}^{r} r_{22}^{r s}
\end{array}\right] \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

and $V^{s} B^{s s}+V^{r} B^{r s}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}1 & 1\end{array}\right]$. Domestic value-added multiplier from $V B$ for Country $s$ is

$$
V^{s}\left(1-A^{s s}\right)^{-1}=V^{s} L^{s s}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
v_{1}^{s} L_{11}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} L_{21}^{s s} & v_{1}^{s} l_{12}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} l_{22}^{s s} \tag{13}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Let \# denote an element-wise matrix multiplication operator. Then, we can rewrite intermediate export from $s$ to $r A^{s r} X^{r}$ and final exports $y^{s r}$ as

$$
\begin{align*}
& A^{s r} X^{r}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r} \\
a_{21}^{s r} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r} \\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}
v_{1}^{s} l_{11}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} l_{21}^{s s} \\
v_{1}^{s} l_{12}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} l_{22}^{s s}
\end{array}\right] \#\left\{\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r} \\
a_{21}^{s r} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r} \\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]\right\} \\
&+\left\{\left[\begin{array}{l}
v_{1}^{s} b_{11}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} b_{21}^{s s} \\
v_{1}^{s} b_{12}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} b_{22}^{s s}
\end{array}\right]\right.\left.\left.-\left[\begin{array}{l}
v_{1}^{s} l_{11}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} l_{21}^{s s} \\
v_{1}^{s} l_{12}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} l_{22}^{s s}
\end{array}\right]\right\} \#\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r} \\
a_{21}^{s r} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\right\}\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r} \\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]  \tag{14}\\
&+\left[\begin{array}{l}
v_{1}^{r} b_{11}^{r s}+v_{2}^{r} b_{21}^{r s} \\
v_{1}^{r} b_{12}^{r s}+v_{2}^{r} b_{22}^{r s}
\end{array}\right] \#\left\{\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r} \\
a_{21}^{s r} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r} \\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]\right\}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s r}  \tag{15}\\
y_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}
v_{1}^{s} b_{11}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} b_{21}^{s s} \\
v_{1}^{s} b_{12}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} b_{22}^{s s}
\end{array}\right] \#\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s r} \\
y_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{l}
v_{1}^{r} b_{11}^{r s}+v_{2}^{r} b_{21}^{r s} \\
v_{1}^{r} b_{12}^{r s}+v_{2}^{r} b_{22}^{r s}
\end{array}\right] \#\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s r} \\
y_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

If we plug Equation (14) and Equation (15) into Equation (5), we get the full decomposition of country $s$ 's export:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
{\left[\begin{array}{l}
e_{1}^{s r} \\
e_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s r} \\
y_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r} \\
a_{21}^{s s} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}^{r} \\
x_{2}^{r}
\end{array}\right]=} & {\left[\begin{array}{l}
v_{1}^{s} b_{11}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} b_{21}^{s s} \\
v_{1}^{s} b_{12}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} b_{22}^{s s}
\end{array}\right] \#\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{s r} \\
y_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]}
\end{array}+\left[\begin{array}{l}
v_{1}^{s} l_{11}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} l_{21}^{s s} \\
v_{1}^{s} l_{12}^{s s}+v_{2}^{s} l_{22}^{s s}
\end{array}\right] \#\left\{\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a_{11}^{s r} & a_{12}^{s r} \\
a_{21}^{s s} & a_{22}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{ll}
b_{12}^{r r} & b_{12}^{r r} \\
b_{21}^{r r} & b_{22}^{r r}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
y_{1}^{r r} \\
v_{2}^{s r}
\end{array}\right]\right\}\right\}
$$

## 2 Missing Values

We provided detailed information about missing observations here. First, the total number of missing observations in our fully saturated model is 78 , which corresponds to $12 \%$ of the total observations. Table 1 reports the number of missing observations by country. Note that all the missing observations are from the right-hand side of the regression equation. While many countries have small numbers of missing observations, Luxembourg, Malta, and Taiwan are completely dropped from the analysis in our most saturated model. The main reason is that the World Bank data set and the polity data set have a large number of missing data for these three countries.

| Country | Number of Missing Observations |
| :---: | :---: |
| AUS | 1 |
| AUT | 1 |
| BEL | 4 |
| CHE | 1 |
| CYP | 3 |
| DEU | 1 |
| DNK | 3 |
| FIN | 3 |
| GRC | 1 |
| HUN | 3 |
| IDN | 3 |
| IRL | 1 |
| ITA | 1 |
| JPN | 2 |
| LUX | 15 |
| LVA | 1 |
| MLT | 15 |
| NOR | 1 |
| SVK | 1 |
| SVN | 1 |
| SWE | 1 |
| TWN | 15 |

Table 1: The Number of Missing Observations by Country

Imputing missing information for these three countries can be problematic because we have no information about the missing data of these three countries. The second best way is to check the sensitivity of our results using a less saturated model that includes all the three countries in the sample data. Table 5 shows the results of the regression analysis ((3) and (4)) in parallel with the original findings ((1) and (2)). For an easier interpretation, we use a simple linear regression and panel robust standard error. Also, for easy check, data are not scaled.

Table 5 shows the results. Note that we need to drop some control variables to add Luxembourg, Malta, and Taiwan in the sample. Our original findings in (1) and (2) do not change much when we add Luxembourg, Malta, and Taiwan in the sample ((3) and (4)).

## 3 Control Variables

We report control variables and their sources in this section.


Figure 1: Predicted Effects of PTA Hub Score on Value Added Exports

- GDP Log transformed gross domestic product. Source: The World Bank (2018)
- GDPpercap Log transformed gross domestic product per capita. Source: The World Bank (2018)
- population Log transformed population. Source: The World Bank (2018)
- land Log transformed arable land. Source: The World Bank (2018)
- FDI Log transformed net inflow of foreign direct investment. Source: The World Bank (2018)
- Polity Polity scores. Source: Center for Systemic Peace (2017)
- MarketOpen The Chinn-Ito index of degree of capital account openness. Source: Chinn and Ito (2006)
- PTA Number The total number of PTAs in the system over time. Source: Author compilation
- degree Unweighted degree centrality by country over time. Source: Author compilation
- betweenness Betweenness centrality by country over time. Source: Author compilation
- participation Participation coefficient centrality by country over time. Source: Author compilation
- closeness Closeness centrality by country over time. Source: Author compilation
- trend A linear trend. Source: Author compilation
- Europe An indicator of European Union members as of 2014. Source: Author compilation


## 4 List of Countries and Industries

EU countries countries in the data set are Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Denmark, Spain, Estonia, Finland, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Latvia, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden. Non-EU countries in the data set are Australia, Bulgaria, Brazil, Canada, Switzerland, China, Croatia, Indonesia, India, Japan, South Korea, Mexico, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey, Taiwan, Province of China, the United States.

The included industries and their industry codes are reported in Table 3.

Table 2: Country and Year Fixed-effect Analysis of PTA Hub Effects on Value-added Exports: Variables are unstandardized. The first two models have missing values and the last two models do not have missing values.

|  | DVA <br> (1) | FVA <br> (2) | DVA <br> (3) | FVA <br> (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PTA hub | $32.01^{* * *}$ | $31.88^{* * *}$ | $32.05^{* * *}$ | $20.50{ }^{* * *}$ |
|  | (5.71) | (7.41) | (6.99) | (7.26) |
| betweenness | $0.005^{* *}$ | 0.01*** | 0.01** | $0.01^{* * *}$ |
|  | (0.002) | (0.003) | (0.003) | (0.003) |
| participation | $-8.41^{* * *}$ | -0.64 | -2.37 | 2.12 |
|  | (2.94) | (3.82) | (3.85) | (4.00) |
| closeness | 5, 720.50*** | 4,413.45 | -561.19 | -549.07 |
|  | (2,173.76) | $(2,822.21)$ | $(2,614.47)$ | (2,715.78) |
| ego centrality | $-0.18^{* *}$ | $-0.32^{* * *}$ | $-0.30^{* * *}$ | $-0.31^{* * *}$ |
|  | (0.07) | (0.09) | (0.09) | (0.10) |
| ego centrality 7 | -0.02 | 0.12 | $-0.34^{* * *}$ | 0.12 |
|  | (0.09) | (0.12) | (0.11) | (0.11) |
| ego centrality 6 | $-0.61^{* * *}$ | $-0.30^{*}$ | $-0.80^{* * *}$ | -0.20 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.16) | (0.17) | (0.17) |
| ego centrality ${ }_{5}$ | $-0.63{ }^{* * *}$ | $-0.89^{* * *}$ | $-1.67{ }^{* * *}$ | $-1.38^{* * *}$ |
|  | (0.21) | (0.28) | (0.28) | (0.29) |
| ego centrality 4 | 0.30 *** | $0.41^{* * *}$ | $0.62{ }^{* * *}$ | $0.64{ }^{* * *}$ |
|  | (0.08) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) |
| ego centrality3 | 0.21 | 0.15 | 0.50 *** | 0.46** |
|  | (0.14) | (0.18) | (0.18) | (0.19) |
| ego centrality2 | $0.64{ }^{* * *}$ | $1.16{ }^{* * *}$ | $1.73{ }^{* * *}$ | $1.73{ }^{* * *}$ |
|  | (0.16) | (0.21) | (0.20) | (0.21) |
| ego centrality ${ }_{1}$ | -0.05 | -0.06 | -0.003 | -0.05 |
|  | (0.04) | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| ego centralityo | $-1.30{ }^{* * *}$ | 0.48 | -0.89 | 0.53 |
|  | (0.43) | (0.56) | (0.59) | (0.61) |
| GDP | $-437.50{ }^{* * *}$ | $-560.85^{* * *}$ |  |  |
|  | (91.13) | (118.32) |  |  |
| land | $-17.89^{* * *}$ | -18.61*** |  |  |
|  | (3.77) | (4.90) |  |  |
| population | $394.82^{* * *}$ | $511.65{ }^{* * *}$ |  |  |
|  | (92.24) | (119.75) |  |  |
| GDP per capita | 460.67*** | $568.34^{* * *}$ |  |  |
|  | (91.10) | (118.27) |  |  |
| FDI | 0.41 | 0.43 |  |  |
|  | (0.27) | (0.35) |  |  |
| polity | 0.38 | 0.72 |  |  |
|  | (0.58) | (0.76) |  |  |
| MarketOpen | $12.42^{* * *}$ | $8.67{ }^{* * *}$ |  |  |
|  | (2.07) | (2.69) |  |  |
| Number of Countries | 40 | 40 | 43 | 43 |
| Observations | 567 | 567 | 645 | 645 |
| R ${ }^{2}$ | 0.69 | 0.45 | 0.36 | 0.31 |
| Adjusted R ${ }^{2}$ | 0.68 | 0.43 | 0.35 | 0.29 |


|  | IndustryCode | IndustryLabel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A01 | Crop and animal production, hunting and related service activities |
| 2 | A02 | Forestry and logging |
| 3 | A03 | Fishing and aquaculture |
| 4 | B | Mining and quarrying |
| 5 | C10-C12 | Manufacture of food products, beverages and tobacco products |
| 6 | C13-C15 | Manufacture of textiles, wearing apparel and leather products |
| 7 | C16 | Manufacture of wood and of products of wood and cork, except furniture; manufacture of articles of straw and plaiting materials |
| 8 | C17 | Manufacture of paper and paper products |
| 9 | C18 | Printing and reproduction of recorded media |
| 10 | C19 | Manufacture of coke and refined petroleum products |
| 11 | C20 | Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products |
| 12 | C21 | Manufacture of basic pharmaceutical products and pharmaceutical preparations |
| 13 | C22 | Manufacture of rubber and plastic products |
| 14 | C23 | Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products |
| 15 | C24 | Manufacture of basic metals |
| 16 | C25 | Manufacture of fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment |
| 17 | C26 | Manufacture of computer, electronic and optical products |
| 18 | C27 | Manufacture of electrical equipment |
| 19 | C28 | Manufacture of machinery and equipment n.e.c. |
| 20 | C29 | Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers |
| 21 | C30 | Manufacture of other transport equipment |
| 22 | C31_C32 | Manufacture of furniture; other manufacturing |
| 23 | C33 | Repair and installation of machinery and equipment |
| 24 | D35 | Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply |
| 25 | E36 | Water collection, treatment and supply |
| 26 | E37-E39 | Sewerage; waste collection, treatment and disposal activities; materials recovery; remediation activities and other waste management services |
| 27 | F | Construction |
| 28 | G45 | Wholesale and retail trade and repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles |
| 29 | G46 | Wholesale trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles |
| 30 | G47 | Retail trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles |
| 31 | H49 | Land transport and transport via pipelines |
| 32 | H50 | Water transport |
| 33 | H51 | Air transport |
| 34 | H52 | Warehousing and support activities for transportation |
| 35 | H53 | Postal and courier activities |
| 36 | I | Accommodation and food service activities |
| 37 | J58 | Publishing activities |
| 38 | J59_J60 | Motion picture, video and television programme production, sound recording and music publishing activities; programming and broadcasting activities |
| 39 | J61 | Telecommunications |
| 40 | J62_J63 | Computer programming, consultancy and related activities; information service activities |
| 41 | K64 | Financial service activities, except insurance and pension funding |
| 42 | K65 | Insurance, reinsurance and pension funding, except compulsory social security |
| 43 | K66 | Activities auxiliary to financial services and insurance activities |
| 44 | L68 | Real estate activities |
| 45 | M69_M70 | Legal and accounting activities; activities of head offices; management consultancy activities |
| 46 | M71 | Architectural and engineering activities; technical testing and analysis |
| 47 | M72 | Scientific research and development |
| 48 | M73 | Advertising and market research |
| 49 | M74_M75 | Other professional, scientific and technical activities; veterinary activities |
| 50 | N | Administrative and support service activities |
| 51 | O84 | Public administration and defence; compulsory social security |
| 52 | P85 | Education |
| 53 | Q | Human health and social work activities |
| 54 | R_S | Other service activities |
| 55 | T | Activities of households as employers; undifferentiated goods- and services-producing activities of households for own use |
| 56 | U | Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies |

Table 3: List of Industries

## 5 Selection of Regularization Methods

We selected regularization methods by comparing the residual sum of squares (RSS). Three candidate methods are ordinary least squares (OLS), Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996), adaptive Lasso (Zou, 2006). We choose $\lambda$ for the lasso and the adaptive lasso using 10 -fold crossvalidation. In the case of the adaptive lasso method, we choose $\lambda$ within one standard error of the minimum that is known to provide the most regularized model.

Table 4 shows the RSS for different regularization methods. The top panel and the bottom panel show the results from different fixed-effects model specifications. Note that we already detrended data by a linear trend model. Thus, the addition of year fixed-effects term does not make much difference, which is consistent across our various trials. The adaptive lasso method always outperform the other two methods in both equations. Thus, we use the adaptive lass method in the subsequent analysis.

| Fixed Effects | RSS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Dependent Variable | OLS |  | Lasso |  | Adaptive Lasso |  |
|  |  | First stage | Second stage | First stage | Second stage | First stage | Second stage |
| Country |  | DVA | 392228.52 | 81094.01 | 5.59 | 12.02 | 1.46 |

Table 4: Residual Sum of Squares

## 6 Lagged Variable Specifications

We check the sensitivity of our findings against different lag specifications of our causal variable. Table 5 reports the fixed-effects (FE) analysis results using our causal variable (PTA hub ${ }_{t-2}$ ) as well as its different lag specifications ( PTA hub ${ }_{t-1}$ and PTA hub ${ }_{t}$ ). Now, the coefficients of PTA hub ${ }_{t-2}$ show the marginal effects of the two-year lagged PTA hub status controlling for its contemporaneous and one-year lagged effects.

In the first two model specifications (One-way FE and Two-way FE), our original results do not change much. The two-year lagged PTA hub status has a positive and significant effect on value-added exports. Adding PTA hub ${ }_{t-1}$ and PTA hub ${ }_{t}$ mitigates the effect of PTA
hub status between country averages of value-added exports. Note the small sample size in the between model $(\mathrm{N}=40, \mathrm{~K}=25)$. The first-differenced model shows a positive and significant effect only in DVA. Interestingly, PTA hub ${ }_{t-1}$ takes a positive and significant effect from PTA hub ${ }_{t-2}$ in FVA. Also, PTA hub ${ }_{t}$ is positive in One-way FE and Two-way FE models.

Although these new findings are somewhat interesting, PTA hub ${ }_{t-2}$ shows larger and more consistent signs than other lag specifications. Also, adding different lag specifications does not change our main findings and conclusions.

## 7 Additional Regression Results

Table 6 shows the additional regression results of the fixed-effects analysis under different model specifications. In most cases, the statistical significance does not change by dropping some covariates. PTA hub score has a consistent sign on value-added exports across different model specifications.

## 8 Computation of Participation Coefficient

Participation coefficient is calculated in two steps. First, bloc structure in a network is calculated by optimizing the modularity score. Modularity optimization algorithm is widely employed method for finding stable community structure in a network in various fields of study (Guimera and Amaral, 2005; Newman, 2006; Zhang et al., 2008; Lupu and Traag, 2013). Modularity, which is a "function of the particular division of the network into groups, with larger values indicating stronger community structure" (Newman, 2006, 5), is given by

$$
Q=\sum_{s=1}^{B}\left[\frac{t_{s}}{L}-\left(\frac{d_{s}}{2 T}\right)^{2}\right]
$$

where $B$ indicates the number of blocs, $T$ is the total number of ties in the network, and $t_{s}$ is the number of ties between actors in bloc $s$ and $d_{s}$ is the sum of the degrees of the actors in bloc $s$. Here, $\left.\frac{d_{s}}{2 T}\right)^{2}$ is equivalent to the expected degree of connection between actors within the same bloc. Intuitively, The second step is to identify different roles of actors with respect

Table 5: Lagged Variable Sensitivity Test

| Model | One-way FE |  | Two-way FE |  | Between |  | First-differenced |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DVA | FVA | DVA | FVA | DVA | FVA | DVA | FVA |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| PTA hub $_{t-2}$ | 0.19 *** | 0.19** | $0.16^{* * *}$ | $0.14 * *$ | 1.47 | -1.89 | 0.10 ** | 0.08 |
|  | (0.06) | (0.09) | (0.05) | (0.07) | (3.36) | (4.66) | (0.04) | (0.07) |
| PTA $\mathrm{hub}_{t-1}$ | -0.07 | -0.08 | -0.09** | -0.10 | -8.43 | -0.83 | 0.01 | 0.06* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.08) | (0.04) | (0.06) | (7.58) | (10.53) | (0.02) | (0.04) |
| PTA hub ${ }_{t}$ | $0.07{ }^{* *}$ | 0.14*** | 0.09*** | $0.14{ }^{* * *}$ | 7.70 | 5.15 | -0.02 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.03) | (0.04) | (4.65) | (6.46) | (0.02) | (0.03) |
| Europe |  |  |  |  | 0.08 | 0.59 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.25) | (0.35) |  |  |
| betweenness | 0.02 | 0.05** | 0.02* | 0.05*** | -0.05 | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.07) | (0.10) | (0.01) | (0.02) |
| participation | -0.01 | 0.02 | $-0.04{ }^{* * *}$ | -0.01 | 0.03 | 0.22 | $-0.02^{* * *}$ | $-0.05^{* * *}$ |
|  | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.18) | (0.25) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| closeness | -0.01 | -0.02 | $0.05^{* * *}$ | 0.05** | -0.06 | 0.01 | -0.004 | -0.003 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.36) | (0.50) | (0.005) | (0.01) |
| ego centrality | -0.09 | -0.18* | -0.10* | $-0.20^{* *}$ | -0.42 | -1.90 | -0.01 | 0.04 |
|  | (0.06) | (0.10) | (0.05) | (0.08) | (1.01) | (1.41) | (0.05) | (0.08) |
| ego centrality ${ }_{7}$ | $-0.02^{* *}$ | 0.01 | -0.01 | 0.02 | -1.49* | -1.34 | 0.0000 | 0.02** |
|  | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.74) | (1.04) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| ego centrality 6 | $-0.03^{* * *}$ | $-0.02^{* *}$ | $-0.02^{* * *}$ | -0.01 | -0.11 | -0.12 | -0.01** | -0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.34) | (0.48) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| ego centrality ${ }_{5}$ | $-0.07^{* *}$ | -0.09* | $-0.08^{* * *}$ | $-0.12^{* * *}$ | -0.02 | -0.32 | $-0.05^{* *}$ | -0.05 |
|  | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.18) | (0.25) | (0.02) | (0.04) |
| ego centrality ${ }_{4}$ | -0.03 | $-0.08^{* * *}$ | $0.06{ }^{* * *}$ | 0.09 *** | 0.24 | -0.39 | $-0.06^{* * *}$ | $-0.15{ }^{* * *}$ |
|  | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.40) | (0.56) | (0.01) | (0.02) |
| ego centrality ${ }_{3}$ | $0.12$ | $0.11$ | $0.05$ | 0.06 | $-0.08$ | $-0.42$ | -0.06 | $-0.34^{* *}$ |
|  | (0.09) | $(0.15)$ | $(0.08)$ | $(0.12)$ | $(0.27)$ | $(0.38)$ | $(0.08)$ | $(0.13)$ |
| ego centrality 2 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.12*** | $0.21^{* * *}$ | 0.15** | 0.10 | 0.06* | 0.10** |
|  | (0.03) | (0.06) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.07) | (0.10) | (0.03) | (0.05) |
| ego centrality ${ }_{1}$ | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.02 | -0.03 | -0.08 | 0.58 | -0.03 | $-0.06^{* *}$ |
|  | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.43) | (0.60) | (0.02) | (0.03) |
| ego centralityo | $-0.55^{* * *}$ | -0.21 | $-0.35^{* * *}$ | 0.09 | 0.13 | 0.43 | -0.15 | -0.18 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.23) | (0.12) | (0.18) | (0.25) | (0.35) | (0.15) | (0.24) |
| GDP | $-9.06^{* * *}$ | $-14.82^{* * *}$ | $-9.18^{* * *}$ | $-14.82^{* * *}$ | 4.25* | $8.67{ }^{* *}$ | -0.84 | -1.01 |
|  | (3.33) | (5.30) | (2.69) | (4.10) | (2.27) | (3.16) | (3.52) | (5.63) |
| land | $-0.24{ }^{* * *}$ | $-0.29^{* *}$ | $-0.20^{* * *}$ | $-0.24^{* * *}$ | 0.06 | -0.07 | 0.02 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.07) | (0.12) | (0.06) | (0.09) | (0.08) | (0.11) | (0.06) | (0.09) |
| population | 8.02** | 13.59** | $8.84^{* * *}$ | $14.55^{* * *}$ | $-3.21$ | -7.95** | $-0.44$ | -0.76 |
|  | (3.58) | (5.71) | $(2.90)$ | $(4.42)$ | $(2.42)$ | (3.36) | $(3.84)$ | (6.12) |
| GDP per capita | $6.04{ }^{* * *}$ | 9.45*** | $5.99^{* * *}$ | 9.22*** | -1.78 | -4.54** | 1.15 | 1.26 |
|  | (2.04) | (3.25) | (1.65) | (2.52) | (1.37) | (1.91) | (2.16) | (3.46) |
| FDI | 0.02** | $0.03 * *$ | 0.01* | 0.01 | 0.18** | $0.34 * * *$ | 0.01** | 0.02*** |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.07) | (0.10) | (0.004) | (0.01) |
| polity | 0.08** | $0.17^{* * *}$ | 0.02 | 0.07 | -0.03 | -0.10 | -0.01 | 0.03 |
|  | (0.04) | (0.06) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.08) | (0.11) | (0.03) | (0.05) |
| MarketOpen | $0.07{ }^{* * *}$ | 0.05*** | 0.05*** | $0.03^{* *}$ | -0.03 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.02) | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.10)$ | (0.14) | $(0.01)$ | (0.02) |
| trend | $0.04 * * *$ | 0.07*** |  |  | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.02 | 0.07*** |
|  | (0.004) | (0.01) |  |  | (0.17) | (0.24) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Observations | 497 | 497 | 497 | 497 | 40 | 40 | 457 | 457 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.92 | 0.88 | 0.70 | 0.44 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.65 | 0.54 |
| Adjusted R ${ }^{2}$ | 0.91 | 0.86 | 0.64 | 0.34 | 0.94 | 0.89 | 0.64 | 0.52 |

to their blocs. Guimera and Amaral (2005) proposes z-score to differentiate roles of actors within a bloc. The z-score is given by

$$
z_{i}=\frac{\kappa_{i}-\bar{\kappa}_{s_{i}}}{\sigma_{\kappa_{s_{i}}}}
$$

where $\kappa_{i}$ is the number of ties of $i$ to the other actors within the same bloc, $\bar{\kappa}_{s_{i}}$ is the average number of ties within the bloc that $i$ belongs to, and $\sigma_{\kappa_{s_{i}}}$ indicates the standard deviation of $\kappa$ in $s_{i}$. What z-score measures is the extent of connectivity of actor $i$ to other actors in the same bloc.

Using the z-score, we can now measure the participation coefficient. The participation coefficient $P_{i}$ is,

$$
P_{i}=1-\sum_{s=1}^{B}\left(\frac{\kappa_{i, s}}{k_{i}}\right)^{2}
$$

Here, $\kappa_{i, s}$ is the number of ties from $i$ to actors in bloc $s$ and $k_{i}$ is the degree of actor $i$. What the latter term measures is the number of actor $i$ 's ties to bloc $s$ divided by the total degree of that actor. In other words,

$$
P_{i}=1-\sum_{s=1}^{B}\left(\frac{\text { number of } i \text { 's ties to bloc } s}{\text { total degree of actor } i}\right)^{2} .
$$
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The 8 auxiliary categories are "total intermediate" "tax", "adjustment", "direct purchase abroad", "purchase by domestic", "value added" ,"international transport margins", and "output at basic prices."
    ${ }^{2}$ These 5 categories are "Total intermediate consumption", "taxes less subsidies on products", "Cif/ fob adjustments on exports", "Direct purchases abroad by residents", and "Purchases on the domestic territory by non-residents."

