

Term Premia Co-movement and Global Trade Network

AI JUN HOU^{*a}, CAIHONG XU^a, and XIAOXIA YE^b

^aStockholm Business School, Stockholm University

^bUniversity of Exeter Business School

This version: September 2023

Abstract

We study how the global trade network provides a channel through which term premia comove and transmit across countries. We first develop a network term structure model to show why the term premia may decrease with the trade network centrality and conjuncture that the information contained in the trade network can predict the trading partners' term premium change, then we empirically test our theoretical predictions using both trade data and bond yields across different maturities from 37 countries. Our results indicate that the links of the global trade network contain useful information in explaining the variations in term premia through time and across countries. Term premia co-movement and transmission are more pronounced among developed countries than developing countries. The theoretical and empirical evidence in this paper indicates the propagation local country term premium shocks transferring in the global macro-economy through the global trade network.

JEL Classification: C32, C58, C52

Keywords: Term structure of interest rates, Term premium, Global trade network

*Hou (aijun.hou@sbs.su.se) and Xu (caihong.xu@sbs.su.se) are with Stockholm Business School, Stockholm University, Ye (x.ye@exeter.ac.uk) is with University of Exeter Business School. The authors are grateful to Robert Ready for providing the classifications of Basic and Complex goods, Dong Lou, Quentin Moreau, Jiangze Bian, Jiayin Hu and participants at Stockholm Business School Finance seminar (2021), and the Paris Financial Management Conference (2022), the annual CICF conference (2023) and the Asian Meeting of the Econometrics Society (2023) for their helpful comments and suggestions. The authors thank Dong Zhang for his technical assistance. The authors are also grateful to the Handelsbanken Jan Wallanders och Tom Hedelius Foundation and Nasdaq Nordic Foundation for financial support.

1 Introduction

International trade is always one of the main concerns for trade policymakers because they are directly connected to the contagion of economic crises and financial market instability. International trade linkage may serve as a channel through which unexpected changes in economic policies, sovereign creditworthiness, inflation, etc., from a single sector or a single country propagate and aggregate in the national or global macro-economy. Existing studies (such as Acemoglu et al. (2012)) explore the role of firm and sectoral shocks in generating aggregate fluctuations, and report that the input and output linkage of the inter-sectoral trade network forms a conduit through which sector-level shocks transmit across the economy of a single country. With a multi-country version of Acemoglu et al. (2012)'s sectoral trade network, Richmond (2019) shows that the global trade network conduits the global currency risk premia. Recently, Chang et al. (2022) demonstrate that the risk embodied in the credit default swaps is transferred across countries through the international trade network.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the role of the international trade linkages in transferring fluctuations of term premia implied in the bond yield curves across countries.¹ In particular, we study how the trade network could provide a channel through which term premia comove and transmit among global trade partner countries. Previous literature reports that bond yields are driven by a few hidden factors; however, these factors and shocks work their way to the long end of the term structure largely through the term premia.² Some papers find that term premia are the main drivers of cross-sectional variation in bond yields (see, e.g., Cochrane and Piazzesi, 2005; Crump, Eusepi, and Moench, 2018). Existing literature in the international setting of term structure also acknowledges that yield curve fluctuations across the most advanced economies are highly correlated (Dahlquist and Hasseltoft, 2013; Jotikasthira, Le, and Lundblad, 2015). Jotikasthira, Le, and Lundblad (2015) argued that the co-movement at the short end of the yield curve is likely to reflect co-movement in the economic fundamentals to which central banks are responding.³ Given the established evidence showing that systematic risks transmit across countries and that term premia are driven by systematic risks (Wright, 2011), it follows that the term premia may also be highly correlated. However, to the best of our knowledge, apart from Wright (2011) studying term premia in 10 industrialized countries, no other empirical research examines term premia co-movement

¹The long term bond yields can be decomposed into two parts: the expected short rates and the term premia, see, e.g., Adrian, Crump, and Moench (2013), and Wright (2011). The term premium refers to the compensation investors demand for the risk associated with holding long-term bonds over short-term ones.

²See e.g., Ang and Piazzesi (2003); Dai and Philippon (2005); Evans and Marshall (1996).

³They investigate why term structure in the US, the UK, and Germany co-move by exploring the channels through which macroeconomic shocks are transmitted across borders. Two channels have been identified, i.e., the policy channel (arises when monetary authorities target the short rate as a policy tool to manage domestic growth and inflationary pressures) and the risk compensation channel (through the risk premia).

across countries, in particular across both developed and developing countries.

In Figure 1, we plot the 1-year rolling window average pairwise correlation of daily changes in 10-year bond yields (blue color), term premia (red color), and the expected short rates (green color) for 37 global countries (the first plot), 24 developed (the second plot), and 13 developing countries (the third plot).⁴ We can clearly observe that the term premia are correlated across countries regardless of whether they are developed or developing countries. However, the term premia in developed countries are much more correlated than the developing countries.

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

We identify the international trade channel with a global trade network approach where countries are linked by pairwise imports and exports, and through which global and local shocks are transmitted across countries. Earlier literature argues that the international transmission of inflation is affected by the movement of goods prices in international trade, e.g. Kolodko (1987). With the world economy exhibiting ever stronger international linkages, trade linkage (through bilateral trade) is one important channel transferring risks.⁵ Increased trade simply increases the magnitude of the transmission of shocks between two countries (Kose and Yi, 2006). If a country's major importing countries experience negative shocks due to, for example, new regulation policy, productivity shocks, or changes in raw material prices, the country's imports, and exports will be affected, which tends to drive up its own risk, the trade linkage between countries and therefore provides a channel through which the risks could spread between the importing and exporting countries. Shocks to the prices of trade goods may cause inflation uncertainty in a given country, which in turn might be transmitted to this country's trading partners through international trade. Thus it follows that shocks to term premia might also be transmitted across borders through trade linkage since inflation uncertainty is an important component of term premia, according to Wright (2011). We study how international trade can be a channel causing term premia co-move and transferring risks across the trading countries with a global network approach. We address why term premia comove by proposing a multi-country model with a network-based production environment as in Richmond (2019) where countries share and are exposed to risk through trade links that form a global trade network. One example of the trade network can be visualized in Figure 2. Within the trade network, each circle corresponds to a country and each line represents a trade link. Each link is measured using pairwise total trade normalized by each country's total trade.

⁴The decomposition of the 10-year bond into the term premium and expected short rate is done with the method of Adrian, Crump, and Moench (2013). See later section of the paper for details on this method

⁵Glick and Rose (1999) is one of the earliest papers to make this argument. Forbes (2002, 2004) provides evidence on the role of trade at the industry and firm level, respectively.

[Insert Figure 2 about here]

In our theoretical model, each country consumes non-tradable and tradable bundles of goods in a global production network. Because all countries consume a bundle of tradable goods, there is a common component in each country's consumption. We derive theoretically that both the common factor and country individual factors affect the term premia through the global trade network. Countries that are more central in the global trade network have higher exposures to global systematic shocks. The government bonds in these countries provide a better hedge against these shocks; therefore, investors demand lower premia for holding them. This intuition is confirmed in our model where we show that term premium decreases with the trade network centrality in simulations, implying that countries with higher (lower) trade network centrality tend to have lower (higher) term premia. After decomposing term premia into several components, we demonstrate that the negative correlation between trade network centrality and the risk premium is attributed to the component dominated by the long-term yield.

Our model also allows us to identify the trade network's role in the term premia' cross-country correlations. Numerical results show that country a's term premia correlation with country b increases with country b's centrality in the trade network. Based on this observation, we hypothesize that the trading intensity weighted term premia can predict the next period's term premia.

To test our hypotheses, we construct an empirical analysis using both trade data and bond yields across different maturities and from different countries. The panel dataset of nominal bond yields covers a large spectrum of maturities from 1-month, 3-month, 6-month, 9-month, 12-month, 1-year, 3-year, 5-year, 10-year, 12-year, 15-year. We collect all bond yield data from Global Yield database and Datastream. For trade data, we use the yearly country-level imports and exports that are collected from UNComtrade. Yields data are from 1999 through 2019, whereas trade data are from 1989 to 2018 covering 37 countries, i.e., from 24 developed countries and 13 developing countries. Following Chang et al. (2022), for each country in our sample, we construct several trade-linkage based risk proxies to capture the variations in term premia in all the other countries which are connected to the country in question through the trade network. These trade-linkage-based risk proxies are then used to explain the variations in term premia and to predict the change in term premia of the country in question.

The global trade network is continuously changing. In Figure 3, we plot the share of the country's export to its total GDP in percentage against its share of the country's imports to its total GDP in percentage. Four years have been randomly selected: 1992, 2002, 2012, and 2018. We can find that countries (such as China) have gradually changed from importing-dominated countries to exporting countries. Therefore, our sample covers a large group of global countries including both developing (such as China) and developed countries to study the risk premia comovement across them separately.

[Insert Figure 3 about here]

According to Ready, Roussanov, and Ward (2017), the fundamental economic differences between countries could give rise to a heterogeneity of interest rate levels. For example, countries that specialize in exporting basic commodities (such as Australia or New Zealand) tend to have high interest rates, whereas countries that import most of the basic inputs and export finished consumption goods (such as Japan) have low interest rates on average. We establish trade sub-networks based on categories of traded goods (commodity vs. final goods), and examine whether and how the term structure risks may be transmitted across countries through the trade sub-networks. Whether a country is commodities or final goods oriented is captured by the import ratio of the country.⁶ We test if the import ratio contains any useful information in explaining the comovements and transmissions in term premia.

Our empirical analysis shows consistent results with the simulation study based on our theoretical model. The results from panel regression indicate that the trading intensity weighted change in term premia from the partner countries can predict next period's change in term premia of own country. As an additional test, we sort term premia into portfolios. When sorted on trade network centrality, we find that term premia are decreasing from the group of central countries to the group of peripheral countries. The peripheral-minus-central term premium is significantly positive at 16 (32) basis points on average for the whole sample (the sub-sample from 2010–2019). Both findings are consistent with the model's prediction.

This paper contributes to the term structure of interest rates, network, and international finance literature in several important ways. First, it is the first paper to examine the international covariations of the term premia across a large number of both developed and developing countries. The long-established literature studies the term structure, yet most of the existing literature on the estimation of term premia is done for a single country. One exception is Wright (2011), who studies the term premia in 10 industrialized countries, including the US, the UK, Canada, Japan, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, and New Zealand; however, this paper has not studied risk premia in developing countries. Brennan and Xia (2006), Diebold, Li, and Yue (2008), and Dungey, Vance, and Pagan (2000) have studied zero yields for several countries and have fitted factors models to these countries' zero yields, but they have not examined term premia.

A few papers study the excess returns on long-term bond yield comovements. Jotikasthira, Le, and Lundblad (2015) studied why term structure comove among three advanced economies, i.e., the US, the UK, and Germany, yet their focus is how macroeconomic variables affect bond yields through their correlation with the pricing factors. Dahlquist and Hasseltoft (2013) studied the zero coupon interest rates for

⁶The import ratio is defined as the sum of net imports of final goods and net exports of basic goods scaled by the outputs of a country.

Germany, Switzerland, and the UK and found that the cross-country correlations of the excess return of the bonds are highly correlated. Greenwood et al. (forthcoming) develop a model in which long-term bonds and foreign exchange are both exposed to unexpected movements in short-term interest rates. They show that both the foreign exchange rate between the two currencies and bond term premia in both currencies are influenced by the supply of long-term bonds in one currency.

Second, this paper links fundamental quantities to trade network and term structure. In order to explain the carry trade abnormal returns, Richmond (2019) proposed a theoretical model in the global production economy consisting of many countries that are affected by a common factor and shocks from individual countries. Using our term structure model, we show that the term premia is negatively correlated with the network centrality due to the long-term interest rate's negative correlation with the network centrality. These results complement those of Richmond (2019).

Finally, our paper contributes to the understanding of the role of international trade network as a channel for risk transmission. The results from our paper help elaborate on well-established literature reporting that pairs of countries with stronger trade linkages tend to have more highly correlated business cycles (see, e.g., Frankel and Rose, 1998; Kose and Yi, 2006). This paper makes contributions by providing novel facts about the risk propagation in the global macro-economy and showing the importance of the trade network for the propagation of macroeconomic shocks. Chang et al. (2022) has also studied how the shocks to global countries' sovereign CDS markets are transmitted through the trade network; however, their focus is the CDS markets while we study the term premia.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we develop a theoretical model that derives the links between the global trade network centrality and the term premia, then formulate hypotheses accordingly. We present the data and methodology in section 3. Section 4 presents the empirical results confirming our hypotheses, and section 5 concludes. Appendices contain technical details and further robustness results.

2 Model and Hypotheses Development

Countries that are more central in the global trade network have higher exposures to global systematic shocks. The government bonds in these countries provide a better hedge against these shocks, and therefore carry lower premia in equilibrium. We aim to verify this intuition within a Gaussian affine term structure model with a global factor structure incorporating the global trade network. Specifically, in this section, we theoretically derive the relationship between the trade network centrality and the term premia and construct the hypothesis we test in the empirical section. In our model, both the common factor and

country individual factors affect the term premia through the global trade network where countries are central if they have many strong trade links to countries that are important to the global output tradable goods. Our model separates term premia into several parts, and we demonstrate that the negative correlation between trade network centrality and the risk premium is attributed to the parts dominated by the long-term yield, and that term premia are the main driver of cross-sectional variations in bond yields.

2.1 A trading network term structure model

Global factor structure

We follow the model of Richmond (2019), assuming an economy consisting of n countries. Each country has a unique tradable good production sector and a non-tradable good production sector. At time t , there is a pair of shocks to tradable and non-tradable goods in each country. We assume the same correlation structure of factor shocks of Richmond (2019), in which the cross countries idiosyncratic shocks to non-tradable outputs are uncorrelated, whereas the shocks to the tradable outputs are correlated due to heterogeneous business-cycle correlations.

More specifically, we start by modeling the shocks to tradable outputs in different countries. For n countries, these shocks to tradable outputs that are captured by an $n \times 1$ state variable \mathbf{X}_t and \mathbf{X}_t 's SDE under the \mathbb{P} measure are given by:

$$d\mathbf{X}_t = -\mathbf{X}_t dt + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_X dW_{\mathbf{X},t}^{\mathbb{P}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $W_{\mathbf{X},t}^{\mathbb{P}}$ is an $n \times 1$ correlated Wiener process, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_X$ is an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with i th diagonal element being $\sigma_{X,i}$, and the instantaneous covariance matrices of \mathbf{X}_t , $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_X \rho_X \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_X^T$ is an $n \times n$ matrix, where ρ_X is the correlation matrix between tradable outputs, which is a proxy of the business cycle correlation. Frankel and Rose (1998) show that these bilateral business correlations are increasing in bilateral trade intensity.

Similarly, we model the shocks to non-tradable output in different countries as an $n \times 1$ state variable \mathbf{Y}_t and \mathbf{Y}_t 's SDE under the \mathbb{P} measure are:

$$d\mathbf{Y}_t = -\mathbf{Y}_t dt + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_Y dW_{\mathbf{Y},t}^{\mathbb{P}},$$

where $W_{\mathbf{Y},t}^{\mathbb{P}}$ is an $n \times 1$ independent Wiener process independent of $W_{\mathbf{X},t}^{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_Y$ is an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with i th diagonal element being $\sigma_{Y,i}$. We denote the stacked $2n \times 1$ state variable $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_t^T & \mathbf{Y}_t^T \end{bmatrix}^T$ by \mathbf{Z}_t which follows the SDE under the \mathbb{P} measure as

$$d\mathbf{Z}_t = -\mathbf{Z}_t dt + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_Z dW_{\mathbf{Z},t}^{\mathbb{P}}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\text{where } \Sigma_Z = \begin{bmatrix} \underbrace{\Sigma_X}_{n \times n} & \underbrace{\mathbb{0}}_{n \times n} \\ \underbrace{\mathbb{0}}_{n \times n} & \underbrace{\Sigma_Y}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } W_{Z,t}^{\mathbb{P}} = \left[\left(W_{X,t}^{\mathbb{P}} \right)^\top, \left(W_{Y,t}^{\mathbb{P}} \right)^\top \right]^\top.$$

Country factor structure

Given X_t , we define the following two state variables for country i :

$$z_{i,t} = e_i^\top X_t \text{ and } x_t = \varsigma^\top X_t,$$

where e_i is an $n \times 1$ vector with its i th element being one and all others being zero, ς is an $n \times 1$ vector with its i th element being $\frac{(1-\theta)\alpha}{n}s_i$. According to Richmond (2019, eq.25), θ is a constant, α is elasticity respect to labor, s_i is the share of output in tradable goods for country i . This is also known as the Katz centrality in the network literature (Katz, 1953) and the influence vector in Acemoglu et al. (2012). Therefore, x_t is the tradable output share weighted average of all countries' shocks to tradable outputs, representing a common global factor.

We also have another state variable $y_{i,t} = e_i^\top Y_t$ that captures the shock to non-tradable output in country i . Therefore, for i th country we have a typical Gaussian three-factor setup for term structure modeling. Following the canonical Gaussian Dynamic Term Structure Model specification (see, e.g., Joslin, Singleton, and Zhu, 2011; Li, Ye, and Yu, 2020), we specify the Q measure dynamic of $Z_{i,t}$ as:

$$dZ_{i,t} = A_i Z_{i,t} dt + \Xi_i dw_{i,t}^{\mathbb{Q}}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $w_{i,t}^Q$ is a 3×1 independent Wiener process under the Q measure,

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{i,t} &= \begin{bmatrix} z_{i,t} & x_t & y_{i,t} \end{bmatrix}^\top = \zeta_i^\top Z_t, \quad \zeta_i = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} e_i \\ \mathbb{0} \\ \mathbb{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S} \\ \mathbb{0} \\ \mathbb{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{0} \\ \mathbb{0} \\ e_i \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}, \\
A_i &= \begin{bmatrix} -\lambda_{z,i} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_{x,i} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\lambda_{y,i} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \lambda_{z,i} > 0, \lambda_{x,i} > 0, \lambda_{y,i} > 0 \\
\Xi_i &= (\zeta_i^\top \Sigma_Z \rho_Z \Sigma_Z^\top \zeta_i)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\
\rho_Z &= \begin{bmatrix} \underbrace{\rho_X}_{n \times n} & \underbrace{\mathbb{0}}_{n \times n} \\ \underbrace{\mathbb{0}}_{n \times n} & \underbrace{\mathbb{I}}_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

To start the term structure modeling, we assume the short rate is an affine function of the three fundamental factors. The short rate being an affine function of fundamental factors is a very typical and reasonable assumption in the term structure literature, supported in many theoretical studies (Cox, Ingersoll Jr, and Ross, 1985). Also, Richmond (2019)'s equilibrium in a trading network economy confirms that the interest rate is an affine function of the three fundamental factors above, namely the two factors related to tradable and non-tradable outputs $z_{i,t}$ and $y_{i,t}$, and one global common factor, x_t . Therefore, we model the short rate as an affine function of the state variables:

$$r_{i,t} = \varphi_i + C_i^\top Z_{i,t}. \tag{2.5}$$

By the non-arbitrage condition, the time t price of a country i zero coupon bond with maturity at $t + \tau$ is the expectation of the discounted payoff under the Q measure. That is

$$zcb_{i,t}(\tau) = \mathbb{E}_t^Q \left(e^{-\int_t^{t+\tau} r_{i,s} ds} \right),$$

and its zero yield is given by

$$zy_{i,t}(\tau) = -\frac{\log \left[\mathbb{E}_t^Q \left(e^{-\int_t^{t+\tau} r_{i,s} ds} \right) \right]}{\tau}.$$

Because the state vector $Z_{i,t}$ is Gaussian, $zy_{i,t}(\tau)$ can be solved analytically using the well-known affine

term structure model machinery (e.g., Duffie and Kan, 1996; Dai and Singleton, 2000):

$$zy_{i,t}(\tau) = -\frac{\mathbf{H}_i(\tau)}{\tau} + \frac{\mathbf{F}_i(\tau)^\top}{\tau} Z_{i,t},$$

where

$$\mathbf{H}_i(\tau) = -\int_0^\tau \mathbf{C}_i(s)^\top (A_i^{-1} \Xi_i \Xi_i^\top A_i^{-1}) \left(C_i - \frac{\mathbf{C}_i(s)}{2} \right) ds - \left(\varphi_i - \frac{1}{2} C_i^\top (A_i^{-1} \Xi_i \Xi_i^\top A_i^{-1}) C_i \right) \tau,$$

$$\mathbf{F}_i(\tau) = A_i^{-1} (C_i(\tau) - C_i),$$

$$C_i(\tau) = \exp(A_i \tau) C_i.$$

Using a constrained version of the “essentially affine” (Duffee, 2002) market price of risk setting, we can have a \mathbb{P} -measure dynamic of $Z_{i,t}$ consistent with (2.1). That is,

$$dZ_{i,t} = A_i^{\mathbb{P}} Z_{i,t} dt + \Xi_i dw_{i,t}^{\mathbb{P}}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $A_i^{\mathbb{P}} = A_i - \Xi_i R_{i,m} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ (i.e., $R_{i,m} = -\Xi_i^{-1} (A_i^{\mathbb{P}} - A_i)$) and $w_{i,t}^{\mathbb{P}} = R_{i,m} Z_{i,t} t + w_{i,t}$.

2.2 Term premia and network centrality

For term premia, we define the instantaneous forward rate curve as follows:

$$f_{i,t}(\tau) = \frac{d [zy_{i,t}(\tau) \tau]}{d\tau} = \varphi_i - \Theta_i(0) + \Theta_i(\tau) + C_i(\tau)^\top Z_{i,t},$$

where $\Theta_i(\tau) = C_i(\tau)^\top (A_i^{-1} \Xi_i \Xi_i^\top A_i^{-1}) \left(C_i - \frac{C_i(\tau)}{2} \right)$. Note that $f_{i,t}(0) = r_{i,t}$. Similarly, using the same affine techniques but applying to the \mathbb{P} measure dynamic, we can define the expected short rate at future time $t + \tau$:

$$\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{P}} (r_{i,t+\tau}) = \varphi_i + C_i^{\mathbb{P}}(\tau)^\top Z_{i,t},$$

where $C_i^{\mathbb{P}}(\tau) = \exp(A_i^{\mathbb{P}}\tau) C_i$. Following its typical definition (e.g., Wright, 2011; Adrian, Crump, and Moench, 2013), the term premium from future time t_1 to t_2 can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
tp_{i,t}(t_1, t_2) &= \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} f_{i,t}(s) - \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{P}}(r_{i,s}) ds}{t_2 - t_1} \\
&= \left[\frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \Theta_i(s) ds}{t_2 - t_1} - \Theta_i(0) \right] + C_i^{\top} \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \exp(A_i s) - \exp(A_i^{\mathbb{P}} s) ds}{t_2 - t_1} Z_{i,t} \\
&= \left[\frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \Theta_i(s) ds}{t_2 - t_1} - \Theta_i(0) \right] + C_i^{\top} \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \exp(A_i s) - \exp(A_i^{\mathbb{P}} s) ds}{t_2 - t_1} \zeta_i^{\top} Z_t. \tag{2.7}
\end{aligned}$$

We follow Richmond (2019) and define the trade network centrality of country i as

$$v_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_X(i, j) s_j. \tag{2.8}$$

where $\rho_X(i, j)$ is the correlation between shocks to the tradeable outputs of country i and j . The trade network centrality affects the term premium unconditionally via the first two terms in Equation (2.7) and the trade network structure (e.g., the influence vector of the network Acemoglu et al., 2012) affects the term premium conditionally via the last term in Equation (2.7). No analytical relation can be derived for tp_i and v_i . To quantify the relation, we resort to simulations. In the simulations, the parameters are set to be consistent with the empirical observations in the later empirical study.

Specifically, we construct a 37-country network and conduct 1000 time simulations. In each simulation, we calculate the 37 countries' 1- to 10-year term premia, $tp_i(1, 10), i = 1, 2, \dots, 37$, and their trade network centrality v_i , and record the OLS slope coefficient in regressing $tp_i(1, 10)$ to $v_i / \max_{i=1, \dots, 37}(s_i)$.⁷ In the end, we compute the average value of the recorded slope coefficients and the t-statistic. The numerical values of parameters are set as following: $\lambda_{x,i} = \lambda_{y,i} = \lambda_{z,i} = 5$; s_i 's are drawn from the uniform distribution and normalized to have sum of one; $\rho_{i,j}$'s in ρ_X (σ_i 's in Σ_X and Σ_Y) are drawn from an even distribution on $[-0.05, 0.2]$ ($[0.4, 0.6]$). $C_i(1) = C_i(3) = 1$ and $C_i(2)$'s are drawn from an even distribution on $[0.4, 4]$ to ensure there are heterogeneity in exposures to x_t among the 37 countries. The elements in Z_t are drawn from an even distribution on $[-0.3, 0.3]$. The result is presented in the second column of Table 2. We can see the slope coefficient is significantly negative. This indicates that countries with larger (smaller) trade network centrality tend to have lower (higher) term premia.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

⁷Dividing by $\max_{i=1, \dots, 37}(s_i)$ is to make the LHS and RHS in the regression more comparable in magnitude.

To further understand which component in the term premium contributes to this result, we decompose the term premium into three parts:

$$tp_{i,t}(t_1, t_2) = \underbrace{\frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \Theta_i(s) ds}{t_2 - t_1}}_{\text{Part 1}} + \underbrace{[-\Theta_i(0)]}_{\text{Part 2}} + \underbrace{C_i^\top \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \exp(A_i s) - \exp(A_i^P s) ds}{t_2 - t_1}}_{\text{Part 3}} \zeta_i^\top \mathbf{Z}_t. \quad (2.9)$$

The average slope coefficients of regressing simulated Parts 1 to 3 to $v_i / \max_{i=1, \dots, 37}(s_i)$ are presented in Table 2 as well. We can clearly see that the negative relation between the term premium and the trade network centrality is driven by the negative relation between Part 2 $[-\Theta_i(0)]$ and the trade network centrality. Part 2 is an important part in the long term interest rate. To see this, let us set $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ in $f_{i,t}(\tau)$:

$$f_{i,t}(\infty) = \varphi_i - \Theta_i(0) + \Theta_i(\infty) + \mathbf{C}_i(\infty)^\top \mathbf{Z}_{i,t} = \varphi_i - \Theta_i(0). \quad (2.10)$$

$\Theta_i(\infty)$ and $\mathbf{C}_i(\infty)$ being zero is by the definition of $\Theta_i(\tau)$ and $\lambda_{z,i} > 0, \lambda_{x,i} > 0, \lambda_{y,i} > 0$. Setting aside φ_i , the negative relation between Part 2 and the trade network centrality indicates that the long-term interest rates tend to decrease with the centrality. This is consistent with Richmond (2019)'s equilibrium result. Our model shows that this relation between the long-term interest rate and the centrality has resulted in a similar relation between the term premium and the centrality. Our model also confirms the intuition that more central countries have higher exposures to global systematic shocks, and that government bonds in these countries provide better hedge against these shocks; therefore, investors demand lower premia for holding them. This leads us to Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 1 *Term premia decreases with the trade network centrality.*

Our model also allows us to identify the trade network's role in the term premia' cross-country correlations. To see this, we stack $tp_{i,t}$'s into an $n \times 1$ column vector, \mathbf{tp}_t and rewrite Equation (2.7) in matrix form as:

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{tp}_t}_{n \times 1} = \underbrace{\mathbf{L}}_{n \times 1} + \underbrace{\mathbf{J}}_{n \times 2n} \mathbf{Z}_t, \quad (2.11)$$

where

$$\mathbf{L}_i = \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \Theta_i(s) ds}{t_2 - t_1} - \Theta_i(0)$$

$$\mathbf{J}_{(i,:)} = C_i^\top \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \exp(A_i s) - \exp(A_i^P s) ds}{t_2 - t_1} \zeta_i^\top.$$

Therefore we have the variance-covariance matrix of \mathbf{tp} as

$$\mathbf{Cov}(\mathbf{tp}) = \frac{\mathbf{J}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_Z \rho_Z \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_Z^\top) \mathbf{J}^\top}{2}. \quad (2.12)$$

Then the correlation matrix of \mathbf{tp} is given by

$$\mathbf{Corr}(\mathbf{tp}) = \mathbf{Cov}(\mathbf{tp}) \oslash \left(\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}(\mathbf{tp})} \sqrt{\mathbf{Var}(\mathbf{tp})}^\top \right), \quad (2.13)$$

where \oslash is the element-by-element division, and $\mathbf{Var}(\mathbf{tp})$ is the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{Cov}(\mathbf{tp})$. Given Equation (2.4), it is easy to see that $\mathbf{Corr}(\mathbf{tp})$ is positively related to ρ_X in the matrix sense. Based on the same numerical setting, we show in Figure 4 this positive relation between $\mathbf{Corr}(\mathbf{tp})$ and ρ_X using pair-wise correlations from one simulated sample of 37 countries.

[Insert Figure 4 and Table 3 about here]

To further understand the trade network's role in the term premia's cross-country correlations, we conduct a similar simulation exercise based on the same numerical setting as above, in which three rank correlations (Spearman's rho) are calculated for each country by pairing its partner countries' normalized Richmond centralities, influence vector, and trading intensities with their term premium correlations with this country. The results are presented in Table 3. We find that all three rank correlations are positive and highly significant. This means that unconditionally country i 's term premium is likely to have a higher correlation with country j 's term premium when country j is more central in the trade network relative to country i 's other trading partners. One implication for these results is that the trading intensity weighted term premium can provide incremental explanatory power in forecasting term premia. We summarize this implication in Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 2 *A country's term premium is positively associated with the trading intensity weighted term premia of this country's trading partners. This association is robust to using other centralities, e.g., Richmond centrality, as the weights.*

3 Data and Empirical Design

In this section, we first present the trade and bond yield data and the way we process these data, and the detailed procedures for estimating the term premium. Second, we present the methodology we employ in this paper to investigate the co-movement and transmission in term premia across countries.

3.1 Global trade and financial linkage data

We use the yearly country-level trade data that are collected from the UN ComTrade with their online Application Programming Interface (API) program. The trade data are annual from 1989 to 2018, covering 37 reporting countries.

We construct the trade network based on the annual import and export from UN ComTrade and calculate various measures of centrality and trading intensity. Each year, all countries report their imports and exports values as well as which countries they import from and which they export in the UN ComTrade database, which allows us to construct the trade network according to their bilateral trades. In Table 1, we show one portion of the sample data from UN ComTrade for Germany in 2018 (see Appendix A for details of data processing). Figure 5 shows the top 25 imports and exports values of the trading partners for four randomly selected countries (Germany, Japan, USA, and New Zealand) in 2018. It is obvious from this figure that the import and export values of each country vary. Therefore, we carry out our empirical analysis by constructing the total trade, import, and export trade network and calculating the centrality for total trade, import and export network, respectively.

For controlling the possible impact of the financial linkage on transferring the shocks, we also use the IMF Coordinated Direct investment Survey (CDIS) database to collect bilateral FDI data and the IMF Coordinated Portfolio Investment Survey (CPIS) database to collect bilateral portfolio investment data. The FDI data is available from 2009–2018 and the portfolio investment data covers a period from 2001 to 2018. Other macroeconomic data, including GDP growth, CPI inflation, the export-to-GDP ratio, the import-to-GDP ratio, and the total-trade-to-GDP ratio in a yearly basis are all collected from the International Monetary Fund World Economic Outlook (WEO) database.

For the basic and finished goods based sub-network, we collect the classifications of trade data at the STIC 2-digit (Rev 2) level on the UN ComTrade with the online API. The classifications of the Basic and Complex goods are from Ready, Roussanov, and Ward (2017), kindly provided and updated by Robert Ready.

[Insert Table 1 and Figure 5 about here]

3.2 Bond yields and term premia

Interest rates and term premia

We access data on daily bond yields at all maturities from Bloomberg and Global Yield Database. Our sample include 37 countries consisting of 24 developed countries and 13 emerging markets. The final

sample period starts from 2002 to 2019. These 37 countries are chosen because these countries are liquid markets with a broad range of maturities, i.e., have at least five maturities. We start the sample from 2002 as a trade-off between maximizing the sample size and minimizing the likelihood of a large structural break.

Decomposition of expected short rate and term premia

This section discusses the decomposition of the sovereign yield curves of 37 developed and emerging market economies into the expected short rate and term premium components.

Long-term bond yields are made up of two parts: the expected short rate and the term premia. The latter part represents the compensation that risk-averse investors demand for holding long-term bonds. In order to study the term premia, we need to first decompose the long-term bond yields and get the term premia. One simple way of estimating the term premium is to subtract a survey measure of the average expected short rate from the observed yield. However, survey data are not updated frequently and include only a limited set of forecast horizons. Survey may not always represent the actual expectations of market participants due to the fact that large players have a disproportionate impact on the market.

The term structure literature disentangles term premia and interest rate expectations (see, e.g., Duffie and Kan, 1996; Dai and Singleton, 2000). Typically, the models are affine and represent the time-series dynamics of bond yields with simple vector autoregressions. Restrictions are imposed to reflect the no-arbitrage assumption. Much of the term structure literature has relied on models where pricing factors are assumed to be affine. Therefore, the choice of factors used typically represent or determine the size and the dynamic of term premia, see e.g., Hördahl and Tristani (2014); Dai and Singleton (2000); Kim and Wright (2005). Wright (2011) estimate term premia with two methods, i.e., decomposing forward rates into future expected three-month interest rates and the term premium by fitting an affine term structure and using the survey data on future 3-month interest rates.

Another stream of papers relies on models where a small set of yield-based factors are assumed to drive the bond yields. For example, the model from Adrian, Crump, and Moench (2013) uses principle components of bond yields as pricing factors. What makes the model appealing is its simplicity and that it provides better in- and out-of-sample estimates of term premia than the four-factor specification of Cochrane and Piazzesi (2005), as demonstrated by the authors. We estimate the term premia using the decomposition method of Adrian, Crump, and Moench (2013) (see Appendix B for detailed steps).

We calibrate the model of Adrian, Crump, and Moench (2013) based on the daily interest rates and re-calibrate the model monthly. The last term premia in each month are used in the regression analysis. In other words, term premia at month t are estimated using only information available up to t . This way

avoids look-ahead bias.

3.3 Empirical design

Portfolio sorting

We first test our Hypothesis 1, that term premia decrease with the trade network centrality, with a portfolio sorting strategy. We sort all countries' term premia at month t into four portfolios based on the centrality estimates based on the trade data from the previous year, $t - 12$. In particular, portfolios are re-balanced monthly although trade network centralities are observed yearly. The portfolio with the highest (lowest) centrality estimates is the central (peripheral) portfolio. We also create a peripheral minus central portfolio to reflect a mimicking portfolio by buying the peripheral countries' term premia and selling central countries' term premia.

Dynamic panel regression model

In order to test our Hypothesis 2, we examine whether and how term premia co-move across countries through the international trade network, we employ the following dynamic panel regression model:

$$\Delta TP_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta \Delta TP^*(Trade)_{j,t} + \rho \Delta TP_{i,t-1} + Control'_{i,y-1} \gamma + \mu_i + \lambda_y + \epsilon_{i,t} \quad (3.1)$$

where ΔTP_{it} denotes the change in country i 's term premium from month $t - 1$ to month t . $\Delta TP^*(Trade)_{j,t}$ is the risk proxy to capture the variations in term premia among the countries js from month $t - 1$ to month t . More specifically, $TP^*(Trade)_{j,t}$ is calculated as the weighted change in term premia of the other countries js which are connected to country i through the trade network from month $t - 1$ to month t . The weights are determined according to several different network weighting schemes based on the trade network (for details see the next subsection). $Control_{i,y-1}$ include: export-to-GDP ratio, import to GDP ratio, total trade to GDP ratio, inflation, and lagged GDP growth rate in the previous calendar year $y - 1$ of month t . μ_i, λ_y are the country and year fixed effects, respectively.

We investigate further whether and how term premium can be transmitted from one country to another through international trade network, according to:

$$\Delta TP_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta \Delta TP^*(Trade)_{j,t-1} + \rho \Delta TP_{i,t-1} + Control'_{i,y-1} \gamma + \mu_i + \lambda_y + \epsilon_{i,t} \quad (3.2)$$

Here, we replace $\Delta TP(Trade)_{j,t}$ with $\Delta TP(Trade)_{j,t-1}$ in equation 3.1 in order to examine whether $\Delta TP^*(Trade)_{j,t-1}$ is useful to predict the change in term premium of country i in month t , the $\Delta TP_{i,t}$.

Richmond (2019) proposed a trade centrality as state-variable to uncover the risk premia of the currency carry trade. In this trade network, central (peripheral) countries have low (high) average interest rates and currency risk premia. Richmond (2019) showed that two components decide the centrality of a country in the total trade network. The first is the bilateral trade.⁸ The second component is the share of the exports of the countries trading partners in the global total exports. In equilibrium, the central countries have strong trade linkages with countries that are important for the global total output of tradable goods. We follow Richmond (2019) to calculate the empirical centrality of the country as follows:

$$C_{it} = \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\frac{X_{ijt} + X_{jit}}{G_{it} + G_{jt}} \right) s_{jt} \quad (3.3)$$

where C_{it} is the trade network centrality of country i at month t , $\frac{X_{ijt} + X_{jit}}{G_{it} + G_{jt}}$ is the bilateral trade intensity between country i and j at month t ⁹. X_{ijt} is the total trade between countries i and j , and G_{it} is the GDP of country i . The s_{jt} is the fraction of the exports of country j to the global exports at month t . Thus, we use C_{jt} is one measure of the trade Linkage. Similarly, we use page rank centrality for the import network and export network to capture the trade linkage of country i with all the other countries.

$TradeLinkage_{j,y-1}$ can also be the import value, export value or total trade value between country i and country j in the previous calendar year $y - 1$.

$\Delta TP^*(Trade)_{j,t}$ measures the overall change in the term premia among a country's trade-linked countries. Thus, a positive β in equation (3.1) indicates term premia co-move in the same direction through the trade linkages. Similarly, a positive β in equation (3.2) implies changes in term premia among one countries' trade-linked partners in month $t - 1$ will induce a change in term premia in month t of this particular country. In other words, changes in term premia in one country can be spilled over or transmitted to other countries through the trade network.

Trade linkage measurement

Following Chang et al. (2022), for each country i at month t in our sample, we construct several trade-linkage-based risk proxies to capture the variations in term premia in all the other countries js which are connected to country i through the trade network. We define $\Delta TP^*(Trade)_{j,t}$ as the trade linkage variable

⁸Many papers have also reported the positive relation between business cycle and bilateral trades. Frankel and Rose (1998) show that bilateral business cycle correlations are increasing in bilateral intensity, Baxter and Houparitsas (2012) show that the relation between bilateral trade intensity and business cycle correlations is robust across developed and developing countries. Many other studies that reported the positive relations between business cycle correlations and bilateral trades, see e.g., Kose and Yi (2006).

⁹This is the proxy for ρ_X in (2.8)

weighted changes in term premium of all trading partners of country i , as follows,

$$\Delta TP^*(Trade)_{j,t} = \frac{\sum_{j \neq i} TradeLinkage_{j,y-1} \Delta TP_{j,t}}{\sum_{j \neq i} TradeLinkage_{j,y-1}} \quad (3.4)$$

where $\Delta TP_{j,t}$ is calculated as the change in country j 's term premium from month $t - 1$ to month t . $TradeLinkage_{j,y-1}$ is trade linkage measure from country i to country j through the trade network in the prior calendar year $y - 1$ before month t . We use the prior calendar year's trade linkage information as the weight to make sure that the trade data are accessible to investors at the time they need to calculate our proxy and adjust their portfolio accordingly.

Here, we consider several measures to capture the trade linkage among the countries, e.g. trade intensity and centrality in the trade network. Thus, $\Delta TP^*(Trade)_{j,t}$ can be trade centrality (or import centrality, export centrality) weighted change in term premia of all the other countries (all $j \neq i$) in the trade (or import and export) network, excluding country i . Alternatively, it can be the trade value (or import value, export value) weighted change in term premia of all the countries (all $j \neq i$), which are the trading partners of country i . The key difference between the centrality weighting scheme and the trade value weighted scheme is that centrality weighting considers the fact that all countries are connected through either direct trade between two countries, or indirectly linked by trading partners. Conversely, the trade value weighting scheme considers only the countries that import from or export to country i .

The commodities and final goods channel: the composition of the trade

Ready, Roussanov, and Ward (2017) found that the countries are different in interest rates due to the composition of their trades. In particular, countries that specialize in exporting basic commodities tend to have high interest rates. Although countries that import most of the basic inputs and export finished consumption goods have low interest rates. They show that final good producing countries are substantially more exposed to global output shocks, which makes the commodity countries less risky, the countries are categorized as commodity or final goods producer according to the import ratio:

$$\frac{Net\ Imports\ of\ Finished\ Goods\ +\ Net\ Exports\ of\ Basic\ Goods}{Manufacturing\ Output}. \quad (3.5)$$

where manufacturing output is the total output in the sector that produces complex goods. The non-negative import ratio indicates that the country is a commodity country. We will test if the import ratio contains useful information in transferring the term premia fluctuations across countries.

System GMM estimation for dynamic panel regression model

Our fixed effects panel regression model has a dynamic feature in that we include the lagged dependent variables in the model. Therefore, the usual Least Square Dummy Variable (LSDV) estimation method may not be the best choice because the estimation may be subjected to Nickell's bias. Hence, we estimate the dynamic panel regression models in equations (3.1) and (3.2) by system GMM proposed by Blundell and Bond (1998, 2000) to alleviate this problem.

4 Empirical Results

4.1 Time variation and cross-country heterogeneity in term premia

In Figure 6 and Figure 7, we show the 10-year bond yield (blue), fitted bond yield (black), and the decomposed two parts of term premia (red) and expected short rate (green) for the five randomly chosen developed (US, Japan, UK, Germany, Sweden) and developing countries (China, India, Mexico, Thailand, Philippines) from 2002 to 2019. In all countries, the model implied is effectively indifferent from the observed bond yields. All term premia and expected short rates demonstrate plausible time series variations.

In developed countries, the estimates of the term premia show an overall downward trend both in the US and in the euro area since 2007–2009 Great Financial Crisis. The term premia have increased recently, but are still well below the pre-financial crisis period. These term premia are higher than interest rate expectations, and especially in recent years, higher than the bond yields, reflecting the negative interest rate in most of the developed countries. However, we observe a different trend for term premia in developing countries. The expected short rates are more correlated than the term premia in general. The bond yields and the term premia remain on the same level before and after Great Financial Crisis. The term premia are much flatter in developing countries than the developed countries.

[Insert Figure 6 and Figure 7 about here]

4.2 Summary statistics

Table 4 reports the summary statistics for the term premia, and the changes in term premia and other macroeconomic variables based on 37 countries during 2002–2019. On average, the term premia is 1.38%, indicating investors require positive compensation to hold long-term bonds instead of short-term interest rates. The second row indicates that although changes in term premia are on average very small, i.e.,

only -0.67 basis points, there are considerable variations in term premia. The mean inflation and GDP growth rate for the sample are 2.64% and 2.94%, respectively. The fourth to seventh row shows that the average total trade-to-GDP ratio is 95.64%, with even shares from imports and exports. As a consequence, understanding trade activity is critical to understanding GDP.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

4.3 Portfolio sorting results

Richmond (2019) shows the countries which are more central in the global trade network have lower interest rates and currency risk premia. Adding to Richmond (2019), we propose that central countries also have lower term premia. Table 5 presents the results on portfolio sorting based on the centrality of Richmond (2019) and the 10y yield levels.¹⁰ We sort the 37 countries' term premia into four portfolios according to their centrality scores in the total trade network and their 10y yield levels. The central countries with low yield levels are included in P4 whereas the peripheral countries with high yield levels are included in P1, respectively. The P4 minus P1 portfolio refers to a strategy by selling the term premia of central countries with low yield levels and buying term premia of peripheral countries with high yield levels.¹¹ Panel A reports the summary statistics for the term premia in each of the four centrality groups for the whole sample whereas Panel B is based on a more recent sample period from 2010 to 2019. As seen in both Panel A and Panel B, the average term premia increase almost monotonically with the decreases in the trade network centrality and the increases in the 10y yield levels. Furthermore, the average difference in term premia between P4 and P1 portfolios is 28 basis points, significant at the 1% significance level in Panel A, and 98 basis points, significant at the 1% level in Panel B, respectively. The results in Table 5 are consistent with the simulation results reported in Table 2. This is also a confirmation of our Hypothesis 1 that term premiums decrease with the trade network centrality after controlling for the 10y yield levels.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

4.4 Term premium co-movement through trade network

In this subsection, we report the results from the dynamic panel regression to verify our Hypothesis 2 that the trading intensity weighted term premiums are associated with the next period's term premiums and the explanatory power is robust to using centrality measures. We consider the total trade network centrality

¹⁰We are grateful to an anonymous referee for suggesting the double sorting method instead of centrality sorting only.

¹¹This is not a tradable strategy, however, we have it here as an experiment for demonstrative purposes.

of Richmond (2019) and the total import and export trade network centrality based on the page ranking. We also report the results from the different types of subnetworks constructed based on developed vs developing, and the basic and complex goods of Ready, Roussanov, and Ward (2017).

In Table 6, we present the Blundell-Bond system GMM estimation results for the dynamic panel regression model in equation (3.1) based on 37 countries and from 2002 to 2019. Here we constructed six measures of trade-linkage weighted risk proxy of change in term premia based on the centrality of Richmond (2019), two pagerank centralities of the export and import trade network, total trade, total export, and total import values. We include country-fixed effects and year-fixed effects in all regression specifications. As can be seen in the second to the seventh column, the β coefficient is always positive and highly significant for each of the six measures based on different trade linkages. For example, the coefficients for the centrality of Richmond (2019), the centrality of export trade network, and import trade network are 0.846, 0.819, and 0.856, respectively, and all coefficients are significant at the 1% level. Similarly, the coefficients for total trade, export, and import values are slightly lower, but still significant at the 1% level.

As documented in previous literature (see, e.g., Asgharian, Liu, and Larsson, 2018), the financial linkage among the countries can also be a risk transfer channel. Trade linkage between two countries is often accompanied by financial linkages. Therefore, in our empirical analysis, we control for the bilateral financial linkage. More specifically, we examine the bilateral capital flow that is composed of both the long-term equity investment (FDI) and the portfolio investment including both debt and speculative equity investment from CPIS. We measure the FDI and portfolio investment following Chang et al. (2022) by replacing the $TradeLinkage_{j,y-1}$ with $FinancialLinkage_{j,y-1}$ in equation 3.4. Then we include $\Delta TP^*(Financial)_{j,t}$ in equation (3.1) as an additional control in our panel regression.

The coefficients of the additional control of the financial linkage between country i and its financial partners, through FDI (CDIS) or portfolio investment (CPIS) from country i , are reported in columns 8 to 15. The results indicate that the trade linkage is most of the time robustly significant after controlling the financial linkage.

[Insert Table 6 about here]

As can be shown in appendix Figure A1, the estimated term premia data covers 24 to 31 countries from 2002 to 2009 whereas the data include 34–37 countries for the period 2010 to 2019. Thus, by focusing on the more recent period, we suffer fewer problems brought by unbalanced panels. Further, the period 2010–2019 simply excludes 2007–2009 global financial crisis, which might drive up or down the possible relationship between the dependent and independent variables. Lastly, the bilateral CDIS data are only available from 2009.

Therefore, we repeat the same panel regression of specification in equation (3.1) with the more recent sample period from 2010 to 2019, and the results from this sub-sample regression can be found in Table A3. Comparing the results in Table 6 and Table A3, we find the co-movement in term premia is much stronger in the more recent period with more counties included in the trade network. Hence, we conclude that the trade network is one channel that significantly transfers the contemporaneous term premia risk across international borders.

4.5 Term premium transmission through trade network

In this session, we test if the lagged information contained in the trade network can be used to predict the global term premia across countries. In particular, we study if the trade network weighted term premia of one country’s trading partners at time $t - 1$ can be used to predict the term premia of the country in question with the trade network as a transmission channel.

We perform the panel regression based on the specification in equation (3.2). The regression results with the Blundell-Bond system GMM estimation for the dynamic panel in equation (3.2) based on 37 countries and from 2002 to 2019 are present in Table 7. As in the previous regression, we constructed six measures of trade-linkage weighted risk proxy of change in term premia based on the centrality of Richmond (2019), two pagerank centralities of the export and import trade network, total trade, total export, and total import values from the previous year. We include country-fixed effects and year-fixed effects in all regression specifications. As can be seen in the second to the seventh column, the β coefficient is always positive and highly significant for each of the six measures based on different trade linkages, such as trade centrality and trade intensity. The trading network weighted average term premia of all trading partners significantly and positively predict the term premis of this country in question. We also control for the financial linkage as in the previous section, and use $\Delta TP^*(Financial)_{j,t-1}$ in equation 3.2 as an additional control in our panel regression.

In columns 8 to 15, we report the results of adding additional control of the financial linkage between country i and its financially linked partners, through FDI (CDIS) or portfolio investment (CPIS) from country i . The results indicate that the trade linkage is most of the time robust after controlling the financial linkage.

[Insert Table 7 about here]

We again repeat the same exercise based on the more recent sample period from 2010 to 2019. The results are presented in Table A4. Comparing the results in Table 7 and Table A4, we find the spillover

or transmission in term premia is stronger with higher β in the more recent period with more counties included in the network.

Therefore, we conclude that Hypothesis 2 is verified. The term premia of the trading network weighted average of the country's trading partner are positively associated with this country's own term premia, and the trading network is a channel transfer for the contemporaneous and intertemporal term premia risk.

4.6 Developed countries vs developing countries

In this section, we study if the trade network based on only developed or developing countries can be a channel through which the term premia risk transfers globally.

We re-estimate the dynamic fixed effects panel regression model in equations (3.1) and (3.2) based on the sub-network, which includes developed or developing countries only. The motivation for conducting such an analysis is that we find the correlation is higher in term premia among developed countries, which is consistent with the frequently reported results that countries have higher trading intensity tend to have more correlated business cycle (see Frankel and Rose, 1998). We thus investigate further whether the co-movement through the trade network is stronger in developed countries compared to developing.

[Insert Table 8 and Table 9 about here]

In Table 8, we report the regression results based on the trade network consisting only of the developed countries. As can be seen in Table 8, the β s are all significant and positive in these six trade-linkage-based risk proxies. Furthermore, β s are higher in the developed countries' trade network compared to that reported in Table A3 including all 37 countries.¹² We also see significant co-movement through the financial linkages and the β is lower than using the trade linkages.

Table 9 presents the predictive regression results in equation (3.2). All six trade-linkage-based risk proxies are positive and significant at the 1% significance level. Thus, our trade-linkage-based term premia risk proxy is useful to predict the term premia change for the typical country. Further, an increase in term premia of all the other countries j , which are connected to country i through the trade network from month $t - 1$ to month t , would induce an increase in country i 's term premia from month t to month $t + 1$. However, the β is lower compared to the case where we include all 37 countries.

For developing countries, Table A5 presents the panel regression results according to equation (3.1). The co-movement in term premia is much less compared to developed countries and is only significant

¹²Here we do not control the financial linkage variables in the panel regression since these financial linkage variables are highly correlated to the trade linked measure. The correlation is much higher than the sample with 37 countries.

at the 10% level. In addition, we find β for the financial linkages is much lower and less significant than using the trade linkages.

Similarly, we examine whether trade-linkage-based term premia risk proxy is useful to predict the term premia change for the typical country for the developing countries only according to equation (3.2). However, neither trade linkages nor financial linkages show any predictability in the change in term premia for the typical country.

In sum, co-movement in term premia is stronger in developed countries than in developing countries. However, when it comes to the investigation of whether the trade linkage-based risk proxy is useful for prediction in term premium change for a certain country, we find that β coefficients are smaller and less significant in a network of either developed countries only or developing countries only than a network of all 37 countries. This shows that a more complete network-based risk proxy is more influential in predicting the term premium changes.

4.7 Sub-trade network: Basic goods vs Final goods

As illustrated in Ready, Roussanov, and Ward (2017), countries differ a lot in their endowments and technologies. In their model, Ready, Roussanov, and Ward (2017) show that the production of the basic goods is relatively insulated from global productivity shocks, whereas final goods production is substantially more exposed to global output shocks. Therefore, if a country is more of an exporter of basic goods relative to final goods, it may play a larger role in transmitting the shocks to its partner countries. Thus, we apply the import ratio defined in Ready, Roussanov, and Ward (2017) and as specified in equation (3.5) to capture the linkage in sub-trade networks. For country i , the term premia in partner countries with higher import ratios should affect the term premia in country i more than partner countries with lower import ratios.¹³

Table 10 presents the term premia co-movement and transmission results according to equation (3.1) and equation (3.2) for the sub-trade network of basic goods trade and the import ratio-based network. Columns 2 and 3 in Panel A present the results for the whole sample from 2002 to 2019 whereas Columns 4 and 5 show the results for the sub-sample from 2010 to 2019. We can see that column 2 and column 4 imply that β coefficient in equation (3.1) is always positive and highly significant for the whole sample and the more recent sample, which indicates that the sub-network information based on both basic goods and final goods, as captured by import ratio in Ready, Roussanov, and Ward (2017), is useful in explaining the comovement in term premia.

¹³Here we re-scale the original import ratio as defined in 3.5 into an adjusted import ratio which lies in $[0,1]$, in order to calculate the import ratio weighted change in the term premium.

[Insert Table 10 about here]

Columns 3 and 5 present the term premia transmission results according to equation (3.2) for the sub-network of basic and final goods trade (import ratio). We find that both of the β coefficients of import ratio trade-linkage-based risk proxies are positive and significant. An increase in the term premia of all the other countries j , which are connected to country i through the sub-trade networks from month $t - 1$ to month t , would induce an increase in country i 's term premia from month t to month $t + 1$. To sum up, the import ratio constructed based on the sub-trade networks contains useful information in explaining the comovements and transmissions in term premia.

4.8 Additional tests

So far, we have presented evidence for the trade network as a channel to drive co-movement and transmission in term premia. A natural question arises: What about expected short rate, the other part from the yield decomposition? Therefore, we repeat the empirical investigation according to equation (3.1) and equation (3.2), but replace term premium with expected short rate. The results are reported in Table A6 and Table A7. We can see from Table A6 that the expected short rate seems also co-move through the international trade linkage; however, Table A7 shows that the information of expected short rates of all the other countries j , which are connected to country i through the trade network, cannot be used to predict country i 's expected short rate.

In addition, to verify that it is the trade network that serves as a channel conduiting comovement and transmission across countries and through time, we construct a simple average change in term premium proxy among all the other countries, js , except for country i , denoted as *Naive*. Then, we use this simple average proxy at month t to explain or predict the change in term premium of country i in month t or $t + 1$. We also construct an equal weighted change in term premium proxy among all the other countries, js , which are partner countries of country i , denoted as *Trade_equal*. As is presented in Table A8, although *Naive* and *Trade_equal* at period t can help explain the change in term premium of country i in month t contemporaneously, the β coefficients (around 0.65) are much lower than that of Richmond centrality weighted proxies (0.85). More importantly, neither *Naive* nor *Trade_equal* at period t can help predict the change in term premium of country i in month $t + 1$.

5 Conclusions

This paper investigates the impact of international trade linkages on global term premia. In particular, we study how the trade network could provide a channel through which term premia co-move between the importing and exporting countries.

We study how term premia co-move across 37 international countries consisting of both developed and developing countries, and identify the international trade channel with a global trade network approach where countries are linked by pairwise imports and exports, and through which global and local shocks are transmitted across countries. We address why term premia co-move by proposing a multi-country model with a network-based production environment from Richmond (2019) where countries share and are exposed to risk through trade links and hypothesize that term premia decrease with the trade network centrality and the trading intensity weighted term premia can predict next period's term premia. Last, we hypothesize that the predictive power is robust to using other centralities.

We test the hypotheses using both trade data and bond yields across different maturities and from different countries. We create a total trade network based on the trade links and use the centrality proxied by the trading intensity to investigate if the trade centrality weighted term premia of the countries' trading partners help to explain and predict the term premia of this country. Both the simulation and the empirical results have confirmed our hypothesis and show that the trade network is a channel to transmit the term premia risk.

References

- Acemoglu, D., V. Carvalho, A. Ozdaglar, and A. Tahbaz-Salehi. 2012. The network origins of aggregate fluctuations. *Econometrica* 80:1977–2016.
- Adrian, T., R. Crump, and E. Moench. 2013. Pricing the term structure with linear regressions. *Journal of Financial Economics* 110:110–318.
- Ang, A., and M. Piazzesi. 2003. A no-arbitrage vectorautoregressive regression of term structure dynamics with macroeconomic and latent variables. *Journal of monetary economics* 50:745–87.
- Asgharian, H., L. Liu, and M. Larsson. 2018. Cross-border asset holdings and comovements in sovereign bond markets. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 86:189–206.
- Baxter, M., and Houparitsas. 2012. Determinants of business cycle comovement: a robust analysis. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 52:113–57.
- Blundell, R., and S. Bond. 1998. Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models. *Journal of econometrics* 87:115–43.
- . 2000. Gmm estimation with persistent panel data: an application to production functions. *Econometric reviews* 19:321–40.
- Brennan, M., and Y. Xia. 2006. International capital markets and foreign exchange risk. *Review of Financial Studies* 19:793–95.
- Chang, J. J., H. Du, D. Lou, and C. Polk. 2022. Ripples into waves: Trade networks, economic activity, and asset prices. *Journal of financial economics* 145:217–38.
- Cochrane, J., and M. Piazzesi. 2005. Bond risk premia. *American Economic Review* 95:138–60.
- Cox, J. C., J. E. Ingersoll Jr, and S. A. Ross. 1985. A theory of the term structure of interest rates. *Econometrica* 53:385–408.
- Crump, R. K., S. Eusepi, and E. Moench. 2018. The term structure of expectations and bond yields. *Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff Reports* .
- Dahlquist, M., and H. Hasseltoft. 2013. International bond risk premia. *Journal of International Economics* 90:17–32.

- Dai, Q., and T. Philippon. 2005. Fiscal policy and the term structure of interest rates. *NBER Working paper* .
- Dai, Q., and K. J. Singleton. 2000. Specification analysis of affine term structure models. *The Journal of Finance* 55:1943–78.
- Diebold, F. X., C. Li, and V. Z. Yue. 2008. Global yield curve dynamics and interactions: a dynamic nelson–siegel approach. *Journal of Econometrics* 146:351–63.
- Duffee, G. R. 2002. Term premia and interest rate forecasts in affine models. *The Journal of Finance* 57:405–43.
- Duffie, D., and R. Kan. 1996. A yield-factor model of interest rates. *Mathematical finance* 6:379–406.
- Dungey, M., L. M. Vance, and A. R. Pagan. 2000. A multivariate latent factor decomposition of international bond yield spreads. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 15:697–715.
- Evans, C., and D. Marshall. 1996. Economic determinants of the nominal treasury yield curve. *Journal of monetary economics* 54:1896–2003.
- Forbes, K. 2002. Are trade linkages important determinants of country vulnerability to crises? *NBER working paper* in S. Edwards and J. A. Frankel (Eds.), *Preventing Currency Crises in Emerging Markets*:77–124.
- . 2004. The asian flu and russian virus: Firm-level evidence on how crises are transmitted internationally. *Journal of International Economics* 63:59–92.
- Frankel, J., and A. Rose. 1998. The endogeneity of the optimum currency area criteria. *The Economic Journal* 108:1009–025.
- Glick, R., and A. Rose. 1999. Tcontagion and trade why are currency crises regional? *Journal of International Money and Finance* 18:603–17.
- Greenwood, R., S. Hanson, J. Stein, and A. Sunderam. forthcoming. A quantity-driven theory of term premia and exchange rates. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* .
- Hördahl, P., and O. Tristani. 2014. Inflation risk premia in the euro area and the united states. *International Journal of Central Banking* 10:1–47.

- Joslin, S., K. J. Singleton, and H. Zhu. 2011. A new perspective on gaussian dynamic term structure models. *The Review of Financial Studies* 24:926–70.
- Jotikasthira, C., A. Le, and C. Lundblad. 2015. Why do term structures in different currencies co-move? *Journal of Financial Economics* 115:58–83.
- Katz, I. 1953. A new status index derived from sociometric analysis. *Psychometrika* 18:39–43.
- Kim, D., and J. Wright. 2005. An arbitrage-free three factor term structure model and the recent behavior of long term yields and distant-horizon forward rates. *Finance and Discussion Series, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System* 33.
- Kolodko, G. W. 1987. International transmission of inflation: Its economics and its politics. *World Development* 15:1131–8.
- Kose, M., and K.-M. Yi. 2006. Can the standard international business cycle model explain the relation between trade and comovement? *Journal of international economics* 68:197–225.
- Li, H., X. Ye, and F. Yu. 2020. Unifying gaussian dynamic term structure models from a Heath–Jarrow–Morton perspective. *European Journal of Operational Research* 286:1153–67.
- Ready, R., N. Roussanov, and C. Ward. 2017. Commodity trade and the carry trade: A tale of two countries. *The Journal of Finance* 72:2629–84.
- Richmond, R. J. 2019. Trade network centrality and currency risk premia. *The Journal of Finance* 74:1315–61.
- Wright, J. H. 2011. Term premia and inflation uncertainty: Empirical evidence from an international panel dataset. *American Economic Review* 101:1514–34.

Table 1: Sample of raw trade data

Year	Flow Code	Flow	RCode	RISO	PCode	PISO	Value (Billions)
2018	1	import	276	DEU	0	WLD	1292.726
2018	2	export	276	DEU	0	WLD	1562.419
2018	1	import	276	DEU	4	AFG	0.013
2018	2	export	276	DEU	4	AFG	0.096
2018	1	import	276	DEU	8	ALB	0.144
2018	2	export	276	DEU	8	ALB	0.295
2018	1	import	276	DEU	12	DZA	0.764
2018	2	export	276	DEU	12	DZA	2.596
2018	1	import	276	DEU	156	CHN	126.751
2018	2	export	276	DEU	156	CHN	110.453
2018	1	import	276	DEU	20	CHL	1.599
2018	2	export	276	DEU	20	CHL	3.165
2018	1	import	276	DEU	484	MEX	9.449
2018	2	export	276	DEU	484	MEX	16.480
2018	1	import	276	DEU	31	NOR	8.701
2018	2	export	276	DEU	31	NOR	11.025

Notes: This table shows the sample data of the raw trading for Germany (DEU) in 2018. RISO (PISO) is the ISO code for the reporting (partner) country. The first two rows with PISO of WLD are the total exports and the imports for Germany. Randomly selected trading partners reported in this table including: AFG (Asgharian), ALB (Albania), DZA (Algeria), CHN (China), CHL (Chile), MEX (Mexico), NOR (Norway). Trade data are collected from the UN Comtrade Database.

Table 2: Simulation results

This table shows the average slope coefficients and t-statistics in regressing the simulated $tp_i(1, 10)$ (term premia), and its decomposition of $\frac{1}{9} \int_1^{10} \Theta_i(s) ds$ (Part 1), $-\Theta_i(0)$ (Part 2), and $C_i^\top \frac{1}{9} \int_1^{10} \exp(A_i s) - \exp(A_i^\mathbb{P} s) ds \zeta_i^\top \mathbf{Z}_t$ (Part 3) specified in equation 2.9 on $v_i / \max_{i=1, \dots, 50}(s_i)$, where v_i is calculated according to equation 2.8. The sample contains 1000 simulation results. The numerical values of parameters in the simulations are set as following: $\lambda_{x,i} = \lambda_{y,i} = \lambda_{z,i} = 5$; s_i 's are drawn from the uniform distribution and normalized to have sum of one; $\rho_{i,j}$'s in ρ_X (σ_i 's in Σ_X and Σ_Y) are drawn from an even distribution on $[-0.05, 0.2]$ ($[0.4, 0.6]$). $C_i(1) = C_i(3) = 1$ and $C_i(2)$'s are drawn from an even distribution on $[0.4, 4]$. The elements in \mathbf{Z}_t are drawn from an even distribution on $[-0.3, 0.3]$.

	term premia	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3
average	-0.10***	0.00	-0.09***	-0.00
t statistic	[-7.54]	[23.08]	[-23.08]	[-0.05]

Table 3: Simulation results: cross-country term premia correlations

This table shows the average rank correlation (Spearman's rho) coefficients and their t-statistics. The rank correlations are calculated for each country by pairing its partner countries' normalized centralities of Richmond (2019), the influence vector, and the trading intensity with their term premia correlations. The sample contains 1000 simulation results. The numerical values of parameters in the simulations are set as following: $\lambda_{x,i} = \lambda_{y,i} = \lambda_{z,i} = 5$; s_i 's are drawn from the uniform distribution and normalized to have sum of one; $\rho_{i,j}$'s in ρ_X (σ_i 's in Σ_X and Σ_Y) are drawn from an even distribution on $[-0.05, 0.2]$ ($[0.4, 0.6]$). $C_i(1) = C_i(3) = 1$ and $C_i(2)$'s are drawn from an even distribution on $[0.4, 4]$.

	Richmond centrality	Influence Vector	Trading Intensity
average	0.11***	0.06***	0.32***
t statistic	[162.63]	[85.38]	[435.02]

Table 4: Summary statistics for the term premia and other macro variables

This table reports the summary statistics for the monthly term premia, change in term premia, and the yearly macro variables, such as inflation, GDP growth and trade to GDP ratio for the sample period from 2002 to 2019. N denotes the number of observations. std is the standard deviation. p05 and p95 are the 5% and 95% quantile of the entire sample, respectively.

variables	N	mean	std	p05	median	p95	min	max
term premia (%)	6825	1.38	1.69	-0.60	1.15	4.03	-10.39	15.28
Change in term premia (bps)	6825	-0.67	44.55	-48.28	-1.42	50.12	-742.32	679.18
Inflation (%)	6825	2.64	2.94	-0.27	2.08	7.96	-2.98	29.50
GDP growth rate (%)	6825	2.94	2.76	-1.09	2.70	7.66	-6.70	14.53
Import to GDP ratio (%)	6825	47.18	38.45	16.46	34.29	165.24	9.67	221.01
Export to GDP ratio (%)	6825	49.33	42.63	13.18	35.95	178.14	8.26	228.99
Total trade to GDP ratio (%)	6825	95.64	79.77	30.01	69.86	329.47	19.80	442.62

Table 5: Portfolio sorting based on the Richmond centrality and the 10y yield levels

This table reports the results of the term premia sorting based on the Richmond centrality and the 10y yield levels for the 37 countries. The term premia are sorted into four portfolios. The reported are the number of observations, mean, median, and standard deviations of the portfolio returns. The t ratio is for testing if the mean is significantly different from zero.

Portfolio Bins (2002-2019)	N	mean	median	std	t ratio
Central with low 10y yields (P1)	215	1.27%	1.18%	0.49%	38.49
P2	215	1.31%	1.20%	0.65%	29.73
P3	215	1.33%	1.26%	0.68%	28.57
Peripheral with high 10y yields (P4)	215	1.55%	1.76%	1.21%	18.78
P4-P1	215	0.28%	0.54%	1.23%	3.33
Portfolio Bins (2010-2019)	N	mean	median	std	t ratio
Central with low 10y yields (P1)	119	1.16%	1.04%	0.42%	30.35
P2	119	1.19%	1.14%	0.44%	29.49
P3	119	1.42%	1.28%	0.56%	27.62
Peripheral with high 10y yields (P4)	119	2.14%	2.18%	0.91%	25.66
P4-P1	119	0.98%	1.16%	0.89%	12.10

Table 6: Term premia comovement through the trade network

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the sample period from 2002 to 2019, according to equation 3.1. The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premia for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest are the centrality measures. RM_centrality (j,t) denotes the Richmond centrality weighted average change in term premia in month t among all trading partner countries of country i , and it is calculated based on equation 3.3. EX_centrality (j,t) and IM_centrality (j,t) are the page rank centrality of the export and import network weighted average of all trading partners term premia at month t . Trade Value, Export Value, and Import Value are the total trade, export, and import values weighted average of all trading partner countries term premia, respectively. CDIS and CPIS values are the long term equity investment (FDI) and the portfolio investment including both debt and speculative equity investment. In all specifications, country i ' own change in term premia in month $t - 1$, country fixed effects, and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.

32

	$\Delta TP_{i,t}$, change in term premia (t) for country i													
RM_centrality (j,t)	0.783*** (0.113)							0.731** (0.326)	0.482* (0.251)					
EX_centrality (j,t)		0.795*** (0.111)												
IM_centrality (j,t)			0.870*** (0.121)							0.712** '(0.320)	0.505* '(0.030)			
Trade Value (j,t)				0.698*** (0.115)								0.772*** (0.245)	0.466* (0.268)	
Export Value (j,t)					0.625*** (0.117)									
Import Value (j,t)						0.776*** (0.126)							0.772*** (0.225)	0.521* (0.271)
CDIS Value (j,t)							0.111 (0.223)		0.136 '(0.218)		0.012 (0.158)		0.032 (0.142)	
CPIS Value (j,t)								0.435** (0.193)		0.444** '(0.212)		0.387* (0.215)		0.365* (0.211)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.186*** (0.053)	-0.186*** (0.053)	-0.186*** (0.053)	-0.186*** (0.053)	-0.186*** (0.053)	-0.187*** (0.052)	-0.168*** (0.034)	-0.154*** (0.043)	-0.169*** '(0.033)	-0.153*** '(0.044)	-0.167*** (0.032)	-0.153*** (0.043)	-0.168*** (0.033)	-0.154*** (0.043)
Control variables														
Inflation	1.200 (1.202)	1.179 (1.189)	1.225 (1.210)	1.297 (1.219)	1.217 (1.212)	1.312 (1.229)	4.015** (1.573)	0.663 (0.676)	4.332** '(1.837)	0.690 '(0.951)	4.434** (1.839)	0.725 (0.672)	4.469** (1.843)	0.672 (0.866)
GDP growth	-0.345 (0.877)	-0.235 (0.839)	-0.384 (0.923)	-0.395 (0.883)	-0.325 (0.830)	-0.429 (0.943)	-1.132 (1.231)	-1.107 (0.778)	-0.435 '(1.736)	-0.884 '(0.903)	-0.555 (1.722)	-1.198 (0.783)	-0.577 (1.746)	-1.303 (0.951)
Trade to GDP	-0.048 (0.052)			-0.046 (0.052)			-0.074 (0.070)	0.032 (0.033)	0.038 '(0.101)	0.046 '(0.036)	0.041 (0.103)	0.033 (0.032)	0.038 (0.104)	0.029 (0.036)
export to GDP		-0.105 (0.097)			-0.102 (0.096)									
import to GDP			-0.086 (0.116)			-0.075 (0.113)								
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	6777	6777	6777	6777	6765	6765	4275	5656	4275	5656	4275	5656	4275	5656

Table 7: Term premium spillover/transmission through the trade network

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the sample period from 2002 to 2019, according to equation 3.2. The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premia for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest is presented are the centrality measures. $RM_centrality(j,t-1)$ denotes the Richmond centrality weighted average change in term premia in month t among all trading partner countries of country i , and it is calculated based on equation 3.3. $EX_centrality(j,t-1)$ and $IM_centrality(j,t-1)$ are the page rank centrality of the export and import network weighted average change in term premia in month $t-1$ among all trading partner countries of country i . Trade Value, Export Value, and Import Value are the total trade, export and import values weighted average changes in term premia in month $t-1$, respectively. CDIS and CPIS values are the long term equity investment (FDI) and the portfolio investment including both debt and speculative equity at $t-1$. For example, $RM_centrality(j,t-1)$ denotes the Richmond centrality weighted average change in term premia in month $t-1$ among all trading partner countries of country i , and it is calculated based on equation 3.3. In all specifications, country i ' own change in term premia in month $t-1$, country fixed effects and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.

33

	change in term premium (t) for country i													
RM_centrality ($j,t-1$)	0.269*** (0.100)						0.329*** (0.326)	0.134 (0.121)						
EX_centrality ($j,t-1$)		0.253** (0.108)												
IM_centrality ($j,t-1$)			0.282** (0.113)						0.272*** (0.085)	0.203* (0.120)				
Trade Value ($j,t-1$)				0.204*** (0.074)							0.190 (0.154)	0.079 (0.097)		
Export Value ($j,t-1$)					0.188*** (0.068)									
Import Value ($j,t-1$)						0.204** (0.080)							0.172* (0.104)	0.024 (0.077)
CDIS Value ($j,t-1$)							0.059 (0.151)		0.097 (0.143)		0.116 (0.215)		0.132 (0.175)	
CPIS Value ($j,t-1$)								0.172* (0.101)		0.164* (0.095)		0.193 (0.143)		0.230* (0.121)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.193*** (0.051)	-0.192*** (0.050)	-0.192*** (0.051)	-0.191*** (0.050)	-0.191*** (0.049)	-0.191*** (0.051)	-0.178*** (0.036)	-0.176*** (0.046)	-0.177*** (0.036)	-0.176*** (0.046)	-0.175*** (0.045)	-0.176*** (0.045)	-0.176*** (0.035)	-0.175*** (0.045)
Control variables														
Inflation	1.259 (1.224)	1.229 (1.221)	1.280 (1.231)	1.272 (1.227)	1.235 (1.220)	1.299 (1.233)	4.550** (1.798)	0.849 (0.778)	4.535** (1.786)	1.424 (1.182)	4.538** (1.800)	0.862 (0.768)	4.536** (1.788)	0.862 (0.763)
GDP growth	-0.396 (0.885)	-0.358 (0.846)	-0.460 (0.928)	-0.486 (0.890)	-0.427 (0.850)	-0.549 (0.934)	-0.633 (1.693)	-1.387 (0.851)	-0.672 (1.693)	-1.292 (1.041)	-0.793 (1.692)	-1.427 (0.858)	-0.794 (1.695)	-1.422* (0.856)
Trade to GDP	-0.046 (0.049)			-0.043 (0.049)			0.036 (0.105)	0.032 (0.031)	0.035 (0.105)	0.031 (0.044)	0.033 (0.107)	0.033 (0.032)	0.033 (0.107)	0.034 (0.032)
export to GDP		-0.100 (0.090)					-0.099 (0.090)							
import to GDP			-0.076 (0.108)				-0.071 (0.109)							
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	6777	6777	6777	6777	6765	6765	4275	5656	4275	5656	4275	5656	4275	5656

Table 8: Term premia comovement through the trade network in developed countries

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the sample from 2010 to 2019 for the 24 developed countries, according to equation 3.1. The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premia for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest is presented in the first column for each regression model specification. For example, $RM_centrality(j,t)$ denotes the Richmond centrality weighted average change in term premia in month t among all trading partner countries of country i , where Richmond centrality is calculated based on the prior year's bilateral total trade network. $EX_centrality(j,t)$ and $IM_centrality(j,t)$ are the page rank centrality of the export and import network weighted average of all trading partners term premia at month t . Trade Value, Export Value, and Import Value are the total trade, export, and import values weighted average of all trading partner countries term premia, respectively. CDIS and CPIS values are the long term equity investment (FDI) and the portfolio investment including both debt and speculative equity investment, respectively. In all specifications, country i ' own change in term premia in month $t - 1$, country fixed effects, and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.

$\Delta TP_{i,t}$, change in term premia (t) for country i								
RM_centrality (j,t)	0.981*** (0.105)							
EX_centrality (j,t)		0.880*** (0.098)						
IM_centrality (j,t)			0.944*** (0.107)					
Trade Value (j,t)				0.946*** (0.157)				
Export Value (j,t)					0.901*** (0.143)			
Import Value (j,t)						0.975*** (0.165)		
CDIS Value (j,t)							0.805*** (0.095)	
CPIS Value (j,t)								0.819*** (0.139)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.125*** (0.024)	-0.128*** (0.023)	-0.127*** (0.024)	-0.130*** (0.023)	-0.127*** (0.023)	-0.132*** (0.022)	-0.130*** (0.022)	-0.134*** (0.022)
Control variables								
Inflation	-1.940 (1.881)	-1.813 (1.800)	-1.729 (1.807)	-2.008 (2.000)	-1.908 (1.895)	-2.043 (2.099)	-1.420 (1.433)	-1.990 (1.866)
GDP growth	-1.729*** (0.640)	-1.587** (0.646)	-1.621** (0.638)	-1.807*** (0.846)	-1.651** (0.814)	-1.953** (0.862)	-1.767** (0.840)	-1.667** (0.783)
Trade to GDP	0.087 (0.100)			0.078 (0.098)			0.081 (0.110)	0.072 (0.097)
export to GDP		0.144 (0.181)			0.134 (0.180)			
import to GDP			0.148 (0.182)			0.179 (0.214)		
Country FE	Yes							
Year FE	Yes							
N	2755	2755	2755	2755	2755	2755	2755	2755

Table 9: Term premia transmission through the trade network in developed countries

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the sample from 2010 to 2019 for the 24 developed countries, according to equation 3.2. The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premia for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest is presented in the first column for each regression model specification. For example, $RM_centrality(j, t - 1)$ denotes the Richmond centrality weighted average change in term premia in month $t - 1$ among all trading partner countries of country i , where Richmond centrality is calculated based on the prior year's bilateral total trade network. $EX_centrality(j, t - 1)$ and $IM_centrality(j, t - 1)$ are the page rank centrality of the export and import network weighted average of all trading partners term premia at month $t - 1$. Trade Value, Export Value, and Import Value are the total trade, export, and import values weighted average of all trading partner countries term premia, respectively. CDIS and CPIS values are the long term equity investment (FDI) and the portfolio investment including both debt and speculative equity investment, respectively. In all specifications, country i ' own change in term premia in month $t - 1$, country fixed effects, and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.


$\Delta TP_{i,t}$, change in term premia (t) for country i								
RM_centrality ($j, t - 1$)	0.211*** (0.047)							
EX_centrality ($j, t - 1$)		0.200*** (0.042)						
IM_centrality ($j, t - 1$)			0.203*** (0.042)					
Trade Value ($j, t - 1$)				0.190*** (0.042)				
Export Value ($j, t - 1$)					0.207*** (0.047)			
Import Value ($j, t - 1$)						0.176*** (0.042)		
CDIS Value ($j, t - 1$)							0.220*** (0.051)	
CPIS Value ($j, t - 1$)								0.144*** (0.036)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.145*** (0.023)	-0.146*** (0.024)	-0.145*** (0.024)	-0.147*** (0.024)	-0.150*** (0.024)	-0.145*** (0.025)	-0.154*** (0.025)	-0.146*** (0.027)
Control variables								
Inflation	0.406 (2.005)	0.615 (1.925)	0.214 (2.098)	0.423 (2.038)	0.627 (1.937)	0.207 (2.134)	-1.234 (1.5662)	0.382 (2.049)
GDP growth	-1.922*** (0.706)	-1.889*** (0.695)	-1.988*** (0.708)	-2.061*** (0.710)	-2.037*** (0.718)	-2.083*** (0.704)	-2.035*** (0.729)	-2.020*** (0.679)
Trade to GDP	0.104 (0.107)			0.106 (0.108)			0.082 (0.113)	0.104 (0.107)
export to GDP		0.184 (0.194)			0.186 (0.196)			
import to GDP			0.238 (0.236)			0.239 (0.237)		
Country FE	Yes							
Year FE	Yes							
N	2755	2755	2755	2755	2755	2755	2755	2755

Table 10: Term premia co-movement and transmission through the trade sub-network (import ratio)

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the sample from 2002 to 2019 and the sub sample from 2010 to 2019 for the 37 countries, according to equation 3.1 and equation 3.2. The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premia for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest is presented in the first column for each regression model specification. For example, Import Ratio (j,t) (Import Ratio ($j,t-1$)) denotes the Import ratio weighted average change in term premia in month t ($t-1$) among all trading partner countries of country i , where Import ratio is calculated based on the prior year's bilateral total trade sub networks. In all specifications, country i ' own change in term premia in month $t-1$, country fixed effects and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels, respectively.


$\Delta TP_{i,t}$, change in term premia (t) for country i				
	Panel A: Sample period: 2002-2019		Panel B: Sample period: 2010-2019	
Import Ratio (j,t)	0.658*** (0.089)		0.631*** (0.108)	
Import Ratio ($j,t-1$)		0.270*** (0.103)		0.328** (0.146)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.191*** (0.051)	-0.194*** (0.051)	-0.169*** (0.034)	-0.176*** (0.037)
Control variables				
Inflation	1.279 (1.146)	1.401 (1.149)	3.885*** (1.400)	4.423*** (1.386)
GDP growth	-0.267 (0.883)	-0.335 (0.896)	-0.886 (1.156)	-1.221 (1.157)
Trade to GDP	-0.030 (0.051)	-0.232 (0.049)	-0.061 (0.063)	-0.054 (0.061)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	6777	6777	4275	4275

Figure 1: Rolling correlations of 37 global bond yields




Notes: This figure plots the one year rolling window of the average pairwise correlation of daily yield changes (blue), daily changes of risk premia (red) as well as the daily changes in short rates (green) from 37 global countries from 1999 to 2018. The first panel are for all 37 countries, the second one plots correlations for 24 developed countries, and the last one plots correlations for 13 developing countries. The decomposition of the 10 year bond into the risk premium and expected short rate is done with the method of Adrian, Crump, and Moench (2013).

Figure 2: Centrality of total trade network




Notes: The figure plots the centrality of the total trade network of Richmond (2019). The countries are linked by the pair-wise total trade normalized by pair-wise total GDP. The circle size represents the GDP of the country. The position of the circle indicates the country's centrality in the total trade network. The thickness of the link shows the size of bilateral trades of the paired countries.

Figure 3: Global exports and imports




This figure plots the share of the country's export to its total GDP in percentage against its share of the country's import to its total GDP in percentage. Four years have been randomly selected: 1992, 2002, 2012 and 2018.

Figure 4: Pair-wise correlations simulations




In this plot, the pair-wise term premium correlations are scatter plotted against the pair-wise correlations in ρ_X based on one simulated sample with 37 countries. The numerical values of parameters in the simulations are set as following: $\lambda_{x,i} = \lambda_{y,i} = \lambda_{z,i} = 5$; s_i 's are drawn from the uniform distribution and normalized to have sum of one; $\rho_{i,j}$'s in ρ_X (σ_i 's in Σ_X and Σ_Y) are drawn from an even distribution on $[-0.05, 0.2]$ ($[0.4, 0.6]$). $C_i(1) = C_i(3) = 1$ and $C_i(2)$'s are drawn from an even distribution on $[0.4, 4]$.

Figure 5: Trading partners of countries: imports and exports




Notes: The figure plots the top 25 imports and exports values of the trading partners for four randomly selected countries in 2018. The four countries are: Germany, Japan, USA and New Zealand. The blue (red) bars plot the exports (imports) values for each country.

Figure 6: 10-year bond yield decomposition: five developed countries



Notes: This figure plots the decomposed risk premia (red) and the expected short rate (green) together with the 10-year bond zero yields (blue) for the largest five developed countries from 2002 to 2019. The decomposition method used is Adrian, Crump, and Moench (2013).

Figure 7: 10-year bond yield decomposition: five developing countries



Notes: This figure plots the decomposed risk premia (red) and the expected short rate (green) together with the 10-year bond zero yields (blue) for the largest five developing countries from 2002 to 2019. The decomposition method used is Adrian, Crump, and Moench (2013).

Appendices

A Trade data processing procedure

Inter-Country Trading values are collected from the UN Comtrade database. We base on each country's reported total trade values and select the 37 countries (due to the availability of the term premium) to construct the trade network. In the original trade data of UN Comtrade, each country reports both "import" and "export" to each "partner country". It is very common that there is a large difference between two countries in reporting the trading values among them. For example, based on the report of USA, the import from China is \$357 Billion, but based on the report of China, the export to the US is only \$250 Billion. Therefore, we decided to use only the exported values of countries to conjecture the imports values so that the reported export and import from the paired countries are identical. Then we construct the export and import as well as the total trade networks. Then, we calculate the centrality of the export and import network, and also the centrality of the total trade according to Richmond (2019). As both the export and import trade networks are directed networks, we use the "pagerank" R package.


B Detailed procedure of decomposing bond yields

The details steps of applying the Adrian, Crump, and Moench (2013) are as follows:

1. In the first step, we estimate a vector autoregression of order one via an ordinary least square and collect all the autoregressive coefficients and estimated factor innovations.
2. In the second step, we regress monthly excess bond returns, i.e., 10 year zero bond yields on a constant, lagged yield curve factors and the contemporaneous factor innovation in the first regression. This procedure will provide us with a vector of predictive coefficients and a vector of risk factors.
3. In the third step, we estimate the price of risk parameters via a third cross-sectional regression.
4. Finally, the term premia is estimated by deducting the expected short rate from the fitted values of the zero yield based on the pricing of risk parameters.

C Tables and Figures

Figure A1: Term premia for 37 countries



Notes: This figure plots the term premia (in percent) for all 37 countries from 2002 to 2019. The vertical line indicates Jan. 2010.

Table A1: Sample of countries with term premium and Trade data

Country	Start Date
Australia	March1999
Austria	March2004
Belgium	February2005
Canada	March1999
Chile	February2009
China	July2002
China, Hong Kong	February2002
Czechia	February2010
Denmark	March1999
Egypt	February2009
Finland	February2013
France	March1999
Germany	March1999
Hungary	March1999
India	October2001
Indonesia	March2010
Israel	June2006
Italy	January2000
Japan	March1999
Korea, Republic of	October2012
Mexico	June2009
Netherlands	March1999
New Zealand	March1999
Norway	March1999
Pakistan	December2004
Philippines	April2001
Poland	December1999
Portugal	December2001
Singapore	September2001
Spain	March1999
Sweden	March1999
Switzerland	March1999
Thailand	October1999
Uganda	February2010
United Kingdom	March1999
United States of America	March1999
Viet Nam	February2009

Notes: This table reports the sample length of countries that have both estimated term premium data and trade date available. Trade data are collected from the UN Comtrade Database. Interest rate data used to calculate the term premium are collected from the Global Yield Curve Database and Bloomberg.

Table A2: Cross correlation in Term premia among selected countries

The diagonal part of this table reports the % of the variance of the 10-year yields that can be explained by the term premia. The off diagonal shows the % of the covariance of cross sectional 10-years yield can be explained by the covariance of the cross sectional risk premia of 11 global countries. We choose the most developed 8 countries and 3 developing countries due to the level of their GDP.

	US	Japan	UK	Germany	Canada	France	Swiss	Sweden	China	India	Thiland
US	0.74										
Japan	0.68	0.85									
UK	0.59	0.46	0.65								
Germany	0.37	0.26	0.27	0.33							
Canada	0.70	0.27	0.54	0.25	0.63						
France	0.67	0.70	0.52	0.39	0.57	0.74					
Swiss	0.53	0.58	0.51	0.24	0.56	0.18	0.87				
Sweden	0.64	0.69	0.62	0.30	0.62	0.58	0.69	0.79			
China	0.34	0.23	0.35	0.22	0.37	0.07	0.20	0.18	0.64		
India	0.61	0.11	0.18	0.15	0.62	0.86	0.08	0.61	0.70	0.46	
Thiland	0.49	0.39	0.61	0.33	0.58	0.10	0.53	0.52	0.91	0.39	0.64

Table A3: Term premium comovement through the trade network for 2010-2019

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the sample period from 2010 to 2019, according to equation 3.1. The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premium for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest is presented in the first column for each regression model specification. For example, $RM_centrality(j,t)$ denotes the Richmond centrality weighted average change in term premia in month t among all countries, where Richmond centrality is calculated based on the prior year's bilateral total trade network. $EX_centrality(j,t)$ and $IM_centrality(j,t)$ are the pagerank centrality of the export and import network weighted average of all trading partners' term premia at month t . Trade Value, Export Value, and Import Value are the total trade, export, and import values weighted average of all trading partner countries' term premia. CDIS and CPIS values are the long-term equity investment (FDI) and the portfolio investment including both debt and speculative equity investment, respectively. In all specifications, country i 's own change in term premium in month $t - 1$ and country fixed effects and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, and 1% levels, respectively.

	$\Delta TP_{i,t}$, change in term premium (t) for country i													
RM_centrality (j,t)	0.846*** (0.151)													
EX_centrality (j,t)		0.819*** (0.147)												
IM_centrality (j,t)			0.856*** (0.149)							0.712** '(0.320)	0.380 '(0.384)			
Trade Value (j,t)				0.773*** (0.146)								0.772*** (0.245)	0.417* (0.237)	
Export Value (j,t)					0.706*** -0.144									
Import Value (j,t)						0.796*** (0.144)							0.772*** (0.225)	0.464** (0.234)
CDIS Value (j,t)							0.108 (0.223)			0.136 '(0.218)		0.012 (0.158)		0.032 (0.142)
CPIS Value (j,t)									0.510* (0.276)		0.566** '(0.281)		0.487** (0.183)	0.461** (0.174)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.165*** (0.035)	-0.166*** (0.034)	-0.165*** (0.035)	-0.165*** (0.034)	-0.165*** (0.034)	-0.165*** (0.034)	-0.169*** (0.033)	-0.202*** (0.047)	-0.169*** '(0.033)	-0.206*** (0.047)	-0.167*** (0.032)	-0.202*** (0.047)	-0.168*** (0.033)	-0.202*** (0.047)
Control variables														
Inflation	3.766*** (1.424)	3.744*** (1.434)	3.792*** (1.426)	3.918*** (1.412)	3.876*** (1.396)	3.964*** (1.414)	4.328** (1.833)	-0.481 (0.856)	4.332** '(1.837)	-0.433 '(1.113)	4.434** (1.839)	-0.333 (0.833)	4.468** (1.843)	-0.299 (0.804)
GDP growth	-0.371 (1.569)	-0.349 (1.593)	-0.376 (1.562)	-0.515 (1.593)	-0.542 (1.590)	-0.513 (1.601)	-0.398 (1.724)	-0.710 (1.257)	-0.435 '(1.736)	-1.339 '(1.710)	-0.555 (1.722)	-0.870 (1.265)	-0.577 (1.746)	-0.901 (1.283)
Trade to GDP	-0.030 (0.076)			-0.024 (0.075)			0.037 (0.102)	0.009 (0.105)	0.038 '(0.101)	0.019 '(0.124)	0.041 (0.103)	0.013 (0.105)	0.038 (0.104)	0.014 (0.105)
export to GDP		-0.069 (0.150)					-0.052 (0.150)							
import to GDP			-0.034 (0.161)				-0.034 (0.155)							
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	3513	4275	3513	4275	3513	4275	3513

Table A4: Term premium spillover/transmission through the trade network for 2010-2019

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the more recent sample period from 2010 to 2019, according to equation 3.2. The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premium for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest is presented in the first column for each regression model specification. For example, Richmond centrality ($j, t - 1$) denotes the Richmond centrality weighted average change in term premia in month $t - 1$ among all countries, where Richmond centrality is calculated based on the prior year's bilateral total trade network. EX_centrality ($j, t - 1$) and IM_centrality ($j, t - 1$) are the pagerank centrality of the export and import network weighted average of all trading partners term premia at month t . Trade Value, Export Value, and Import Value are the total trade, export, and import values weighted average of all trading partner countries term premia. CDIS and CPIS values are the long term equity investment (FDI) and the portfolio investment including both debt and speculative equity investment, respectively. In all specifications, country i 's own change in term premium in month $t - 1$ and country fixed effects and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, and 1% levels, respectively.

49

	$\Delta TP_{i,t}$, change in term premium (t) for country i													
RM_centrality ($j, t - 1$)	0.397*** (0.155)							0.329*** (0.326)	0.380** (0.158)					
EX_centrality ($j, t - 1$)		0.369** (0.155)												
IM_centrality ($j, t - 1$)			0.384** (0.159)							0.272*** (0.085)	0.336*** (0.120)			
Trade Value ($j, t - 1$)				0.312*** (0.114)								0.190 (0.154)	0.101 (0.127)	
Export Value ($j, t - 1$)					0.297*** (0.097)									
Import Value ($j, t - 1$)						0.301** (0.125)								0.142* (0.086) 0.084 (-0.109)
CDIS Value ($j, t - 1$)							0.059 (0.151)		0.097 (0.143)		0.116 (0.215)			0.156 (0.163)
CPIS Value ($j, t - 1$)								0.064 (0.163)		0.095 (0.155)		0.191 (0.231)		0.227 (-0.208)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.177*** (0.037)	-0.176*** (0.037)	-0.175*** (0.037)	-0.175*** (0.036)	-0.174*** (0.035)	-0.175*** (0.036)	-0.178*** (0.036)	-0.218*** (0.055)	-0.177*** (0.036)	-0.217*** (0.055)	-0.175*** (0.045)	-0.218*** (0.055)	-0.175*** (-0.035)	-0.216*** (-0.054)
Control variables														
Inflation	4.465*** (1.434)	4.497*** (1.442)	4.420*** (1.416)	4.486*** (1.427)	4.498*** (1.437)	4.441*** (1.407)	4.550** (1.798)	1.331 (0.984)	4.535** (1.786)	1.336 (0.987)	4.538** (1.800)	1.901* (1.119)	4.531** (1.774)	1.424 (0.967)
GDP growth	-0.409 (1.534)	-0.428 (1.562)	-0.437 (1.517)	-0.613 (1.566)	-0.599 (1.587)	-0.595 (1.553)	-0.633 (1.693)	-0.785 (1.378)	-0.672 (1.693)	-0.819 (1.386)	-0.793 (1.692)	-1.858 (1.934)	-0.783 (1.706)	-1.000 (1.392)
Trade to GDP	0.039 (0.075)			0.038 (0.076)			0.036 (0.105)	0.103 (0.106)	0.035 (0.105)	0.102 (0.106)	0.033 (0.107)	0.097 (0.118)	0.033 (-0.107)	0.100 (0.106)
export to GDP		0.059 (0.142)					0.052 (0.145)							
import to GDP			0.107 (0.164)				0.103 (0.16)							
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	3513	4275	3513	4275	3513	4275	3513

Table A5: Term premium co-movement through the trade network in developing countries

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the sample from 2010 to 2019 for the 13 developing countries, according to equation 3.1. The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premium for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest is presented in the first column for each regression model specification. For example, RM_centrality (j,t) denotes the Richmond centrality weighted average change in term premia in month t among all countries, where Richmond centrality is calculated based on the prior year's bilateral total trade network. EX_centrality (j,t) and IM_centrality (j,t) are the pagerank centrality of the export and import network weighted average of all trading partners term premia at month t . Trade Value, Export Value, and Import Value are the total trade, export, and import values weighted average of all trading partner countries term premia. CDIS and CPIS values are the long term equity investment (FDI) and the portfolio investment including both debt and speculative equity investment, respectively. In all specifications, country i 's own change in term premium in month t and country fixed effects and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, and 1% levels, respectively.

$\Delta TP_{i,t}$, change in term premium (t) for country i								
RM_centrality (j,t)	0.370 (0.262)							
EX_centrality (j,t)		0.351* (0.213)						
IM_centrality (j,t)			0.301* (0.164)					
Trade Value (j,t)				0.336* (0.173)				
Export Value (j,t)					0.348** (0.158)			
Import Value (j,t)						0.311* (0.164)		
CDIS Value (j,t)							0.164* (0.088)	
CPIS Value (j,t)								0.156 (0.097)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.169*** (0.047)	-0.171*** (0.049)	-0.170*** (0.048)	-0.169*** (0.049)	-0.170*** (0.051)	-0.169*** (0.049)	-0.175*** (0.053)	-0.284*** (0.048)
Control variables								
Inflation	3.278*** (0.900)	3.213*** (0.908)	3.329*** (0.923)	3.303*** (0.907)	3.219*** (0.857)	3.357*** (0.929)	3.824*** (1.175)	-0.235 (1.179)
GDP growth	0.324 (0.755)	0.365 (0.759)	0.430 (0.784)	0.327 (0.749)	0.308 (0.750)	0.355 (0.782)	0.764 (1.108)	-2.194 (2.431)
Trade to GDP	-0.083 (0.069)			-0.081 (0.067)			0.001 (0.124)	0.245 (0.160)
export to GDP		-0.12 (0.133)			-0.135 (0.120)			
import to GDP			-0.16 (0.189)			-0.180 (0.178)		
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
N	1520	1520	1520	1520	1520	1520	1510	758

Table A6: Expected short rate co-movement through the trade network

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the sample from 2010 to 2019 for the 37 countries, according to equation 3.1. The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premium for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest is presented in the first column for each regression model specification. For example, RM_centrality (j,t) denotes the Richmond centrality weighted average change in term premia in month t among all countries, where Richmond centrality is calculated based on the prior year's bilateral total trade network. EX_centrality (j,t) and IM_centrality (j,t) are the pagerank centrality of the export and import network weighted average of all trading partners term premia at month t . Trade Value, Export Value, and Import Value are the total trade, export, and import values weighted average of all trading partner countries term premia. CDIS and CPIS values are the long term equity investment (FDI) and the portfolio investment including both debt and speculative equity investment, respectively. In all specifications, country i 's own change in term premium in month t and country fixed effects and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, and 1% levels, respectively.

	$\Delta TP_{i,t}$, change in term premium (t) for country i							
RM_centrality (j,t)	0.669*** (0.117)							
EX_centrality (j,t)		0.646*** (0.122)						
IM_centrality (j,t)			0.636*** (0.117)					
Trade Value (j,t)				0.659*** (0.158)				
Export Value (j,t)					0.600*** (0.149)			
Import Value (j,t)						0.658*** (0.159)		
CDIS Value (j,t)							0.332*** (0.113)	
CPIS Value (j,t)								0.764*** (0.283)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.134** (0.065)	-0.134** (0.066)	-0.134** (0.066)	-0.137** (0.066)	-0.135** (0.066)	-0.137** (0.067)	-0.142*** (0.064)	-0.225*** (0.048)
Control variables								
Inflation	-3.688*** (1.121)	-3.711*** (1.134)	-3.692*** (1.112)	-3.744*** (1.134)	-3.748*** (1.110)	-3.758*** (1.136)	-4.240*** (1.130)	-3.598** (1.589)
GDP growth	2.174 (1.559)	2.170 (1.576)	2.180 (1.523)	2.104 (1.530)	2.207 (1.553)	2.061 (1.502)	2.588 (1.658)	4.113* (2.375)
Trade to GDP	0.036 (0.144)			0.033 (0.143)			-0.025 (0.228)	0.062 (0.070)
export to GDP		0.092 (0.292)			0.095 (0.284)			
import to GDP			0.034 (0.288)			0.034 (0.282)		
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	3513

Table A7: Expected short rate transmission through the trade network

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the sample from 2010 to 2019 for the 37 countries, according to equation 3.2. The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premium for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest is presented in the first column for each regression model specification. For example, $RM_centrality(j,t-1)$ denotes the Richmond centrality weighted average change in term premia in month t among all countries, where Richmond centrality is calculated based on the prior year's bilateral total trade network. $EX_centrality(j,t-1)$ and $IM_centrality(j,t-1)$ are the pagerank centrality of the export and import network weighted average of all trading partners term premia at month t . Trade Value, Export Value, and Import Value are the total trade, export, and import values weighted average of all trading partner countries term premia. CDIS and CPIS values are the long term equity investment (FDI) and the portfolio investment including both debt and speculative equity investment, respectively. In all specifications, country i 's own change in term premium in month $t-1$ and country fixed effects and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, and 1% levels, respectively.

$\Delta TP_{i,t}$, change in term premium (t) for country i								
RM_centrality ($j,t-1$)	-0.172 (0.106)							
EX_centrality ($j,t-1$)		-0.166 (0.104)						
IM_centrality ($j,t-1$)			-0.169 (0.107)					
Trade Value ($j,t-1$)				-0.123 (0.110)				
Export Value ($j,t-1$)					-0.103 (0.103)			
Import Value ($j,t-1$)						-0.111 (0.106)		
CDIS Value ($j,t-1$)							0.053 (0.102)	
CPIS Value ($j,t-1$)								-0.090 (0.124)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.131** (0.065)	-0.131** (0.065)	-0.131** (0.065)	-0.130** (0.064)	-0.130** (0.064)	-0.130** (0.064)	-0.136*** (0.065)	-0.216*** (0.049)
Control variables								
Inflation	-3.724*** (1.226)	-3.661*** (1.235)	-3.750*** (1.211)	-3.697*** (1.230)	-3.652*** (1.254)	-3.732*** (1.211)	-4.201*** (1.139)	-2.526** (1.155)
GDP growth	1.910 (1.694)	1.934 (1.730)	1.907 (1.651)	1.918 (1.692)	1.935 (1.721)	1.918 (1.649)	20494.000 (1.785)	4.151* (2.484)
Trade to GDP	0.011 (0.226)			0.011 (0.228)			0.020 (0.234)	0.143 (0.128)
export to GDP		0.07 (0.432)			0.067 (0.438)			
import to GDP			-0.038 (0.457)			-0.038 (0.461)		
Country FE	Yes							
Year FE	Yes							
N	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	4275	3513

Table A8: Term premium spillover/transmission with equal weights and naive average for 2010-2019

This table reports the dynamic panel regression results based on the system GMM method proposed in Blundell and Bond (1998) for the more recent sample period from 2010 to 2019, according to equation 3.1 (Panel A) and 3.2 (Panel B). The dependent variable, $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premium for country i in month t . The main independent variable of interest is presented in the first column for each regression model specification. For example, Trade_equal ($j, t - 1$) denotes Equal weighted average change in term premia in month $t - 1$ among all trade partner countries. Naive ($j, t - 1$) is the simple average change in term premia in month $t - 1$ among all sample countries except the country under investigation. In all specifications, country i 's own change in term premium in month $t - 1$ and country fixed effects and year fixed effects are always included. Other macroeconomic control variables include: lagged one-year trade-to-GDP ratio, lagged one-year inflation, and lagged one-year GDP growth rate. The standard errors are clustered in country and reported in brackets. *, **, and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, and 1% levels, respectively.

Panel A: contemporaneous $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premium for country i in month t			
RM_centrality (j, t)	0.846*** (0.151)		
Trade_equal (j, t)		0.651*** (0.107)	
Naive (j, t)			0.667*** (0.110)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.165*** (0.035)	-0.169*** (0.033)	-0.169** (0.033)
Control variables			
Inflation	3.766*** (1.424)	3.962*** (1.386)	3.984*** (1.387)
GDP growth	-0.371 (1.569)	-0.995 (1.151)	-1.013 (1.157)
Trade to GDP	-0.030 (0.076)	-0.063 (0.062)	-0.062 (0.063)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	4275	4275	4275
Panel B: predictive $\Delta TP_{i,t}$, is the change in term premium for country i in month t			
RM_centrality ($j, t - 1$)	0.397*** (0.155)		
Trade_equal ($j, t - 1$)		0.245 (0.157)	
Naive ($j, t - 1$)			0.245 (0.164)
$\Delta TP_{i,t-1}$	-0.177*** (0.037)	-0.170*** (0.037)	-0.170*** (0.037)
Control variables			
Inflation	4.465*** (1.434)	4.435*** (1.373)	4.432*** (1.372)
GDP growth	-0.409 (1.534)	-1.342 (1.166)	-1.347 (1.163)
Trade to GDP	0.039 (0.075)	-0.051 (0.062)	-0.051 (0.062)
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	4275	4275	4275