Discussion of "World Financial Cycles"

by Yan Bai, Patrick Kehoe, Pierlauro Lopez and Fabrizio Perri

César Sosa-Padilla

University of Notre Dame and NBER

Summary of the paper

What drives EM sovereign spreads? Two views:

- 1. Standard (Eaton-Gersovitz '81, Arellano '08, ...)
 - South real shocks drive South spreads
- 2. Global cycle (Longstaff et al. '11, Rey '13, Morelli-Ottonello-Perez '21, ...)
 - North shocks drive both North and South spreads

What drives EM sovereign spreads? Two views:

- 1. Standard (Eaton-Gersovitz '81, Arellano '08, ...)
 - South real shocks drive South spreads
- 2. Global cycle (Longstaff et al. '11, Rey '13, Morelli-Ottonello-Perez '21, ...)
 - North shocks drive both North and South spreads

This paper: argues that data calls for a model that incorporates <u>both</u> of these views. And that's what it does.

Four phases identified

- 1. Emerging Market Crises (1994-2002): Minimal comovements; U.S. market boomed, EM spreads high.
- 2. Great Spread Moderation (2002-2007): U.S. assets stable; EM spreads fell significantly.
- 3. **Global Cycle (2008-2016):** High comovements; significant spread spikes during financial crisis.
- 4. Geoeconomic Fragmentation (2016-2024): U.S. stocks stable then booming; EM spreads spiked.

Main Elements of the Model

Quantitative model to generates the previous patterns

- One North country (US) and J small South countries
- North (US): Bansal-Yaron + production w/ firm default risk
- South (EMEs): endowment small open economies w/ sovereign default risk
- Common North lenders price North stock, North corporate bonds, South sovereign bonds

Main Elements of the Model

Quantitative model to generates the previous patterns

- One North country (US) and J small South countries
- North (US): Bansal-Yaron + production w/ firm default risk
- South (EMEs): endowment small open economies w/ sovereign default risk
- Common North lenders price North stock, North corporate bonds, South sovereign bonds

Key mechanisms

- Model allows for "global intermediary" and "common shock" mechanisms
- South drives South (from quantity of risk in South)
- North drives both North and South (from price of risk in North)

One Equation

$Q_t(B_{i,t+1}, s_{i,t})B_{i,t+1} = E_t \{M_{N,t+1} [(1 - d_{t+1})\mathcal{R}(B_{i,t+1}, s_{i,t+1}) + d_{t+1}\Omega(B_{i,t+1}, s_{i,t+1})]\}$

One Equation

 $Q_t(B_{i,t+1}, s_{i,t})B_{i,t+1} = E_t \{ M_{N,t+1} [(1 - d_{t+1})\mathcal{R}(B_{i,t+1}, s_{i,t+1}) + d_{t+1}\Omega(B_{i,t+1}, s_{i,t+1})] \}$

- Early Sovereign debt literature: $M_{N,t+1} = 1/(1 + r^*)$.
- Recently, more sophisticated SDFs: time-variation in r* (e.g. Johri, Khan & Sosa-Padilla 2022), risk-aversion, banks, etc.

One Equation

 $Q_t(B_{i,t+1}, s_{i,t})B_{i,t+1} = E_t \{ M_{N,t+1} [(1 - d_{t+1})\mathcal{R}(B_{i,t+1}, s_{i,t+1}) + d_{t+1}\Omega(B_{i,t+1}, s_{i,t+1})] \}$

- Early Sovereign debt literature: $M_{N,t+1} = 1/(1 + r^*)$.
- Recently, more sophisticated SDFs: time-variation in r* (e.g. Johri, Khan & Sosa-Padilla 2022), risk-aversion, banks, etc.

• This paper: full model of the North country delivers endogenous $M_{N,t+1}$.

Results

- Due to long-run risk in North and South, model is consistent with high correlation of spreads across countries even though local economic conditions are not highly correlated
- Quantitatively:
 - most important driver of the corr. of spreads across countries is a common factor in the quantity of risk in the South before 2007 and post Covid
 - time-varying price of risk from North shocks (through SDF) accounts for 2/3 of sovereign spread movements during global cycle phase, but matters less than 30% in other phases.

My comments

- "Narrative + Eyeball" approach to identifying the phases
- I buy it! Concern: others may not

- \bullet "Narrative + Eyeball" approach to identifying the phases
- I buy it! Concern: others may not
- Is there a more systematic way of dating/separating the phases?

- $\bullet~$ "Narrative + Eyeball" approach to identifying the phases
- I buy it! Concern: others may not
- Is there a more systematic way of dating/separating the phases?
 - There is a literature on regime-switching for dynamic correlations... may be an alternative?
 - 'Regimes' not necessarily equal to 'phases'

- $\bullet~$ "Narrative + Eyeball" approach to identifying the phases
- I buy it! Concern: others may not
- Is there a more systematic way of dating/separating the phases?
 - There is a literature on regime-switching for dynamic correlations... may be an alternative?
 - 'Regimes' not necessarily equal to 'phases'
- Don't have a clear actionable idea, sorry! Maybe others in the audience do.

I like GE but it's hard. What is the value added to this paper?

I like GE but it's hard. What is the value added to this paper?

A1: Can study more correlations: corr(US spreads, EMBI spreads), corr(US Stock Mkt, EMBI spreads), etc.

I like GE but it's hard. What is the value added to this paper?

- A1: Can study more correlations: corr(US spreads, EMBI spreads), corr(US Stock Mkt, EMBI spreads), etc.
- **A2:** It allows for a decomposition of the effects: x% is coming from N-growth shocks, y% is from N-volatility shocks, etc.

I like GE but it's hard. What is the value added to this paper?

- A1: Can study more correlations: corr(US spreads, EMBI spreads), corr(US Stock Mkt, EMBI spreads), etc.
- **A2:** It allows for a decomposition of the effects: x% is coming from N-growth shocks, y% is from N-volatility shocks, etc.

Besides that:

• Does it matter for policy (in the South)?

I like GE but it's hard. What is the value added to this paper?

- A1: Can study more correlations: corr(US spreads, EMBI spreads), corr(US Stock Mkt, EMBI spreads), etc.
- **A2:** It allows for a decomposition of the effects: x% is coming from N-growth shocks, y% is from N-volatility shocks, etc.

Besides that:

- Does it matter for policy (in the South)?
- Imagine M(·) following an exogenous but richly specified process (e.g. w/ higher-order shocks).

I like GE but it's hard. What is the value added to this paper?

- A1: Can study more correlations: corr(US spreads, EMBI spreads), corr(US Stock Mkt, EMBI spreads), etc.
- **A2:** It allows for a decomposition of the effects: x% is coming from N-growth shocks, y% is from N-volatility shocks, etc.

Besides that:

- Does it matter for policy (in the South)?
- Imagine $M(\cdot)$ following an exogenous but richly specified process (e.g. w/ higher-order shocks). How far does that take us?

Comment 2. GE: lots of pain, lots of gain (?) – (cont'd)





- Paper emphasizes "North-South" links/flows/comovements
- South countries are not trading with (or otherwise affecting) each other

- Paper emphasizes "North-South" links/flows/comovements
- South countries are not trading with (or otherwise affecting) each other
- International Monetary System increasingly shaped by "South-South" flows
 - The role of China as a large official lender
 - Geoeconomic fragmentation

- Paper emphasizes "North-South" links/flows/comovements
- South countries are not trading with (or otherwise affecting) each other
- International Monetary System increasingly shaped by "South-South" flows
 - The role of China as a large official lender
 - Geoeconomic fragmentation

- Paper emphasizes "North-South" links/flows/comovements
- South countries are not trading with (or otherwise affecting) each other
- International Monetary System increasingly shaped by "South-South" flows
 - The role of China as a large official lender
 - Geoeconomic fragmentation
- Not a comment for the paper, just thinking out loud:
 - What elements of <u>this paper</u> should we retain when thinking about South-South flows?
 - What to add? Geopolitical interests? Market power? Climate risks? Other risks?

[I have many detailed questions \rightarrow email to Yan]

- **Really** liked the paper!
- A complete **Tour de force**: cool data facts, ambitious model + solution, thorough decomposition of results

• Looking forward to the next iteration!