

Productivity Shocks and Input Misallocation: A Decomposition

Davide Luparello

The Pennsylvania State University and BAFPI

May 20, 2026

[\[click here for the most updated version\]](#)

This paper investigates how productivity dispersion relates to input misallocation in European manufacturing. The model features staggered productivity shocks that create wedges between anticipated and realized productivity for any production input. Using European firm-level data from 2001–2017, I show that, under the maintained model, shocks realized after inputs are committed are the largest contributor to marginal revenue product dispersion for every input, accounting for 75% of the variance for materials, 37% for labor, and 18% for capital. These results are consistent with input misallocation in European manufacturing reflecting post-commitment productivity shocks more than persistent heterogeneity across firms.

Davide Luparello: dluparello@psu.edu. I would like to thank Mark Roberts, Paul Grieco, and Jim Tybout for their invaluable comments and suggestions. I am also grateful to Carlo Altomonte, Gianmarco Ottaviano, Italo Colantone, Jonathan Eaton, Marc Henry, Karl Schurter, Ewout Verriest, Conor Ryan, Bradley Setzler, Fernando Parro, Jingting Fan, Kai-Jie Wu, Stephen Yeaple, Kala Krishna, and Benedicta Marzinotto for their helpful feedback. My appreciation extends to the organizers and participants of the Penn State Trade and Development and Applied Microeconomics Brownbag seminars, Bocconi Trade Tea seminar, MICROPROD Final Event Conference, and the 12th CompNet Annual Conference. Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the research assistance provided by Anthropic's Claude LLM within the guidelines specified in Korinek (2023). This paper previously circulated under the names "Productivity, Inputs Misallocation, and the Financial Crisis" and "Do Productivity Shocks Cause Input Misallocation?". The data used in this study were collected during the development of the EU Horizon 2020 funded MICROPROD project (Grant Agreement No. 822390), which concluded in 2022. Additional project information is available at <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/822390/results>.

1. Introduction

A firm’s forecast productivity informs key executive decisions about operations and investments. When leadership anticipates high productivity, they may increase orders for manufacturing inputs, expand staff and facilities, or allocate more funding to research and development for new products. Conversely, if lower productivity is projected, executives may reduce input orders to contain costs. However, firms face dynamic uncertainty in forecasting future productivity. As productivity shocks occur unpredictably over time, initial forecasts may diverge from realized productivity. When wedges emerge between anticipated and realized productivity, input decisions set *ex ante* can substantially diverge from optimal *ex post* quantities, generating *ex post* misallocation even when choices are *ex ante* optimal.

This paper quantitatively investigates how productivity uncertainty can account for *ex post* misallocation across all production inputs. The mechanism operates through productivity shocks that arrive at various stages of the firms’ input decision timeline, under the timing assumptions of a partial equilibrium production function model. Aligning with established approaches (Restuccia and Rogerson (2008), Hsieh and Klenow (2009)), this analysis uses the dispersion of marginal revenue product (MRP) for an input across firms to quantify *ex post* misallocation. Under certain assumptions, a non-negligible dispersion indicates the presence of frictions preventing resource flows from less to more efficient uses within an industry.¹

Asker, Collard-Wexler, and De Loecker (2014) show that for capital, a dynamic input

¹Misallocative determinants include idiosyncratic regulations and institutions (Bartelsman, Haltiwanger, and Scarpetta (2009), Bartelsman, Haltiwanger, and Scarpetta (2013)), employment protection measures (Restuccia and Rogerson (2017)), credit supply shocks and financial frictions (Gopinath, Kalemli-Özcan, Karabarbounis, and Villegas-Sanchez (2017), Ben Zeev (2023)), sub-optimal endogenous firms’ selection (Yang (2021)), factor adjustment costs and productivity information frictions (Asker, Collard-Wexler, and De Loecker (2014), David and Venkateswaran (2019)). Other determinants are noise introduced by measurement error (Gollin and Udry (2021), Bils, Klenow, and Ruane (2021)), production and demand heterogeneity (Restuccia and Rogerson (2013), Bento and Restuccia (2017), Blackwood, Foster, Grim, Haltiwanger, and Wolf (2021), Haltiwanger, Kulick, and Syverson (2018)).

with adjustment costs, MRP dispersion and optimal allocations coexist because of heterogeneity in firms' productivity and adjustment frictions, even if a static view would imply suboptimality and misallocation due to the dispersion in MRP. This paper focuses specifically on how revenue total factor productivity (TFPR) idiosyncrasies and uncertainty generate MRP dispersion for any production input, expanding on David, Hopenhayn, and Venkateswaran (2016) by allowing imperfect information to affect all inputs and firms at various stages.

To infer the relationship between MRP and TFPR and its shock components, I estimate a partial equilibrium production function model based on Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020), augmented with time-varying TFPR processes to capture regime shifts (including the Financial Crisis), on 2001–2017 firm-level panel data from six European countries. The model treats capital and labor as predetermined relative to materials, a flexible input, and abstracts from specific distortions such as adjustment costs and financial frictions; productivity uncertainty is the sole modeled source of misallocation.

The model's key feature is that TFPR can be separated into three components according to when they are observed: an expected productivity level, available when all input decisions are made; an ex-ante innovation, revealed between the allocation of predetermined and flexible inputs; and an ex-post shock, unresolved until production is complete. By exploiting the Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020) estimator's ability to separate productivity into these timing-specific components, I provide the first, to my knowledge, decomposition of MRP dispersion that traces misallocation to when each shock is revealed along the input allocation timeline.

I obtain several results. First, MRP and TFPR dispersion co-move over time within each of the six countries. I quantify this relationship by regressing the log variance of each input's MRP on the log variance of TFPR at the country-industry-year level with country-year and country-industry fixed effects. The pooled elasticities are 0.30, 0.41, and 0.55 for capital, labor, and materials respectively.

Second, a variance decomposition reveals a clear hierarchy among the three TFPR components. The ex-post shock, the only component unknown at every stage of input allocation, accounts for the largest share of MRP variance: 18% for capital, 37% for labor, and 75% for materials. Expected productivity and the ex-ante innovation contribute substantially less, particularly for materials. This is consistent with the model's prediction: firms adjust materials after observing $m(\omega_{-1})$ and η , so the ex-post shock (which arrives after all inputs are committed) accounts for the dominant share of dispersion in its marginal revenue product.

These results hinge on the Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020) estimator. Monte Carlo simulations show that a factor shares estimation approach, by imposing constant returns to scale, overstates capital elasticities and compresses labor and materials MRP distributions toward input prices, masking productivity-driven dispersion. A proxy-variable estimator is approximately unbiased on average but too imprecise to support inference on elasticity dispersion. Re-estimation under imperfect competition, with period-specific markups and EUROSTAT producer price deflators, preserves the TFPR and MRP dispersion patterns, indicating that they are not attributable to industry-period-level deviations from price-taking.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the theoretical framework. Section 3 describes the data and relevant descriptive statistics. Section 4 discusses the empirical framework and identification strategy. Section 5 presents the main results: elasticity and returns to scale estimates, the TFPR–MRP dispersion regressions and the TFPR variance decomposition. Section 6 validates the main findings against alternative estimation methods via Monte Carlo simulation and examines robustness to imperfect competition. Section 7 concludes.

2. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework follows Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020), which I augment by including time-varying productivity processes. The framework incorporates firms' imperfect information around productivity as the sole modeled source of friction. Specifically, the model assumes multiple productivity shocks occurring between and after input allocations. The model remains intentionally agnostic on the allocation problem of capital and labor, assuming only they are predetermined relative to materials. This flexible approach allows the framework to generate dynamics consistent with a wide range of distortions that could impact these predetermined inputs in both static and intertemporal settings², while still focusing solely on productivity uncertainty as the only modeled distortion.

Let Y_{jt} denote the revenue and K_{jt} , L_{jt} and M_{jt} the capital, labor, and materials allocations of firm j at time t . Lowercase variables indicate natural logarithms. The log revenue function is non-parametrically specified as

$$(1) \quad y_{jt} = f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) + v_{jt}$$

With a slight abuse of notation, let $F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) \equiv e^{f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}$ denote the corresponding level production function written as a function of log inputs, so that the level revenue equation reads $Y_{jt} = F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) e^{v_{jt}}$. Here v_{jt} is revenue total factor productivity, specified as the composition of a persistent and an unexpected component (Olley and Pakes (1996))

$$(2) \quad v_{jt} = \omega_{jt} + \varepsilon_{jt}$$

²Examples are resale losses due to transaction costs, the market for lemons phenomenon (Akerlof (1970)), the physical cost of resale and refit costs for capital, hiring, firing, and training losses for workers (Bloom (2009)), working capital and borrowing constraints, government regulations, transportation costs, subsidies, and taxes (Hsieh and Klenow (2009)).

ω_{jt} is a persistent productivity factor that firm j observes at the beginning of period t but does not know at $t-1$. By contrast, ε_{jt} represents a residual, short-term idiosyncratic revenue fluctuation observed only as the period ends.³

Let $\mathcal{J}_{jt}$ denote the information set that firm j holds at time t before the realization of ε_{jt} , and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{jt}$ the information set that firm j holds at the end of period t . The following assumptions characterize the pricing behavior, the input allocation, the persistent productivity process, and the realization of the productivity shocks.

ASSUMPTION 1 (Pricing Behavior). *Firms are price takers in the output and input markets. The firm faces the nominal input prices w_{jt} , r_{jt} , and ρ_{jt} as the wage rate, the rental rate of capital, and the unit cost of materials. Each input price is paid at the time of that input's allocation.*

ASSUMPTION 2 (Input Allocations). *Firm j allocates the period t capital and labor inputs, K_{jt} and L_{jt} , just before period t starts. Hence, these inputs are predetermined. By contrast, the firm allocates intermediate materials, M_{jt} , after knowing ω_{jt} but before knowing ε_{jt} , by solving a static value-added maximization problem. Consequently, intermediate materials are a flexible production input.*

ASSUMPTION 3 (Persistent Productivity Process). *ω_{jt} follows a time-varying stochastic*

³ ε_{jt} admits two observationally equivalent alternative interpretations. First, ε_{jt} may reflect ex-post measurement error in firm revenue: Bils, Klenow, and Ruane (2021) show that revenue noise alone can account for a nontrivial share of measured input misallocation. Second, because the estimation targets revenue rather than physical output, ε_{jt} also absorbs firm-specific demand shocks (Foster, Haltiwanger, and Syverson (2008)). Following Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020), I adopt the *ex post productivity shock* interpretation: a shock to revenue productivity observed only at the end of period t . Under the timing assumptions below, the supply-side versus demand-side origin of ε_{jt} does not affect the misallocation argument, since any unforecastable revenue component revealed after inputs are committed generates dispersion in input MRPs that firms cannot eliminate ex post. Following the convention in the production-function estimation literature, I assume no measurement error in the input variables; Collard-Wexler and De Loecker (2016) and Il Kim, Petrin, and Song (2016) study measurement error in capital.

Markov process with a mean 0 innovation that realizes in period t . Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \omega_{jt} &= m_t(\omega_{jt-1}) + \eta_{jt} \\
 (3) \quad \omega_{jt-1} &\in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{jt-1}, \quad \eta_{jt} \notin \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{jt-1} \quad \forall j, t \\
 E(\eta_{jt} \mid \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{jt-1}) &= E(\eta_{jt}) = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

where $m_t(\cdot)$ is a continuous, strictly monotonic function, and η_{jt} is the productivity innovation that realizes in period t .

The innovation η_{jt} is not necessarily identically distributed each period since the only restriction pertains to its first moment. Let its cross-sectional variance be time-varying, σ_t^2 .

ASSUMPTION 4 (Productivity Shocks Realization Timing). η_{jt} realizes at the beginning of period t . The persistent productivity component, ω_{jt} , is then known at the beginning of period t . The unexpected component, ε_{jt} , is mean-independent of $\mathcal{J}_{jt}$ and realizes towards the end of period t . Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \omega_{jt} &\in \mathcal{J}_{jt}, \quad \varepsilon_{jt} \notin \mathcal{J}_{jt}, \quad \varepsilon_{jt} \in \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{jt} \quad \forall j, t \\
 (4) \quad E(\varepsilon_{jt} \mid \mathcal{J}_{jt}) &= E(\varepsilon_{jt}) = 0 \\
 E(e^{\varepsilon_{jt}} \mid \mathcal{J}_{jt}) &= E(e^{\varepsilon_{jt}}) = \mathcal{E}
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is a scalar constant.

Similarly, the short-term fluctuation ε_{jt} is not necessarily identically distributed. Let its cross-sectional variance be time-varying, τ_t^2 .

The following timeline summarizes the assumptions above.

- a. Firm j ends period $t - 1$ knowing the period's TFPR v_{jt-1} and the observed revenue Y_{jt-1} . That is, the firm has information set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{jt-1}$.

- b. The firm now chooses L_{jt} and K_{jt} for nominal wage rate w_{jt} and rental rate of capital r_{jt} , as a function of $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{jt-1}$.
- c. Firm j enters period t . η_{jt} realizes. The firm now knows ω_{jt} and has information set $\mathcal{J}_{jt}$.
- d. The firm chooses the period t materials allocation, m_{jt} , as a function of $\mathcal{J}_{jt}$ solving the following value-added maximization problem given the materials unit price ρ_{jt}

$$(5) \quad \max_{M_{jt}} \left[E(F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})e^{\nu_{jt}} \mid \mathcal{J}_{jt}) - \rho_{jt}M_{jt} \right]$$

- e. Finally, right before period t ends, the firm can now observe ε_{jt} and, then, the period's TFPR ν_{jt} and observed revenue Y_{jt} . The firm now has the information set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{jt}$.

Throughout this paper, I refer to η_{jt} as the *ex-ante productivity shock* and ε_{jt} as the *ex-post productivity shock*, relative to the material inputs allocation.

2.1. How Productivity Shocks Map into MRP Dispersion

Under the model's assumptions, I derive how each productivity component maps into the marginal revenue product of each input at the firm level, so that dispersion in firm-level productivities translates into dispersion of input marginal revenue products across firms at the industry level (an indication of misallocation).

The MRP of input X is the derivative of revenue Y with respect to input allocation X . By the chain rule, a simple decomposition expresses the marginal revenue product of any input X as a function of final revenue Y_{jt} , input allocation X_{jt} , and the revenue elasticity of that input $\frac{\partial y_{jt}}{\partial x_{jt}}$.

$$(6) \quad \text{MRP}_{jt}^X = \frac{\partial Y_{jt}}{\partial X_{jt}} = \frac{\partial Y_{jt}}{\partial y_{jt}} \frac{\partial y_{jt}}{\partial x_{jt}} \frac{\partial x_{jt}}{\partial X_{jt}} = \frac{Y_{jt}}{X_{jt}} \text{elas}_{jt}^X \quad \forall X \in \{K, L, M\}$$

Taking the natural logarithm, and totally differentiating⁴ with respect to TFPR leads to

$$(7) \quad \frac{d\text{mrp}_{jt}^X}{dv_{jt}} = \frac{dy_{jt}}{dv_{jt}} - \frac{dx_{jt}}{dv_{jt}} + \frac{d\log \text{elas}_{jt}^X}{dv_{jt}}$$

Equation (7) shows that three factors determine the elasticity of an input's marginal product with respect to a hypothetical change in the firm's TFPR. The first and second terms are the elasticities of revenue and input allocation with respect to TFPR. The third term captures TFPR's effect on the input's revenue elasticity.

By combining equations (2) and (3), TFPR can be further decomposed into three distinct components based on the firm's productivity information:

$$(8) \quad v_{jt} = m_t(\omega_{jt-1}) + \eta_{jt} + \varepsilon_{jt}$$

By the chain rule,⁵ the total effect of a change in TFPR on the MRP of an input can be expressed as the combination of the effects of the changes in each component of TFPR on that input's MRP. More formally,

$$(9) \quad \frac{d\text{mrp}_{jt}^X}{dv_{jt}} = c \left(\frac{d\text{mrp}_{jt}^X}{d\omega_{jt-1}} \left(\frac{\partial m_t(\omega_{jt-1})}{\partial \omega_{jt-1}} \right)^{-1}, \frac{d\text{mrp}_{jt}^X}{d\eta_{jt}}, \frac{d\text{mrp}_{jt}^X}{d\varepsilon_{jt}} \right)$$

where $c(\cdot)$ aggregates the three path-specific responses. In turn, the effect of each

⁴Indeed,

$$\frac{\partial \text{mrp}_{jt}^X}{\partial y_{jt}} = - \frac{\partial \text{mrp}_{jt}^X}{\partial x_{jt}} = \frac{\partial \text{mrp}_{jt}^X}{\partial \log \text{elas}_{jt}^X} = 1.$$


⁵ mrp_{jt}^X depends on v_{jt} only through its three components $(m_t(\omega_{jt-1}), \eta_{jt}, \varepsilon_{jt})$. Each path-specific response, defined as $d\text{mrp}_{jt}^X/dv_{jt}$ when v_{jt} varies through a single component while the other two are held fixed, is given by the chain rule: $(\partial \text{mrp}_{jt}^X/\partial \omega_{jt-1}) (\partial m_t(\omega_{jt-1})/\partial \omega_{jt-1})^{-1}$ along the ω_{jt-1} -path, $\partial \text{mrp}_{jt}^X/\partial \eta_{jt}$ along the η_{jt} -path, and $\partial \text{mrp}_{jt}^X/\partial \varepsilon_{jt}$ along the ε_{jt} -path. The total response $d\text{mrp}_{jt}^X/dv_{jt}$ depends on the direction in $(\omega_{jt-1}, \eta_{jt}, \varepsilon_{jt})$ -space along which v_{jt} is taken to vary; the combination function $c(\cdot)$ aggregates the three path-specific responses for a given direction. The estimator's identification argument relies only on the mean-independence conditions in Assumptions 3–4.

productivity driver can be decomposed as

$$(10) \quad \frac{d\text{mrp}_{jt}^X}{d\theta} = \frac{dy_{jt}}{d\theta} - \frac{dx_{jt}}{d\theta} + \frac{d\log \text{elas}_{jt}^X}{d\theta} \quad \forall \theta \in \{\omega_{jt-1}, \eta_{jt}, \varepsilon_{jt}\}$$

In summary, the theoretical framework outlined here implies that past productivity, the ex-ante productivity shock, and the ex-post productivity shock affect three model objects: the firm's final revenue, the input allocation, and the input's revenue elasticity. The combined response of these three pathways yields the model-implied derivative of the MRP of a given input with respect to TFPR variation. Figure 1 summarizes this mechanism. At the industry level, dispersion in firm-level productivity components is therefore predicted to generate dispersion in input MRPs.

FIGURE 1. How Productivity Shocks Map into MRP Dispersion: Mechanism



This diagram illustrates the theoretical channels from Section 2.1. Each productivity driver (left) affects the MRP of an input (right) through three pathways: realized revenue, input allocation, and revenue elasticity. Arrows represent the partial effects formalized in equations (7)–(10).

3. Data and Descriptive Statistics

The annual firm-level harmonized balance sheet data used in this paper are obtained from the MICROPROD project's Micro Data Infrastructure for European manufacturing firms (Statistical Classification of Economic Activities, NACE, Rev2 code C), hereafter

MP.⁶ Funded by the European Union (EU) and built on Bureau van Dijk’s Orbis database, MICROPROD integrates international European microdata to inform policymakers on growth and reform policies.

As of 2020, MP contained approximately 500,000 unique manufacturing firms for Italy, France, and Spain operating between 2000 and 2017. Additional German, Polish, and Romanian manufacturing firms operating between 2004 and 2017 have since been included. MP’s careful examination of firm operating status⁷, conservative imputation of missing values, and identification of a *productivity sample* minimally subject to imputation produce a representative sample that closely replicates Eurostat’s aggregate Structural Business Statistics.⁸ Altomonte and Coali (2020) extensively detail MP’s data collection and cleansing. Recent applications of MP include Abele, Bénassy-Quéré, and Fontagné (2021) and Altomonte, Bauer, Gilardi, and Soriolo (2022); the underlying Orbis data have been used more widely (e.g., Asker, Collard-Wexler, and De Loecker (2014), Gopinath et al. (2017), Kalemli-Özcan, Sørensen, Villegas-Sanchez, Volosovych, and Yesiltas (2024), Altomonte, Morlacco, Sonno, and Favoino (2025)).

I use the variable *Operating Revenue (Turnover)* to approximate the firm’s revenue Y , and the *Number of Employees* to approximate the workforce L . MP does not have separate information on prices and quantities for the variables relative to intermediates and capital. I deflate the variables *Cost of Materials* for intermediates M , and *Total Fixed Assets* for capital K . I source industry-level (NACE Rev2 two digits) intermediate inputs (for materials) and gross output (for capital) deflators from EU-KLEMS (Capital, Labor, Energy, Materials, Services).

Table 1 reports summary statistics for the main variables used in the analysis. From the three quartiles (Q1, median, and Q3), it is apparent that all variables’ distributions are heavily right-skewed, with many small firms and few big firms. The minima and

⁶<https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/822390>

⁷i.e., active or inactive.

⁸<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/structural-business-statistics>

maxima indicate that I capture both very small and very large firms. However, the comparison of medians and means across countries indicates that the German and Polish samples underrepresent smaller firms, which may attenuate the estimated variance of productivity shocks for those countries. This problem is less pronounced for the other countries.⁹ The sample is an unbalanced panel spanning 2000–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania): firms may enter or exit, but those with gaps in consecutive-year coverage are dropped to ensure valid lag construction.

4. Empirical Framework

Building on the nonparametric approach of Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020) (hereafter GNR), I adapt the estimation procedure to allow for time-varying productivity dynamics. Additional details can be found in Appendix A.

Stage one rearranges the first-order firm maximization condition (5) into an estimable nonlinear equation. Applying least squares delivers two key outputs: materials revenue elasticities and firm-level ex-post productivity shocks. Integrating the estimated materials elasticity over materials and subtracting both the integral and the estimated shocks from revenue uncovers the sum of two unobserved components: the portion of revenue unrelated to materials and the persistent component of TFP.

In stage two, polynomials approximate the Markov process for the persistent component of TFP and the remaining part of the revenue function. The polynomial parameters are estimated via generalized method of moments (GMM), exploiting the orthogonality of the ex-ante productivity shock to past input allocations and persistent productivity. Validity of the nonparametric bootstrap standard errors is discussed in Appendix A.1. The estimated model recovers firm-level input elasticities, marginal revenue products, and productivity components.

⁹Coverage also varies across countries along sector composition, firm age, and time-series length, so cross-country comparisons should be read as conditional on the observed sample.

TABLE 1. Descriptive Statistics for Main Variables

Variable	Statistic	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Operating Revenue, Th. Euros	Mean	82,820	5,305	14,335	7,209	18,848	3,246
	SD	682,296	98,994	263,397	90,308	96,147	35,602
	Median	19,132	681	1,201	1,673	4,137	160
	Q1	5,390	261	399	679	1,523	49
	Q3	53,200	2,063	4,654	4,562	11,196	650
	Min	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Max	65,336,438	25,537,175	51,905,000	29,382,602	4,818,801	4,990,944
Cost of Materials, Th. Euros, Undeclared	Mean	51,540	3,459	7,336	3,945	12,132	1,936
	SD	1,201,597	85,857	181,084	68,914	72,588	27,217
	Median	7,946	305	331	644	2,051	62
	Q1	1,816	99	94	198	632	16
	Q3	25,716	1,073	1,704	2,077	6,406	281
	Min	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Max	298,700,068	23,475,881	36,833,000	24,205,783	4,239,812	4,192,198
Fixed Assets, Th. Euros, Undeclared	Mean	23,210	1,980	3,644	2,284	7,112	1,516
	SD	177,734	29,474	98,443	36,201	42,499	13,156
	Median	2,589	180	167	314	1,034	41
	Q1	483	50	53	81	260	10
	Q3	9,852	644	589	1,164	3,403	195
	Min	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Max	20,739,803	5,867,352	17,469,000	12,144,733	2,420,068	956,784
Number of Employees	Mean	219	23	48	28	156	56
	SD	641	120	306	154	367	264
	Median	87	8	10	11	70	8
	Q1	32	4	4	5	26	3
	Q3	209	19	31	24	159	28
	Min	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Max	38,383	17,284	49,425	33,636	14,600	18,456
Observations		76,403	1,000,134	606,514	1,261,767	55,581	168,393

This table presents summary statistics for the key variables used in the analysis by country. The variables shown are *Operating Revenue*, a proxy for output (Y); *Cost of Materials*, a proxy for intermediates (M), reported before deflation; *Fixed Assets*, a proxy for capital (K), reported before deflation; and *Number of Employees* (headcount), a proxy for labor (L). Materials and capital are deflated using industry-level (Nace Rev2 two-digit) intermediate inputs and gross output deflators from EU-KLEMS, respectively. The table displays the mean, standard deviation (SD), median, first and third quartiles (Q1 and Q3), minimum and maximum for each variable and country. The sample period is 2000–2017 for France, Spain, and Italy, and 2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania. Observations denote firm-year observations.

5. Results and Discussion

I let the productivity Markov process $m_t(\cdot)$ vary across five time periods: *Beginning of the millennium* (2001–2003); *Pre-crisis* (2004–2007); *Great Recession and European debt crisis* (2008–2010); *Crisis aftermath* (2011–2014); and *Post-crisis* (2015–2017). Due to sample availability, productivity parameters for the period (2001–2003) are only available for Spain, France, and Italy. I estimate the production function for each country, industry by industry.¹⁰ I compute standard errors via a non-parametric clustered bootstrap procedure. The model estimation results are reported in Appendix B.

Across historical periods, the parameter estimates and standard errors for the Markov process ω_{jt} indicate it can be closely approximated by a first-order autoregressive (AR(1)) process with drift. The one exception is the German textiles, apparel, and leather industry (Table A2), for which the AR(1) coefficients are negative and imprecisely estimated. This divergence may originate from the small sample size for this industry (2,544 firms, 3.3% of the German sample), resulting in low statistical power.


The estimated input revenue elasticities and returns to scale distributions, which are functions of the model parameters¹¹, are more informative about the underlying production technology than the production function parameters themselves. Figure 2 plots the distribution densities of elasticities and returns to scale for each country, pooled across years and industries.

¹⁰Specifically, together with their NACE Rev. 2 codes they are

- a. Food, beverages and tobacco (10, 11, and 12);
- b. Textiles, apparel and leather (13, 14, and 15);
- c. Wood, paper, and printing (16, 17, and 18);
- d. Coke, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals (19, 20, 21);
- e. Rubber, plastics, metallic and non-metallic mineral products, fabricated metal products (22, 23, 24, and 25);
- f. Electronic, optical products and electrical equipment (26 and 27);
- g. Machinery, motor vehicles and other transport equipment (28, 29, and 30);
- h. Furniture and other manufacturing (31, 32, and 33).

¹¹For derivations of the firm-time specific elasticities, see the system of equations (A15). I compute firm-time specific returns to scale as the sum of the input elasticities.

FIGURE 2. Revenue Elasticities and Returns to Scale Distributions



This figure displays the industry and time pooled distributions of estimated input revenue elasticities and returns to scale (RS) by country: Germany (Fig. 2A), Spain (Fig. 2B), France (Fig. 2C), Italy (Fig. 2D), Poland (Fig. 2E), and Romania (Fig. 2F). The inputs shown are materials (black solid line), capital (black dashed line), and labor (black dotted line). A solid grey line depicts the distribution of RS. The two dashed grey vertical lines delimit the interval (0, 1). Sample period: 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania).

Most revenue elasticity distributions lie within the unit interval. France and Germany display similar input intensities, with median¹² capital, materials, and labor elasticities of 0.17, 0.18, 0.58 and 0.15, 0.17, 0.67 respectively. Italy and Spain rely more heavily on intermediates, with median materials elasticities of 0.28 (Italy) and 0.41 (Spain); Italy's labor elasticity distribution is double-peaked, with one mode near the low end and another near the high end. Romania's elasticities resemble Spain's but are slightly more capital-intensive. Poland's elasticity distributions largely overlap with those of the other countries, suggesting similar input intensities. Germany, France, Spain, and Romania largely exhibit constant returns to scale (median 1.00, 0.96, 1.01, 1.01), while Italy and Poland show decreasing returns (0.88 and 0.92). Overall, the estimates reveal substantial heterogeneity across the six countries' manufacturing production economies.

5.1. The (Co)Evolution of the Dispersions of Input MRP and TFPR


I generate aggregate (log) TFPR and MRP dispersion statistics for the manufacturing sector at the country-year level by taking the weighted average of the computed industry-specific variances for these variables. The weights are time-invariant and equal to each industry's average annual share of manufacturing revenue.¹³ I plot the evolution over time of TFPR dispersion, as well as the average TFPR level, for each country in Figure 3. In Figure 4, I plot the evolution of aggregate dispersion for capital, labor, and materials MRP over time for each country.

The variance of log labor and log materials MRP remains smaller than that of log capital MRP in absolute terms, ranging from 16% to 85% of the capital MRP variance by country over 2001–2017. Within each country, MRP dispersion for capital, labor, and materials tends to move concurrently with TFPR dispersion, though with magnitudes that vary across countries and inputs. As detailed in Section 2.1, this co-movement

¹²Because the distributions are highly skewed, I use the median as the measure of central tendency.

¹³This approach reflects solely within-industry variation over time, as suggested in Gopinath et al. (2017).

FIGURE 3. TFPR Dispersion and Mean Evolution



The solid black line in Figure 3 displays the evolution of the (log) aggregate variance for TFPR, v , by country: Germany (Fig. 3A), Spain (Fig. 3B), France (Fig. 3C), Italy (Fig. 3D), Poland (Fig. 3E), and Romania (Fig. 3F). The solid gray line shows the (log) average value of TFPR in levels, reported on the secondary y-axis. I aggregate variances and means at the country level by taking a weighted average of the industry-specific variances and means, using average total manufacturing revenue shares for each industry as weights. Sample period: 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania).

FIGURE 4. Input MRP Dispersion Evolution




Figure 4 displays the evolution of the (log) aggregate variance for the inputs' log marginal revenue products by country: Germany (Fig. 4A), Spain (Fig. 4B), France (Fig. 4C), Italy (Fig. 4D), Poland (Fig. 4E), and Romania (Fig. 4F). The inputs shown are materials (solid black line), capital (dashed black line), and labor (dotted black line). I aggregate the log variances at the country level by taking a weighted average of the industry-specific variances, using the average shares in total manufacturing revenue for each industry as weights. Sample period: 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania).

is consistent with the micro-level relationship in which firm-specific TFPR generates variation in MRPs.

For instance, in Spain and Italy rising TFPR dispersion coincided with the Great Recession;¹⁴ in France the visible TFPR rise is concentrated after 2014, while Romania's TFPR variance fluctuates around a flat trend. Capital MRP variance displays an overall increasing trajectory across most countries, with particularly sharp increases in Spain, Italy, and Romania during the crisis.¹⁵

Labor and materials MRP variance exhibit less stable dynamics, with pre-crisis surges and later declines (e.g., Romania), rises during the crisis (e.g., Spain materials), or eventual reversed downturns after the crisis (e.g., Germany, France). Poland diverges slightly, as its sharp rises in TFPR and MRP dispersion occurred predominantly in the aftermath period rather than during the crisis. Aggregate mean TFPR *in levels* also differs across sample countries: it declines mildly in Spain post-2008 and dips briefly in Poland during the crisis, while continuing to rise or remain stable in the other four countries.

5.2. The Contribution of TFPR Dispersion to Input MRP Dispersion

In this section, I empirically assess the relationship between the dispersion of inputs' MRP and the dispersion of TFPR across industries over time. The question of central interest for misallocation is whether industries with greater productivity dispersion also exhibit greater dispersion in marginal revenue products.


Figures 5, 6, and 7 provide evidence on this relationship for each input using the full

¹⁴Comparable countercyclical patterns are documented for U.S. manufacturing by Kehrig (2015), who finds that cross-firm TFP variance rises in recessions through both compositional shifts and within-firm productivity changes.

¹⁵This is consistent with Gopinath et al. (2017), who document a significant increase in the dispersion of the return to capital among Spanish manufacturing firms between 1999 and 2012, with similar patterns in Italy and Portugal but not in Germany, France, or Norway. They attribute this rise to size-dependent financial frictions through which the post-euro decline in real interest rates channeled capital toward firms with high net worth rather than high productivity. The mechanism documented in this paper may operate alongside financial frictions; the structural model abstracts from financial constraints to isolate the role of productivity timing, and quantifying the two would require a specification that explicitly includes both mechanisms.

pooled dataset. Panels A show binscatterplots of firm-level log MRP for each input (y-axis) against TFPR (x-axis). For capital and labor, there is a clear increasing relationship: because these inputs are predetermined, firms cannot fully adjust them in response to productivity realizations, so more productive firms earn higher marginal revenue per unit of capital and labor. The relationship is weaker for materials, a flexible input that firms adjust to equate expected marginal revenue product to input cost. Panels B display scatterplots of the log variance of log MRP for each input (y-axis) against the log variance of TFPR (x-axis) at the country-industry-year level. A positive relationship between industry-level dispersions of MRP and TFPR emerges for all production inputs, including materials.

FIGURE 5. TFPR – MRP Correlation: Capital




Panel A displays a binscatterplot of the log marginal revenue product (MRP) for capital (y-axis) against TFPR (x-axis). The solid line is a fitted regression. Panel B displays a scatterplot of the log variance of log MRP for capital (y-axis) against the log variance of TFPR (x-axis) for country-industry-year observations. The solid line is a fitted regression. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017.

To account for cross-country heterogeneity in this relationship, I estimate a simple linear specification and a fixed-effects specification, regressing the log variance of MRP for input X on the log variance of TFPR at the country-industry-year level:

$$(11) \quad \log \text{Var}_{cst}(\text{mrp}^X) = \beta_0 + \beta \log \text{Var}_{cst}(v) + \xi_{cst},$$

FIGURE 6. TFPR – MRP Correlation: Labor



Panel A displays a binscatterplot of the log marginal revenue product (MRP) for labor (y-axis) against TFPR (x-axis). The solid line is a fitted regression. Panel B displays a scatterplot of the log variance of log MRP for labor (y-axis) against the log variance of TFPR (x-axis) for country-industry-year observations. The solid line is a fitted regression. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017.

where $\text{Var}_{cst}(\cdot)$ denotes the cross-firm variance in country c , industry s , and year t , mrp^X denotes the log MRP for input X , ν denotes TFPR, and ξ_{cst} is an error term. The fixed-effects specification differs between country-specific and pooled regressions:


$$(12) \quad \log \text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X) = \iota_t + \iota_s + \beta \log \text{Var}_{st}(\nu) + \xi_{st} \quad (\text{country-specific})$$

$$(13) \quad \log \text{Var}_{cst}(\text{mrp}^X) = \iota_{ct} + \iota_{cs} + \beta \log \text{Var}_{cst}(\nu) + \xi_{cst} \quad (\text{pooled})$$

The country-specific specification adds additive year (ι_t) and industry (ι_s) fixed effects, estimated separately for each country. The pooled specification adds country-year (ι_{ct}) and country-industry (ι_{cs}) fixed effects. The results are reported in Table 2.

The coefficient β estimates the elasticity of MRP dispersion with respect to TFPR dispersion. Both fixed-effects specifications account for unobserved sector- and period-specific determinants of MRP dispersion, yielding higher R^2 values and removing omitted variable bias. Accordingly, the fixed-effects specifications are preferred. Because the pooled fixed effects are interacted with country, the pooled β is identified

FIGURE 7. TFPR – MRP Correlation: Materials



Panel A displays a binscatterplot of the log marginal revenue product (MRP) for materials (y-axis) against TFPR (x-axis). The solid line is a fitted regression. Panel B displays a scatterplot of the log variance of log MRP for materials (y-axis) against the log variance of TFPR (x-axis) for country-industry-year observations. The solid line is a fitted regression. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017.

from the same within-country residual variation as the country-by-country regressions but constrains the slope to be common across countries.

In the preferred fixed-effects specification, the pooled elasticity of MRP dispersion with respect to TFPR dispersion is 0.30 for capital, 0.41 for labor, and 0.55 for materials, each statistically significant.¹⁶ The R^2 values with fixed effects are very high, ranging from 0.71 to 0.99 across countries and inputs. Much of this explanatory power reflects the fixed effects themselves: without fixed effects, the pooled R^2 is 0.20, 0.43, and 0.26 for capital, labor, and materials, respectively, indicating that TFPR dispersion alone explains a meaningful but more modest share of MRP dispersion variation.

The elasticity estimates exhibit notable cross-country heterogeneity. For capital, the

¹⁶For context, Asker, Collard-Wexler, and De Loecker (2014) report a pooled coefficient of 0.55 (unweighted) in a regression of the standard deviation of capital MRP on TFPR *volatility* (the within-firm time-series standard deviation of TFPR changes) with year dummies and an R^2 of 0.67. The specifications differ in important ways: they use levels of standard deviations rather than log variances, their regressor captures time-series volatility rather than cross-sectional dispersion, and they employ calibrated output shares rather than GNR-estimated elasticities. The capital elasticity of 0.30 here is therefore not directly comparable, though both estimates point to a positive and economically meaningful association between productivity dispersion and capital MRP dispersion.

TABLE 2. Elasticity of Input MRP Dispersion with Respect to TFPR Dispersion, by Country and Pooled

Dependent variable: $\log \text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X)$														
	Germany		Spain		France		Italy		Poland		Romania		Pooled	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Cap.														
β	0.185*** (0.065)	0.145*** (0.055)	0.349*** (0.043)	0.252*** (0.034)	0.210** (0.102)	0.453*** (0.074)	0.206*** (0.021)	−0.020 (0.041)	0.456*** (0.056)	0.370*** (0.041)	0.264*** (0.054)	0.381*** (0.057)	0.224*** (0.022)	0.297*** (0.028)
N	112	112	144	144	144	144	144	144	112	112	112	112	768	768
R^2	0.279	0.768	0.315	0.973	0.231	0.921	0.163	0.951	0.636	0.930	0.168	0.912	0.200	0.950
RMSE	0.155	0.071	0.176	0.038	0.132	0.044	0.173	0.037	0.160	0.088	0.210	0.068	0.234	0.061
Lab.														
β	0.675*** (0.198)	0.497*** (0.083)	0.663*** (0.047)	0.357*** (0.031)	0.754*** (0.122)	0.659*** (0.073)	0.632*** (0.031)	0.179 (0.116)	0.294*** (0.043)	0.419*** (0.038)	0.083* (0.043)	0.266*** (0.056)	0.567*** (0.029)	0.409*** (0.030)
N	112	112	144	144	144	144	144	144	112	112	112	112	768	768
R^2	0.336	0.965	0.494	0.989	0.601	0.983	0.490	0.857	0.328	0.901	0.029	0.864	0.433	0.967
RMSE	0.378	0.096	0.215	0.039	0.217	0.046	0.200	0.106	0.199	0.088	0.188	0.058	0.305	0.078
Mat.														
β	0.722*** (0.102)	0.630*** (0.166)	0.373*** (0.080)	0.448*** (0.088)	−0.218 (0.238)	0.085 (0.174)	0.143*** (0.038)	0.443*** (0.080)	0.615*** (0.078)	0.471*** (0.131)	1.626*** (0.139)	1.105*** (0.112)	0.495*** (0.037)	0.550*** (0.068)
N	112	112	144	144	144	144	144	144	112	112	112	112	768	768
R^2	0.510	0.705	0.181	0.917	0.058	0.909	0.026	0.952	0.426	0.723	0.638	0.970	0.261	0.908
RMSE	0.428	0.272	0.298	0.100	0.394	0.088	0.315	0.080	0.421	0.284	0.409	0.128	0.441	0.175
Const.	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
FE	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES

The table presents regression results of the log variance of MRP for each input on the log variance of TFPR at the country-industry-year level, by country and pooled. Specification (1) refers to the simple linear model (11). Specification (2) refers to the fixed-effects model: the country columns use additive year and industry fixed effects (equation 12), while the pooled column uses country-year and country-industry fixed effects (equation 13). In both models, the observations are weighted by the industry average revenue share of total manufacturing revenue. Reported are the estimates for the slope coefficient (β), number of observations (N), unadjusted R^2 , and root mean squared error (RMSE). Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) are obtained by re-estimating the regression on each of 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications of the GNR structural estimation and taking the standard deviation of the resulting coefficient estimates. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$.

estimates range from effectively zero in Italy ($\beta = -0.02$, statistically insignificant) to 0.45 in France, with Germany (0.15), Spain (0.25), Poland (0.37), and Romania (0.38) showing intermediate values. For labor, France displays the highest sensitivity (0.66), followed by Germany (0.50), Poland (0.42), and Spain (0.36). For materials, Romania stands out with a particularly high elasticity of 1.11, while other countries cluster between 0.44 and 0.63, with the exception of France where the estimate is small and imprecise (0.09).

A permutation test that randomly reassigns v_{jt} across firms within each country-industry-year cell rules out the possibility that the estimated β coefficients merely reflect

the accounting identity linking mrp^X to v :¹⁷ the permuted-data coefficients exceed the empirical estimates in the pooled fixed-effects specification (0.31, 0.51, and 0.70 vs. 0.30, 0.41, and 0.55 for capital, labor, and materials, respectively). This attenuation is theoretically expected: firms equate expected marginal revenue products to input prices, which compresses cross-sectional MRP dispersion below the level the accounting link alone would generate, leaving β to identify the portion of TFPR variation that firms cannot offset through input adjustment within the period.¹⁸ Appendix C reports per-country and per-specification results.

5.3. The Contribution of TFPR Component Dispersion to Input MRP Dispersion

In this section, I decompose the aggregate relationship between TFPR and MRP dispersion from Section 5.2 into its underlying components. Specifically, I quantify how the dispersion of each TFPR component (expected productivity $m(\omega_{-1})$, ex-ante productivity shock η_{jt} , and ex-post productivity shock ε_{jt}) contributes to the cross-sectional dispersion of inputs' MRP at the industry level.

Figure 8 plots the weighted average share of industry TFPR variance attributable to each component¹⁹ by country and year, with weights equal to each industry's average annual share of manufacturing revenue. The figure reveals that, across all countries and years, the bulk of TFPR variation stems from the ex-post productivity shock ε , which accounts for roughly 60–115 percentage points of TFPR variance depending on country and year; expected productivity $m(\omega_{-1})$ explains a moderate share (typically

¹⁷Specifically, $\text{mrp}_{jt}^X = f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) + v_{jt} - x_{jt} + \log \text{elas}_{jt}^X$, obtained by taking logs of Equation (6) and substituting Equation (1).

¹⁸Capital, the most rigid input under Assumption 4, exhibits negligible attenuation because firms have no within-period margin to scale capital in response to productivity realizations; materials, chosen after η_{jt} realizes, exhibits the largest attenuation since firms adjust materials to the persistent component of productivity; labor exhibits comparable attenuation despite being modeled as predetermined, likely reflecting within-period flexibility.

¹⁹Under the mean-independence conditions of Assumptions 3–4, the three TFPR components from the decomposition in equation (8) have zero pairwise covariance in population.

15–80 percentage points), while the ex-ante productivity shock η_{jt} contributes the least (generally 10–45 percentage points). These shares sum to well above 100% in most cells, reflecting nonzero negative covariances between the components.²⁰

To assess how the dispersion of each TFPR component relates to MRP dispersion, I estimate a simple linear specification and a fixed-effects specification at the country-industry-year level. To address the correlated-component concern, all specifications include the vector $\mathbf{r}_{cst} = (\log(1 + \hat{\rho}_{cst}^{\omega-1, \eta}), \log(1 + \hat{\rho}_{cst}^{\omega-1, \varepsilon}), \log(1 + \hat{\rho}_{cst}^{\eta, \varepsilon}))'$ of log-transformed pairwise Pearson correlations between the three TFPR components as controls.²¹ The simple specification is:

$$(14) \quad \log \text{Var}_{cst}(\text{mrp}^X) = \beta_0 + \beta_{m(\omega_{-1})} \log \text{Var}_{cst}(m(\omega_{-1})) + \beta_{\eta} \log \text{Var}_{cst}(\eta) \\ + \beta_{\varepsilon} \log \text{Var}_{cst}(\varepsilon) + \boldsymbol{\psi}' \mathbf{r}_{cst} + \xi_{cst},$$

where $\text{Var}_{cst}(\cdot)$ denotes the cross-firm variance in country c , industry s , and year t , ξ_{cst} is an error term, and $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is the coefficient vector on $\mathbf{r}_{cst}$. As in Section 5.2, the fixed-effects specification differs between country-specific and pooled regressions:

$$(15) \quad \log \text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X) = \iota_t + \iota_s + \beta_{m(\omega_{-1})} \log \text{Var}_{st}(m(\omega_{-1})) + \beta_{\eta} \log \text{Var}_{st}(\eta) \\ + \beta_{\varepsilon} \log \text{Var}_{st}(\varepsilon) + \boldsymbol{\psi}' \mathbf{r}_{st} + \xi_{st} \quad (\text{country-specific})$$


$$(16) \quad \log \text{Var}_{cst}(\text{mrp}^X) = \iota_{ct} + \iota_{cs} + \beta_{m(\omega_{-1})} \log \text{Var}_{cst}(m(\omega_{-1})) + \beta_{\eta} \log \text{Var}_{cst}(\eta) \\ + \beta_{\varepsilon} \log \text{Var}_{cst}(\varepsilon) + \boldsymbol{\psi}' \mathbf{r}_{cst} + \xi_{cst} \quad (\text{pooled})$$

The country-specific specification adds additive year (ι_t) and industry (ι_s) fixed effects, estimated separately for each country. The pooled specification adds country-year (ι_{ct})


²⁰A formal test in Appendix D reports the three pairwise correlations between TFPR components: $\text{Cor}(m(\omega_{-1}), \eta) = 0.01$, $\text{Cor}(m(\omega_{-1}), \varepsilon) = -0.21$, and $\text{Cor}(\eta, \varepsilon) = -0.28$. All three are statistically significant.

²¹The shift by one ensures positivity of the argument under the log transform, since Pearson correlations lie in $[-1, 1]$.


FIGURE 8. Annual Component Shares of TFPR Variance, by Country




A. Germany




B. Spain




C. France



D. Italy



E. Poland



F. Romania

Stacked bars show the annual weighted average share of industry-year TFPR variance attributable to each of the three TFPR components from equation (8): expected productivity $m(\omega_{-1})$ (white), ex-ante shock η (grey), and ex-post shock ε (black). Shares are computed as the ratio of each component's variance to total TFPR variance within each industry-year cell. The weights are each industry's average share of total annual manufacturing revenue in that country.

and country-industry (ι_{cs}) fixed effects, again constraining the slope coefficients to be common across countries. The results by country are in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Elasticity of Input MRP Dispersion with Respect to TFPR Component Dispersion, by Country and Pooled

	Dependent variable: $\log \text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X)$													
	Germany		Spain		France		Italy		Poland		Romania		Pooled	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Cap.														
$\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$	-0.024 (0.083)	-0.083 (0.073)	-0.153*** (0.047)	0.007 (0.037)	0.014 (0.054)	-0.072 (0.085)	0.104*** (0.037)	-0.135*** (0.046)	0.005 (0.058)	0.114*** (0.043)	0.110** (0.043)	0.093 (0.078)	0.036 (0.029)	0.049* (0.028)
β_{η}	0.071*** (0.022)	0.044 (0.028)	0.005 (0.025)	-0.005 (0.021)	0.072*** (0.026)	0.126*** (0.025)	0.139*** (0.027)	0.101*** (0.021)	0.092*** (0.022)	0.049* (0.027)	-0.044 (0.033)	0.068** (0.029)	0.007 (0.013)	0.062*** (0.013)
β_{ε}	0.118** (0.050)	0.060 (0.042)	0.466*** (0.062)	0.234*** (0.038)	0.315*** (0.066)	0.167*** (0.059)	-0.007 (0.048)	0.148*** (0.048)	0.456*** (0.049)	0.229*** (0.062)	0.287*** (0.073)	0.221*** (0.068)	0.189*** (0.027)	0.144*** (0.029)
N	104	104	136	136	136	136	136	136	104	104	104	104	720	720
R^2	0.318	0.769	0.529	0.981	0.469	0.919	0.205	0.968	0.703	0.913	0.253	0.923	0.195	0.945
RMSE	0.164	0.071	0.157	0.035	0.116	0.048	0.170	0.030	0.172	0.098	0.192	0.063	0.233	0.064
Lab.														
$\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$	0.019 (0.241)	0.061 (0.113)	0.458*** (0.067)	0.087*** (0.025)	0.499*** (0.099)	0.031 (0.087)	0.758*** (0.089)	0.101 (0.167)	0.072 (0.065)	0.075* (0.041)	0.038 (0.038)	0.036 (0.065)	0.204*** (0.050)	0.066** (0.033)
β_{η}	0.074 (0.070)	0.032 (0.036)	-0.110*** (0.037)	0.076*** (0.021)	-0.233*** (0.050)	0.045 (0.033)	-0.521*** (0.051)	-0.130** (0.066)	0.054** (0.024)	0.045 (0.028)	0.048 (0.032)	0.080*** (0.030)	0.037 (0.027)	0.022 (0.015)
β_{ε}	0.425*** (0.137)	0.221*** (0.056)	0.401*** (0.096)	0.178*** (0.032)	0.363*** (0.132)	0.178*** (0.057)	0.227*** (0.080)	-0.330** (0.137)	0.200*** (0.068)	0.255*** (0.048)	-0.037 (0.067)	0.134** (0.054)	0.284*** (0.050)	0.196*** (0.028)
N	104	104	136	136	136	136	136	136	104	104	104	104	720	720
R^2	0.293	0.958	0.649	0.989	0.650	0.982	0.637	0.900	0.291	0.879	0.132	0.867	0.425	0.964
RMSE	0.382	0.101	0.196	0.036	0.218	0.052	0.177	0.091	0.214	0.100	0.177	0.061	0.310	0.082
Mat.														
$\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$	-0.016 (0.094)	-0.124 (0.135)	-0.017 (0.103)	0.292*** (0.065)	-0.231* (0.138)	0.056 (0.132)	-0.401*** (0.079)	0.123 (0.077)	0.059 (0.084)	0.048 (0.073)	0.143*** (0.045)	0.045 (0.101)	0.028 (0.043)	0.032 (0.045)
β_{η}	-0.005 (0.036)	0.056 (0.047)	-0.140*** (0.048)	-0.062 (0.045)	-0.059 (0.050)	0.071** (0.036)	-0.400*** (0.047)	-0.067** (0.034)	0.012 (0.046)	0.016 (0.051)	-0.078* (0.043)	0.037 (0.062)	-0.118*** (0.021)	0.026 (0.025)
β_{ε}	0.614*** (0.075)	0.629*** (0.073)	0.703*** (0.116)	0.500*** (0.077)	0.644*** (0.178)	0.497*** (0.076)	1.134*** (0.087)	0.578*** (0.069)	0.853*** (0.080)	0.818*** (0.100)	1.147*** (0.129)	0.938*** (0.090)	0.741*** (0.049)	0.660*** (0.044)
N	104	104	136	136	136	136	136	136	104	104	104	104	720	720
R^2	0.717	0.906	0.354	0.952	0.412	0.968	0.441	0.977	0.682	0.888	0.917	0.980	0.571	0.958
RMSE	0.335	0.171	0.268	0.080	0.283	0.056	0.251	0.058	0.294	0.188	0.182	0.101	0.327	0.124
Const.	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
FE	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES

The table presents regression results of the log variance of MRP for each input on the log variance of the three TFPR components at the country-industry-year level, by country and pooled. Specification (1) refers to the simple linear model (14). Specification (2) refers to the fixed-effects model: the country columns use additive year and industry fixed effects (equation 15), while the pooled column uses country-year and country-industry fixed effects (equation 16). Both specifications control for the three pairwise Pearson correlations between TFPR components, entered as $\log(1 + \hat{\rho})$ (coefficients not reported). The sample contains 720 observations (versus 768 in Table 2) because the TFPR decomposition requires lagged productivity, dropping the first year for each country-industry cell. Observations are weighted by the industry average revenue share of total annual manufacturing revenue. Reported are the component-specific slope coefficients ($\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$, β_{η} , β_{ε}), number of observations (N), unadjusted R^2 , and root mean squared error (RMSE). Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) are obtained by re-estimating the regression on each of 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications of the GNR structural estimation and taking the standard deviation of the resulting coefficient estimates. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$.

The coefficients $\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$, β_{η} , and β_{ε} estimate the partial elasticity of MRP dispersion

with respect to each component's dispersion, controlling for pairwise cross-component correlations. I focus on the fixed-effects specifications (equations 15 and 16), which account for unobserved sector- and period-specific determinants and yield higher R^2 values, consistent with the findings in the aggregate TFPR regression.

The ex-post productivity shock ε exhibits the strongest association with MRP dispersion for all three inputs in the pooled specification and in most country-input cells.²² For capital, the pooled elasticity with respect to the variance of ε is 0.14, compared to 0.05 for expected productivity and 0.06 for the ex-ante productivity shock. For labor, the gap between ε and the other components is even larger, with a pooled elasticity of 0.20, versus 0.07 for $m(\omega_{-1})$ and 0.02 for η . The country-specific estimates reinforce this pattern: the elasticity with respect to ε is the largest for capital in Spain (0.23), Poland (0.23), and Romania (0.22), and for labor in Poland (0.26), Germany (0.22), and Spain (0.18).

For materials, the pooled elasticity with respect to ε is 0.66, roughly twenty times the insignificant pooled estimates for $m(\omega_{-1})$ and η (both 0.03). Country-specific ε elasticities range from 0.50 in Spain to 0.94 in Romania, while the other two components show no consistent sign or significance pattern across countries. These patterns are broadly consistent with the mechanism developed in Section 2.1, in which the unanticipated ε is the dominant source of dispersion in the materials marginal product.²³ Isolated country cells do show significant non- ε coefficients (Spain $\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})} = 0.29$, France $\beta_{\eta} = 0.07$, Italy $\beta_{\eta} = -0.07$, each $p < 0.05$), but ε remains the largest contributor in every country.

To complement the elasticities in Table 3, Table 4 reports a levels decomposition

²²This finding is robust to two specification changes. First, dropping the pairwise correlation controls $\psi' \mathbf{r}_{cst}$ from equations (14)–(16) leaves the pooled β_{ε} estimates at 0.126 for capital, 0.172 for labor, and 0.688 for materials, each within 0.03 of the baseline; the ranking across inputs is preserved (Table A11 in Appendix D reports the full no-controls regression). Second, excluding the German textiles cell flagged for negative AR(1) coefficients shifts the pooled fixed-effects coefficients in Table 3 by at most 0.003, again preserving the ranking.

²³Monte Carlo experiments in Appendix F.3.5 yield the model's benchmark of $\beta_{\varepsilon} = 1$ and $\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})} = \beta_{\eta} = 0$ for materials.

of MRP variance attributable to each TFPR component. For each input $X \in \{K, L, M\}$, component $\kappa \in \{m(\omega_{-1}), \eta, \varepsilon\}$, and country (and pooled), I estimate by weighted OLS the bivariate regression

$$(17) \quad \text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X) = \beta_0 + \beta_\kappa \text{Var}_{st}(\kappa) + \xi_{st}$$

weighting each observation by the industry's average share of total annual manufacturing revenue, and report $\hat{\beta}_\kappa \cdot \overline{\text{Var}_{st}(\kappa)} / \overline{\text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X)}$, where the bars denote the corresponding weighted means over the estimation sample: the share of average MRP variance predicted by component κ alone. Because the three rows come from separate regressions, each absorbs the contribution of κ together with any cross-cell variation correlated with $\text{Var}_{st}(\kappa)$ in the other components, hence they do not have to sum to 100%. Unlike Table 3, which estimates elasticities and quantifies how MRP dispersion moves with component dispersion, equation (17) operates in levels and reports the share of sample-mean MRP variance attributable to each component.

The contributions are consistent with the regression findings. In the pooled sample, the ex-post productivity shock ε accounts for 18% of capital MRP variance, 37% of labor MRP variance, and 75% of materials MRP variance. This is substantially more than either expected productivity ($m(\omega_{-1})$: 8%, 19%, 21%) or the ex-ante productivity shock (η_{jt} : 8%, 21%, 34%). The 95% bootstrap intervals confirm ε as the largest pooled contributor for all three inputs, but the relative ranking of $m(\omega_{-1})$ and η_{jt} is less stable. At the country level, ε remains the largest contributor in most (country, input) cells, with notable exceptions in France labor, Romania capital, and Italy labor, where either $m(\omega_{-1})$ is larger or the ε share is statistically indistinguishable from zero.

The result that ε_{jt} exhibits the largest pooled association for all three inputs, and the largest country-level association in most country-input cells, carries a precise economic interpretation. Under the model's timing assumptions (Assumption 4), ex-post produc-

TABLE 4. Share of Input MRP Variance Predicted by Each TFPR Component, by Country and Pooled

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania	Pooled
Capital							
$m(\omega_{-1})$	8%	1%	2%	10%	13%	14%	8%
	[0, 16]	[-3, 5]	[-6, 11]	[6, 15]	[1, 26]	[6, 21]	[4, 12]
η	8%	5%	4%	17%	10%	2%	8%
	[2, 13]	[-1, 10]	[-1, 10]	[13, 21]	[2, 18]	[-3, 7]	[6, 10]
ε	11%	44%	17%	22%	47%	5%	18%
	[4, 19]	[35, 52]	[5, 29]	[16, 27]	[34, 61]	[-2, 11]	[15, 20]
Labor							
$m(\omega_{-1})$	32%	17%	32%	52%	9%	6%	19%
	[-8, 73]	[4, 29]	[14, 49]	[43, 61]	[-3, 22]	[0, 12]	[9, 29]
η	26%	38%	-1%	28%	12%	0%	21%
	[8, 45]	[24, 52]	[-8, 6]	[14, 42]	[5, 18]	[-5, 4]	[18, 25]
ε	43%	70%	1%	50%	22%	-5%	37%
	[14, 72]	[58, 81]	[-19, 21]	[38, 61]	[12, 32]	[-12, 1]	[30, 43]
Materials							
$m(\omega_{-1})$	30%	30%	-15%	5%	19%	34%	21%
	[15, 46]	[19, 40]	[-37, 7]	[-4, 14]	[-2, 39]	[23, 44]	[13, 28]
η	20%	13%	17%	0%	9%	64%	34%
	[6, 34]	[-4, 31]	[8, 26]	[-10, 11]	[-6, 24]	[56, 71]	[30, 39]
ε	62%	42%	50%	65%	84%	133%	75%
	[50, 74]	[29, 56]	[32, 69]	[53, 78]	[70, 97]	[125, 140]	[71, 79]

For each input $X \in \{K, L, M\}$, component $\kappa \in \{m(\omega_{-1}), \eta, \varepsilon\}$, and country (and pooled), I estimate by weighted OLS the bivariate levels regression $\text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X) = \beta_0 + \beta_\kappa \text{Var}_{st}(\kappa) + \varepsilon_{st}$ separately. Each cell reports $\hat{\beta}_\kappa \cdot \overline{\text{Var}_{st}(\kappa)} / \overline{\text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X)}$, the share of average MRP variance predicted by component κ alone. Because the three rows come from separate regressions, each absorbs the contribution of κ together with any cross-cell correlated variation from the other components, and the rows need not sum to 100%. Observations are weighted by each industry's average share of total annual manufacturing revenue (pooled regressions normalize within-year). 95% confidence intervals in brackets are normal-approximation CIs from the standard deviation of the share estimates across 100 non-parametric GNR structural bootstrap replications. Sample period: 2001–2017.

tivity shocks are realized *after* firms have committed their inputs and represent genuine uncertainty about the production environment. This pattern suggests that, under the maintained model, productivity *uncertainty*, not persistent productivity *heterogeneity*, accounts for the largest share of input misallocation in the six European manufacturing

economies studied over 2001–2017.²⁴ Appendix E presents suggestive cross-country evidence that stronger institutions are associated with lower dispersion of ex-ante and ex-post productivity shocks, but not with the dispersion of expected productivity.

6. Robustness

6.1. Sensitivity to the Estimation Method

The results in this paper rely on the Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020) estimator to recover firm-level input elasticities, marginal revenue products, and TFPR components. One question is whether the main findings are an artifact of this particular estimation method. Appendix F addresses this question through Monte Carlo experiments and an empirical comparison with two widely used alternatives: the factor shares approach (see De Loecker and Syverson 2021 for a review) and the proxy-variable method of Akerberg, Caves, and Frazer (2015).

The Monte Carlo experiments, calibrated to the specifications in Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020), show that the factor shares approach introduces systematic biases directly relevant to the misallocation analysis. The constant returns to scale assumption overstates capital elasticities by 27–35%, and the ex-post shock ε_{jt} contaminates expenditure shares through output y_{jt} , creating spurious elasticity heterogeneity. These biases propagate into MRP estimates: the algebraic structure of factor shares MRPs causes the materials and labor distributions to collapse toward input prices, masking the productivity-driven dispersion that this paper documents. The proxy-variable estimator, while approximately unbiased on average, delivers estimates too imprecise for reliable

²⁴David and Venkateswaran (2019) decompose average revenue product of capital (ARPK) dispersion by source (adjustment costs, informational frictions, and a residual firm-specific component) and attribute the bulk of it to the residual; Bento and Restuccia (2021) attribute a large share of cross-country establishment-size dispersion to distortions correlated with firm productivity. The present paper partitions TFPR by the *timing* of its resolution rather than by source or distortion structure. Because these decompositions rest on different moment conditions, identifying assumptions, and object definitions, the estimates are not directly comparable and I do not interpret them as in conflict.

inference on elasticity dispersion.

The experiments also reveal that the choice of estimator determines the TFPR variance decomposition. The GNR estimator recovers the true decomposition, in which unexpected productivity components (η_{jt} and ε_{jt}) account for the majority of TFPR dispersion. Under factor shares, this pattern no longer holds: because ε_{jt} cannot be separated from ω_{jt} , it inflates the lagged residual's variance share while attenuating estimated persistence, shifting the estimated decomposition away from the unexpected components.²⁵ The same estimator choice also shapes which TFPR component is identified as the largest contributor to MRP dispersion: Appendix F.3.5 shows that GNR recovers the model-implied pattern, while the factor shares regression uses a coarser two-component decomposition (the lagged Solow residual and its first difference, since ε cannot be separated from ω) and yields near-zero explanatory power.

The empirical comparison in Appendix F.4 applies the three estimators to the MICROPROD data and reproduces the qualitative Monte Carlo predictions: the factor shares approach yields systematically higher TFPR dispersion, compresses cross-firm MRP variation for materials and labor, and produces a TFPR variance decomposition dominated by the expected productivity level component.

6.2. Sensitivity to Imperfect Competition

The baseline framework assumes that firms are price takers in the output market (Assumption 1). Unmodeled market power could contaminate the productivity estimates and, consequently, the MRP dispersion patterns documented in Section 5. If firms face downward-sloping demand curves, observed revenue reflects both physical output and an endogenous price response, so that the baseline revenue elasticities may conflate pro-

²⁵Under additive measurement error in an AR(1), the attenuation effect alone would shrink the level share rather than raise it; the reversal observed arises because ε_{jt} enters the Solow residual non-additively through the expenditure shares, with contamination magnitude depending on firm-level input-to-revenue ratios rather than on independent additive noise.

duction technology with demand structure. Markups correlated with productivity could then generate spurious MRP dispersion that is attributed to productivity uncertainty rather than to market power.

To address this concern, I re-estimate the production function under imperfect competition (IC) using the extension in Appendix O6-4 of Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020). The approach allows firms to face time-varying, industry-specific demand elasticities by introducing period-specific markup parameters into the first-stage share equation. The second stage uses revenue deflated by EUROSTAT producer price indices (PPI) and an aggregate demand shifter as an additional instrument to separately identify a markup constant from the production function coefficients. The full derivation and estimation details are in Appendix G.

I estimate the IC model for all six countries and eight NACE industry groups, using the same firm-level samples as the competitive baseline where producer price index coverage permits.²⁶ The estimation yields period-specific markups that vary across industries and time but are common across firms within a given industry-period cell.²⁷ Mean markups range from 1.00 (Romania)²⁸ to 1.18 (Germany), indicating modest market power in the remaining five countries.

The key question is whether accounting for market power alters the TFPR and MRP dispersion patterns. The temporal patterns closely replicate the competitive baseline: TFPR dispersion exhibits a broad upward trend in all six countries, and the ordering of input MRP dispersions is preserved: capital MRP dispersion exceeds labor and materials

²⁶The EUROSTAT PPI series begins later than the firm data for some country-industry cells. France loses the first time period (2001–2003), reducing its estimation sample by approximately 30%. Other countries are minimally affected.

²⁷The Appendix O6-4 extension of Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020) identifies markups through the share equation's time-varying intercepts under constant elasticity of substitution (CES) demand within industry-period cells, which requires markups to be common within each cell.

²⁸The Romanian mean markup sits at the competitive lower bound, which may reflect weak identification of markups in the Romanian sample (e.g., limited within-industry-period variation in the aggregate demand shifter) rather than genuinely zero market power; the Romanian IC results should be read with this caveat in mind.

in most country-year cells. The level and dynamics of dispersion under IC are comparable to the competitive case, indicating that industry-period-level deviations from price-taking do not substantively alter the measured cross-firm variation in productivity or in marginal revenue products.

Re-estimating the component variance decomposition regressions of Section 5.3 under IC yields elasticity coefficients of the same sign and ordering as the competitive baseline estimated on the matched sample. In the pooled fixed-effects specification, each of the three IC β_ε estimates exceeds its competitive-baseline counterpart, strengthening the role of ε .²⁹ Together with the preserved temporal patterns of TFPR and MRP dispersion, these results indicate that the association between productivity uncertainty and MRP dispersion documented in Section 5 is robust to industry-period-level deviations from price-taking.

7. Summary and Concluding Remarks

In this paper I decomposed firm-level TFPR into three components resolved at different stages of the input allocation timeline (expected productivity $m(\omega_{-1})$, the ex-ante shock η_{jt} , and the ex-post shock ε_{jt}) to trace input misallocation to when each productivity shock is revealed. The mechanism rests on timing: because capital and labor are chosen before η and ε realize, and materials before ε realizes, the inability to condition on unrealized shocks generates dispersion in marginal revenue products even absent additional frictions. Estimating the model on European manufacturing microdata from 2001–2017 using the Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020) procedure, I found that the ex-post shock ε_{jt} is the primary contributor to MRP dispersion across all three inputs, accounting for 18%, 37%, and 75% of MRP variance for capital, labor, and materials

²⁹In the pooled fixed-effects specification on the matched sample, the IC β_ε estimates of 0.155, 0.212, and 0.818 for capital, labor, and materials exceed the competitive baseline values of 0.143, 0.195, and 0.664 by roughly 8, 9, and 23 percent, respectively.

respectively. The findings are consistent with productivity *uncertainty*, rather than persistent productivity *heterogeneity*, being the primary contributor to input misallocation under the maintained model, and are validated against alternative estimators via Monte Carlo simulation and robust to industry-period-level deviations from price-taking.

Several directions would extend this framework. First, embedding the three-component TFPR decomposition in a general equilibrium model with input-output linkages along the lines of Baqaee and Farhi (2020) would map MRP dispersion into welfare losses and decompose aggregate efficiency gaps by uncertainty horizon. Second, jointly estimating productivity uncertainty with structural models of factor adjustment costs, financial frictions, or labor-market frictions would separate the role of incomplete information from concrete distortions. Third, separating ε_{jt} from ex-post measurement error and firm-specific demand shocks would sharpen the productivity-uncertainty interpretation.³⁰ Fourth, sharper capital measures that capture economic depreciation and utilization differences (rather than book value of total fixed assets; Collard-Wexler and De Loecker (2016)) and firm-level price deflators in place of NACE two-digit industry deflators would reduce input measurement error throughout the elasticity estimation and TFPR decomposition. Fifth, allowing the TFPR component variances to vary with firm characteristics (age, size, financial structure) would connect the decomposition to firm-level heterogeneity.

³⁰The cross-country evidence in Appendix E pushes against a strict measurement-error reading: $\text{Var}_{st}(\varepsilon_{jt})$ co-varies systematically with country-level indices of institutional quality.

References

- Abele, Christian, Agnès Bénassy-Quéré, and Lionel Fontagné. 2021. "One Size Does Not Fit All: TFP in the Aftermath of Financial Crises in Three European Countries." *CESifo Working Paper* (8891).
- Akerberg, Daniel A, Kevin Caves, and Garth Frazer. 2015. "Identification properties of recent production function estimators." *Econometrica* 83 (6): 2411–2451.
- Akerlof, George A. 1970. "The Market for" Lemons": Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*: 488–500.
- Altomonte, Carlo, Peter Bauer, Alberto Maria Gilardi, and Chiara Soriolo. 2022. "Intangible Assets, Industry Performance and Finance During Crises." *BAFFI CAREFIN Centre Research Paper* (2022-173).
- Altomonte, Carlo, and Andrea Coali. 2020. "Employment, Productivity and Import Shock: Evidence from the European Manufacturing Industry." *MICROPROD deliverable D 5*.
- Altomonte, Carlo, Monica Morlacco, Tommaso Sonno, and Domenico Favoino. 2025. "Liquidity as Competitive Advantage: The Role of Intangibles." *Journal of International Economics* 158: 104168.
- Asker, John, Allan Collard-Wexler, and Jan De Loecker. 2014. "Dynamic Inputs and Resource (Mis) Allocation." *Journal of Political Economy* 122 (5): 1013–1063.
- Baqae, David Rezza, and Emmanuel Farhi. 2020. "Productivity and misallocation in general equilibrium." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135 (1): 105–163.
- Bartelsman, Eric, John Haltiwanger, and Stefano Scarpetta. 2009. "Measuring and Analyzing Cross-Country Differences in Firm Dynamics." In *Producer Dynamics: New Evidence from Micro Data*, 15–76: University of Chicago Press.
- Bartelsman, Eric, John Haltiwanger, and Stefano Scarpetta. 2013. "Cross-Country Differences in Productivity: The Role of Allocation and Selection." *American Economic Review* 103 (1): 305–34.
- Ben Zeev, Nadav. 2023. "The TFP Channel of Credit Supply Shocks." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 105 (2): 425–441.
- Bento, Pedro, and Diego Restuccia. 2017. "Misallocation, Establishment Size, and Productivity." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 9 (3): 267–303.
- Bento, Pedro, and Diego Restuccia. 2021. "On Average Establishment Size Across Sectors and Countries." *Journal of Monetary Economics* 117: 220–242.
- Bils, Mark, Peter J Klenow, and Cian Ruane. 2021. "Misallocation or Mismeasurement?" *Journal of Monetary Economics* 124: S39–S56.
- Blackwood, G Jacob, Lucia S Foster, Cheryl A Grim, John Haltiwanger, and Zoltan Wolf. 2021. "Macro and Micro Dynamics of Productivity: From Devilish Details to Insights." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 13 (3): 142–72.
- Bloom, Nicholas. 2009. "The impact of uncertainty shocks." *Econometrica* 77 (3): 623–685.
- Chen, Xiaohong. 2007. "Large Sample Sieve Estimation of Semi-Nonparametric Models." *Handbook of Econometrics* 6: 5549–5632.
- Collard-Wexler, Allan, and Jan De Loecker. 2016. "Production Function Estimation and Capital

- Measurement Error.” *NBER Working Paper* (w22437).
- David, Joel M, Hugo A Hopenhayn, and Venky Venkateswaran. 2016. “Information, Misallocation, and Aggregate Productivity.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 131 (2): 943–1005.
- David, Joel M, and Venky Venkateswaran. 2019. “The Sources of Capital Misallocation.” *American Economic Review* 109 (7): 2531–67.
- De Loecker, Jan, and Chad Syverson. 2021. “An Industrial Organization Perspective on Productivity.” In *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, vol. 4, 141–223: Elsevier.
- Foster, Lucia, John Haltiwanger, and Chad Syverson. 2008. “Reallocation, firm turnover, and efficiency: Selection on productivity or profitability?” *American Economic Review* 98 (1): 394–425.
- Gandhi, Amit, Salvador Navarro, and David A Rivers. 2020. “On the Identification of Gross Output Production Functions.” *Journal of Political Economy* 128 (8): 2973–3016.
- Gollin, Douglas, and Christopher Udry. 2021. “Heterogeneity, Measurement Error, and Misallocation: Evidence from African Agriculture.” *Journal of Political Economy* 129 (1): 1–80.
- Gopinath, Gita, Şebnem Kalemli-Özcan, Loukas Karabarbounis, and Carolina Villegas-Sanchez. 2017. “Capital Allocation and Productivity in South Europe.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 132 (4): 1915–1967.
- Hahn, Jinyong, Zhipeng Liao, and Geert Ridder. 2018. “Nonparametric Two-Step Sieve M Estimation and Inference.” *Econometric Theory* 34 (6): 1281–1324.
- Haltiwanger, John, Robert B Kulick, and Chad Syverson. 2018. “Misallocation Measures: The Distortion that Ate the Residual.” *NBER Working Paper* (w24199).
- Hsieh, Chang-Tai, and Peter J Klenow. 2009. “Misallocation and Manufacturing TFP in China and India.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124 (4): 1403–1448.
- Kalemli-Özcan, Şebnem, Bent E Sørensen, Carolina Villegas-Sanchez, Vadym Volosovych, and Sevcan Yesiltas. 2024. “How to Construct Nationally Representative Firm Level Data from the Orbis Global Database: New Facts on SMEs and Aggregate Implications for Industry Concentration.” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 16 (2): 353–374.
- Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kraay, and Massimo Mastruzzi. 2011. “The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues.” *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law* 3 (2): 220–246.
- Kehrig, Matthias. 2015. “The Cyclical Nature of the Productivity Distribution.” SSRN Working Paper 1854401.
- il Kim, Kyoo, Amil Petrin, and Suyong Song. 2016. “Estimating Production Functions with Control Functions when Capital is Measured with Error.” *Journal of Econometrics* 190 (2): 267–279.
- Korinek, Anton. 2023. “Generative AI for Economic Research: Use Cases and Implications for Economists.” *Journal of Economic Literature* 61 (4): 1281–1317.
- Olley, G Steven, and Ariel Pakes. 1996. “The Dynamics of Productivity in the Telecommunications Equipment Industry.” *Econometrica* 64 (6): 1263–1297.
- Restuccia, Diego, and Richard Rogerson. 2008. “Policy Distortions and Aggregate Productivity with Heterogeneous Establishments.” *Review of Economic Dynamics* 11 (4): 707–720.
- Restuccia, Diego, and Richard Rogerson. 2013. “Misallocation and Productivity.” *Review of Economic Dynamics* 16 (1): 1–10.

- Restuccia, Diego, and Richard Rogerson. 2017. "The Causes and Costs of Misallocation." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31 (3): 151–74.
- Yang, Mu-Jeung. 2021. "Micro-Level Misallocation and Selection." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 13 (4): 341–68.

Appendix A. Identification and Estimation of the Partial Equilibrium Model (Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020))

Taking the FOC for M_{jt} in equation (5) yields

$$(A1) \quad \frac{\partial E(F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})e^{y_{jt}} | \mathcal{I}_{jt})}{\partial M_{jt}} - \rho_{jt} = 0$$

By the distributional assumptions on ω_{jt} and ε_{jt} (see Assumptions 3 and 4), the FOC reads

$$(A2) \quad \frac{\partial F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial M_{jt}} e^{\omega_{jt}} \varepsilon - \rho_{jt} = 0$$

Taking logs, and substituting $\omega_{jt} = y_{jt} - f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) - \varepsilon_{jt}$ delivers

$$(A3) \quad \log(\rho_{jt}) = y_{jt} - f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) - \varepsilon_{jt} + \log \varepsilon + \log \frac{\partial F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial M_{jt}}$$

Let $s_{jt} = \log \left(\frac{\rho_{jt} M_{jt}}{Y_{jt}} \right)$, the (log) intermediates cost share of revenue of firm j at time t . Rearranging ³¹ equation (A3) yields an expression of the log intermediates share as a function of the log revenue elasticity of intermediate inputs, a scalar constant, and the

³¹Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \frac{\partial F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial M_{jt}} - f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) \\ &= \log \frac{\partial F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial M_{jt}} - \log F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) \\ &= \log \left(\frac{\partial F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})} / \frac{\partial M_{jt}}{M_{jt}} \right) - \log M_{jt} \\ &= \log \left(\frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}} \right) - m_{jt} \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $\frac{\partial F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{F(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})} / \frac{\partial M_{jt}}{M_{jt}} = \frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}}$, being the revenue elasticity of material inputs.

ex-post productivity shock

$$(A4) \quad s_{jt} = \log \left(\frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}} \right) + \log \mathcal{E} - \varepsilon_{jt}$$

A second-degree complete polynomial in capital, labor, and materials approximates the intermediate inputs elasticity $\frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}}$. Substituting it into equation (A4) yields

$$(A5) \quad s_{jt} = \log \left(\begin{aligned} &\gamma_0 + \gamma_k k_{jt} + \gamma_l l_{jt} + \gamma_m m_{jt} + \gamma_{kk} k_{jt}^2 + \gamma_{ll} l_{jt}^2 \\ &+ \gamma_{mm} m_{jt}^2 + \gamma_{kl} k_{jt} l_{jt} + \gamma_{km} k_{jt} m_{jt} + \gamma_{lm} l_{jt} m_{jt} \end{aligned} \right) + \log \mathcal{E} - \varepsilon_{jt}$$

Nonlinear least squares consistently estimates the γ parameters in equation (A5) up to the scalar constant $\mathcal{E}$. Denote this estimate $\hat{\gamma}'$.³² However, since the (negative) regression residuals are estimates for the ex-post productivity shock ε_{jt} , by Assumption 4, the residuals yield an estimate $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{(j,t)} e^{j_t}$, where $N = \sum_t J_t$ is the total number of firm-year observations, and J_t denotes the number of firms observed at time t .

Having an estimate for $\mathcal{E}$, I recover an estimate³³ $\hat{\gamma}$ for the parameter vector free of the constant $\mathcal{E}$ and an estimate for the intermediate input elasticity, $\frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}}$. Finally, I estimate the cross-sectional variance τ_t^2 by taking the cross-sectional sample variance of the estimates $\hat{\varepsilon}_{jt}$.

$$(A6) \quad \hat{\tau}_t^2 = \frac{1}{J_t - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{J_t} \left(\hat{\varepsilon}_{jt} - \frac{1}{J_t} \sum_{j=1}^{J_t} \hat{\varepsilon}_{jt} \right)^2$$

³²From equation (A5), regressing just

$$s_{jt} = \log \left(\begin{aligned} &\gamma_0 + \gamma_k k_{jt} + \gamma_l l_{jt} + \gamma_m m_{jt} + \gamma_{kk} k_{jt}^2 + \gamma_{ll} l_{jt}^2 \\ &+ \gamma_{mm} m_{jt}^2 + \gamma_{kl} k_{jt} l_{jt} + \gamma_{km} k_{jt} m_{jt} + \gamma_{lm} l_{jt} m_{jt} \end{aligned} \right) - \varepsilon_{jt}$$

delivers the vector $\hat{\gamma}'$ which is an estimate for $\gamma \mathcal{E}$.

³³ $\hat{\gamma} = \hat{\gamma}' / \hat{\mathcal{E}}$.

The Fundamental Theorem of Calculus³⁴ derives the deterministic part of the revenue function by integrating the revenue elasticity of material inputs

$$(A7) \quad \int \frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}} dm_{jt} = f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) + \mathcal{C}(k_{jt}, l_{jt})$$

where $\mathcal{C}(k_{jt}, l_{jt})$ is a constant of integration. The integral has a closed form solution since a complete, second-order polynomial approximates $\frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}}$:

$$(A8) \quad \int \frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}} dm_{jt} = \left(\begin{aligned} &\gamma_0 + \gamma_k k_{jt} + \gamma_l l_{jt} + \frac{\gamma_m}{2} m_{jt} \\ &+ \gamma_{kk} k_{jt}^2 + \gamma_{ll} l_{jt}^2 + \frac{\gamma_{mm}}{3} m_{jt}^2 \\ &+ \gamma_{kl} k_{jt} l_{jt} + \frac{\gamma_{km}}{2} k_{jt} m_{jt} + \frac{\gamma_{lm}}{2} l_{jt} m_{jt} \end{aligned} \right) m_{jt}$$

Substituting the γ parameter vector with its estimate $\hat{\gamma}$ is enough to retrieve the sample analog for the integral.

Finally, consider constructing the following random variable $\mathcal{Y}_{jt}$

$$(A9) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_{jt} &\equiv y_{jt} - \varepsilon_{jt} - \int \frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}} dm_{jt} \\ &= y_{jt} - \varepsilon_{jt} - f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) - \mathcal{C}(k_{jt}, l_{jt}) \\ &= \omega_{jt} - \mathcal{C}(k_{jt}, l_{jt}) \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows by equation (A7) and the third line by equations (1) and (2). Revenue y_{jt} is observed, and the previous steps provide estimates for the ex-post productivity shock ε_{jt} and $\int \frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}} dm_{jt}$. I can therefore compute $\mathcal{Y}_{jt}$; denote its values $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}_{jt}$.

³⁴For a more detailed discussion about the use of integration for identification, see Section IV in Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020).

From the last line of equation (A9), y_{jt} is also a function of ω_{jt} , the persistent component of TFPR, and $\mathcal{C}(\cdot)$, the residual function from integrating in equation (A7). The $\mathcal{C}(\cdot)$ function is approximated by a second-order complete polynomial. Formally³⁵

$$(A10) \quad \mathcal{C}(k_{jt}, l_{jt}) = \alpha_k k_{jt} + \alpha_l l_{jt} + \alpha_{kk} k_{jt}^2 + \alpha_{ll} l_{jt}^2 + \alpha_{kl} k_{jt} l_{jt}$$

The time-varying Markovian process for ω_{jt} is given by the following truncated third-order polynomial approximation with period-specific coefficients ($1 \leq p \leq P$, where $P = 5$ is the number of time periods)

$$(A11) \quad \omega_{jt} = m_t(\omega_{jt-1}) + \eta_{jt} = \sum_{0 \leq a \leq 3} \delta_{ap} \omega_{jt-1}^a + \eta_{jt}$$

Substituting equations (A10) and (A11) in (A9), and replacing for ω_{jt-1} using the third line of equation (A9), yields

$$(A12) \quad \hat{y}_{jt} = -(\alpha_k k_{jt} + \alpha_l l_{jt} + \alpha_{kk} k_{jt}^2 + \alpha_{ll} l_{jt}^2 + \alpha_{kl} k_{jt} l_{jt}) + \sum_{0 \leq a \leq 3} \sum_{1 \leq p \leq P} I(t \in p) \delta_{ap} \left(\hat{y}_{jt-1} + \alpha_k k_{jt-1} + \alpha_l l_{jt-1} + \alpha_{kk} k_{jt-1}^2 + \alpha_{ll} l_{jt-1}^2 + \alpha_{kl} k_{jt-1} l_{jt-1} \right)^a + \eta_{jt}$$

where $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function.

By the allocation assumptions, k_{jt} and l_{jt} are predetermined inputs at period $t - 1$. Given Assumptions 3 and 4 regarding the information set available to firm j at the end of period $t - 1$, their allocation is made before realizing the productivity innovation η_{jt} . Thus, an exactly identified GMM system estimates the parameter vectors α and δ from

³⁵The $\mathcal{C}(\cdot)$ function is normalized to contain no constant since this latter cannot be separately identified later from the mean productivity, $E(\omega_{jt})$.

(A12) using the following unconditional moment conditions

$$(A13) \quad \begin{aligned} E \left[\eta_{jt} k_{jt}^{\tau_k} l_{jt}^{\tau_l} \right] &= 0, \quad \forall \tau_k, \tau_l, \quad 0 < \tau_k + \tau_l \leq 2 \\ E \left[\eta_{jt} \hat{y}_{jt-1}^a \mathbf{1}(t \in p) \right] &= 0, \quad \forall a, p, \quad 0 \leq a \leq 3, \quad 1 \leq p \leq P \end{aligned}$$

The first set of conditions contains five moments identifying the five components of the α parameter vector. The second set of moments contains $P \times 4$ conditions identifying the period-specific coefficients of the Markov process for ω_{jt} .

The cross-sectional sample variance of the GMM residuals estimates the cross-sectional variance of the productivity innovation η_{jt} , σ_t^2 :

$$(A14) \quad \hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \frac{1}{J_t - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{J_t} \left(\hat{\eta}_{jt} - \frac{1}{J_t} \sum_{j=1}^{J_t} \hat{\eta}_{jt} \right)^2$$

Having the estimates $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\alpha}$ for the γ and α parameter vectors allows computing the firm-time specific revenue elasticities for material inputs, capital, and labor. Respectively,

$$(A15) \quad \begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^M &= \hat{\gamma}_0 + \hat{\gamma}_k k_{jt} + \hat{\gamma}_l l_{jt} + \hat{\gamma}_m m_{jt} + \hat{\gamma}_{kk} k_{jt}^2 + \hat{\gamma}_{ll} l_{jt}^2 + \hat{\gamma}_{mm} m_{jt}^2 + \hat{\gamma}_{kl} k_{jt} l_{jt} + \hat{\gamma}_{km} k_{jt} m_{jt} + \hat{\gamma}_{lm} l_{jt} m_{jt} \\ \widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^K &= m_{jt} \left(\hat{\gamma}_k + 2\hat{\gamma}_{kk} k_{jt} + \hat{\gamma}_{kl} l_{jt} + \frac{\hat{\gamma}_{km}}{2} m_{jt} \right) - \hat{\alpha}_k - 2\hat{\alpha}_{kk} k_{jt} - \hat{\alpha}_{kl} l_{jt} \\ \widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^L &= m_{jt} \left(\hat{\gamma}_l + 2\hat{\gamma}_{ll} l_{jt} + \hat{\gamma}_{kl} k_{jt} + \frac{\hat{\gamma}_{lm}}{2} m_{jt} \right) - \hat{\alpha}_l - 2\hat{\alpha}_{ll} l_{jt} - \hat{\alpha}_{kl} k_{jt} \end{aligned}$$

A.1. Asymptotic Inference

The empirical model is consistent with the just-identified case of the two-step sieve procedure in Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020), with the difference that the polynomial parameters of the Markovian process for TFPR are period-specific in this paper. Nonetheless, the setting in this paper can also be mapped to the setting in Hahn, Liao,

and Ridder (2018), ensuring not only consistency and asymptotic normality of the non-parametric estimator but also the numerical equivalence of the asymptotic variance to its parametric counterpart.

Indeed the first-stage estimator is similar to Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020) and takes the form

$$(A16) \quad \hat{\gamma}_n = \arg \max_{\gamma} - \sum_{j,t} \left\{ s_{jt} - \ln \left(\sum_{r_k+r_l+r_m \leq r(n)} \gamma_{r_k, r_l, r_m} k_{jt}^{r_k} l_{jt}^{r_l} m_{jt}^{r_m} \right) \right\}^2$$

which, using the notation in Hahn, Liao, and Ridder (2018), corresponds to

$$(A17) \quad \hat{h}_n = \arg \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(Z_{1,i}; h)$$

where $r(n)$ is a sequence growing to infinity with n , $\mathcal{H}_n$ is a sieve space with dimension increasing in n , $Z_{1,i} = \{s_{jt}, k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}\}$, and $h = \gamma$.

By contrast, the second-stage estimator is different from Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020) since it accounts for period-specific Markov regime variations. It takes the form

$$(A18) \quad (\hat{\alpha}_n, \hat{\delta}_n) = \arg \max_{\alpha, \delta} - \left\{ \sum_{0 < \tau_k + \tau_l \leq \tau(n)} \left[\sum_{j,t} \eta_{jt}(\alpha, \delta) k_{jt}^{\tau_k} l_{jt}^{\tau_l} \right]^2 + \sum_{0 \leq a \leq A(n)} \sum_{1 \leq p \leq P} \left[\sum_{j,t} I(t \in p) \eta_{jt}(\alpha, \delta) \hat{y}_{jt-1}^a(\hat{\gamma}_n) \right]^2 \right\}$$

where $\tau(n)$ and $A(n)$ are sequences growing to infinity with n , $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function and

$$(A19) \quad \begin{aligned} \eta_{jt}(\alpha, \delta) &= \hat{y}_{jt}(\hat{\gamma}_n) + \sum_{0 < \tau_k + \tau_l \leq \tau(n)} \alpha_{\tau_k, \tau_l} k_{jt}^{\tau_k} l_{jt}^{\tau_l} \\ &- \sum_{0 \leq a \leq A(n)} \sum_{1 \leq p \leq P} I(t \in p) \delta_{ap} \left(\hat{y}_{jt-1}(\hat{\gamma}_n) + \sum_{0 < \tau_k + \tau_l \leq \tau(n)} \alpha_{\tau_k, \tau_l} k_{jt-1}^{\tau_k} l_{jt-1}^{\tau_l} \right)^a \end{aligned}$$

The second-stage estimator corresponds, using the notation in Hahn, Liao, and Ridder (2018), to

$$(A20) \quad \hat{g}_n = \arg \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(Z_{2,i}; g, \hat{h}_n)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_n$ is a sieve space with dimension increasing in n , $g = \{\mathcal{C}(\alpha), h(\delta)\}$, and $Z_{2,i} = \{y_{jt}, k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}, y_{jt-1}, k_{jt-1}, l_{jt-1}, m_{jt-1}\}$.

Similar to Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020), since I use linear polynomial sieves, under the standard assumptions in Chen (2007) and Hahn, Liao, and Ridder (2018), the estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal. Hence, I use a non-parametric bootstrap procedure to compute confidence intervals for my estimates.

Appendix B. Model Estimates

In this section, I report the results of estimating the production function for each country, industry by industry (see the industry classification in Footnote 10). The productivity Markov process $m_t(\cdot)$ varies across five historical periods: *Beginning of the millennium* (2001–2003); *Pre-crisis* (2004–2007); *Great Recession and European debt crisis* (2008–2010); *Crisis aftermath* (2011–2014); and *Post-crisis* (2015–2017). I compute standard errors via a non-parametric clustered bootstrap procedure, drawing with replacement from the pool of firm identifiers 100 times. Tables A1 to A8 report the full estimation results for all eight industry groups.

TABLE A1. Food, Beverages and Tobacco

Production Function Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Observations	5,153	156,587	143,753	111,367	6,959	26,761
γ_0	0.493 (0.050)	0.567 (0.049)	0.141 (0.083)	0.171 (0.012)	0.031 (0.045)	0.722 (0.032)
γ_k	-0.033 (0.012)	-0.079 (0.005)	-0.053 (0.031)	-0.082 (0.006)	-0.277 (0.013)	-0.099 (0.008)
γ_l	-0.083 (0.021)	-0.003 (0.016)	0.033 (0.019)	0.160 (0.010)	0.317 (0.026)	0.032 (0.016)
γ_m	0.148 (0.012)	0.135 (0.012)	0.041 (0.024)	0.043 (0.004)	0.075 (0.014)	0.164 (0.011)
γ_{kk}	-0.004 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.008 (0.001)	-0.016 (0.001)	0.002 (0.001)
γ_{ll}	0.003 (0.003)	-0.019 (0.002)	-0.012 (0.007)	-0.046 (0.003)	-0.053 (0.003)	-0.026 (0.003)
γ_{mm}	0.015 (0.001)	0.013 (0.001)	0.003 (0.002)	0.005 (0.000)	0.008 (0.002)	0.010 (0.001)
γ_{kl}	0.003 (0.003)	0.007 (0.001)	0.015 (0.009)	0.012 (0.001)	0.059 (0.003)	0.010 (0.002)
γ_{km}	-0.011 (0.003)	-0.017 (0.001)	-0.009 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.000)	-0.020 (0.002)	-0.014 (0.001)
γ_{lm}	-0.011 (0.003)	0.011 (0.003)	0.001 (0.001)	0.018 (0.001)	0.015 (0.003)	0.002 (0.002)
α_k	-0.088 (0.086)	-0.138 (0.026)	-0.551 (0.065)	-0.302 (0.031)	-0.283 (0.200)	0.006 (0.036)
α_l	-0.323 (0.093)	-0.195 (0.027)	0.031 (0.051)	0.220 (0.044)	0.089 (0.247)	-0.132 (0.097)
α_{kk}	-0.039 (0.012)	-0.022 (0.002)	-0.043 (0.003)	-0.035 (0.004)	-0.033 (0.023)	-0.022 (0.003)

α_{ll}	-0.010	-0.045	-0.102	-0.155	-0.035	-0.052
	(0.014)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.039)	(0.019)
α_{kl}	-0.033	-0.036	0.075	-0.026	-0.014	-0.062
	(0.020)	(0.005)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.060)	(0.013)

Productivity Process Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
2001 - 2003						
δ_0	NA	-0.184	0.026	0.058	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.016)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_1	NA	0.540	0.927	0.802	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.042)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_2	NA	-0.029	-0.032	-0.016	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.028)	(0.018)	(0.010)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_3	NA	-0.002	-0.008	-0.009	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(NA)	(NA)
2004 - 2007						
δ_0	0.074	-0.106	0.010	0.068	0.071	-0.070
	(0.037)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.222)	(0.062)
δ_1	0.758	0.636	0.920	0.860	0.826	0.973
	(0.117)	(0.030)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.339)	(0.140)
δ_2	-0.075	-0.042	-0.005	-0.030	0.069	0.013
	(0.255)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.008)	(0.227)	(0.116)
δ_3	-0.081	-0.006	-0.001	-0.008	-0.067	-0.043
	(0.148)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.065)	(0.042)
2008 - 2010						
δ_0	0.071	-0.070	0.022	0.065	0.152	-0.316
	(0.027)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.204)	(0.058)
δ_1	0.704	0.648	0.924	0.817	0.769	0.564
	(0.131)	(0.027)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.270)	(0.127)
δ_2	0.122	-0.062	-0.000	0.026	-0.001	-0.081
	(0.232)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.010)	(0.145)	(0.086)
δ_3	0.002	-0.006	0.001	-0.001	-0.005	-0.034
	(0.183)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.029)	(0.040)
2011 - 2014						
δ_0	0.063	0.005	0.037	0.077	0.244	-0.036

	(0.018)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.095)	(0.022)
δ_1	0.854	0.768	0.940	0.845	0.679	0.926
	(0.073)	(0.019)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.091)	(0.063)
δ_2	0.223	-0.073	0.007	0.013	0.009	0.078
	(0.149)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.006)	(0.059)	(0.063)
δ_3	-0.192	-0.019	0.000	-0.001	-0.007	0.001
	(0.114)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.018)	(0.025)
2015 - 2017						
δ_0	0.006	-0.095	0.016	0.051	0.220	-0.209
	(0.028)	(0.006)	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.078)	(0.029)
δ_1	1.049	0.701	0.989	0.861	0.657	0.757
	(0.147)	(0.020)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.056)	(0.099)
δ_2	-0.156	-0.066	-0.042	-0.013	-0.012	0.097
	(0.180)	(0.017)	(0.010)	(0.005)	(0.032)	(0.103)
δ_3	-0.059	-0.006	-0.007	-0.003	0.006	-0.004
	(0.084)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.014)	(0.030)

This table reports estimates from the two-stage GNR procedure (Appendix A). The upper panel presents production function parameters: γ coefficients from the first-stage share regression (equation A5) and α coefficients from the second-stage GMM (equation A12). The lower panel presents Markov process coefficients δ for each time period (equation A11), where δ_0 is the drift, δ_1 the AR(1) persistence, and δ_2, δ_3 higher-order terms. Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) from 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania). NA indicates insufficient data for that country-period cell.

TABLE A2. Textiles, Apparel and Leather

Production Function Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Observations	2,544	98,052	35,389	163,069	3,219	26,155
γ_0	0.320 (0.093)	0.891 (0.015)	0.536 (0.029)	0.112 (0.016)	0.312 (0.032)	0.803 (0.019)
γ_k	-0.087 (0.029)	-0.049 (0.002)	-0.030 (0.002)	-0.051 (0.003)	-0.171 (0.014)	-0.064 (0.001)
γ_l	0.082 (0.047)	-0.176 (0.004)	-0.133 (0.007)	0.042 (0.002)	0.053 (0.012)	-0.173 (0.004)
γ_m	0.092 (0.026)	0.209 (0.004)	0.160 (0.009)	0.068 (0.006)	0.204 (0.014)	0.184 (0.005)
γ_{kk}	-0.003 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)	0.003 (0.001)	-0.009 (0.001)	-0.007 (0.001)
γ_{ll}	-0.022 (0.006)	0.009 (0.000)	0.011 (0.001)	-0.005 (0.000)	-0.011 (0.002)	0.012 (0.000)
γ_{mm}	0.005 (0.003)	0.012 (0.000)	0.010 (0.001)	0.010 (0.000)	0.011 (0.001)	0.009 (0.000)
γ_{kl}	0.022 (0.006)	0.005 (0.000)	0.004 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)	0.025 (0.003)	0.006 (0.000)
γ_{km}	-0.005 (0.003)	-0.006 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.010 (0.000)	0.000 (0.002)	0.003 (0.001)
γ_{lm}	-0.002 (0.006)	-0.021 (0.001)	-0.016 (0.001)	0.008 (0.001)	-0.017 (0.002)	-0.016 (0.001)
α_k	-0.384 (0.088)	-0.033 (0.007)	-0.192 (0.022)	-0.318 (0.020)	-0.532 (0.073)	-0.351 (0.034)
α_l	0.664 (0.163)	-0.116 (0.017)	-0.374 (0.023)	-0.157 (0.028)	0.194 (0.111)	-0.065 (0.028)
α_{kk}	-0.019 (0.010)	-0.009 (0.001)	-0.003 (0.002)	-0.013 (0.002)	-0.047 (0.006)	-0.029 (0.003)

α_{ll}	-0.166	-0.054	-0.009	0.002	-0.044	-0.033
	(0.025)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.013)	(0.005)
α_{kl}	0.092	-0.038	0.006	-0.015	0.037	0.005
	(0.021)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.013)	(0.008)

Productivity Process Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
2001 - 2003						
δ_0	NA	-0.032	-0.012	0.121	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_1	NA	0.747	0.698	0.874	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.025)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_2	NA	-0.102	-0.127	-0.004	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.038)	(0.020)	(0.010)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_3	NA	-0.054	-0.026	-0.020	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.013)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(NA)	(NA)
2004 - 2007						
δ_0	3.276	-0.035	-0.012	0.086	0.342	-0.067
	(1.813)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.128)	(0.016)
δ_1	-5.866	0.733	0.705	0.938	0.381	0.771
	(3.131)	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.230)	(0.050)
δ_2	4.677	-0.094	-0.097	-0.018	0.223	-0.005
	(1.874)	(0.029)	(0.018)	(0.012)	(0.153)	(0.044)
δ_3	-1.037	-0.034	-0.016	-0.022	0.026	-0.033
	(0.386)	(0.009)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.092)	(0.021)
2008 - 2010						
δ_0	1.008	-0.027	-0.017	0.083	0.132	-0.220
	(0.790)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.010)	(0.127)	(0.022)
δ_1	-1.130	0.716	0.774	0.896	0.863	0.391
	(1.655)	(0.018)	(0.027)	(0.012)	(0.348)	(0.032)
δ_2	1.512	-0.158	-0.099	0.000	-0.039	-0.082
	(1.192)	(0.035)	(0.020)	(0.009)	(0.335)	(0.022)
δ_3	-0.353	-0.045	-0.015	-0.019	0.043	-0.013
	(0.301)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.127)	(0.006)
2011 - 2014						
δ_0	0.823	-0.022	0.034	0.119	0.257	-0.087

	(0.264)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.106)	(0.010)
δ_1	-0.517	0.792	0.876	0.918	0.553	0.684
	(0.494)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.011)	(0.299)	(0.022)
δ_2	0.981	-0.064	-0.078	-0.009	0.240	-0.104
	(0.329)	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.006)	(0.364)	(0.022)
δ_3	-0.214	-0.062	-0.035	-0.022	-0.047	-0.026
	(0.078)	(0.016)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.164)	(0.007)
2015 - 2017						
δ_0	0.281	-0.053	0.006	0.099	0.324	-0.072
	(0.357)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.087)	(0.012)
δ_1	0.434	0.633	0.896	0.911	0.749	0.661
	(0.649)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.011)	(0.158)	(0.022)
δ_2	0.361	-0.181	-0.032	-0.015	-0.048	-0.123
	(0.402)	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.006)	(0.158)	(0.020)
δ_3	-0.075	-0.025	-0.016	-0.017	0.006	-0.026
	(0.085)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.003)	(0.057)	(0.005)

This table reports estimates from the two-stage GNR procedure (Appendix A). The upper panel presents production function parameters: γ coefficients from the first-stage share regression (equation A5) and α coefficients from the second-stage GMM (equation A12). The lower panel presents Markov process coefficients δ for each time period (equation A11), where δ_0 is the drift, δ_1 the AR(1) persistence, and δ_2, δ_3 higher-order terms. Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) from 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania). NA indicates insufficient data for that country-period cell.

TABLE A3. Wood, Paper, and Printing

Production Function Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Observations	5,997	155,263	82,221	109,908	6,075	29,486
γ_0	0.123 (0.097)	0.572 (0.048)	0.456 (0.079)	0.124 (0.006)	0.416 (0.115)	0.627 (0.035)
γ_k	-0.040 (0.026)	-0.105 (0.004)	-0.029 (0.005)	-0.142 (0.007)	-0.033 (0.020)	-0.109 (0.004)
γ_l	0.010 (0.016)	0.005 (0.021)	-0.094 (0.016)	0.068 (0.003)	-0.037 (0.027)	-0.050 (0.013)
γ_m	0.071 (0.050)	0.141 (0.015)	0.130 (0.023)	0.089 (0.004)	0.086 (0.035)	0.142 (0.010)
γ_{kk}	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.006 (0.000)	0.001 (0.000)	-0.006 (0.000)	0.004 (0.002)	-0.008 (0.001)
γ_{ll}	-0.006 (0.004)	-0.017 (0.002)	0.004 (0.001)	-0.006 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.003)	-0.000 (0.001)
γ_{mm}	0.006 (0.004)	0.008 (0.001)	0.011 (0.002)	0.010 (0.000)	0.007 (0.003)	0.003 (0.001)
γ_{kl}	0.006 (0.004)	0.023 (0.001)	0.002 (0.001)	0.020 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.003)	0.011 (0.001)
γ_{km}	-0.003 (0.002)	-0.008 (0.001)	-0.008 (0.001)	-0.016 (0.001)	-0.013 (0.004)	0.001 (0.001)
γ_{lm}	-0.006 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.011 (0.002)	0.007 (0.000)	0.003 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.002)
α_k	-0.437 (0.089)	-0.148 (0.018)	-0.175 (0.043)	-0.580 (0.020)	-0.121 (0.077)	-0.216 (0.027)
α_l	0.106 (0.103)	-0.084 (0.022)	-0.394 (0.028)	-0.088 (0.028)	-0.641 (0.196)	-0.030 (0.026)
α_{kk}	-0.033 (0.006)	-0.019 (0.002)	-0.017 (0.003)	-0.055 (0.002)	-0.023 (0.006)	-0.020 (0.002)

α_{ll}	-0.109	-0.065	-0.031	0.012	0.034	-0.044
	(0.015)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.025)	(0.005)
α_{kl}	0.056	-0.008	-0.014	0.044	-0.047	-0.004
	(0.019)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.018)	(0.005)

Productivity Process Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
2001 - 2003						
δ_0	NA	-0.020	-0.086	0.213	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.019)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_1	NA	0.719	0.747	0.717	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.022)	(0.036)	(0.029)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_2	NA	-0.004	-0.105	0.019	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.034)	(0.039)	(0.020)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_3	NA	-0.006	-0.030	-0.029	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.006)	(NA)	(NA)
2004 - 2007						
δ_0	0.050	-0.002	-0.046	0.231	-0.223	-0.193
	(0.028)	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.021)	(0.231)	(0.053)
δ_1	0.893	0.822	0.797	0.771	0.674	0.350
	(0.109)	(0.015)	(0.021)	(0.028)	(0.501)	(0.202)
δ_2	0.096	-0.026	-0.138	-0.031	-0.122	-0.364
	(0.179)	(0.044)	(0.030)	(0.012)	(0.435)	(0.194)
δ_3	-0.045	-0.025	-0.045	-0.008	-0.016	-0.050
	(0.107)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.004)	(0.147)	(0.045)
2008 - 2010						
δ_0	0.066	-0.014	-0.058	0.220	-0.288	-0.175
	(0.041)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.028)	(0.221)	(0.021)
δ_1	0.861	0.865	0.812	0.776	0.564	0.561
	(0.093)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.033)	(0.451)	(0.060)
δ_2	0.056	0.110	-0.091	-0.019	-0.235	-0.101
	(0.067)	(0.062)	(0.028)	(0.010)	(0.330)	(0.065)
δ_3	-0.039	0.015	-0.017	-0.019	-0.063	-0.027
	(0.028)	(0.022)	(0.010)	(0.004)	(0.095)	(0.012)
2011 - 2014						
δ_0	0.048	-0.014	-0.016	0.228	-0.327	-0.021

	(0.021)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.022)	(0.127)	(0.008)
δ_1	0.949	0.852	0.854	0.812	0.283	0.760
	(0.046)	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.231)	(0.037)
δ_2	0.020	0.004	-0.084	-0.045	-0.445	-0.136
	(0.035)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.007)	(0.167)	(0.061)
δ_3	-0.025	-0.007	-0.037	-0.009	-0.084	-0.054
	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.011)	(0.004)	(0.039)	(0.020)
2015 - 2017						
δ_0	-0.015	-0.042	-0.007	0.265	-0.124	-0.066
	(0.028)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.015)	(0.062)	(0.012)
δ_1	1.047	0.867	0.887	0.761	1.002	0.628
	(0.052)	(0.022)	(0.031)	(0.016)	(0.143)	(0.026)
δ_2	-0.023	-0.023	-0.139	-0.047	0.126	-0.058
	(0.036)	(0.053)	(0.035)	(0.006)	(0.106)	(0.044)
δ_3	-0.018	-0.007	-0.025	-0.011	0.008	-0.020
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.002)	(0.022)	(0.012)

This table reports estimates from the two-stage GNR procedure (Appendix A). The upper panel presents production function parameters: γ coefficients from the first-stage share regression (equation A5) and α coefficients from the second-stage GMM (equation A12). The lower panel presents Markov process coefficients δ for each time period (equation A11), where δ_0 is the drift, δ_1 the AR(1) persistence, and δ_2, δ_3 higher-order terms. Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) from 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania). NA indicates insufficient data for that country-period cell.

TABLE A4. Coke, Chemicals, and Pharmaceuticals

Production Function Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Observations	5,653	39,794	21,373	45,809	2,916	4,797
γ_0	0.019 (0.022)	0.596 (0.030)	0.549 (0.025)	0.020 (0.004)	0.539 (0.071)	0.654 (0.068)
γ_k	-0.084 (0.026)	-0.089 (0.007)	-0.042 (0.004)	-0.096 (0.011)	-0.146 (0.017)	-0.081 (0.014)
γ_l	0.091 (0.026)	-0.060 (0.012)	-0.123 (0.008)	0.186 (0.022)	-0.054 (0.038)	-0.082 (0.026)
γ_m	0.070 (0.025)	0.134 (0.007)	0.167 (0.007)	0.018 (0.002)	0.190 (0.021)	0.150 (0.017)
γ_{kk}	-0.003 (0.001)	-0.003 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.000)	0.005 (0.001)	-0.014 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.001)
γ_{ll}	-0.016 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.002)	0.007 (0.001)	-0.040 (0.005)	-0.001 (0.005)	0.000 (0.002)
γ_{mm}	0.008 (0.003)	0.008 (0.000)	0.012 (0.001)	0.004 (0.000)	0.014 (0.002)	0.009 (0.001)
γ_{kl}	0.016 (0.005)	0.014 (0.002)	0.006 (0.001)	0.021 (0.002)	0.026 (0.004)	0.010 (0.002)
γ_{km}	-0.001 (0.003)	-0.008 (0.001)	-0.002 (0.001)	-0.015 (0.002)	-0.004 (0.002)	-0.009 (0.002)
γ_{lm}	-0.006 (0.003)	-0.008 (0.001)	-0.020 (0.001)	0.023 (0.003)	-0.018 (0.005)	-0.011 (0.003)
α_k	-0.806 (0.129)	-0.144 (0.022)	-0.172 (0.030)	-0.455 (0.046)	-0.358 (0.111)	-0.113 (0.045)
α_l	0.720 (0.202)	-0.257 (0.037)	-0.273 (0.033)	0.439 (0.063)	-0.322 (0.161)	-0.175 (0.067)
α_{kk}	-0.021 (0.014)	-0.019 (0.003)	-0.007 (0.003)	-0.014 (0.005)	-0.043 (0.010)	-0.017 (0.006)

α_{ll}	-0.178	-0.022	-0.048	-0.144	0.006	-0.041
	(0.031)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.023)	(0.012)
α_{kl}	0.140	-0.026	0.000	0.066	0.010	-0.029
	(0.035)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.025)	(0.010)

Productivity Process Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
2001 - 2003						
δ_0	NA	0.009	0.011	0.258	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.026)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_1	NA	0.920	0.877	0.799	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.026)	(0.020)	(0.032)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_2	NA	0.014	-0.045	-0.012	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.078)	(0.056)	(0.015)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_3	NA	-0.079	-0.049	-0.011	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.042)	(0.031)	(0.004)	(NA)	(NA)
2004 - 2007						
δ_0	1.203	0.034	0.055	0.164	0.004	-0.192
	(0.402)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.023)	(0.032)	(0.098)
δ_1	0.324	0.926	0.836	0.933	0.892	0.338
	(0.270)	(0.016)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.109)	(0.314)
δ_2	0.032	0.035	-0.128	0.007	-0.074	-0.597
	(0.086)	(0.047)	(0.047)	(0.012)	(0.238)	(0.324)
δ_3	0.014	-0.047	-0.048	-0.021	-0.146	-0.198
	(0.021)	(0.040)	(0.029)	(0.004)	(0.202)	(0.106)
2008 - 2010						
δ_0	0.504	0.018	0.016	0.157	0.015	-0.229
	(0.214)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.030)	(0.018)	(0.065)
δ_1	0.734	0.908	0.935	0.851	0.969	0.487
	(0.263)	(0.014)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.073)	(0.237)
δ_2	0.002	0.049	-0.113	0.024	-0.095	-0.357
	(0.134)	(0.030)	(0.043)	(0.012)	(0.172)	(0.285)
δ_3	0.006	-0.008	-0.080	-0.008	-0.273	-0.150
	(0.023)	(0.045)	(0.029)	(0.004)	(0.140)	(0.111)
2011 - 2014						
δ_0	0.455	0.023	0.070	0.153	0.053	-0.044

	(0.241)	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.018)	(0.038)	(0.014)
δ_1	0.753	1.002	0.933	0.902	0.810	0.882
	(0.149)	(0.017)	(0.039)	(0.017)	(0.101)	(0.056)
δ_2	0.020	-0.020	-0.120	0.030	-0.248	0.012
	(0.090)	(0.025)	(0.053)	(0.012)	(0.155)	(0.087)
δ_3	0.003	-0.136	-0.088	-0.013	-0.078	-0.019
	(0.021)	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.004)	(0.054)	(0.049)
2015 - 2017						
δ_0	0.397	-0.051	0.004	0.095	-0.016	-0.082
	(0.182)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.017)
δ_1	0.735	0.855	0.911	0.925	0.877	0.874
	(0.137)	(0.016)	(0.030)	(0.025)	(0.055)	(0.067)
δ_2	0.037	-0.115	-0.061	0.029	-0.035	-0.060
	(0.088)	(0.033)	(0.052)	(0.016)	(0.077)	(0.130)
δ_3	0.000	-0.088	-0.018	-0.022	-0.058	-0.088
	(0.019)	(0.033)	(0.024)	(0.006)	(0.029)	(0.075)

This table reports estimates from the two-stage GNR procedure (Appendix A). The upper panel presents production function parameters: γ coefficients from the first-stage share regression (equation A5) and α coefficients from the second-stage GMM (equation A12). The lower panel presents Markov process coefficients δ for each time period (equation A11), where δ_0 is the drift, δ_1 the AR(1) persistence, and δ_2, δ_3 higher-order terms. Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) from 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania). NA indicates insufficient data for that country-period cell.

TABLE A5. Rubber, Plastics, Metallic and Non-Metallic Mineral Products, Fabricated Metal Products

Production Function Estimates						
	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Observations	25,363	333,239	175,009	431,855	18,733	41,745
γ_0	0.187 (0.131)	0.858 (0.018)	0.584 (0.016)	0.542 (0.029)	0.361 (0.202)	0.339 (0.072)
γ_k	-0.037 (0.027)	-0.058 (0.001)	-0.039 (0.001)	-0.019 (0.001)	-0.040 (0.023)	-0.151 (0.032)
γ_l	-0.026 (0.018)	-0.152 (0.008)	-0.133 (0.004)	-0.131 (0.007)	-0.078 (0.043)	-0.030 (0.006)
γ_m	0.086 (0.061)	0.206 (0.004)	0.188 (0.005)	0.120 (0.010)	0.094 (0.056)	0.146 (0.031)
γ_{kk}	-0.002 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)	0.002 (0.000)	-0.006 (0.003)	-0.009 (0.002)
γ_{ll}	-0.000 (0.001)	0.005 (0.001)	0.007 (0.000)	0.010 (0.000)	0.006 (0.003)	0.002 (0.001)
γ_{mm}	0.006 (0.004)	0.012 (0.000)	0.015 (0.000)	0.005 (0.001)	0.002 (0.003)	0.008 (0.002)
γ_{kl}	0.007 (0.005)	0.006 (0.000)	0.006 (0.000)	0.004 (0.000)	0.004 (0.003)	0.023 (0.005)
γ_{km}	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.006 (0.000)	-0.005 (0.000)	-0.004 (0.000)	0.006 (0.003)	-0.003 (0.001)
γ_{lm}	-0.011 (0.008)	-0.018 (0.001)	-0.023 (0.001)	-0.006 (0.002)	-0.008 (0.006)	-0.012 (0.003)
α_k	-0.543 (0.096)	-0.029 (0.005)	-0.221 (0.009)	-0.024 (0.009)	-0.279 (0.087)	-0.412 (0.084)
α_l	0.176 (0.067)	-0.086 (0.009)	-0.124 (0.008)	-0.536 (0.026)	-0.669 (0.118)	-0.235 (0.051)
α_{kk}	-0.029	-0.009	-0.016	0.009	-0.031	-0.033

	(0.005)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.006)	(0.003)
α_{ll}	-0.118	-0.065	-0.070	0.009	0.034	-0.004
	(0.014)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.006)	(0.014)	(0.007)
α_{kl}	0.090	-0.032	0.016	-0.031	-0.020	0.008
	(0.020)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.016)	(0.016)

Productivity Process Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
2001 - 2003						
δ_0	NA	0.011	-0.007	-0.192	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.009)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_1	NA	0.872	0.919	0.668	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.014)	(0.007)	(0.018)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_2	NA	-0.017	-0.031	-0.054	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.027)	(0.034)	(0.016)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_3	NA	-0.076	-0.014	-0.012	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.022)	(0.009)	(0.003)	(NA)	(NA)
2004 - 2007						
δ_0	0.139	0.051	0.048	-0.097	-0.118	-0.129
	(0.013)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.055)	(0.026)
δ_1	0.865	0.928	0.903	0.690	0.985	0.640
	(0.066)	(0.005)	(0.007)	(0.015)	(0.152)	(0.092)
δ_2	0.066	-0.024	0.014	-0.073	0.111	-0.100
	(0.098)	(0.021)	(0.039)	(0.011)	(0.106)	(0.092)
δ_3	-0.015	-0.052	-0.005	-0.014	0.002	-0.032
	(0.042)	(0.012)	(0.010)	(0.003)	(0.013)	(0.016)
2008 - 2010						
δ_0	0.061	0.019	0.023	-0.144	-0.163	-0.199
	(0.017)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.006)	(0.048)	(0.042)
δ_1	0.888	0.929	0.925	0.673	0.936	0.521
	(0.048)	(0.010)	(0.025)	(0.013)	(0.134)	(0.026)
δ_2	0.012	-0.002	-0.058	-0.064	0.055	-0.066
	(0.036)	(0.028)	(0.044)	(0.014)	(0.089)	(0.025)
δ_3	-0.013	-0.088	-0.052	-0.018	-0.001	-0.012
	(0.016)	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.003)	(0.011)	(0.005)
2011 - 2014						
δ_0	0.127	-0.020	0.054	-0.126	-0.073	-0.066

	(0.023)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.008)	(0.030)	(0.027)
δ_1	0.847	0.885	0.849	0.630	0.937	0.654
	(0.046)	(0.005)	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.082)	(0.028)
δ_2	0.021	-0.031	0.032	-0.056	0.032	-0.082
	(0.029)	(0.016)	(0.022)	(0.009)	(0.045)	(0.022)
δ_3	-0.004	-0.040	0.005	-0.013	-0.002	-0.012
	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.002)	(0.006)	(0.005)
2015 - 2017						
δ_0	-0.018	-0.055	0.010	-0.147	-0.167	-0.112
	(0.021)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.008)	(0.043)	(0.030)
δ_1	1.052	0.709	0.990	0.617	0.872	0.629
	(0.059)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.095)	(0.025)
δ_2	-0.030	-0.194	-0.102	-0.095	0.047	-0.056
	(0.054)	(0.043)	(0.023)	(0.009)	(0.062)	(0.021)
δ_3	-0.007	-0.066	-0.018	-0.017	0.001	-0.007
	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.010)	(0.004)

This table reports estimates from the two-stage GNR procedure (Appendix A). The upper panel presents production function parameters: γ coefficients from the first-stage share regression (equation A5) and α coefficients from the second-stage GMM (equation A12). The lower panel presents Markov process coefficients δ for each time period (equation A11), where δ_0 is the drift, δ_1 the AR(1) persistence, and δ_2, δ_3 higher-order terms. Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) from 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania). NA indicates insufficient data for that country-period cell.

TABLE A6. Electronic, Optical Products and Electrical Equipment

Production Function Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Observations	10,030	32,404	31,683	92,970	3,569	5,705
γ_0	0.090 (0.036)	0.696 (0.066)	0.115 (0.171)	0.538 (0.018)	0.700 (0.065)	0.323 (0.042)
γ_k	-0.058 (0.022)	-0.039 (0.005)	-0.008 (0.011)	-0.027 (0.002)	-0.116 (0.011)	-0.129 (0.014)
γ_l	0.007 (0.004)	-0.103 (0.023)	-0.036 (0.051)	-0.088 (0.003)	-0.125 (0.028)	-0.023 (0.007)
γ_m	0.050 (0.019)	0.144 (0.019)	0.028 (0.043)	0.150 (0.005)	0.211 (0.020)	0.118 (0.015)
γ_{kk}	-0.005 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.016 (0.002)	-0.006 (0.001)
γ_{ll}	-0.003 (0.001)	0.003 (0.002)	0.004 (0.005)	0.001 (0.000)	0.008 (0.003)	-0.000 (0.001)
γ_{mm}	0.003 (0.001)	0.006 (0.002)	0.002 (0.003)	0.010 (0.000)	0.006 (0.002)	0.008 (0.001)
γ_{kl}	0.012 (0.004)	0.006 (0.001)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.002 (0.000)	0.014 (0.002)	0.015 (0.002)
γ_{km}	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002 (0.003)	-0.002 (0.000)	0.011 (0.003)	-0.008 (0.001)
γ_{lm}	-0.005 (0.002)	-0.008 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.013 (0.000)	-0.017 (0.004)	-0.006 (0.001)
α_k	-0.503 (0.108)	-0.061 (0.021)	-0.329 (0.078)	-0.039 (0.014)	-0.190 (0.077)	-0.486 (0.072)
α_l	-0.537 (0.139)	-0.147 (0.027)	-0.670 (0.053)	-0.292 (0.013)	-0.519 (0.106)	-0.275 (0.092)
α_{kk}	-0.056 (0.009)	-0.004 (0.002)	-0.021 (0.005)	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.030 (0.010)	-0.046 (0.007)

α_{ll}	-0.018 (0.017)	-0.057 (0.006)	0.006 (0.013)	-0.042 (0.003)	0.027 (0.015)	-0.004 (0.012)
α_{kl}	0.077 (0.024)	-0.004 (0.008)	-0.001 (0.019)	-0.031 (0.003)	-0.022 (0.017)	-0.001 (0.015)

Productivity Process Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
2001 - 2003						
δ_0	NA	0.046	-0.088	-0.034	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.004)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_1	NA	0.908	0.831	0.731	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.021)	(0.031)	(0.019)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_2	NA	-0.131	-0.122	-0.147	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.041)	(0.033)	(0.040)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_3	NA	-0.051	-0.042	-0.030	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.024)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(NA)	(NA)
2004 - 2007						
δ_0	-0.017	0.030	-0.037	-0.005	-0.167	-0.026
	(0.037)	(0.007)	(0.012)	(0.003)	(0.083)	(0.049)
δ_1	0.774	0.939	0.816	0.769	0.484	0.592
	(0.049)	(0.024)	(0.047)	(0.019)	(0.280)	(0.140)
δ_2	-0.072	-0.026	-0.104	-0.107	-0.346	-0.349
	(0.042)	(0.030)	(0.044)	(0.026)	(0.441)	(0.202)
δ_3	-0.013	-0.039	-0.029	-0.030	-0.074	-0.142
	(0.017)	(0.042)	(0.010)	(0.006)	(0.290)	(0.094)
2008 - 2010						
δ_0	-0.068	-0.005	-0.041	-0.042	-0.197	-0.030
	(0.028)	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.003)	(0.073)	(0.061)
δ_1	0.841	0.929	0.934	0.782	0.774	0.474
	(0.031)	(0.022)	(0.034)	(0.012)	(0.218)	(0.059)
δ_2	-0.043	0.043	-0.016	-0.093	0.150	-0.099
	(0.023)	(0.033)	(0.042)	(0.022)	(0.238)	(0.059)
δ_3	-0.002	-0.063	-0.007	-0.031	0.011	-0.020
	(0.005)	(0.042)	(0.010)	(0.006)	(0.075)	(0.016)
2011 - 2014						
δ_0	-0.010	0.022	-0.017	-0.021	-0.151	-0.024

	(0.030)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.055)	(0.031)
δ_1	0.848	0.918	0.930	0.752	0.584	0.784
	(0.028)	(0.024)	(0.030)	(0.014)	(0.111)	(0.051)
δ_2	-0.019	-0.124	-0.006	-0.138	-0.212	-0.115
	(0.023)	(0.052)	(0.040)	(0.022)	(0.120)	(0.044)
δ_3	-0.005	-0.042	-0.004	-0.031	-0.045	-0.032
	(0.003)	(0.043)	(0.016)	(0.006)	(0.054)	(0.014)
2015 - 2017						
δ_0	0.007	-0.121	-0.016	-0.028	-0.187	-0.029
	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.003)	(0.060)	(0.044)
δ_1	0.936	0.703	0.953	0.736	0.671	0.642
	(0.019)	(0.022)	(0.050)	(0.017)	(0.106)	(0.036)
δ_2	-0.024	-0.046	-0.023	-0.142	-0.030	-0.061
	(0.018)	(0.049)	(0.063)	(0.027)	(0.096)	(0.043)
δ_3	-0.002	-0.002	-0.012	-0.028	-0.008	0.000
	(0.002)	(0.033)	(0.017)	(0.007)	(0.028)	(0.008)

This table reports estimates from the two-stage GNR procedure (Appendix A). The upper panel presents production function parameters: γ coefficients from the first-stage share regression (equation A5) and α coefficients from the second-stage GMM (equation A12). The lower panel presents Markov process coefficients δ for each time period (equation A11), where δ_0 is the drift, δ_1 the AR(1) persistence, and δ_2, δ_3 higher-order terms. Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) from 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania). NA indicates insufficient data for that country-period cell.

TABLE A7. Machinery, Motor Vehicles and Other Transport Equipment

Production Function Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Observations	16,757	82,156	53,558	190,767	7,151	9,115
γ_0	0.362 (0.067)	0.850 (0.016)	0.245 (0.025)	0.222 (0.007)	0.420 (0.041)	0.133 (0.038)
γ_k	-0.046 (0.010)	-0.045 (0.003)	-0.095 (0.008)	-0.133 (0.004)	-0.111 (0.011)	-0.075 (0.005)
γ_l	-0.056 (0.015)	-0.131 (0.007)	-0.000 (0.006)	-0.030 (0.001)	0.031 (0.016)	0.072 (0.012)
γ_m	0.146 (0.026)	0.208 (0.004)	0.124 (0.010)	0.116 (0.004)	0.167 (0.011)	0.028 (0.013)
γ_{kk}	-0.004 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.004 (0.000)	-0.005 (0.000)	-0.005 (0.001)	-0.000 (0.000)
γ_{ll}	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.008 (0.001)	0.008 (0.000)	-0.013 (0.002)	-0.010 (0.001)
γ_{mm}	0.007 (0.002)	0.013 (0.000)	0.014 (0.001)	0.010 (0.000)	0.010 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)
γ_{kl}	0.008 (0.002)	0.007 (0.001)	0.014 (0.001)	0.026 (0.001)	0.020 (0.002)	0.011 (0.001)
γ_{km}	0.004 (0.002)	-0.005 (0.000)	-0.011 (0.001)	-0.006 (0.000)	-0.004 (0.001)	-0.008 (0.001)
γ_{lm}	-0.019 (0.003)	-0.018 (0.001)	-0.006 (0.001)	-0.007 (0.000)	-0.012 (0.002)	0.007 (0.002)
α_k	-0.251 (0.078)	-0.028 (0.014)	-0.398 (0.034)	-0.425 (0.022)	-0.272 (0.067)	-0.741 (0.088)
α_l	-0.018 (0.109)	-0.021 (0.013)	-0.251 (0.032)	-0.455 (0.020)	0.271 (0.085)	0.280 (0.096)
α_{kk}	-0.020 (0.008)	-0.005 (0.002)	-0.036 (0.004)	-0.021 (0.002)	-0.018 (0.007)	-0.053 (0.007)

α_{ll}	-0.097	-0.081	-0.036	0.058	-0.087	-0.075
	(0.020)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.012)	(0.011)
α_{kl}	0.040	-0.017	0.013	0.045	0.030	0.091
	(0.022)	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.017)	(0.017)

Productivity Process Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
2001 - 2003						
δ_0	NA	0.010	0.097	0.110	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.003)	(0.013)	(0.010)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_1	NA	0.735	0.714	0.700	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.015)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_2	NA	0.017	-0.081	-0.017	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.058)	(0.017)	(0.010)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_3	NA	0.001	-0.012	-0.002	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.015)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(NA)	(NA)
2004 - 2007						
δ_0	0.070	0.034	0.089	0.131	0.182	0.143
	(0.009)	(0.004)	(0.013)	(0.007)	(0.042)	(0.022)
δ_1	0.897	0.793	0.797	0.808	0.762	0.839
	(0.031)	(0.018)	(0.028)	(0.013)	(0.161)	(0.027)
δ_2	0.004	-0.045	-0.060	-0.064	0.014	0.060
	(0.047)	(0.054)	(0.020)	(0.008)	(0.193)	(0.045)
δ_3	-0.002	-0.025	-0.014	-0.009	-0.051	-0.010
	(0.020)	(0.013)	(0.006)	(0.002)	(0.107)	(0.033)
2008 - 2010						
δ_0	0.058	0.034	0.116	0.129	0.050	0.194
	(0.014)	(0.004)	(0.017)	(0.012)	(0.033)	(0.042)
δ_1	0.870	0.840	0.729	0.757	0.840	0.690
	(0.050)	(0.016)	(0.034)	(0.016)	(0.124)	(0.032)
δ_2	-0.030	-0.171	-0.064	-0.043	0.268	-0.003
	(0.060)	(0.048)	(0.020)	(0.006)	(0.220)	(0.036)
δ_3	-0.037	-0.043	-0.004	-0.008	-0.202	-0.032
	(0.023)	(0.018)	(0.006)	(0.002)	(0.169)	(0.016)
2011 - 2014						
δ_0	0.070	0.029	0.127	0.151	0.051	0.102

	(0.019)	(0.004)	(0.013)	(0.009)	(0.023)	(0.020)
δ_1	0.771	0.886	0.742	0.760	1.026	0.892
	(0.043)	(0.016)	(0.032)	(0.010)	(0.072)	(0.027)
δ_2	0.091	-0.141	-0.052	-0.056	-0.032	0.035
	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.015)	(0.005)	(0.058)	(0.026)
δ_3	0.000	-0.070	-0.003	-0.005	-0.083	-0.034
	(0.013)	(0.037)	(0.005)	(0.001)	(0.046)	(0.011)
2015 - 2017						
δ_0	0.009	-0.037	0.118	0.136	0.099	0.110
	(0.019)	(0.006)	(0.020)	(0.009)	(0.038)	(0.021)
δ_1	0.991	0.662	0.764	0.783	1.028	0.841
	(0.059)	(0.014)	(0.044)	(0.010)	(0.125)	(0.022)
δ_2	-0.005	-0.171	-0.069	-0.065	-0.109	0.039
	(0.049)	(0.037)	(0.024)	(0.005)	(0.079)	(0.025)
δ_3	-0.023	-0.048	-0.008	-0.006	-0.098	-0.029
	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.008)	(0.001)	(0.042)	(0.007)

This table reports estimates from the two-stage GNR procedure (Appendix A). The upper panel presents production function parameters: γ coefficients from the first-stage share regression (equation A5) and α coefficients from the second-stage GMM (equation A12). The lower panel presents Markov process coefficients δ for each time period (equation A11), where δ_0 is the drift, δ_1 the AR(1) persistence, and δ_2, δ_3 higher-order terms. Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) from 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania). NA indicates insufficient data for that country-period cell.

TABLE A8. Furniture and Other Manufacturing

Production Function Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Observations	4,906	102,639	63,528	116,022	6,959	24,629
γ_0	0.395 (0.076)	1.177 (0.015)	0.596 (0.024)	0.570 (0.018)	0.339 (0.029)	1.018 (0.032)
γ_k	-0.061 (0.012)	0.021 (0.006)	-0.048 (0.002)	-0.059 (0.003)	-0.157 (0.009)	-0.137 (0.012)
γ_l	-0.071 (0.022)	-0.268 (0.006)	-0.130 (0.005)	-0.139 (0.005)	-0.034 (0.010)	-0.175 (0.010)
γ_m	0.147 (0.025)	0.231 (0.004)	0.176 (0.007)	0.170 (0.006)	0.154 (0.010)	0.289 (0.011)
γ_{kk}	-0.004 (0.001)	0.003 (0.000)	-0.006 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.013 (0.001)	-0.006 (0.001)
γ_{ll}	0.002 (0.002)	0.013 (0.001)	0.006 (0.000)	0.012 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.006 (0.001)
γ_{mm}	0.011 (0.002)	0.012 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.013 (0.000)	0.014 (0.001)	0.015 (0.001)
γ_{kl}	0.009 (0.002)	-0.007 (0.001)	0.004 (0.000)	0.003 (0.000)	0.019 (0.001)	0.026 (0.003)
γ_{km}	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.004 (0.001)	-0.003 (0.000)	-0.007 (0.000)	-0.004 (0.001)	-0.006 (0.001)
γ_{lm}	-0.017 (0.003)	-0.026 (0.001)	-0.020 (0.001)	-0.013 (0.001)	-0.005 (0.002)	-0.033 (0.002)
α_k	-0.416 (0.064)	0.044 (0.005)	-0.241 (0.016)	-0.108 (0.009)	-0.553 (0.062)	0.076 (0.034)
α_l	0.035 (0.089)	0.091 (0.012)	-0.140 (0.022)	-0.463 (0.019)	-0.168 (0.048)	0.221 (0.057)
α_{kk}	-0.036 (0.007)	0.001 (0.001)	-0.036 (0.002)	-0.010 (0.001)	-0.052 (0.007)	-0.000 (0.003)

α_{ll}	-0.082	-0.109	-0.083	0.008	0.001	-0.091
	(0.013)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.009)
α_{kl}	0.049	-0.033	0.003	-0.042	0.035	-0.037
	(0.015)	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.012)	(0.008)

Productivity Process Estimates

	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
2001 - 2003						
δ_0	NA	-0.020	-0.067	-0.066	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.002)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_1	NA	0.768	0.648	0.675	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.033)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_2	NA	-0.005	-0.121	-0.120	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.059)	(0.022)	(0.043)	(NA)	(NA)
δ_3	NA	-0.058	-0.026	-0.044	NA	NA
	(NA)	(0.030)	(0.006)	(0.014)	(NA)	(NA)
2004 - 2007						
δ_0	0.210	0.004	-0.053	-0.036	0.128	-0.035
	(0.069)	(0.002)	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.046)	(0.047)
δ_1	0.324	0.777	0.677	0.752	0.848	0.776
	(0.317)	(0.025)	(0.021)	(0.025)	(0.138)	(0.158)
δ_2	0.811	-0.036	-0.133	-0.055	-0.035	-0.100
	(0.594)	(0.052)	(0.020)	(0.031)	(0.150)	(0.173)
δ_3	-0.362	-0.070	-0.027	-0.023	-0.059	-0.058
	(0.403)	(0.036)	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.088)	(0.064)
2008 - 2010						
δ_0	0.091	0.013	-0.027	-0.040	0.303	-0.005
	(0.026)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.070)	(0.025)
δ_1	0.716	0.817	0.765	0.754	0.511	0.512
	(0.099)	(0.014)	(0.019)	(0.024)	(0.118)	(0.068)
δ_2	0.136	-0.095	-0.104	-0.045	0.009	-0.114
	(0.098)	(0.060)	(0.022)	(0.038)	(0.078)	(0.070)
δ_3	0.036	-0.071	-0.027	-0.027	0.005	-0.037
	(0.071)	(0.025)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.042)	(0.028)
2011 - 2014						
δ_0	0.073	0.006	-0.022	-0.035	0.202	-0.154

	(0.015)	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.042)	(0.028)
δ_1	0.989	0.793	0.752	0.683	0.820	0.385
	(0.057)	(0.017)	(0.027)	(0.018)	(0.067)	(0.060)
δ_2	-0.075	-0.022	-0.081	-0.105	-0.170	-0.112
	(0.055)	(0.042)	(0.027)	(0.022)	(0.052)	(0.077)
δ_3	-0.036	-0.058	-0.033	-0.025	-0.050	-0.005
	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.012)	(0.006)	(0.018)	(0.023)
2015 - 2017						
δ_0	0.066	-0.055	-0.026	-0.045	0.199	-0.111
	(0.034)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.026)	(0.028)
δ_1	1.007	0.643	0.751	0.660	0.709	0.426
	(0.128)	(0.012)	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.039)	(0.056)
δ_2	-0.081	-0.155	-0.101	-0.117	-0.052	-0.090
	(0.156)	(0.032)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.025)	(0.065)
δ_3	-0.026	-0.052	-0.017	-0.022	-0.004	-0.005
	(0.089)	(0.017)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.011)	(0.016)

This table reports estimates from the two-stage GNR procedure (Appendix A). The upper panel presents production function parameters: γ coefficients from the first-stage share regression (equation A5) and α coefficients from the second-stage GMM (equation A12). The lower panel presents Markov process coefficients δ for each time period (equation A11), where δ_0 is the drift, δ_1 the AR(1) persistence, and δ_2, δ_3 higher-order terms. Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) from 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications. Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania). NA indicates insufficient data for that country-period cell.

Appendix C. Permutation Test for the Mechanical Component of MRP–TFPR Regressions

The aggregate regressions in Section 5.2 (Table 2) project the cross-firm log variance of each input’s MRP on the cross-firm log variance of TFPR at the country-industry-year level. As discussed in Section 5.2, these coefficients could in principle reflect a purely mechanical accounting identity rather than economic content: because $\text{mrp}_{jt}^X = f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) + v_{jt} - x_{jt} + \log \text{elas}_{jt}^X$ contains TFPR as an additive term, the cross-sectional variances of mrp^X and v are mechanically linked even when firms make no productivity-contingent input choices.

To gauge the magnitude of this mechanical component, I implement a permutation test that mirrors Table 2 cell by cell. Within each country-industry-year cell, I randomly reassign v_{jt} across firms and recompute each firm’s MRP using the permuted TFPR. This procedure preserves the additive accounting link between mrp^X and v while severing the economic correspondence between a firm’s productivity and its input choices. I then re-estimate equations (11), (12), and (13) on the permuted data, repeat the procedure 100 times, and report the cross-permutation mean coefficient with the cross-permutation standard deviation in parentheses. The results are reported in Table A9, which is the cell-by-cell mechanical counterpart of Table 2.

In the preferred pooled fixed-effects specification, the permuted coefficients exceed the actual coefficients for all three inputs, confirming that the accounting identity, taken alone, would generate a stronger MRP–TFPR relationship than the one observed in the data: the permuted coefficients are 0.31 for capital, 0.51 for labor, and 0.70 for materials, compared to the actual estimates of 0.30, 0.41, and 0.55 (Table 2). Across the country-by-country fixed-effects regressions in Table A9, the only statistically significant reversal is Romania materials, where the permuted benchmark (0.800) falls outside the bootstrap

TABLE A9. Permutation Test for the TFPR Variance Regression: Mechanical Counterpart of Table 2

		Dependent variable: $\log \text{Var}_{cst}(\text{mrp}^X)$ (permuted)													
		Germany		Spain		France		Italy		Poland		Romania		Pooled	
		(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Cap.															
β		0.238 (0.014)	0.186 (0.019)	0.185 (0.004)	0.189 (0.009)	0.167 (0.004)	0.435 (0.023)	0.062 (0.003)	0.058 (0.014)	0.511 (0.009)	0.381 (0.018)	0.137 (0.009)	0.433 (0.026)	0.188 (0.002)	0.311 (0.010)
N		112	112	144	144	144	144	144	144	112	112	112	112	768	768
R^2		0.309	0.880	0.088	0.972	0.082	0.959	0.012	0.956	0.644	0.933	0.063	0.887	0.122	0.957
RMSE		0.219	0.076	0.211	0.039	0.202	0.038	0.204	0.039	0.176	0.098	0.208	0.066	0.261	0.063
Lab.															
β		0.835 (0.016)	0.698 (0.022)	0.710 (0.005)	0.470 (0.011)	0.799 (0.003)	0.755 (0.029)	1.171 (0.003)	0.459 (0.015)	0.307 (0.008)	0.412 (0.019)	0.372 (0.010)	0.546 (0.032)	0.730 (0.003)	0.508 (0.012)
N		112	112	144	144	144	144	144	144	112	112	112	112	768	768
R^2		0.472	0.962	0.561	0.992	0.876	0.986	0.855	0.976	0.225	0.936	0.303	0.954	0.582	0.982
RMSE		0.368	0.110	0.215	0.029	0.111	0.033	0.152	0.063	0.253	0.091	0.221	0.052	0.296	0.071
Mat.															
β		0.855 (0.015)	0.533 (0.021)	0.632 (0.005)	0.548 (0.012)	0.699 (0.004)	0.225 (0.025)	0.717 (0.003)	0.643 (0.016)	0.970 (0.011)	0.831 (0.017)	1.491 (0.010)	0.800 (0.030)	0.878 (0.003)	0.700 (0.010)
N		112	112	144	144	144	144	144	144	112	112	112	112	768	768
R^2		0.791	0.942	0.692	0.961	0.718	0.963	0.773	0.986	0.872	0.953	0.873	0.987	0.758	0.979
RMSE		0.272	0.124	0.180	0.050	0.187	0.056	0.146	0.037	0.204	0.130	0.209	0.068	0.260	0.085
Const.	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
FE	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO

The table reports the mechanical-counterpart of Table 2, obtained by permuting TFPR (v_{jt}) across firms within each country-industry-year cell and re-estimating the regressions on the permuted data. The procedure preserves the additive accounting link between mrp^X and v (since $\text{mrp}_{jt}^X = f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) + v_{jt} - x_{jt} + \log \text{elas}_{jt}^X$) while severing the economic correspondence between productivity and input choices. Cells report the mean coefficient over 100 permutations, with the cross-permutation standard deviation in parentheses. Specification (1) refers to the simple linear model and Specification (2) refers to the fixed-effects model: country columns use additive year and industry fixed effects, the pooled column uses country-year and country-industry fixed effects. The reported R^2 , RMSE, and N are averaged over permutations (mean N is invariant). Six countries (Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, Romania), 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania).

95% confidence interval of the empirical coefficient (1.105).

The empirical estimates lie below the mechanical benchmarks because firms with higher realized productivity allocate more inputs, equating their expected marginal revenue products to input prices and thereby compressing the cross-sectional dispersion of mrp^X relative to the dispersion of TFPR. Normalized to the mechanical benchmark, the attenuation is smallest for capital (5 percent), consistent with limited within-period

responsiveness for the predetermined input; labor and materials exhibit substantially larger and nearly identical attenuations (20 and 21 percent, respectively).

Appendix D. Orthogonality of TFPR Components

Table A10 reports the weighted average pairwise Pearson correlations between the three TFPR components ($m(\omega_{-1})$, η_{jt} , and ε_{jt}) across country-industry-year cells. The correlation between expected productivity and the ex-ante shock is economically small (0.012), though statistically significant. The remaining two correlations are negative: $\text{Cor}(m(\omega_{-1}), \varepsilon) = -0.21$ and $\text{Cor}(\eta, \varepsilon) = -0.28$.

To assess the impact on the variance decomposition, I re-estimate the component regressions (equations 14, 15, and 16) dropping the pairwise correlation controls $\psi' \mathbf{r}_{cst}$. Table A11 reports the resulting estimates; Table 3 gives the baseline with controls. In the preferred pooled fixed-effects specification, the β_ε coefficients without controls are 0.126 for capital, 0.172 for labor, and 0.688 for materials, compared to 0.144, 0.196, and 0.660 with controls. All three shifts are small (under 0.03 in absolute value), the ranking across inputs is preserved, and ε remains the largest contributor to MRP dispersion for each input.

The other two components are more sensitive. The pooled $\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$ shifts by at most 0.035 in absolute value, and β_η by at most 0.045, with β_η changing sign for labor (0.022 to -0.023) and materials (0.026 to -0.007). All shifts remain under 0.05, leaving the central finding intact.

TABLE A10. Orthogonality of TFPR Components

	Mean	SE	Frac. > 0
$\text{Cor}(m(\omega_{-1}), \eta)$	0.012***	(0.002)	55%
$\text{Cor}(m(\omega_{-1}), \varepsilon)$	-0.206***	(0.008)	10%
$\text{Cor}(\eta, \varepsilon)$	-0.282***	(0.004)	4%

Each row reports the weighted average pairwise Pearson correlation between two TFPR components across country-industry-year cells, with weights equal to each industry's share of total manufacturing revenue. Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) from 100 non-parametric replications. The last column reports the fraction of country-industry-year cells in which the correlation is positive. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$. Sample period: 2001–2017 (2005–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania).

TABLE A11. Elasticity of Input MRP Dispersion with Respect to TFPR Component Dispersion, Without Pairwise Correlation Controls

	Dependent variable: $\log \text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X)$													
	Germany		Spain		France		Italy		Poland		Romania		Pooled	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Cap.														
$\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$	-0.002 (0.062)	-0.071 (0.066)	-0.176*** (0.038)	-0.021 (0.028)	0.064 (0.042)	-0.115* (0.063)	0.070** (0.029)	-0.141*** (0.042)	0.044 (0.055)	0.131*** (0.044)	0.160*** (0.036)	0.086 (0.070)	0.023 (0.025)	0.046* (0.027)
β_{η}	0.026* (0.015)	0.001 (0.023)	-0.003 (0.014)	-0.029 (0.020)	-0.098*** (0.013)	-0.009 (0.020)	0.025*** (0.009)	0.102*** (0.018)	0.052** (0.024)	0.023 (0.027)	-0.124*** (0.016)	0.046 (0.032)	-0.024*** (0.008)	0.026** (0.012)
β_{ε}	0.125** (0.049)	0.059 (0.039)	0.510*** (0.030)	0.297*** (0.034)	0.283*** (0.061)	0.081 (0.061)	0.118*** (0.038)	0.138*** (0.045)	0.455*** (0.055)	0.198*** (0.065)	0.070* (0.038)	0.221*** (0.063)	0.206*** (0.025)	0.126*** (0.029)
N	104	104	136	136	136	136	136	136	104	104	104	104	720	720
R^2	0.286	0.741	0.525	0.976	0.147	0.885	0.156	0.968	0.644	0.891	0.142	0.920	0.154	0.935
RMSE	0.163	0.075	0.155	0.035	0.131	0.056	0.178	0.031	0.186	0.112	0.207	0.063	0.240	0.068
Lab.														
$\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$	0.076 (0.215)	0.083 (0.116)	0.252*** (0.052)	0.080*** (0.022)	0.450*** (0.066)	-0.213** (0.083)	0.732*** (0.043)	0.230 (0.150)	0.084 (0.057)	0.086** (0.042)	0.061* (0.032)	0.027 (0.057)	0.135*** (0.048)	0.069** (0.035)
β_{η}	-0.046 (0.047)	-0.042 (0.034)	0.093*** (0.025)	-0.022 (0.019)	-0.348*** (0.020)	-0.051** (0.026)	-0.576*** (0.021)	-0.178*** (0.059)	0.040* (0.022)	0.033 (0.032)	-0.011 (0.014)	0.056** (0.026)	-0.054*** (0.012)	-0.023 (0.017)
β_{ε}	0.454*** (0.128)	0.226*** (0.060)	0.515*** (0.045)	0.295*** (0.042)	0.307*** (0.105)	0.094 (0.069)	0.292*** (0.055)	-0.310** (0.134)	0.199*** (0.062)	0.220*** (0.057)	-0.100*** (0.036)	0.118** (0.055)	0.338*** (0.042)	0.172*** (0.033)
N	104	104	136	136	136	136	136	136	104	104	104	104	720	720
R^2	0.274	0.951	0.618	0.984	0.360	0.972	0.633	0.896	0.280	0.843	0.062	0.860	0.226	0.959
RMSE	0.389	0.110	0.209	0.043	0.251	0.069	0.179	0.092	0.220	0.113	0.184	0.061	0.352	0.088
Mat.														
$\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$	0.029 (0.077)	-0.058 (0.109)	0.237*** (0.079)	0.319*** (0.054)	-0.256** (0.122)	0.105 (0.091)	-0.248*** (0.053)	0.163** (0.066)	0.079 (0.078)	0.078 (0.069)	0.174*** (0.039)	0.049 (0.093)	0.054 (0.034)	0.067 (0.043)
β_{η}	-0.025 (0.023)	0.038 (0.038)	-0.237*** (0.031)	0.027 (0.040)	-0.028 (0.022)	0.068** (0.028)	-0.181*** (0.014)	-0.086** (0.035)	-0.040 (0.041)	-0.052 (0.050)	-0.068*** (0.022)	-0.014 (0.057)	-0.068*** (0.011)	-0.007 (0.022)
β_{ε}	0.619*** (0.068)	0.624*** (0.066)	0.409*** (0.053)	0.367*** (0.076)	0.629*** (0.149)	0.535*** (0.074)	0.842*** (0.065)	0.588*** (0.066)	0.857*** (0.074)	0.832*** (0.096)	1.314*** (0.065)	0.908*** (0.078)	0.725*** (0.039)	0.688*** (0.044)
N	104	104	136	136	136	136	136	136	104	104	104	104	720	720
R^2	0.712	0.899	0.267	0.941	0.408	0.967	0.347	0.977	0.659	0.863	0.908	0.977	0.525	0.955
RMSE	0.336	0.174	0.291	0.087	0.286	0.058	0.268	0.059	0.311	0.204	0.185	0.109	0.346	0.127
Const.	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
FE	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES

Replicates Table 3 with the three log-transformed pairwise Pearson correlation controls $\psi' \mathbf{r}_{cst}$ dropped from both specifications. Specification (1) refers to the simple linear model (without correlation controls, without fixed effects); specification (2) adds the same fixed-effects structure as in Table 3 (additive year and industry fixed effects for the country columns; country-year and country-industry fixed effects for the pooled column). Observations are weighted by the industry average revenue share of total annual manufacturing revenue. Reported are the component-specific slope coefficients ($\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$, β_{η} , β_{ε}), number of observations (N), unadjusted R^2 , and root mean squared error (RMSE). Bootstrap standard errors (in parentheses) from 100 non-parametric bootstrap replications of the GNR structural estimation. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$.

Appendix E. Institutional Quality and Productivity Dispersion

This appendix examines whether the dispersion of each productivity component varies systematically with the quality of economic institutions, exploiting cross-country variation in institutional indices. I consider nine standardized institutional indices: the six World Governance Indicators (Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, Control of Corruption, Voice and Accountability, Political Stability; Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi 2011), the World Bank Ease of Doing Business score, the OECD Product Market Regulation indicator, and the World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness Index.


For each index, I estimate:

$$(A21) \quad \log \text{Var}_{cst}(z) = \iota_s + \iota_t + \beta \tilde{I}_{ct} + \xi_{cst}$$

where $z \in \{m(\omega_{-1}), \eta, \varepsilon\}$ is the productivity component, $\text{Var}_{cst}(\cdot)$ is the cross-firm variance in country c , industry s at time t , $\tilde{I}_{ct}$ is the standardized institutional index for country c at time t , ξ_{cst} is an error term, and ι_s and ι_t are separate industry and year fixed effects. Standard errors are obtained from the non-parametric bootstrap of the structural estimation. Figure A1 reports the estimated coefficients with 95% bootstrap confidence intervals for each index-component pair.

Better institutions are associated with lower dispersion of productivity shocks but bear little relation to the dispersion of expected productivity, as shown in Panel (a) of Figure A1. Panel (b) confirms that this pattern holds for both shock components: a one-standard-deviation improvement in Government Effectiveness is associated with approximately 25% and 19% reductions in the variance of η_{jt} and ε_{jt} , respectively, with comparable magnitudes for Rule of Law, Control of Corruption, and the Global Competitiveness Index. Two indices stand out. Product Market Regulation has the largest

FIGURE A1. Institutional Quality and Productivity Dispersion: Coefficient Estimates



Each point reports the coefficient β from a separate regression with dependent variable $\log \text{Var}_{\text{cst}}(z)$, where z is a productivity component, on a standardized institutional index, with industry and year fixed effects. Panel (a) contrasts expected productivity $\text{Var}(m(\omega_{t-1}))$ with total shock dispersion $\text{Var}(\eta_t) + \text{Var}(\varepsilon_t)$. Panel (b) plots coefficients for the ex-ante shock η_t and the ex-post shock ε_t separately. Bars denote 95% confidence intervals from 100 structural bootstrap replications. Six countries: Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Poland, and Romania, 2001–2017 (2005–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania).

negative association with expected productivity dispersion ($\beta = -0.205$, $p < 0.01$). Political Stability is the only Worldwide Governance Indicator with positive coefficients on shock dispersion, and is also positively associated with expected productivity dispersion ($\beta = 0.147$, $p < 0.01$), opposite to the pattern of the other governance indicators.

These patterns are suggestive rather than causal. The analysis exploits variation across only six countries, and the regressions do not control for other country-level determinants (such as financial development, trade openness, or GDP per capita) that may correlate with both institutional quality and productivity dispersion. With that caveat, the association between stronger governance, more competitive markets, and

lower regulatory barriers on the one hand, and lower shock dispersion on the other, is consistent with the interpretation that institutions may operate primarily by reducing the uncertainty firms face, rather than by narrowing persistent productivity differences across firms.

Appendix F. Comparison of Production Function Estimators

In this appendix I evaluate the finite-sample performance of the Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020) estimator (henceforth GNR) against two widely used alternatives: the factor shares approach (De Loecker and Syverson 2021) and the proxy-variable method of Akerberg, Caves, and Frazer (2015) (henceforth ACF). I conduct Monte Carlo experiments under two data-generating processes calibrated as in Appendix O4 of Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020): a translog specification and a Cobb-Douglas specification. The experiments assess each estimator’s ability to measure the dispersion in input elasticities, marginal revenue products, and TFPR.

F.1. Data-Generating Processes

Both DGPs feature two inputs (log capital, k , and log materials, m) and share the productivity structure and input timing assumptions described in Section 2. I simulate 500 firms over 200 periods, discarding the first 170 as burn-in. I conduct 100 independent replications.

F.1.1. Production Technology

Translog. The log revenue function is

$$(A22) \quad y_{jt} = \gamma_k k_{jt} + \gamma_m m_{jt} + \gamma_{kk} k_{jt}^2 + \gamma_{mm} m_{jt}^2 + \gamma_{km} k_{jt} m_{jt} + \omega_{jt} + \varepsilon_{jt}$$

with parameters $(\gamma_k, \gamma_m, \gamma_{kk}, \gamma_{mm}, \gamma_{km}) = (0.25, 0.65, 0.015, 0.015, -0.032)$.³⁶ The implied returns to scale, evaluated at sample means, are 0.897.

³⁶These γ symbols denote production function coefficients, following Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020)’s notation. They are distinct from the γ coefficients in Appendix A, which parameterize the polynomial approximation of $\partial f / \partial m$.

Cobb-Douglas (CD). The log revenue function is

$$(A23) \quad y_{jt} = \alpha_k^{\text{CD}} k_{jt} + \alpha_m^{\text{CD}} m_{jt} + \omega_{jt} + \varepsilon_{jt}$$

with $(\alpha_k^{\text{CD}}, \alpha_m^{\text{CD}}) = (0.25, 0.65)$ and returns to scale 0.90. Since the Cobb-Douglas technology has constant output elasticities of inputs, this DGP provides a clean test of whether each estimator introduces spurious heterogeneity.

F.1.2. Productivity

In both DGPs, the persistent component of TFPR follows an AR(1) process as in Assumption 3:

$$(A24) \quad \omega_{jt} = d_0 + d_1 \omega_{jt-1} + \eta_{jt}, \quad \eta_{jt} \sim N(0, \sigma_\eta^2)$$

with $d_1 = 0.80$ and $\sigma_\eta^2 = 0.04$. The translog DGP sets $d_0 = 0$, while the Cobb-Douglas DGP sets $d_0 = 0.20$ (implying a stationary mean of 1.0). The ex-post productivity shock is $\varepsilon_{jt} \sim N(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$, with $\sigma_\varepsilon^2 = 0.07$ (translog) and $\sigma_\varepsilon^2 = 0.04$ (Cobb-Douglas).

F.1.3. Input Timing and Capital Dynamics

Capital is predetermined, consistent with Assumption 2. The law of motion is $k_{jt} = \log(\exp(k_{jt-1})(1 - \delta_j) + I_{jt-1})$, where investment follows a reduced-form rule

$$(A25) \quad I_{jt} = \exp(\varphi_0 + \varphi_k k_{jt} + \varphi_\omega \omega_{jt} + \zeta_{jt})$$

with $(\varphi_0, \varphi_k, \varphi_\omega) = (-1.70, 0.60, 0.50)$ and $\zeta_{jt} \sim N(0, 0.0025)$. Firm-specific depreciation rates $\delta_j \in \{0.05, 0.075, 0.10, 0.125, 0.15\}$, assigned uniformly across firms, generate cross-sectional capital heterogeneity.

Materials are a flexible input allocated after ω_{jt} is realized, consistent with Assumption 2. The firm chooses m_{jt} to solve the static first-order condition equating the expected marginal revenue product of materials to the input price ρ_t . In the translog DGP, this FOC yields an implicit equation for m_{jt} solved via damped fixed-point iteration. In the Cobb-Douglas DGP, the FOC admits a closed-form solution: $m_{jt} = (\log \alpha_m^{\text{CD}} + \alpha_k^{\text{CD}} k_{jt} + \omega_{jt} - \log \rho_t) / (1 - \alpha_m^{\text{CD}})$.

F.1.4. Materials Prices

To provide an exclusion restriction for the proxy-variable estimator, I introduce time-varying aggregate materials prices following an AR(1) process:

$$(A26) \quad \log \rho_t = \phi_\rho \log \rho_{t-1} + \eta_{\rho,t}, \quad \eta_{\rho,t} \sim N(0, \sigma_\rho^2)$$

with $\phi_\rho = 0.6$ and $\sigma_\rho^2 = 0.001$, where σ_ρ^2 is substantially larger than the baseline in Appendix O4 of Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020). This deliberate choice gives the proxy-variable estimator a favorable environment for identification, since variation in ρ_t shifts the materials demand curve without entering the production function. The log materials share is $s_{jt} = \log \rho_t + m_{jt} - y_{jt}$.

F.2. Estimators

I compare three estimators that differ in their identification strategies, functional form assumptions, and ability to separate the components of TFPR. Each estimator delivers firm-level input elasticities, from which I construct marginal revenue products and TFPR.

F.2.1. GNR Estimator

The GNR estimator follows the two-stage procedure detailed in Appendix A and Section 4. In the first stage, the log materials share equation (A4) is estimated by nonlinear least squares using a second-degree complete polynomial in (k_{jt}, m_{jt}) with six γ parameters. The regression residuals identify the ex-post shock ε_{jt} , and the ε -correction recovers the production function parameters free of the scalar constant.

In the second stage, the constant of integration $\mathcal{C}(k_{jt})$ is approximated by a second-order polynomial in capital with two α parameters. The productivity law of motion (A24) is approximated by a cubic polynomial in ω_{jt-1} with four δ parameters. The α and δ parameters are estimated jointly via GMM using six moment conditions: $E[\eta_{jt} k_{jt}^{\tau_k}] = 0$ for $0 < \tau_k \leq 2$ (identifying α) and $E[\eta_{jt} \hat{y}_{jt-1}^a] = 0$ for $0 \leq a \leq 3$ (identifying δ), yielding a just-identified system. I solve the system via an iterative fixed-point algorithm.

The GNR estimator delivers three distinct objects: firm-level input elasticities from the estimated γ and α parameters via equation (A15); the persistent productivity component ω_{jt} ; and the ex-post shock ε_{jt} . This separation is central to the TFPR decomposition in the main analysis.

F.2.2. Factor Shares Estimator

The factor shares (FS) approach equates the materials revenue elasticity to the observed expenditure share:

$$(A27) \quad \widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^{M,FS} = \exp(s_{jt}) = \frac{\rho_t M_{jt}}{Y_{jt}}$$

Under constant returns to scale (CRS), the capital elasticity is the residual:

$$(A28) \quad \widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^{K,FS} = 1 - \widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^{M,FS}$$

No estimation is required; elasticities are read directly from the data. TFPR is then computed as a Solow residual:

$$(A29) \quad \hat{v}_{jt}^{\text{FS}} = y_{jt} - \widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^{K,\text{FS}} k_{jt} - \widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^{M,\text{FS}} m_{jt}$$

This approach has three limitations in the present context. First, equation (A27) holds only in expectation conditional on J_{jt} ; the realized share also contains ε_{jt} , so firm-level elasticity estimates are contaminated by the ex-post shock. Second, imposing CRS biases the capital elasticity whenever the true technology exhibits non-constant returns, since $\widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^{K,\text{FS}}$ absorbs the full gap between unity and $\widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^{M,\text{FS}}$. Third, the factor shares approach cannot separate ω_{jt} from ε_{jt} within the Solow residual $\hat{v}_{jt}^{\text{FS}}$. The only TFPR variance decomposition available is therefore:

$$(A30) \quad \text{Var}(\hat{v}_{jt}^{\text{FS}}) \approx \text{Var}(\hat{v}_{jt-1}^{\text{FS}}) + \text{Var}(\hat{v}_{jt}^{\text{FS}} - \hat{v}_{jt-1}^{\text{FS}})$$

where the first term captures cross-firm productivity levels and the second captures period-to-period changes.

F.2.3. Proxy-Variable Estimator

The proxy-variable method uses a control function approach to address the endogeneity of materials allocation with respect to productivity realizations. In the first stage, revenue is projected onto a flexible polynomial in state variables to partial out the ex-post shock:

$$(A31) \quad y_{jt} = \phi(k_{jt}, m_{jt}, \log \rho_t) + \varepsilon_{jt}$$

where $\phi(\cdot)$ is approximated by a third-degree polynomial in (k_{jt}, m_{jt}) with $\log \rho_t$ entering linearly. The fitted values $\hat{\phi}_{jt}$ capture $f(k_{jt}, m_{jt}) + \omega_{jt}$.

In the second stage, the production function parameters are identified by exploiting the assumption that ω_{jt} follows a first-order Markov process. For a candidate parameter vector θ , productivity is constructed as

$$(A32) \quad \omega_{jt}(\theta) = \hat{\phi}_{jt} - f(k_{jt}, m_{jt}; \theta)$$

The conditional expectation $E[\omega_{jt} \mid \omega_{jt-1}]$ is approximated by a cubic polynomial in $\omega_{jt-1}(\theta)$, and the innovation $\eta_{jt}(\theta) = \omega_{jt}(\theta) - E[\omega_{jt} \mid \omega_{jt-1}(\theta)]$ is the residual. Since η_{jt} is realized after capital is installed but before materials are chosen, the moment conditions are:

$$(A33) \quad E[\eta_{jt}(\theta) \cdot Z_{jt}] = 0$$

where the predetermined capital k_{jt} and the lagged materials m_{jt-1} serve as instruments.

Under the translog specification, $\theta = (\gamma_k, \gamma_m, \gamma_{kk}, \gamma_{mm}, \gamma_{km})$ and $Z_{jt} = (k_{jt}, k_{jt}^2, m_{jt-1}, m_{jt-1}^2, k_{jt}m_{jt-1})$, yielding a just-identified system with five moments for five parameters. Under the Cobb-Douglas specification, $\theta = (\alpha_k^{\text{CD}}, \alpha_m^{\text{CD}})$ and $Z_{jt} = (k_{jt}, m_{jt-1})$, again just-identified with two moments for two parameters.

The proxy-variable estimator can, in principle, separate ω_{jt} from ε_{jt} and recover the full TFPR decomposition. However, identification of θ relies on the excluded instrument $\log \rho_t$ generating sufficient independent variation in m_{jt} conditional on (k_{jt}, ω_{jt}) . When materials price variation is limited, the GMM objective surface becomes nearly flat, leading to weak identification and imprecise parameter estimates.

F.3. Monte Carlo Results


I assess each estimator along four dimensions: input elasticities, marginal revenue products, TFPR dispersion and persistence, and the TFPR variance decomposition. Results are reported for both the translog and Cobb-Douglas DGPs.

F.3.1. Input Elasticities

Figure A2 displays the pooled density of firm-level revenue elasticity estimates across all 100 replications under the translog DGP. The GNR estimator closely tracks the true elasticity distributions for both materials and capital, with negligible bias and tight cross-replication precision. The factor shares estimator produces materials elasticities centered near the truth but with inflated dispersion, as the ex-post shock ε_{jt} contaminates the materials expenditure share. The CRS assumption forces the capital elasticity upward (the factor shares mean of 0.387 overstates the true mean of 0.305 by 27%) because capital must absorb the full gap between unity and the materials share. The proxy-variable estimator exhibits near-zero mean bias but substantial imprecision: the cross-replication standard deviation of the mean materials elasticity is 0.316, roughly 50 times that of GNR (0.007), rendering firm-level elasticity estimates unreliable for distributional analysis.

Figure A3 repeats the exercise under the Cobb-Douglas DGP, where true elasticities are constants ($\alpha_m^{\text{CD}} = 0.65$, $\alpha_k^{\text{CD}} = 0.25$). The true elasticities appear as vertical lines, so any dispersion in the estimated densities is entirely spurious. The GNR estimator, despite using a flexible translog polynomial, correctly recovers the constant elasticities with near-zero dispersion, confirming that the polynomial nests Cobb-Douglas as a special case. The factor shares estimator generates substantial within-replication dispersion (standard deviation 0.134 for materials) that is entirely spurious, driven by the ex-post shock passing through the materials expenditure share. The CRS bias on capital is even

FIGURE A2. Input elasticity distributions — Translog DGP




Each curve pools firm-level estimates across 100 Monte Carlo replications (500 firms $\times$ 30 periods each). “True” denotes the elasticity implied by the known DGP parameters. The y-axis density values are reported on a square root scale to improve visual resolution in the tails while preserving the relative ordering of peaks.

more pronounced than under translog: the factor shares mean of 0.337 overstates the true 0.250 by 35%. The proxy-variable estimator again shows wide cross-replication variance.

F.3.2. Marginal Revenue Products

The elasticity differences across estimators carry over to marginal revenue products via equation (6). Figures A4 and A5 display the MRP distributions under the translog and Cobb-Douglas DGPs, respectively. Under both DGPs, the GNR estimator closely replicates the true MRP distributions for materials and capital. The factor shares estimator produces a materials MRP distribution that collapses to the log materials price $\log \rho_t$, since $\text{mrp}^{M, \text{FS}} = y - m + s_{jt} = \log \rho_t$ by construction, so that all remaining variation

FIGURE A3. Input elasticity distributions — Cobb-Douglas DGP




Each curve pools firm-level estimates across 100 Monte Carlo replications (500 firms $\times$ 30 periods each). Vertical lines indicate the true constant elasticities. The y-axis density values are reported on a square root scale. The GNR density peaks are truncated to preserve visual comparability across estimators.

is driven by input prices rather than productivity heterogeneity. The proxy-variable estimator produces MRP distributions with heavier tails, reflecting the imprecision of the underlying elasticity estimates.

F.3.3. TFPR Dispersion and Persistence

Figure A6 compares the TFPR distributions. Under the translog DGP, the factor shares estimator produces a TFPR distribution that is more concentrated than the truth, while the proxy-variable estimator generates a wider distribution with heavier tails. These differences are more attenuated under the Cobb-Douglas DGP, though the proxy-variable estimator still exhibits a heavy right tail. The GNR estimator tracks the true TFPR distribution closely under both DGPs.

FIGURE A4. Marginal revenue product distributions — Translog DGP




Each curve pools firm-level estimates across 100 Monte Carlo replications (500 firms $\times$ 30 periods each). “True” denotes the MRP computed from the true DGP parameters. The y-axis density values are reported on a square root scale to improve visual resolution in the tails while preserving the relative ordering of peaks.

The estimators differ in their ability to recover productivity persistence. The true AR(1) coefficient is $d_1 = 0.80$. GNR recovers it accurately in both DGPs (0.801 translog, 0.792 Cobb-Douglas). The factor shares estimator underestimates it substantially: 0.688 under translog (14% below the truth) and 0.401 under Cobb-Douglas (50% below). The proxy-variable estimator also underestimates it: 0.514 under translog and 0.592 under Cobb-Douglas. The factor shares bias is larger under Cobb-Douglas than under translog, contrary to what standard measurement-error attenuation would predict: the noise-to-signal ratio $\sigma_\varepsilon^2/\text{Var}(\omega)$ is 0.36 under Cobb-Douglas versus 0.63 under translog, so a smaller bias under Cobb-Douglas would be expected.

The factor shares bias has two sources. First, the Solow residual mixes ω_{jt} with the iid shock ε_{jt} , adding noise that pulls the AR(1) coefficient toward zero (the famil-

FIGURE A5. Marginal revenue product distributions — Cobb-Douglas DGP




Each curve pools firm-level estimates across 100 Monte Carlo replications (500 firms $\times$ 30 periods each). “True” denotes the MRP computed from the true DGP parameters. The y-axis density values are reported on a square root scale. Factor shares density peaks for materials MRP are truncated to preserve visual comparability across estimators.

iar measurement-error attenuation). Second, the CRS misspecification of the capital elasticity introduces a systematic error that interacts with the dynamics of k and m . Under Cobb-Douglas, the CRS misspecification is larger (35% overstatement vs. 27% under translog), accounting for the larger AR(1) bias. The proxy-variable bias is different in nature: it reflects imprecision in separating ω_{jt} from the first-stage residual when materials-price variation is limited.

F.3.4. TFPR Variance Decomposition

Figure A7 decomposes the cross-firm TFPR variance into its components, expressed as shares of total variance. For the GNR and proxy-variable estimators, which can separate

FIGURE A6. TFPR distributions by estimator



Each curve pools firm-level estimates across 100 Monte Carlo replications (500 firms $\times$ 30 periods each). “True” denotes the TFPR computed from the true DGP parameters. The y-axis density values are reported on a square root scale to improve visual resolution in the tails while preserving the relative ordering of peaks.

ω_{jt} from ε_{jt} , the decomposition is

$$\text{Var}(\hat{v}_{jt}) \approx \text{Var}(m_t(\omega_{jt-1})) + \text{Var}(\eta_{jt}) + \text{Var}(\varepsilon_{jt})$$


corresponding to the expected productivity level, the productivity innovation, and the ex-post shock. For the factor shares estimator, which cannot separate these components, the decomposition is limited to

$$\text{Var}(\hat{v}_{jt}^{\text{FS}}) \approx \text{Var}(\hat{v}_{jt-1}^{\text{FS}}) + \text{Var}(\hat{v}_{jt}^{\text{FS}} - \hat{v}_{jt-1}^{\text{FS}})$$

The GNR estimator closely replicates the true variance shares in both DGPs. Under the true decomposition, the unexpected productivity components (η_{jt} and ε_{jt}) jointly

account for the majority of TFPR variance. The factor shares decomposition replaces the three-component split with the two-component approximation above. Because ε_{jt} contaminates the Solow residual, the expected level component $\text{Var}(\hat{v}_{jt-1}^{\text{FS}})$ is substantially inflated (it captures $\text{Var}(\omega_{jt-1}) + \text{Var}(\varepsilon_{jt-1})$ rather than $\text{Var}(\omega_{jt-1})$ alone), while the first-difference component absorbs both the true innovation η_{jt} and the change in the ex-post shock $\varepsilon_{jt} - \varepsilon_{jt-1}$. The proxy-variable estimator recovers the qualitative pattern of the true decomposition but under-attributes variance to the ex-post shock component.

FIGURE A7. TFPR variance decomposition by estimator



Bars show the share of cross-firm TFPR variance attributed to each component, averaged across 100 replications. For GNR and Proxy (ACF), the three components are the expected productivity level $\text{Var}(m(\omega_{-1}))$, the productivity innovation $\text{Var}(\eta)$, and the ex-post shock $\text{Var}(\varepsilon)$. For Factor Shares, which cannot separate ω_{jt} from ε_{jt} , the decomposition is $\text{Var}(\hat{v}_{jt-1}^{\text{FS}})$ and $\text{Var}(\hat{v}_{jt}^{\text{FS}} - \hat{v}_{jt-1}^{\text{FS}})$.

These Monte Carlo results highlight three limitations of standard approaches that are directly relevant to the analysis in this paper. First, the CRS assumption in the factor shares approach biases capital elasticities and distorts the capital MRP distribution. Second, the factor shares inability to separate ω_{jt} from ε_{jt} attenuates estimated productivity persistence and inflates the expected level component of the TFPR variance

decomposition, obscuring the role of productivity changes across firms. Third, the proxy-variable estimator, even with generous price variation for identification, delivers estimates too imprecise for reliable inference on elasticity heterogeneity and MRP dispersion. The GNR estimator avoids all three issues, motivating its use in the main analysis.

F.3.5. Regression Benchmarks

The Monte Carlo decomposition results also provide a model-implied benchmark for the regression analysis in Section 5.3. Table A12 reports the Monte Carlo equivalents of Tables 2–3, running the same regression specifications on the simulated data.

Each observation in Table A12 is a (replication, period) cell, analogous to an industry-year cell in the empirical analysis. For each cell, I compute the cross-firm variance of mrp^X and, for Panel B, of each TFPR component $m(\omega_{-1})$, η , and ε . The panel has $100 \times 30 - 100 = 2,900$ observations, one per replication-period, with the first period of each replication dropped to accommodate the lag in ω_{-1} . Panel A estimates the simple aggregate specification (11); Panel B estimates (14) with log-transformed pairwise Pearson correlations between the components as controls, matching the main-text specification. The “True” columns use the DGP values of $m(\omega_{-1})$, η , and ε without estimation error; the GNR and Factor Shares columns use the components recovered from the respective estimators. The DGP has only two inputs (capital and materials; see Section F.1), so the table reports two MRP panels rather than three.

For materials, the flexible input, the component decomposition under the true DGP yields $\beta_\varepsilon = 1.000$ with $\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})} = \beta_\eta = 0.000$ and $R^2 = 1.000$. This perfect result reflects the model’s timing structure: because firms observe ω_{jt-1} and η_{jt} before choosing materials, only the ex-post shock ε_{jt} generates dispersion in the materials MRP. The GNR estimator reproduces $\beta_\varepsilon = 1.000$ and $R^2 = 1.000$. For capital, the predetermined

input, all three components contribute to MRP dispersion under the true DGP ($\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})} = 0.525$, $\beta_{\eta} = 0.306$, $\beta_{\varepsilon} = 0.092$, $R^2 = 0.793$), because the firm cannot adjust capital in response to any shock; GNR recovers a close approximation to this pattern (0.463, 0.331, 0.104 with $R^2 = 0.590$). The factor shares columns estimate coefficients on a different decomposition, because ε cannot be separated from ω : the reported $\hat{\beta}$ s are on $\text{Var}(\hat{v}_{-1}^{\text{FS}})$ and $\text{Var}(\hat{v}^{\text{FS}} - \hat{v}_{-1}^{\text{FS}})$ rather than on $\text{Var}(m(\omega_{-1}))$, $\text{Var}(\eta)$, $\text{Var}(\varepsilon)$. The resulting R^2 is near zero for both inputs (0.014 for materials, 0.081 for capital), indicating that the factor shares decomposition fails to capture the mechanism that generates MRP dispersion under the true DGP.

F.4. Empirical Results

I now apply the factor shares estimator to the same firm-level data used in the main analysis and compare the resulting TFPR and MRP dispersion estimates to those obtained from the GNR estimator in Section 5. The Monte Carlo experiments above show that the factor shares approach introduces predictable biases under controlled conditions; this section documents how these biases manifest in practice.

F.4.1. Implementation

For each country-industry-period cell, I compute factor shares elasticities using equations (A27)–(A28), extended to three inputs (capital, labor, materials). The materials elasticity is the observed expenditure share, the labor elasticity is the wage bill share, and the capital elasticity is the CRS residual $1 - \widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^{M,\text{FS}} - \widehat{\text{elas}}_{jt}^{L,\text{FS}}$. TFPR is computed as the Solow residual in equation (A29), extended to include labor.

TABLE A12. Monte Carlo Regression Benchmarks (Translog DGP)

	Panel A: $\log \text{Var}(\text{mrp}^X) \sim \log \text{Var}(\nu)$			Panel B: Component decomposition		
	True	GNR	Factor Shares	True	GNR	Factor Shares
<i>Materials MRP</i>						
β (TFPR)	0.398*** (0.017)	0.365*** (0.017)	0.120*** (0.019)			
$\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$				0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.044** (0.019)
β_{η}				0.000 (0.000)	0.000* (0.000)	0.092*** (0.018)
β_{ε}				1.000*** (0.000)	1.000*** (0.000)	—
R^2	0.155	0.132	0.013	1.000	1.000	0.014
<i>Capital MRP</i>						
β (TFPR)	0.800*** (0.012)	0.811*** (0.016)	0.276*** (0.019)			
$\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$				0.525*** (0.009)	0.463*** (0.013)	0.144*** (0.018)
β_{η}				0.306*** (0.009)	0.331*** (0.014)	0.214*** (0.017)
β_{ε}				0.092*** (0.009)	0.104*** (0.014)	—
R^2	0.610	0.481	0.067	0.793	0.590	0.081
Observations	2900	2900	2900	2900	2900	2900
Correlation controls				Yes	Yes	Yes

This table reports regression coefficients from the Monte Carlo experiment (translog DGP, 100 replications $\times$ 30 periods, 500 firms each). Each replication-period cell is one observation. Panel A regresses the log variance of log MRP on the log variance of TFPR. Panel B decomposes TFPR into expected productivity $m(\omega_{-1})$, ex-ante shock η , and ex-post shock ε (or level and change for Factor Shares, which cannot separate ω from ε). All Panel B specifications include log-transformed pairwise correlations between components as controls. Standard errors in parentheses. — indicates coefficient not identified under this estimator (Factor Shares cannot separate ε from ω). *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$.


F.4.2. TFPR Dispersion

Figure A8 displays the evolution of aggregate TFPR dispersion, measured as $\log \text{Var}_{st}(\nu)$ (black dashed line, primary axis), and mean TFPR level, measured as $\log E_{st}[\exp(\nu)]$ (grey solid line, secondary axis), under the GNR estimator and the factor shares approach.

The factor shares approach yields systematically higher TFPR dispersion than GNR

throughout the sample period: the log variance under factor shares ranges between -0.7 and -0.4 , compared to -1.4 and -0.9 under GNR. Both estimators show a broad upward trend in dispersion over time. The level difference reflects two features of the factor shares approach: the CRS assumption biases the elasticities used to construct the Solow residual, and the ex-post shock ε contaminates both the materials and labor expenditure shares through output, introducing firm-level noise that propagates into $\hat{v}^{\text{FS}}$. The factor shares mean TFPR level is also more volatile than its GNR counterpart throughout the sample.

FIGURE A8. TFPR dispersion and mean evolution



The dashed black line shows $\log(\text{Var}_{st}(\mathbf{v}_{jt}))$ (primary axis); the solid grey line shows $\log(E_{st}[\exp(\mathbf{v}_{jt})])$ (secondary axis). In the left panel, $\mathbf{v}_{jt}$ is the GNR-estimated TFPR from Section 5; in the right panel, $\mathbf{v}_{jt}$ is the factor shares Solow residual. Variances and means are computed within each country-industry-year cell across six countries (France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Poland, Romania) and eight NACE industry groups over 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania), pooled using industry revenue shares as weights.


F.4.3. MRP Dispersion

MRP dispersion is measured as the cross-sectional variance of $\log \text{MRP}^X$ within each country-industry-period cell. Figure A9 compares the evolution of MRP dispersion for each input under the two estimators. Under both GNR and factor shares, capital MRP dispersion (dashed) exceeds labor (dotted) and materials (solid) dispersion, and all

three inputs exhibit similar temporal patterns.

The factor shares approach produces lower MRP dispersion for labor and materials relative to GNR, while capital MRP dispersion is nearly identical across the two estimators. This echoes the Monte Carlo finding: under factor shares, the materials and labor MRPs collapse to the respective input prices, eliminating firm-level productivity variation from the cross-sectional distribution and leaving only residual input price heterogeneity across firms.

FIGURE A9. Input MRP dispersion evolution



Each line shows $\log(\text{Var}_{st}(\log \text{MRP}_{jt}^X))$ for capital (dashed), labor (dotted), and materials (solid). In the left panel, elasticities are from the GNR estimator; in the right panel, from the factor shares approach. Variances are computed within each country-industry-year cell across six countries and eight NACE industry groups over 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania), pooled using industry revenue shares as weights.


F.4.4. TFPR Variance Decomposition

Figure A10 decomposes the cross-firm TFPR variance into its components under each estimator. The GNR decomposition separates the expected productivity level $m(\omega_{-1})$, the productivity innovation η , and the ex-post shock ε , expressed as shares of total TFPR variance. The factor shares decomposition is limited to the lagged Solow residual $\hat{v}_{-1}^{\text{FS}}$ (“Expected level”) and its first difference $\hat{v}^{\text{FS}} - \hat{v}_{-1}^{\text{FS}}$ (“Innovation”), because ω and ε

cannot be separated.

Under GNR, the ex-post shock ε is the largest single component, accounting for roughly 70–95% of TFPR variance across years, followed by the expected productivity level (approximately 35–45%) and the innovation (approximately 20–30%). Unexpected productivity components thus account for the majority of TFPR dispersion. Under factor shares, the expected component (lagged Solow residual) absorbs nearly all of the variance, contributing 90–100%, while the innovation component accounts for only 20–40%. Shares sum to more than 100% because the bars omit cross-component covariance terms. This reversal is a direct consequence of the inability to separate ε from ω : the iid shock is absorbed into the lagged residual, attenuating the apparent persistence of productivity and inflating the lagged-residual component’s variance share, as documented in the Monte Carlo experiments of Section F.3.

FIGURE A10. TFPR variance decomposition



Bars show the percentage of total cross-firm TFPR variance attributed to each component, weighted by industry revenue shares. GNR decomposes into expected level $m(\omega_{-1})$, innovation η , and ex-post shock ε . Factor shares decomposes into lagged residual v_{-1} (“Expected level”) and first difference $v - v_{-1}$ (“Innovation”). Sample period: 2001–2017 (2004–2017 for Germany, Poland, and Romania).

Appendix G. Imperfect Competition Robustness

This appendix relaxes Assumption 1 (output price-taking behavior) and re-estimates the production function under imperfect competition in the output market, following the procedure in Appendix O6-4 of Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020). The objective is to assess whether the TFPR and MRP dispersion patterns documented in Section 5 are robust to allowing firms to exercise output market power.

G.1. Modified Framework

Under imperfect competition, each firm j faces a downward-sloping demand curve. I parameterize demand using a constant-elasticity structure with a time-varying elasticity parameter θ_t^d :

$$(A34) \quad Q_{jt} = D_t P_{jt}^{-\theta_t^d}$$

where Q_{jt} is physical output, P_{jt} is the firm's output price, D_t is an aggregate demand shifter common to all firms in a given industry-year cell, and $\theta_t^d > 1$ is the price elasticity of demand. The key departure from the baseline model is that firms internalize their effect on price when choosing input allocations. Under perfect competition ($\theta_t^d \rightarrow \infty$), the demand curve becomes horizontal and the framework reduces to the baseline in Section 2.

Revenue is $R_{jt} = P_{jt}Q_{jt}$. Using the inverse demand function $P_{jt} = (Q_{jt}/D_t)^{-1/\theta_t^d}$, log revenue can be written as

$$(A35) \quad y_{jt} = \frac{1}{\theta_t^d} y_t^D + \frac{\theta_t^d - 1}{\theta_t^d} \left[f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) + \omega_{jt} + \varepsilon_{jt} \right]$$

where $y_t^D = \log D_t$ is the log aggregate demand shifter. The coefficient $(\theta_t^d - 1)/\theta_t^d < 1$

implies that revenue is a dampened reflection of physical output, since expanding output depresses the firm's price.

The firm's materials allocation problem under IC is

$$(A36) \quad \max_{M_{jt}} \left[E \left(R_{jt} \mid \mathcal{J}_{jt} \right) - \rho_{jt} M_{jt} \right]$$

Following the derivation in Appendix A, but accounting for the demand curvature, the first-order condition delivers a modified log materials cost share equation:

$$(A37) \quad s_{jt} = \phi_t + \log \left(\frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}} \right) + \log \tilde{\mathcal{E}} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{jt}$$

Compared to the competitive share equation (A4), the IC version gains period-specific intercepts $\phi_t = \log((\theta_t^d - 1)/\theta_t^d)$ that absorb the effect of the time-varying demand elasticity on the optimal materials share. The composite shock $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{jt} = \frac{\theta_t^d - 1}{\theta_t^d} \varepsilon_{jt}$ and scalar constant $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} = E[e^{\tilde{\varepsilon}_{jt}}]$ are the IC analogs of ε_{jt} and $\mathcal{E}$, scaled by the demand curvature. Under perfect competition, $\phi_t = 0$ for all t and equation (A37) reduces to equation (A4).

G.1.1. Second Stage Under IC

Since observed revenue reflects both physical output and the endogenous price response, I deflate log revenue by the industry-level output price index Π_t :

$$(A38) \quad r_{jt} = y_{jt} - \log \Pi_t$$

The deflated revenue r_{jt} removes common price movements within an industry-year cell. I use EUROSTAT producer price indices (PPI) at the two-digit NACE level, matched to each firm's industry classification.

The analog of the random variable $\mathcal{Y}_{jt}$ in equation (A9) is constructed using deflated

revenue:

$$(A39) \quad \hat{y}_{jt}^{\mu} = r_{jt} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{jt} - e^{\phi_t} \int \frac{\partial f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})}{\partial m_{jt}} dm_{jt}$$

The composite productivity under IC is then

$$(A40) \quad \omega_{jt}^{\mu} = \hat{y}_{jt}^{\mu} + e^{\phi_t - \mu} \mathcal{C}(k_{jt}, l_{jt}) + \left(e^{\phi_t - \mu} - 1 \right) y_t^{\text{agg}}$$

where μ is a constant that pins down the level of markups, $\mathcal{C}(k_{jt}, l_{jt})$ is the constant of integration from equation (A10) with the same second-order polynomial approximation, and $y_t^{\text{agg}} = \log \sum_j \exp(r_{jt})$ is the log aggregate real revenue within the industry-year cell; y_t^{agg} proxies for the unobserved aggregate demand shifter y_t^D from equation (A34) in all estimation expressions below.

Equations (A39) and (A40) are the IC analogs of equation (A9). The e^{ϕ_t} factor in $\hat{y}_{jt}^{\mu}$ rescales the materials elasticity integral by the demand curvature wedge, and the $e^{\phi_t - \mu}$ factor in ω_{jt}^{μ} rescales the constant of integration $\mathcal{C}(k_{jt}, l_{jt})$ by the markup, with the residual $(e^{\phi_t - \mu} - 1)y_t^{\text{agg}}$ term capturing the aggregate demand shifter contribution that PPI deflation does not remove. Under perfect competition, $\phi_t \rightarrow 0$ and $\mu \rightarrow 0$, so both scaling factors equal 1, the y_t^{agg} term vanishes, and the two equations reduce to $\omega_{jt} = y_{jt} + \mathcal{C}(k_{jt}, l_{jt})$. See Appendix O6-4 of Gandhi, Navarro, and Rivers (2020) for the full derivation.

The period-specific markup is

$$(A41) \quad \text{markup}_t = e^{\phi_t - \mu}$$

which measures the ratio of price to marginal cost.³⁷ Under perfect competition, $\text{markup}_t =$

³⁷The markup varies across time periods but not across firms within a given period, since ϕ_t and μ are common parameters. This is a consequence of the CES demand structure, in which all firms within an industry face the same demand elasticity.

1 for all t .

G.2. Estimation

The estimation proceeds in two stages, paralleling the competitive case in Appendix A.

First stage. The share equation (A37) is estimated by nonlinear least squares. The materials elasticity $\partial f / \partial m_{jt}$ is approximated by the same second-degree complete polynomial in (k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt}) with ten γ parameters used in the baseline. The additional parameters are the $P - 1$ period-specific intercepts ϕ_t (with the first period serving as the reference, $\phi_1 = 0$), where $P = 5$ corresponds to the five time periods defined in Section 4. The regression residuals identify $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{jt}$, and the $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ -correction recovers the γ parameters free of the scalar constant, as in the competitive case.

Second stage. The constant of integration $\mathcal{C}(k_{jt}, l_{jt})$ is approximated by a second-order polynomial with five α parameters, as in the baseline. The parameters α , the period-specific Markov coefficients δ_{ap}^μ , and μ are estimated jointly via GMM using $5 + 4P + 1 = 26$ moment conditions (with $P = 5$):

$$\begin{aligned}
 (A42) \quad & E \left[\eta_{jt}^\mu k_{jt}^{\tau_k} l_{jt}^{\tau_l} \right] = 0 \quad \forall \tau_k, \tau_l, 0 < \tau_k + \tau_l \leq 2 \\
 & E \left[\eta_{jt}^\mu (\hat{y}_{jt-1}^\mu)^a \mathbf{1}(t \in p) \right] = 0 \quad \forall a, p, 0 \leq a \leq 3, 1 \leq p \leq P \\
 & E \left[\eta_{jt}^\mu y_t^{\text{agg}} \right] = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta_{jt}^\mu = \omega_{jt}^\mu - E[\omega_{jt}^\mu \mid \omega_{jt-1}^\mu]$ is the productivity innovation under IC. The first five conditions identify α , the next $4P$ conditions identify the period-specific Markov coefficients δ_{ap}^μ (as in the competitive case), and the final condition identifies μ by exploiting the aggregate demand shifter y_t^{agg} as an instrument: variation in aggregate industry revenue that is orthogonal to firm-level productivity innovations provides the

exclusion restriction needed to separate the markup parameter from the production function coefficients.³⁸

The second stage employs an iterative fixed-point algorithm. Given a candidate $(\alpha, \delta^\mu, \mu)$, I construct ω_{jt}^μ via equation (A40), recover $\eta_{jt}^\mu = \omega_{jt}^\mu - \sum_{a,p} \delta_{ap}^\mu (\omega_{jt-1}^\mu)^a \mathbf{1}(t \in p)$, and update all parameters by minimizing the GMM objective.

I estimate the model separately for each country-industry cell (six countries $\times$ eight NACE industry groups; see the industry classification in Footnote 10), using the same sample as the competitive baseline. One cell (Romania, Electronics & Electrical Equipment) is excluded because the second stage did not converge, reflecting insufficient within-cell variation in the price index to separately identify the markup parameter.

G.3. Results

G.3.1. Markups

Table A13 reports summary statistics for the estimated markups across the six countries. Mean markups range from 1.00 (Romania) to 1.18 (Germany), with medians tracking closely. The estimates indicate moderate market power in the five non-Romanian samples, consistent with manufacturing sectors in which firms face differentiated but substitutable products; the Romanian mean markup sits at the competitive lower bound and likely reflects weak identification (see the discussion in Section 6). The within-country dispersion is modest: standard deviations range from 0.06 (Germany) to 0.21 (Romania), reflecting the identifying restriction that markups vary across time periods but not across firms within a period.

Table A14 disaggregates markups by country and industry. There is considerable

³⁸Since $y_t^{\text{agg}} = \log \sum_j \exp(r_{jt})$ includes firm j 's own deflated revenue, the moment $E[\eta_{jt}^\mu y_t^{\text{agg}}] = 0$ holds only asymptotically as the number of firms per cell grows and firm j 's contribution to the aggregate vanishes. With the cell sizes used here, the implied bias is negligible.

TABLE A13. Markup Summary Statistics Under Imperfect Competition

Statistic	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Observations	76,403	1,000,134	423,793	1,261,767	55,581	162,688
Mean	1.181	1.006	1.108	1.123	1.021	1.000
Median	1.185	1.035	1.112	1.106	1.034	1.004
Std. Dev.	0.064	0.124	0.068	0.067	0.086	0.205
P10	1.076	0.703	1.004	0.990	0.930	0.834
P25	1.140	0.944	1.004	1.043	0.993	0.844
P75	1.235	1.100	1.142	1.170	1.113	1.087
P90	1.249	1.112	1.188	1.171	1.170	1.362

This table reports summary statistics for estimated markups under imperfect competition across the six sample countries. Markups are defined as $\exp(\hat{\phi}_t - \hat{\mu})$, measuring the ratio of price to marginal cost. A markup of 1 corresponds to perfect competition. Markups vary across time periods but are common across firms within a given industry-period cell. France has fewer observations than Spain and Italy because EUROSTAT producer price index coverage for France begins in 2004, dropping 2001–2003 from the IC estimation sample. Romania excludes Electronics & Electrical Equipment due to non-convergence of the second-stage estimator. Sample period: 2001–2017.

heterogeneity across industries within each country — for instance, Germany’s Food, Beverages & Tobacco industry exhibits a mean markup of 1.26, while Coke, Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals is closer to unity at 1.06 — but markups are centered around or above unity in the vast majority of cells. Romania’s Electronics & Electrical Equipment cell is reported as NA due to non-convergence (see Section G.2).


TABLE A14. Mean Markups by Country and Industry, 2001–2017

Industry	Germany	Spain	France	Italy	Poland	Romania
Food, Beverages & Tobacco	1.259	1.105	1.004	1.123	1.109	1.156
Textiles, Apparel & Leather	1.129	1.092	1.017	1.105	1.027	1.362
Wood, Paper & Printing	1.077	1.035	1.142	0.966	1.135	0.905
Coke, Chemicals & Pharma	1.057	1.132	1.196	0.990	1.136	1.180
Rubber, Plastics & Metals	1.203	0.940	1.112	1.170	0.962	0.924
Electronics & Electrical Eq.	1.254	1.062	1.175	1.091	1.206	NA
Machinery & Transport Eq.	1.170	1.107	1.198	1.043	1.019	0.726
Furniture & Other Mfg.	1.170	0.700	1.051	1.149	1.058	0.977

Each cell reports the mean markup $\exp(\hat{\phi}_t - \hat{\mu})$ averaged across time periods within the country-industry cell. NA indicates non-convergence of the second-stage estimator due to insufficient within-cell variation in the producer price index.

Figure A11 displays the cross-country distribution of estimated markups. The distributions are concentrated in the range 1.0–1.2, with Germany exhibiting the highest and most concentrated markups and Romania the widest dispersion. Figure A12 traces the evolution of revenue-weighted mean markups over time. Markups are broadly stable through the mid-2000s in most countries, with some exhibiting declines in the post-crisis years (2011–2017), potentially reflecting increased competitive pressures or compositional changes in the firm population.

FIGURE A11. Cross-Country Markup Density Under Imperfect Competition




Kernel density of estimated markups, pooled across all industry-period cells within each country. Markups are defined as $\exp(\hat{\phi}_t - \hat{\mu})$, measuring the ratio of price to marginal cost. A markup of 1 corresponds to perfect competition. Romania excludes Electronics & Electrical Equipment due to non-convergence. Sample period: 2001–2017.

G.3.2. TFPR Dispersion

Figure A13 displays the evolution of aggregate TFPR dispersion under imperfect competition, measured as $\log(\text{Var}_{st}(v_{jt}^u))$, for each country. The temporal patterns closely

FIGURE A12. Mean Markup Evolution Under Imperfect Competition




Revenue-weighted mean markup by country and year. Revenue weights are computed within each country-industry-year cell and aggregated using industry revenue shares. Romania excludes Electronics & Electrical Equipment due to non-convergence. Sample period: 2001–2017.

mirror those documented under the competitive baseline in Figure 3: all six countries exhibit a broad upward trend in TFPR dispersion over the sample period, with temporary declines during the Great Recession (2008–2010) in several countries. The level of dispersion under IC is comparable to the competitive case, indicating that allowing for market power does not substantively alter the measured cross-firm variation in productivity.


G.3.3. MRP Dispersion

Figure A14 reports the evolution of MRP dispersion for capital (dashed), labor (dotted), and materials (solid) under imperfect competition. The ordering of input MRP dispersions is broadly preserved: capital MRP dispersion exceeds labor and materials in most


FIGURE A13. TFPR Dispersion Under Imperfect Competition




A. Germany




B. Spain




C. France



D. Italy



E. Poland



F. Romania

Each panel displays $\log(\text{Var}_{st}(v_{jt}^{\mu}))$, the log variance of TFPR under imperfect competition, by country: Germany (Fig. A13A), Spain (Fig. A13B), France (Fig. A13C), Italy (Fig. A13D), Poland (Fig. A13E), and Romania (Fig. A13F). TFPR under IC is $v_{jt}^{\mu} = \omega_{jt}^{\mu} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{jt}$. Variances are computed within each industry-year cell and aggregated at the country level using average total manufacturing revenue shares for each industry as weights. Romania excludes Electronics & Electrical Equipment due to non-convergence.


countries and years, consistent with the competitive baseline in Figure 4. The temporal dynamics also parallel the baseline results. The levels of MRP dispersion under IC are comparable to the competitive case. For example, in Germany the log variance of capital MRP ranges between approximately -0.1 and 0.1 under IC, closely tracking the baseline. Labor and materials MRP dispersions are similarly aligned across the two specifications, with no systematic shift in levels. This stability confirms that allowing for market power does not alter the measured cross-firm variation in marginal revenue products.

G.3.4. Component Variance Decomposition


To verify that the Section 5.3 decomposition is robust to market power, I re-run the component variance decomposition regressions of Table 3 on the IC-estimated TFPR components. Table A15 reports the β coefficients with matched-sample competitive-baseline point estimates in braces beneath each cell. The competitive baseline is computed on the same (country, industry, year) cells as IC (France 2001–2003 dropped for PPI coverage; Romania Electronics & Electrical Equipment dropped for non-convergence), so the braces give an apples-to-apples comparison rather than the full-sample values of Table 3.

In the pooled specification with fixed effects, β_ε is 0.155 (capital), 0.212 (labor), and 0.818 (materials), compared to 0.143, 0.195, and 0.664 in the matched-sample competitive baseline. In both specifications, β_ε is largest for materials and smallest for capital. In the pooled FE specification, $\beta_{m(\omega_{-1})}$ is positive for all three inputs in both IC and the matched baseline, while β_η flips sign between IC and the baseline for labor and materials (but not for capital). Both are smaller in magnitude than β_ε for every input.


FIGURE A14. Input MRP Dispersion Under Imperfect Competition




A. Germany




B. Spain




C. France



D. Italy



E. Poland



F. Romania

Each panel displays $\log(\text{Var}_{st}(\log \text{MRP}_{jt}^{X,\mu}))$ for capital (dashed), labor (dotted), and materials (solid) under imperfect competition, by country: Germany (Fig. A14A), Spain (Fig. A14B), France (Fig. A14C), Italy (Fig. A14D), Poland (Fig. A14E), and Romania (Fig. A14F). MRPs are computed using the IC elasticity estimates and revenue. Variances are computed within each industry-year cell and aggregated at the country level using industry revenue shares as weights. Romania excludes Electronics & Electrical Equipment due to non-convergence.

TABLE A15. Elasticity of Input MRP Dispersion with Respect to TFPR Component Dispersion under Imperfect Competition

	Dependent variable: $\log \text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X)$													
	Germany		Spain		France		Italy		Poland		Romania		Pooled	
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Cap.														
$\beta_{m(w_{-1})}$	0.261	0.145	-0.264	0.117	-0.449	-0.107	0.373	-0.077	0.082	0.112	0.087	-0.060	-0.073	0.103
	{-0.024}	{-0.083}	{-0.153}	{0.007}	{0.011}	{0.024}	{0.104}	{-0.135}	{0.005}	{0.114}	{0.110}	{0.082}	{0.027}	{0.054}
β_{η}	-0.002	0.010	0.055	-0.014	-0.053	0.026	0.447	0.126	0.067	0.060	-0.033	-0.067	0.004	0.021
	{0.071}	{0.044}	{0.005}	{-0.005}	{0.038}	{0.114}	{0.139}	{0.101}	{0.092}	{0.049}	{-0.045}	{0.067}	{0.005}	{0.060}
β_{ε}	0.180	0.092	0.756	0.145	0.899	0.199	-1.010	0.083	0.234	0.161	0.033	0.374	0.287	0.155
	{0.118}	{0.060}	{0.466}	{0.234}	{0.371}	{0.128}	{-0.007}	{0.148}	{0.456}	{0.229}	{0.304}	{0.225}	{0.180}	{0.143}
N	104	104	136	136	99	99	136	136	104	104	91	91	670	670
R^2	0.319	0.950	0.266	0.989	0.602	0.993	0.504	0.989	0.440	0.834	0.117	0.935	0.132	0.969
Lab.														
$\beta_{m(w_{-1})}$	0.139	0.097	0.446	0.030	0.509	-0.169	0.674	0.050	-0.250	-0.016	0.029	-0.080	0.200	0.015
	{0.019}	{0.061}	{0.458}	{0.087}	{0.492}	{0.039}	{0.758}	{0.101}	{0.072}	{0.075}	{0.025}	{0.024}	{0.185}	{0.070}
β_{η}	-0.037	0.009	-0.101	0.002	-0.123	0.044	-0.549	-0.118	0.107	0.040	0.144	-0.005	0.050	-0.004
	{0.074}	{0.032}	{-0.110}	{0.076}	{-0.201}	{0.037}	{-0.521}	{-0.130}	{0.054}	{0.045}	{0.054}	{0.084}	{0.040}	{0.016}
β_{ε}	0.315	0.120	0.701	0.449	0.738	0.367	1.460	-0.047	0.223	0.295	-0.042	0.301	0.614	0.212
	{0.425}	{0.221}	{0.401}	{0.178}	{0.364}	{0.203}	{0.227}	{-0.330}	{0.200}	{0.255}	{-0.084}	{0.141}	{0.277}	{0.195}
N	104	104	136	136	99	99	136	136	104	104	91	91	670	670
R^2	0.414	0.836	0.642	0.986	0.832	0.991	0.722	0.964	0.069	0.964	0.635	0.942	0.437	0.973
Mat.														
$\beta_{m(w_{-1})}$	-0.006	0.145	0.145	0.274	-0.371	-0.086	0.107	-0.069	0.062	0.053	-0.072	-0.073	-0.085	0.064
	{-0.016}	{-0.124}	{-0.017}	{0.292}	{-0.231}	{-0.002}	{-0.401}	{0.123}	{0.059}	{0.048}	{0.130}	{0.035}	{0.035}	{0.036}
β_{η}	-0.045	0.007	-0.127	-0.097	0.192	-0.077	-0.245	-0.113	-0.019	-0.026	0.010	0.026	-0.022	-0.032
	{-0.005}	{0.056}	{-0.140}	{-0.062}	{-0.146}	{0.054}	{-0.400}	{-0.067}	{0.012}	{0.016}	{-0.095}	{0.031}	{-0.133}	{0.017}
β_{ε}	0.897	0.826	0.986	0.844	1.044	0.958	1.295	1.009	0.899	0.725	1.002	0.984	1.016	0.818
	{0.614}	{0.629}	{0.703}	{0.500}	{0.769}	{0.500}	{1.134}	{0.578}	{0.853}	{0.818}	{1.117}	{0.965}	{0.739}	{0.664}
N	104	104	136	136	99	99	136	136	104	104	91	91	670	670
R^2	0.819	0.900	0.867	0.949	0.899	0.979	0.962	0.992	0.787	0.859	0.976	0.990	0.837	0.961
Const.	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
FE	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES

The table reports point estimates from re-running the Section 5 component variance decomposition regressions on the IC-estimated TFPR components. Each coefficient cell shows the IC point estimate on top and the corresponding competitive-baseline point estimate in braces underneath, for direct comparison. The competitive baseline is computed on the same set of (country, industry, year) cells used for IC (France 2001–2003 dropped for PPI coverage; Romania Electronics & Electrical Equipment dropped for non-convergence); it therefore differs slightly from the full-sample estimates in Table 3. Specification (1) is the simple linear model; specification (2) adds additive year and industry fixed effects for country columns and country-year plus country-industry fixed effects for the pooled column. Both specifications control for the three pairwise Pearson correlations between TFPR components, entered as $\log(1 + \hat{\rho})$ (coefficients not reported). Observations are weighted by the industry average revenue share of total annual manufacturing revenue. N and R^2 are from the IC regressions.

G.3.5. Discussion

The IC robustness exercise produces four main findings. First, estimated markups are moderate and economically plausible, centered around 1.0–1.2 across countries and industries. This is consistent with the manufacturing sector, in which firms possess some degree of product differentiation but face substantial competitive pressure.

Second, the temporal patterns of TFPR dispersion under IC closely replicate the competitive baseline. The broad upward trend in TFPR variance survives the introduction of market power. Because the IC extension jointly re-estimates the production function coefficients (γ, α, δ) together with the markup parameters, the TFPR residual $v_{jt} = y_{jt} - f(k_{jt}, l_{jt}, m_{jt})$ is redistributed across firms differently from the competitive baseline; cross-firm variation is not mechanically preserved, and the close empirical match between the IC and competitive dispersion patterns is therefore non-trivial.

Third, the input MRP dispersion results are qualitatively unchanged. Capital MRP dispersion continues to dominate labor and materials in most country-year cells, and the temporal dynamics of all three inputs closely track the competitive baseline. The IC framework accounts for endogenous pricing through period-specific markup parameters ϕ_t in the first-stage share equation and deflation of revenue by EUROSTAT producer price indices in the second stage. Since MRP dispersion is preserved after these adjustments, the patterns documented in Section 5 are not attributable to industry-period-level deviations from price-taking.

Fourth, the pooled FE β coefficients (elasticities of $\log \text{Var}_{st}(\text{mrp}^X)$ with respect to the log variance of each TFPR component) re-estimated on the IC-estimated TFPR components preserve the key pattern from Section 5.3: β_ϵ shifts by at most 0.02 (capital, labor) and by 0.15 (materials) from the matched-sample competitive baseline, with β_ϵ remaining largest for materials and smallest for capital. Allowing for industry-period-level deviations from price-taking therefore preserves the qualitative pattern from

Section 5.3, with ε remaining the largest contributor to MRP dispersion for every input.