Does Chinese traded good prices matter to South America?[1]

Fernando Salgueiro Perobelli[2]; Vinicius de Almeida Vale[3]; Guilherme Perobelli Salgueiro[4]

Área de Submissão: Teoria, métodos e modelos de economia regional.

Abstract

The imports from China by South American countries have increased significantly in the last decade. The analysis of the economic effects of trade between China and South America could be made by direct and indirect channels. It is important to highlight that these channels vary in relative importance among South American countries. Thus, it is relevant to consider the degree of heterogeneity of the region and recognize the different impacts upon each country. In this context, this paper aims to explore the channels of interactions between China and South American countries. We explore the changes in China's traded goods prices through a global computable general equilibrium (GCGE) that considers ten South American countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela), China, and the Rest of the World. The paper contributes to the debate by implementing a systemic analysis considering the impacts of the Chinese expansion on the productive structure and export specialization, dealing with the complementarity between the exports of primary products – especially concentrated in iron ore, copper, and soybeans - and diversified import of industrial goods. We observe that there is an unbalanced relationship between China and South America and that China can compete with South American countries in a third country situation, possibly in the European Union and the United States.

Keywords: South America; China; Applied General Equilibrium Analysis.

Resumo

As importações da China com destino aos países sul-americanos, aumentaram significativamente na última década. A análise dos efeitos econômicos do comércio entre a China e a América do Sul pode ser feita por canais diretos e indiretos. É importante destacar que esses canais variam em importância relativa entre os países sul-americanos. Assim, é relevante considerar o grau de heterogeneidade da região e reconhecer os diferentes impactos sobre cada país. Nesse contexto, este artigo tem como objetivo explorar os canais de interação entre a China e os países sul-americanos. Exploramos as mudanças nos preços dos bens comercializados na China por meio de um modelo de equilíbrio geral computável global (EGCG) que considera dez países da América do Sul (Argentina, Bolívia, Brasil, Chile, Colômbia, Equador, Paraguai, Peru, Uruguai e Venezuela), China e o resto do mundo. O trabalho contribui para o debate ao implementar uma análise sistêmica considerando os impactos da expansão chinesa na estrutura produtiva e na especialização exportadora, tratando da complementaridade entre as exportações de produtos primários – especialmente concentrados em minério de ferro,

[1] Os autores agradecem o financiamento da CAPES, CNPq e FAPEMIG para realização desse trabalho.

[2] Professor Titular. Departamento de Economia, Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora. Pesquisador CNPq e FAPEMIG, LATES e NEREUS/USP.

[3] Professor Adjunto. Departamento de Economia, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Pesquisador do NEDUR/UFPR.

[4] Mestrando em Economia do Programa de Pós-graduação em Economia – UFJF e Pesquisador do LATES.

cobre e soja – e a diversidade na importação de bens industriais. Observamos que existe uma relação desequilibrada entre a China e a América do Sul e que a China pode competir com países sul-americanos em situação de terceiro país, possivelmente na União Europeia e nos Estados Unidos.

Keywords: América do Sul; China; Equilíbrio Geral Computável.

JEL Code: F14; F17; C68; D58.

1. Introduction

The imports from China by South American countries increased significantly in the last decade. Observing the GTAP bilateral time series trade data, the share of imports from China by South America was 1.92% in 1995 and 17.10% in 2014. The import share in 2014 was equivalent to 21.84% in Chile, 20.58% in Paraguay, 19.03% in Peru, 18.38% in Uruguay, 16.87% in Colombia, and 16.37% in Brazil. Consequently, the import penetration has increased the competition and it has also led to a substitution effect in favor of Chinese goods.

The economic effects of trade between China and South America can be analyzed from direct and indirect channels. The direct ones consist mainly of the impact of trade flows (export and imports) between the two regions. In respect to the indirect effects, we can highlight the competition in third markets, the growing interconnectedness between China and Latin America's trading partners, such as the United States and the European Union. China also plays a central role in the global price fluctuations, especially in commodities prices (Timini and Sanchez-Albornoz, 2018). It is important to highlight that these channels vary in relative importance among South American countries. Thus, it is relevant to consider the degree of heterogeneity of the region and recognize the different impacts upon individual South American countries

Although the direct effects are significant, the main concern in South America is related to the indirect effects. The Chinese goods compete with some export goods from South America, particularly those to developed countries. There is also a concern about the diversion of investment from South America to China. Further, the effects in the world commodities prices are also common, which has a positive effect on those countries which are the major exporters of commodities.

Thus, the direct effect of Chinese traded good price changes is the increasing opportunities for exports to China. This has effects upon the prices and export volumes. The second effect is related to the substitution of Chinese exports for its trading partners' products, both in their own and third-country markets. The increase in the export volumes is linked to the similarity of export commodities between China and its developing country partners, the more similar they are, the stronger is the substitution effect. The impact on terms of trade between primary commodities and labor-intensive manufactured goods related to the role of China in international trade is another important issue to be considered (Jenkins et al., 2008). On one hand, the increase in Chinese demand for agricultural and mineral products has impacted the prices for primary commodities. On

the other hand, the massive growth of Chinese production of labor-intensive goods has led to a decrease in the prices of such goods. Thus, the growth of China has impacted the South American countries even in the absence of bilateral links of competition in third markets. Furthermore, in relative terms, the Chinese economy is more important for South America than the opposite.

The Chinese expansion generated two distinct effects on countries, a "demand effect" or macroeconomic effect that is exerted through its impact on exports, trade balance, and investments and a "structure effect" or sectoral effect through its unequal impact on sectors or activities according to the degree of complementarity and rivalry. Depending on the characteristics of the countries, the endowment of natural resources, their size, the technological stage, and domestic economic policies, the combination of both effects generates different results on economic growth. Thus, the growth of China has presented positive and negative effects to some countries, sectors, and groups. The literature has shown the producers and exporters of raw material, particularly Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Venezuela, and some sectors, such as agriculture, agroindustry, and industrial inputs, as winners in terms of trade with China. However, this also poses a challenge to policymakers due to the increased competitive strength of China.

Although competition exists, there is also a complementarity between the South American countries and China in terms of their productive structure (Jenkins et al. 2008). Moreover, as suggested by Jenkins et al. (2008), this tendency tends to increase over time. Thus, the South American countries can take advantage of the expansion of China's market and of the increase of global production networks.

The literature deals with the role played by China in the international market and the consequences for a different group of countries. Ianchovichina and Martin (2003) and Yang (2006) analyze the implications of the entrance of China at WTO for other developing countries in a long-run context of opening and growth. Dimaranan et al. (2007) based on a scenario of the rapid growth of exports, the changes in the relative importance of goods and services, and changes in the composition of exports from China and India, developed global-economy wide modeling to measure all the potential impacts upon China and India and other developing countries. Lall et al. (2005), Blázquez-Lidoy et al. (2006), and Jenkins (2012) analyze the impacts of China on Latin American trade and foreign direct investment flows. Jenkins et al. (2008) identify the main channels through which the growth of China could impact Latin America. Afonso et al. (2018) also analyze China and Latin American countries to capture whether the trade agreements among these regions are complementary or if they strengthen the dependence. Import competition [Autor et al. (2013), Mendez (2015), Paz (2018), Arias et al. (2018), Majlesi and Narciso (2018), Baldárrago and Salinas (2017), Pierola and Sanchez-Navarro (2019), Mercado et al. (2019), Sotiriou and Rodriguez-Pose (2021), and Artuc et al. (2015)], the role of Chinese exports and imports for Latin America [Vianna (2016), and Busse et al. (2016)], commodity price effect [Farooki and Kaplinski (2013), Nowak-Lehmann et al. (2007), and Jenkins (2011)] are other themes that compose the literature.

In this context, this paper aims to explore the channels of interactions between China and South American countries. We explore the changes in the prices of China's traded goods

through a global computable general equilibrium (GTAP) which considers ten South American countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela), China, and the Rest of the World. This price shock is justifiable due to the size of China and its influence on world prices. China has the second-largest GDP in the world and a high share in international trade, which gives the country an important price-forming status in the international market.

The paper contributes to the debate by implementing a systemic analysis considering the impacts of the Chinese expansion on the productive structure and export specialization, dealing with the complementarity between the exports of primary products – especially concentrated in iron ore, copper, and soybeans – and diversified import of industrial goods.

The applied general equilibrium analysis allows us to measure the impact in terms of welfare due to different policy scenarios. From academic perspective, equivalent and compensating variation analysis could be the focus of the analysis. On the other hand, on the policy perspective, the focus is on the identification of the winners and losers from a policy change, such as full or partial agreement among countries, unilateral policy of export price changes. In other words, it is necessary to recognize who is affected by policy changes to determine, for example, compensation schemes.

Furthermore, due to the numerical structure behind the CGE models, which includes the inter-sectoral interdependence within each economy, the analyses allow us to project the impacts on national output, employment, income, and other macroeconomics indicators. Thus, departing from our exercise/hypothesis of Chinese traded goods price changes, it is possible to tracing out the impact upon the structure of production, trade, and employment.

In what follows, Section 2 presents an overview of the trade pattern between South American countries and China. Section 3 describes the methodology and database. Section 4 presents the main results. Finally, Section 5 brings the final remarks.

2. Trade Analysis

To have an overview of the trade pattern between South American countries and China, this section presents an exploratory analysis of the recent trade data among them. Furthermore, some trade indexes are calculated to identify possible trade opportunities among these countries.

Table 1 and Table 2 present the bilateral trade shares among China, South American countries, and the Rest of the World (ROW) based on the GTAP database (Aguiar et al., 2019). On one hand, the export share shows how China is an important destination for exports from South America. In 2014, 5.79% of Chilean exports, 23.92 of Uruguayan exports, 21.18% of Brazilian exports, 18.40% of Peruvian exports, 16.17% of Venezuelan exports, and 12.80% of Colombian exports were sent to China. On the other hand, the export share shows that South America is relatively less important to China than the

opposite. In the same year, 2014, only 4.24% of Chinese exports were sent to South America, with the highest share sent to Brazil, 1.67%.

Table 1 – Export shares, 2014 (%)

Regions		Destination											
		CHN	**ARG**	**BOL**	**BRA**	**CHL**	**COL**	**ECU**	**PRY**	**PER**	**URY**	**VEN**	**ROW**
Origin	**CHN**	0.00	0.41	0.06	1.67	0.65	0.46	0.17	0.10	0.34	0.10	0.26	95.76
	ARG	6.94	0.00	1.16	20.80	4.11	1.37	0.60	1.82	1.71	2.19	2.93	56.36
	BOL	2.65	21.01	0.00	31.78	1.28	4.59	0.94	0.56	5.12	0.07	1.07	30.94
	BRA	21.18	6.17	0.70	0.00	2.45	1.08	0.37	1.42	0.83	0.85	2.02	62.93
	CHL	25.79	1.13	1.31	5.59	0.00	1.21	0.69	0.22	1.94	0.21	0.66	61.27
	COL	12.80	0.38	0.24	2.86	1.65	0.00	3.08	0.03	1.99	0.04	3.20	73.74
	ECU	2.01	0.99	0.10	0.53	8.67	3.52	0.00	0.02	5.97	0.08	2.14	75.97
	PRY	0.79	1.98	1.36	17.16	9.73	0.62	0.64	0.00	1.99	1.91	0.48	63.34
	PER	18.40	0.28	1.65	4.27	3.93	3.03	2.34	0.03	0.00	0.09	1.28	64.70
	URY	23.92	4.41	0.47	20.92	1.41	0.42	0.34	1.31	1.49	0.00	4.47	40.86
	VEN	16.17	0.01	0.01	1.62	0.11	0.63	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.62	0.00	80.74
	ROW	11.14	0.23	0.02	1.10	0.26	0.30	0.11	0.03	0.17	0.04	0.16	86.45

Source: GTAP database (Aguiar et al., 2019).

This relative importance of China to South America is also observed by the import side. Table 2 shows that China, in 2014, imported only 6.10% from South American countries while all the South American countries imported more than 10% from China – Chile, 21.84%; Paraguay, 20.58%; Peru, 19.03%; Uruguay, 18.38%; Colombia, 16.87%; Brazil, 16.37%; Ecuador, 15.73%; Bolivia, 15.19%; Argentina, 14.77%; and Venezuela, 14.89%. This relative importance is more evident when we compare these results with those from Mercosur countries. In 2014, Brazil, for example, has imported 6.45% from Argentina, 0.57% from Paraguay, and 0.87% from Uruguay. Only the share of Argentine imports from Brazil (23.51%) and Paraguayan imports from Brazil (29.60%) were greater than those observed between these countries and China.

Table 2 – Import shares, 2014 (%)

Regions		Destination											
		CHN	**ARG**	**BOL**	**BRA**	**CHL**	**COL**	**ECU**	**PRY**	**PER**	**URY**	**VEN**	**ROW**
Origin	**CHN**	0.00	14.77	15.19	16.37	21.84	16.87	15.73	20.58	19.03	18.38	14.89	14.18
	ARG	0.28	0.00	9.21	6.45	4.34	1.58	1.75	11.27	2.99	12.38	5.23	0.26
	BOL	0.02	4.23	0.00	1.76	0.24	0.94	0.48	0.61	1.60	0.07	0.34	0.03
	BRA	2.93	23.51	18.78	0.00	8.71	4.20	3.61	29.60	4.91	16.19	12.19	0.99
	CHL	1.13	1.36	11.07	1.84	0.00	1.49	2.12	1.45	3.61	1.28	1.25	0.31
	COL	0.46	0.37	1.63	0.77	1.51	0.00	7.74	0.16	3.03	0.18	4.96	0.30
	ECU	0.03	0.43	0.32	0.06	3.55	1.57	0.00	0.05	4.05	0.17	1.48	0.14
	PRY	0.00	0.24	1.15	0.57	1.10	0.08	0.20	0.00	0.37	1.16	0.09	0.03
	PER	0.44	0.18	7.55	0.76	2.39	2.01	3.91	0.10	0.00	0.28	1.32	0.17
	URY	0.13	0.67	0.50	0.87	0.20	0.06	0.13	1.09	0.35	0.00	1.07	0.03
	VEN	0.69	0.02	0.07	0.52	0.12	0.75	0.15	0.01	0.07	3.66	0.00	0.39
	ROW	93.90	54.22	34.54	70.03	56.01	70.46	64.19	35.08	60.01	46.24	57.18	83.17

Source: GTAP database (Aguiar et al., 2019).

Another import feature about China and South American countries is related to the trade pattern among them in terms of commodities. Table 3 and Table 4 show the export shares to China and import shares from China by commodities, respectively. The South American countries mainly export to China Other crops (crops), Mining and energy (minergy), and Metal products (metal). In 2014, about 64.92% of Argentina's exports to China were Other crops (crops); 35.06% and 48.81% of Brazil's exports to China were Other crops (crops) and Mining and energy (minergy), respectively; 93.79% of Colombia's exports to China were Mining and energy (minergy); 62.88% of Uruguay's to China were Other crops (crops).

Table 3 – Export shares to China by commodities, 2014 (%)

Com.	ARG	BOL	BRA	CHL	COL	ECU	PRY	PER	URY	VEN	ROW
grains	0.43	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.30
crops	64.92	0.06	35.06	5.66	0.09	25.22	9.04	3.23	62.88	0.00	2.08
animalprd	1.26	1.51	0.02	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.02	0.67	11.14	0.00	0.55
frsfsh	1.16	0.00	0.03	0.20	0.14	0.45	0.05	0.39	0.47	0.00	0.70
minergy	3.24	56.20	48.81	32.36	93.79	27.02	0.00	67.31	0.43	75.58	22.01
meatprd	3.24	0.00	1.08	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.38	0.00	0.33
otrfood	10.38	0.00	1.14	1.65	0.05	31.82	0.00	12.60	1.89	0.00	1.42
dairy	2.39	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.56	0.00	0.40
sugar	0.00	0.00	1.78	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05
bt	2.57	0.00	0.69	0.90	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.37
textiles	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.00	1.47
waplea	5.93	1.45	2.18	0.11	0.55	0.43	37.16	0.10	1.17	0.07	0.88
woodpaper	0.63	5.41	3.90	7.65	0.06	6.02	5.09	0.63	0.60	0.00	1.85
chemicals	3.38	1.46	0.97	1.34	0.36	1.44	1.10	0.80	0.07	23.46	14.38
ferrous	0.10	0.05	1.18	0.03	2.44	0.01	1.28	0.08	0.00	0.23	2.12
metal	0.01	33.82	1.79	49.13	2.31	6.63	45.08	14.08	0.23	0.66	5.67
mqequip	0.23	0.00	0.78	0.06	0.08	0.35	1.01	0.02	0.06	0.00	35.97
motor	0.07	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.49
mnfc	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.00	0.02	0.59	0.12	0.00	0.09	0.00	1.96
services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Source: GTAP database (Aguiar et al., 2019).

China, on the other hand, mainly exports Machinery and equipment (mqequip); Chemicals, rubber, and plastic (chemicals); Motor vehicles and parts (motor); Textiles (textiles); and Wearing apparels (waplea) to South America. In 2014, Brazilian and Argentine imports from China were concentrated in Machinery and equipment (mqeqip), 45.84% and 46.66%, and in Chemicals, rubber, and plastic (chemicals), 16.02% and 20.11%, respectively. The same pattern is observed in most of the South American countries, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4 – Import shares from China by commodities, 2014 (%)

Com.	ARG	BOL	BRA	CHL	COL	ECU	PRY	PER	URY	VEN	ROW
grains	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
crops	0.03	0.03	0.34	0.08	0.28	0.29	0.10	0.04	0.04	0.81	0.63
animalprd	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.26
frsfsh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.09
minergy	0.66	0.05	0.09	0.02	0.11	0.16	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.07	0.31
meatprd	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19
otrfood	0.41	0.62	1.23	1.17	0.64	0.39	0.20	0.68	0.69	0.16	1.65
dairy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
sugar	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.01	0.13	0.01	0.01	0.03
bt	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.14	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.12
textiles	4.25	5.66	6.50	5.64	6.54	3.99	3.98	6.44	2.96	2.66	4.55
waplea	4.48	6.26	7.04	23.28	6.12	4.98	4.96	8.18	12.38	5.52	12.78
woodpaper	1.06	1.68	1.05	1.33	1.53	1.73	0.69	1.59	0.83	1.04	1.96
chemicals	20.11	14.56	16.02	10.86	12.60	12.66	17.67	12.77	16.68	7.77	10.11
ferrous	2.20	12.03	6.71	8.47	9.17	15.62	3.06	12.70	2.41	9.95	5.54
metal	5.16	6.79	5.02	5.89	5.10	6.67	2.57	5.55	3.37	7.98	5.97
mqequip	46.66	31.19	45.84	33.10	44.99	38.52	55.16	38.59	44.75	44.56	45.46
motor	11.36	16.83	6.38	5.36	7.08	10.54	8.10	8.85	11.57	15.86	4.12
mnfc	3.58	4.24	3.53	4.70	5.60	4.39	3.47	4.41	4.25	3.59	6.21
services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Source: GTAP database (Aguiar et al., 2019).

Given the trade pattern between China and South American countries, it is relevant to evaluate the comparative advantage of each region and the complementarity among them. Based on Balassa's (1965) Revealed Comparative Advantage (RCA) index, a trade complementarity index[5] has been calculated. Basically, the index identifies those products that an exporter country has revealed to have comparative advantage and the importer has revealed to have comparative disadvantage.

Table 5 shows the trade complementarity index among South American countries and China. The indexes greater than the country average is highlighted in grey. On one hand, it is possible to observe a trade complementarity among South American countries. In general, the trade complementary indexes are higher than the average for the South American countries. On the other hand, the results do not show a trade complementarity among China and South America. Considering the South American countries as importers, only Uruguay presents an index with China above the average. China, otherwise, presents an index above the average with Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, and Uruguay.

[5] The trade complementarity index is calculated as follows:

$$TC_{ij} = \left[1 - \left(\sum\nolimits_k \left|\frac{M_j^k}{M_j} - \frac{X_i^k}{X_i}\right| \div 2\right)\right] \times 100$$

where M_j^k is the import of product *k* by country *j*; M_j is the total import of country *j*; X_i^k is the exports of product *k* by country *i*; and X_i is the total exports of country *i*. The index is expressed in percentage terms, where higher values indicate greater complementarity between the exports of country *i* and the imports of country *j*.

Table 5 – Trade complementary index, 2014

Regions		Importer										
		CHN	**ARG**	**BOL**	**BRA**	**CHL**	**COL**	**ECU**	**PRY**	**PER**	**URY**	**VEN**
Exporter	**CHN**	-	27.03	10.91	33.63	19.04	25.85	13.59	16.62	21.84	27.90	11.33
	ARG	26.75	-	29.87	54.84	33.57	35.33	27.35	43.69	35.92	46.36	17.19
	BOL	10.86	30.10	-	31.76	34.04	20.12	18.36	20.06	41.67	14.39	12.91
	BRA	33.17	55.35	31.14	-	42.85	38.56	27.25	36.01	43.13	45.31	21.01
	CHL	18.66	32.86	34.03	42.46	-	25.93	31.51	13.40	75.81	24.75	12.27
	COL	25.71	35.98	20.27	39.79	26.44	-	63.77	14.86	35.45	26.77	54.38
	ECU	13.24	25.44	17.52	26.42	30.59	62.42	-	11.25	31.78	18.78	54.94
	PRY	16.32	43.50	19.51	34.28	13.40	14.57	11.04	-	15.01	49.37	6.48
	PER	21.71	35.89	41.81	43.27	75.30	35.37	34.37	15.37	-	26.25	16.78
	URY	27.67	46.78	14.45	44.03	25.46	26.71	19.21	50.22	26.83	-	10.42
	VEN	11.37	17.46	12.87	21.66	12.39	54.91	57.82	6.70	16.67	10.59	-
	ROW	52.88	54.92	23.99	56.80	29.02	47.10	28.73	22.10	37.76	40.63	23.83
Average		**21.53**	**33.77**	**21.36**	**35.75**	**28.51**	**32.24**	**27.75**	**20.86**	**31.82**	**27.59**	**20.13**

Source: Own calculations. Note: Gray indicates values greater than the country average.

To capture the complementarity by products, Table 6 presents the number of products by main activities (Agriculture, Mining, Industry, Trade, and Services) with IC[6]> 1 for each pair of countries. We observe that Uruguay, Argentina, and Brazil present the highest number of cases with IC > 1, 171, 151, and 138 cases, respectively.

For Agriculture, Argentina presents the highest number of products with IC > 1, with 55 cases, followed by Uruguay, with 51 cases, and Brazil, with 47 cases. For Industry, the first place is also occupied by Argentina, with 59 cases, followed by Brazil, with 58 cases, and Uruguay, with 55 cases. For services, Uruguay presents the highest number of cases, 62 cases, followed by Peru, with 39 cases.

[6] The IC by products is calculated as follows:

$$IC_{ij}^{k} = RCA_{i}^{k} \times RCD_{j}^{k}$$

where RCA_i^k is the Revealed Comparative Advantage Index and RCD_j^k is the Revealed Comparative Disadvantage Index. An index greater than 1 indicates complementarity in the trade of this good between country *i* and country *j*. Higher index indicate greater complementarity.

The RCA index is defined as the ratio of two shares. The numerator is the share of a country's total exports of the commodity of interest in its total exports. The denominator is share of world exports of the same commodity in total world exports.

The RCD index is also defined as the ratio of two shares. The numerator is the share of a country's total imports of the commodity of interest in its total imports. The denominator is share of world imports of the same commodity in total world imports.

Table 6 - Distribution of products with IC > 1 for each pair of countries

Exporter	Sector	Importer											Total
		CHN	ARG	BOL	BRA	CHL	COL	ECU	PRY	PER	URY	VEN	
	Agriculture	-	5	2	4	3	2	3	2	4	4	-	29
	Mining	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
China	Industry	-	4	3	8	4	4	2	6	5	6	1	43
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	4
	Agriculture	5	-	4	9	6	4	5	6	7	8	1	55
	Mining	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	7
Argentina	Industry	3	-	4	11	9	6	2	9	5	9	1	59
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	Services	-	-	2	2	2	4	2	2	7	8	1	30
	Agriculture	-	2	-	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	26
	Mining	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	2	-	2	-	9
Bolivia	Industry	-	3	-	4	6	3	3	4	4	2	6	35
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	Services	-	-	-	2	1	1	2	2	1	4	8	21
	Agriculture	-	4	9	-	4	4	4	5	6	5	6	47
	Mining	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	2	-	1	-	8
Brazil	Industry	-	8	11	-	6	9	7	4	7	6	1	59
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	Services	-	-	2	-	1	2	2	1	3	5	9	25
	Agriculture	-	3	5	2	-	4	2	3	3	5	7	34
	Mining	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	8
Chile	Industry	-	4	9	3	-	9	4	4	8	4	9	54
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	Services	-	-	2	1	-	1	3	2	1	5	6	21
	Agriculture	-	2	4	2	3	-	2	3	4	2	4	26
	Mining	-	-	1	2	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	6
Colombia	Industry	-	4	6	3	7	-	3	2	3	5	5	38
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	Services	-	-	3	2	2	-	3	2	2	6	8	28
	Agriculture	-	3	5	2	5	3	-	3	5	4	5	35
	Mining	-	-	1	2	2	1	-	1	-	1	-	8
Ecuador	Industry	-	2	2	4	4	4	-	2	5	4	6	33
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	Services	-	-	2	2	1	2	-	2	2	3	6	20
	Agriculture	-	2	6	2	6	4	4	-	5	6	6	41
	Mining	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Paraguay	Industry	-	6	8	5	7	8	3	-	5	4	7	53
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Services	-	1	2	2	3	1	2	-	2	4	7	24
	Agriculture	-	4	7	4	5	5	2	4	-	5	8	44
	Mining	-	1	1	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	8
Peru	Industry	-	5	5	2	7	4	5	4	-	4	7	43
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	Services	-	-	7	4	4	5	6	3	-	3	7	39
	Agriculture	-	4	8	4	6	7	4	5	6	-	7	51
	Mining	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2
Uruguay	Industry	-	6	9	6	1-	9	5	6	7	-	7	55
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
	Services	-	3	8	8	9	6	8	6	7	-	7	62
	Agriculture	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	6
	Mining	-	-	1	2	2	1	2	1	-	2	-	11
Venezuela	Industry	-	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	-	2	-	11
	Trade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
	Services	-	-	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	-	10

Source: Own calculations. Note: The sectoral coverage is available on the annex.

Considering each bilateral trade, it is possible to observe the highest number of cases with IC > 1 in the trade between China and Uruguay, with 12 cases, and between China and Brazil, with 11 cases. For Argentina, the trade with Uruguay and Brazil are those with the highest number of cases, 25 and 23, respectively. Venezuela, Uruguay, and Chile present a higher number of cases in the trade with Bolivia. In the case of Brazil, we can also highlight the number of cases with Bolivia and Uruguay, 23 and 17, respectively. Venezuela and Bolivia are the countries with the highest number of cases in trade with Chile. For Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, and Peru, the trade with Venezuela presents the highest number of cases of IC > 1, 17 for Colombia and Ecuador, 21 for Paraguay, and 23 for Peru. The trade between Uruguay and Bolivia is the one with most cases. For Venezuela, the trade with Chile and Colombia is the most important in terms of the number of cases of IC > 1.

3. Methodology and database

To explore the channels of interactions among China and South American countries, this study uses an applied general equilibrium analysis. The following subsections describe the methodology, the empirical strategy, and the database.

3.1. Methodology and empirical strategy

Since the early 1990s, Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) models have been used to investigate the effects of trade policy (e.g., trade liberalization, regional agreements, and impact of reforms implemented by the WTO) on industries, production factors, and welfare (Burfisher, 2011). In this context, the Global Trade Analysis Project (GTAP) was established in 1992 (Hertel, 1997). Besides a global network of researchers, the GTAP includes a global database and models to conduct applied general equilibrium analysis of global economic issues.

In this paper, we use a global CGE model derived from the GTAP Data Base. The standard modeling framework, the GTAP model structure, and the database are well described in Hertel (1997), Walmsley et al. (2012), and Burfisher (2011).[7] In the GTAP model, producers maximize their efficiency according to the cost of inputs, sales prices, and technological constraints, and consumers maximize their utility according to their budgets and prices. Furthermore, production assumes constant returns to scale and the markets are perfectly competitive. Finally, global investments are equal to global savings (Burfisher, 2011).

In general, the model can be represented by three core modules: i) database with input-output/social accounting matrices, tax matrices, and other data that provide the numeric structure of the model; ii) system of mathematical equations that provides the functional and theoretical structure of the model by describing an economy as a whole, including the producer and consumer behavior, and equilibrium conditions, and other constraints, identity, and behavioral equations; and iii) macroeconomic closure that determines the endogenous and exogenous variables.

[7] Technical papers are also available at https://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu.

The functioning of the global economy structure modeled in the GTAP can be explained by performing an analysis through an arbitrary region and therefore its interactions with the other regions. These interactions occur through the imposition of conditions of equilibrium between the global players.

To capture the impact of China's business upon South American countries, we consider a decrease of 10% in China's traded goods prices. Our strategy is based on the idea that China currently has significant participation in the international market, the second-largest GDP in the world, and a solid exportation model, which gives the country an important price-forming status in the global foreign market. Based on this assumption, we implement a shock at the market price (*pm*) of all Chinese commodities. Since there is an explicit structure of interrelations between internal and external economic agents, it affects the whole economic system.

To implement this shock, we have changed the traditional GTAP closure. The market prices in China have been fixed to allows us to capture the impact of a decrease in the price of Chinese goods upon the South American countries and the Rest of the World. The new closure consists in a strategy of fixing the import prices of China (pm in trade partner). We implement this closure by swapping the following slack variables in the trade partner country. Thus, the closure includes the following modifications:

```
swap walraslack = pfactwld;
swap incomeslack("China") = y("China");
swap profitslack(PROD_COMM,"China") = qo(PROD_COMM,"China");
swap endwslack(ENDW_COMM,"China") = pm(ENDW_COMM,"China");
swap tradslack(TRAD_COMM,"China") = pm(TRAD_COMM,"China");
swap cgdslack("China") = pm(CGDS_COMM,"China");
```

In other words, since a decrease in the price of Chinese commodities means a decrease in import prices of Chinese products by South American countries and the Rest of the World, it allows us to see how China's business matters to South America.

3.2. Database

The Global Trade Analysis Project Data Base, version 10 (GTAP-10), was used in this study. The full description of this version is available in Aguiar et al. (2019), including the improvements over previous versions. The GTAP-10 considers four reference years (2004, 2007, 2011, and 2014) and it covers 65 sectors, 141 regions, and five factors of production (land, skilled labor, unskilled labor, capital, and natural resources). However, to assess the systemic effects of the trade relationship among South American countries and China, we have used 2014 as the base year (reference year). Furthermore, we have aggregated the database to consider the following spatial dimension: China (CHN), Argentina (ARG), Bolivia (BOL), Brazil (BRA), Chile (CHL), Colombia (COL), Ecuador (ECU), Paraguay (PRY), Peru (PRY), Uruguay (URY), Venezuela (VEN), and the Rest of the World (ROW).

In general, the GTAP database consists of goods and services flows in USD for the entire world economy in some benchmark (reference) years. As described by Walmsley et al. (2012), the database considers matrices related to bilateral trade, transport, and protection, which links the regional economic databases. Thus, the database includes input-output data, such as sales and uses of domestic and imported commodities, of factors of production, and uses of inputs into production, and additional data related to trade margins, trade taxes, commodity taxes, income taxes, savings, capital stock, depreciation, and population for each region

Considering our empirical strategy described in Section 3.1, it is important to highlight some structural data, such as regional endowments, regional capital stock, and savings shares in the reference year (2014). These shares are important to explain the productive specialization, the trade pattern, and the region/country insertion in the global trade market.

4. Results

This section reports the main results related to a decrease in the prices China's traded goods. We presented first the macroeconomic effects, following by the welfare, sectoral, and trade effects.

Table 7 shows the macroeconomic effects, including those in terms of real GDP, export and import volume, terms of trade, trade balance, equivalent variation, and real consumption. It is possible to observe that all regions had increased their real GDP due to a decrease in the prices of the Chinese traded goods. China, as expected, had the greater increase, 6.30%. These findings indicate that the increase of Chinese traded good prices has positive effects for all the regions in terms of real GDP.

However, the trade results show that China may increase its exports while all the other regions experience decreases. The opposite is observed in terms of imports. Thus, the trade balance indicates, on one hand, that Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Venezuela, and the Rest of the World may worsen. On the other hand, China, Brazil, Colombia, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay may improve their trade balance.

Through the equivalent variation (EV) and real consumption expenditure, we can observe welfare gains.[8] Table 7 shows a positive effect on the EV for all countries. China and the Rest of the World are the two regions with the highest positive impacts, followed by Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay. This result suggests a higher capacity of agents located at each country to react to changes in relative market prices. The impact is also positive in real consumption expenditure for all regions.

Thus, considering the macro results and demand effects, we can affirm that Chinese traded good prices matters to South American countries. Through our simulation, we

[8]According to Brown et al. (2005) and Siriwardana (2006; 2007), the EV measures the amount of income that would have to be given or taken away from an economy before trade liberalization to leave the economy as well off as it would be after the policy has been changed.

observed positive impacts in terms of welfare and real consumption for all countries and a heterogeneous impact upon the trade balance.

Table 7 - Macroeconomic effects

Regions	Real GDP (%)	Export Volume (%)	Import Volume (%)	Terms of Trade (%)	Trade Balance (US$ million)	Equivalent Variation (US$ million)	Real Consumption (%)
China	6.3008	2.7767	-0.6070	-0.4842	20757.49	597357.94	6.3432
Argentina	0.0100	-0.4499	0.3391	0.1806	-742.42	441.72	0.0881
Bolivia	0.0098	-0.0439	0.0615	-0.0482	-294.28	33.31	0.1044
Brazil	0.0148	-0.6239	0.5024	0.2047	2606.58	1901.91	0.0868
Chile	0.0075	-0.1969	0.1341	0.0660	-259.54	227.55	0.0986
Colombia	0.0073	-0.3742	0.3292	0.0397	143.83	294.55	0.0858
Ecuador	0.0154	-0.4320	0.2332	0.1153	-345.38	124.50	0.1386
Paraguay	0.0222	-0.3283	0.1048	0.1373	281.06	21.17	0.0750
Peru	0.0016	-0.1677	0.2185	0.0648	210.58	180.26	0.0950
Uruguay	0.0664	-0.9112	0.4865	0.3241	128.43	95.96	0.1961
Venezuela	0.0116	-0.3066	0.4891	-0.0303	-653.68	406.53	0.0874
ROW	0.0085	-0.3074	0.1142	0.0621	-21832.65	45458.45	0.0816

Source: Own calculations.

Table 8 reports the welfare decomposition. It shows that the resource allocation effect contributes to EV more than the terms of trade and investment-savings terms of trade. The resource allocation effect contributes positively to all regions while the terms of trade contribute negatively to China, Bolivia, and Venezuela. Investment-savings terms of trade contribute negatively to China. Brazil is the country with the highest change in welfare, followed by Argentina and Venezuela. The positive results for these three countries are strongly related to the investment-savings terms of trade.

The terms of trade and the demand derived from the Chinese expansion remain favorable to regional economic growth, taking advantage of them; however, they depend on industrial policies whose absence in recent years, or the low priority given to them has certainly collaborated to reduce the prospects for productive diversification in the region.

Table 8 – Welfare decomposition (US$ million)

Regions	Resource Allocation Effect	Terms of Trade	Investment-Savings terms of trade	Total
China	52279.58	-11916.80	-53555.59	-13192.81
Argentina	54.94	147.36	239.42	441.72
Bolivia	3.25	-5.49	35.55	33.31
Brazil	358.53	542.68	1000.71	1901.91
Chile	19.51	55.47	152.57	227.55
Colombia	27.49	23.25	243.81	294.55
Ecuador	15.51	34.05	74.94	124.50
Paraguay	6.85	13.31	1.01	21.17
Peru	3.20	28.90	148.16	180.26
Uruguay	38.00	43.90	14.07	95.96
Venezuela	59.11	-14.36	361.78	406.53
Rest of the World	5401.85	11271.73	28784.99	45458.57
Total	58267.81	224.00	-22498.59	35993.22

Source: Own calculations.

Further decomposition of the terms–of–trade effect (see Table 9) shows that sector contributions differ among countries. The highest positive values are those to Argentina and Brazil. For Argentina, Other food products (otrfood), Machinery and equipment (mqequip) and Services (services) contributes more than half of the total terms-of-trade effect for the country. For Brazil, Machinery and equipment (mqequip), Crops (crops) and Mining and energy (minergy) contributes around 42% of the total terms-of-trade.

Table 9- Decomposition of the terms–of–trade effects

Com.	CHN	ARG	BOL	BRA	CHL	COL	ECU	PRY	PER	URU	VEM
grains	-6.21	8.48	0.09	8.00	-0.44	-1.20	-0.28	0.62	-0.99	0.65	-1.69
crops	-162.99	10.68	0.35	82.56	3.98	4.83	7.55	3.45	2.46	5.03	-0.17
animalprd	-32.30	0.72	-0.01	2.81	0.00	0.18	-0.02	-0.02	0.05	0.53	-1.55
frsfsh	-24.12	0.09	0.00	-0.48	1.28	0.09	0.28	0.01	0.21	0.07	0.03
minergy	96.61	5.07	-3.69	58.38	-3.76	-21.66	-4.06	0.00	-1.80	0.59	-16.33
meatprd	-28.82	4.06	-0.04	41.70	-1.42	-0.17	-0.01	1.89	-0.15	4.58	-4.42
otrfood	-178.14	44.12	-0.03	31.13	2.94	0.21	10.80	2.10	1.06	3.12	-4.93
dairy	-9.02	2.98	-0.01	0.07	-0.10	-0.12	0.06	-0.02	-0.16	2.74	-2.43
sugar	-6.21	0.19	0.00	22.52	-0.37	0.66	-0.01	0.09	-0.03	-0.11	-0.87
bt	-20.55	2.74	-0.14	6.20	0.86	-0.09	0.15	-0.52	-0.11	0.18	-0.09
textiles	-435.09	1.28	0.17	9.41	3.41	2.62	0.58	0.28	2.07	0.31	0.28
waplea	-1194.34	4.94	0.13	21.14	15.16	3.51	0.92	0.47	3.48	2.15	1.40
woodpaper	-208.93	0.21	-0.26	22.43	2.72	0.54	0.56	-0.15	-0.26	1.27	-0.53
chemicals	-1123.73	9.52	-0.91	30.64	3.49	7.29	1.25	-0.29	0.51	2.95	0.40
ferrous	-513.64	1.50	-0.67	29.43	3.94	3.72	1.66	-0.20	2.87	0.30	2.48
metal	-611.78	5.34	0.28	21.22	8.86	5.70	2.57	-0.05	6.22	0.35	3.08
mqequip	-5187.89	19.78	0.53	86.05	19.10	12.29	7.34	1.49	13.25	2.59	8.73
motor	-506.97	8.43	0.19	16.47	-3.41	-2.59	-0.12	-0.38	-0.36	0.96	2.66
mnfc	-561.66	0.85	0.01	7.65	2.22	2.35	0.67	0.04	1.00	0.83	0.72
services	-1201.51	16.56	-1.53	45.53	-2.92	5.12	4.28	4.65	-0.34	15.11	-1.16

Source: Own calculations.

To observe the contribution to each sectoral shock in the trade balance, Table 10 shows the effects decomposition by the 20 sectors. The results may be interpreted as a subtotal related to the decrease in China's traded prices of each commodity. For Brazil, the trade balance, for example, was 2,606.58 US$ million after the shock. Of this change, -28.88 US$ million was associated with the Chinese price change of Grains, 600,25 US$ million with the Chinese price change of crops (Other crops), and so on. Similarly, we can interpret the trade balance changes for the other countries.

On one hand, we observe that China, as expected, has the highest positive result (2,0757.49 US$ million), followed by Brazil (2606.58 US$ million) and Paraguay (281.06 US$ million). On the other hand, the Rest of the World has the highest trade balance deficit (-21832.65 US$ million), followed by Argentina (-742.42 US$ million) and Venezuela (-653.68 US$ million).

Table 10 - Trade balance changes by subtotal* (US$ million)

Com.	CHN	ARG	BOL	BRA	CHL	COL	ECU	PRY	PER	URY	VEN	ROW
grains	1167.57	-6.55	-0.28	-28.88	-3.69	-6.52	-2.04	-0.19	-3.15	-1.13	-6.52	-1108.62
crops	1124.10	8.77	-2.95	600.25	-15.05	1.46	3.66	9.56	-23.28	46.05	-11.58	-1740.99
animalprd	2020.06	4.32	-1.71	233.76	-6.83	-6.87	1.75	7.26	-23.32	19.98	-13.63	-2234.76
frsfsh	1046.14	-5.23	-0.47	-24.28	-4.33	-4.43	-0.63	0.32	-2.88	2.00	-5.33	-1000.87
minergy	75.48	-50.45	-17.16	305.18	5.62	384.14	92.49	28.65	40.75	11.68	290.61	-1166.98
meatprd	2170.94	-9.95	-1.47	87.50	-8.24	-16.33	-4.78	6.52	-7.29	53.35	-19.90	-2250.36
otrfood	9035.77	-14.97	-4.56	-133.84	-24.60	-58.82	13.23	6.34	-19.76	10.46	-72.12	-8737.13
dairy	487.31	-0.83	-0.45	-11.95	-1.63	-4.23	-1.25	0.45	-1.99	9.89	-5.32	-470.02
sugar	70.04	-1.35	-0.20	79.39	-0.55	-0.33	-0.33	0.16	-0.43	0.47	-1.87	-145.00
bt	3158.97	-18.64	-0.54	-113.86	-6.56	-20.14	-6.96	-1.74	-7.61	-6.62	-19.28	-2957.01
textiles	332.82	-19.07	-7.84	211.20	-44.61	4.09	-1.68	10.80	-2.24	12.96	-41.48	-454.96
waplea	3351.77	13.43	-15.87	108.57	-54.96	-4.03	-10.74	33.79	61.29	161.15	-168.15	-3476.25
woodpaper	52.00	9.25	-4.29	349.73	55.12	7.42	10.94	9.24	-2.08	33.44	-12.98	-507.78
chemicals	978.14	-184.90	-44.83	-224.67	-104.97	150.32	-2.14	23.98	12.89	-31.23	141.36	-713.93
ferrous	75.62	22.73	-9.62	445.00	-51.83	17.84	-74.07	4.90	19.95	-5.80	-3.96	-440.77
metal	135.66	1.58	-11.35	652.98	568.01	63.36	-9.27	23.82	164.96	22.71	-75.59	-1536.88
mqequip	393.76	-32.92	-25.33	-47.35	-71.87	-81.78	-58.17	2.13	-45.36	-130.31	-121.85	219.04
motor	1172.15	-477.07	-120.99	-405.69	-426.94	-357.63	-329.81	64.10	22.82	-183.39	-440.74	1483.23
mnfc	200.46	-5.32	-10.10	163.15	-33.92	21.95	23.54	16.11	7.18	20.57	-40.08	-363.54
services	-6290.94	24.74	-14.25	360.39	-27.70	54.35	10.86	34.87	20.13	82.22	-25.26	5770.60
Total	20757.49	-742.42	-294.28	2606.58	-259.54	143.83	-345.38	281.06	210.58	128.43	-653.68	-21832.65

Source: Own calculations. Note: *The table shows the trade balance changes related to the decrease in China's traded prices of each commodity.

Considering these subtotals, we can affirm that the decrease in imports prices from China on Other food products (otrfoof), Wearing apparels (waplea) and Beverage and tobacco (bt) are the sectors that most influence the positive total variation at trade balance. For Brazil, we can highlight trade balance change associated with Chinese price changes of Metal products (metal), Other crops (crops), and Ferrous metals (ferrous). These results are partially linked to the IC index presented in Section 2 since we did not observe a trade complementarity among China and South American countries and partially linked to the sectoral effect, which we had expected an unequal impact on sectors according to the degree of complementarity and rivalry (see Table 5).

5. Final Considerations

The rapid economic growth, the degree of openness, and the dimension of China's economy has led to a controversial discussion in the literature. Questions were raised looking for the best understanding of who could win and who could lose. Specifically, the literature has based on different methodological approaches, raised hypotheses about the impact upon export prices, jobs, international prices of commodities, income, and other economic dimensions.

Thus, this paper aimed to answer the following question: Does Chinese traded good prices matter to South America? By the exercise proposed, it is possible to affirm that Chinese traded goods prices matter to South American countries. We observe that there is an unbalanced relationship between China and South America and that China can compete with South American countries in a third country situation, possibly in the European Union and the United States.

Besides the first question, a complementary question can be raised: Is Chinese traded good prices good or not for South American countries? There are positive and negative effects. Positive impacts were observed in terms of GDP, real consumption, and welfare

in all countries. However, they are not balanced. Furthermore, we can also highlight the importance of imports. For all South American countries, there is a positive variation in imports.

Finally, one more question can be raised: For which sectors is Chinese traded good prices more important? To answer it, we analyzed the contribution to each sectoral shock in the trade balance by making a decomposition by the 20 sectors. On one hand, we observed that China, as expected, had the highest positive result, followed by Brazil and Paraguay. On the other hand, the Rest of the World had the highest deficit at trade balance, followed by Argentina and Venezuela.

References

Afonso, D. L., Bastos, S. Q. and Perobelli, F. S. (2018). *Latin America and China: multilateralism or dependency*? An approach of computable general equilibrium for selected countries. GTAP 2018 Conference Paper, GTAP Resource n. 5455.

Aguiar, A., Chepeliev, M., Corong, E. L., McDougall, R., and van der Mensbrugghe, D. (2019). The GTAP Data Base: Version 10. *Journal of Global Economic Analysis*, v. 4, n. 4, p. 1-27.

Arias, J. Artu, E., Lederman, D., and Rojas, D. (2018). Trade, informal employment and labor adjustment costs. *Journal of Development Economics*, 133, p. 396-414.

Artuc, E., Lederman, D. and Rojas, D. (2015). *The rise of China and labor market adjustments in Latin America*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, n. 7155.

Autor, D. H., Dorn, D., Hanson, G. H. (2013). The China syndrome: local labor market effects of import competition in the United States. *American Economic Review*, 103(6), p. 2121–68.

Baldárrago, E., and Salinas, G. (2017). *Trade liberalization in Peru*: Adjustment costs amidst high labor mobility. International Monetary Fund.

Blázquez-Lidoy, J., Rodríguez, J. and Santiso, J. (2006). Angel or devil? China's trade impact on Latin American emerging markets. In: Santiso, J. *The visible hand of China in Latin America*. Development Centre Studies, OECD. p. 45-83.

Brown, D. K., Kiyota, K., and Stern, R. M. (2005). Computational Analysis of the US FTAs with Central America, Australia, and Morocco. *World Economy*, 28(10), p. 1441-1490.

Burfisher, M. E. (2011). *Introduction to computable general equilibrium models*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Busse, M., Erdogan, C., and Mühlen, H. (2016). China's impact on Africa–The role of trade, FDI and aid. *Kyklos*, 69(2), p. 228-262.

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

Dimaranan, B., Ianchovichina, E. and Martin, W. (2007). Competing with giants: who wins, who loses? In: Winters, L. A. and Yusuf, S. *Dancing with giants: China, India, and the global economy.* p. 67-100.

Farooki, M., and Kaplinsky, R. (2013). The impact of China on global commodity prices: The global reshaping of the resource sector. Routledge.

Hertel, T. W. (1997). *Global trade analysis*: modeling and applications. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ianchovichina, E. and Martin, W. (2003). *Economic impacts of China's accession to the World Trade Organization*. Policy Research Working Paper, n. 3053. The World Bank.

Jenkins, R. (2012). Latin America and China—a new dependency? *Third World Quarterly*, 33(7), 1337-1358.

Jenkins, R. O. (2011). The "China effect" on commodity prices and Latin American export earnings. *Cepal Review*, 103, p. 73-87.

Jenkins, R., Peters, E. D. and Moreira, M. M. (2008). The impact of China on Latin America and the Caribbean. *World Development*, 36(2), p. 235-253.

Lall, S., Weiss, J. and Oikawa, H. (2005). China's competitive threat to Latin America: an analysis for 1990–2002. *Oxford Development Studies*, 33(2), p. 163-194.

Majlesi, K., and Narciso, G. (2018). International import competition and the decision to migrate: Evidence from Mexico. *Journal of Development Economics*, 132, p. 75-87.

Mendez, O. (2015). The effect of Chinese import competition on Mexican local labor markets. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 34, p. 364-380.

Mercado, E., Pierola, M. D. and Sanchez-Navarro, D. (2019). *The impact of import competition from China on firm performance in the Peruvian manufacturing sector*. IDB Working Paper Series, n. 01092.

Nowak-Lehmann, F., Vollmer, S., and Martínez-Zarzoso, I. (2007). *Competitiveness: A comparison of China and Mexico*. CESifo Working Paper, No. 2111, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo).

Paz, L. S. (2018). The effect of import competition on Brazil's manufacturing labor market in the 2000s: Are imports from China different?. *The International Trade Journal*, 32(1), p. 76-99.

Pierola, M. D., and Sanchez-Navarro, D. (2019). Import competition in the manufacturing sector in Peru: Its impact on informality and wages. IDB Working Paper Series, n. 01093.

Siriwardana, M. (2007). The Australia-United States free trade agreement: An economic evaluation. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 18(1), p. 117-133.

Siriwardana, M., and Yang, J. (2008). GTAP model analysis of the economic effects of an Australia–China FTA: Welfare and sectoral aspects. *Global Economic Review*, 37(3), p. 341-362.

Sotiriou, A., and Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2021). Chinese vs. US trade in an emerging country: the impact of trade openness in Chile. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 57(12), p. 2095-2111.

Timini, J., and Sánchez-Albornoz, A. E. (2019). The impact of China on Latin America: trade and foreign direct investment channels. *Banco de Espana Article*, 7-19.

Vianna, A. C. (2016). The Impact of Exports to China on Latin American Growth (December 1, 2016). *Journal of Asian Economics*, 47, p. 58-66.

Walmsley, T. L., Aguiar, A. H. and Narayanan, B. (2012). *Introduction to the Global Trade Analysis Project and the GTAP data base*. GTAP Working paper, n. 67. West Lafayette: Center for Global Trade Analysis.

Yang, Y. (2006). China's integration into the world economy: implications for developing countries. *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature*, 20(1), p. 40-56.

Annex

GTAP 10 Data Base Sectors

Original GTAP classification		Aggregate classification*	
Code	**Description**	**Code**	**Description**
pdr	Paddy rice	grains	Grains
wht	Wheat	grains	Grains
gro	Cereal grains nec	grains	Grains
v_f	Vegetables, fruit, nuts	crops	Other crops
osd	Oil seeds	crops	Other crops
c_b	Sugar cane, sugar beet	crops	Other crops
pfb	Plant-based fibers	crops	Other crops
ocr	Crops nec	crops	Other crops
ctl	Bovine cattle, sheep and goats	animalprd	Animal products
oap	Animal products nec	animalprd	Animal products
rmk	Raw milk	animalprd	Animal products
wol	Wool, silk-worm cocoons	animalprd	Animal products
frs	Forestry	frsfsh	Forestry and fishing
fsh	Fishing	frsfsh	Forestry and fishing
coa	Coal	minergy	Mining and energy
oil	Oil	minergy	Mining and energy
gas	Gas	minergy	Mining and energy
oxt	Minerals nec	minergy	Mining and energy
cmt	Bovine meat products	meatprd	Meat products
omt	Meat products nec	meatprd	Meat products
vol	Vegetable oils and fats	otrfood	Other food products
mil	Dairy products	dairy	Dairy
pcr	Processed rice	otrfood	Other food products
sgr	Sugar	sugar	Sugar
ofd	Food products nec	otrfood	Other food products
b_t	Beverages and tobacco products	bt	Beverages and tobacco
tex	Textiles	textiles	Textiles
wap	Wearing apparel	waplea	Wearing apparels
lea	Leather products	waplea	Wearing apparels
lum	Wood products	woodpaper	Wood and paper products, publishing
ppp	Paper products, publishing	woodpaper	Wood and paper products, publishing
p_c	Petroleum, coal products	chemicals	Chemicals, rubber, and plastic
chm	Chemical products	chemicals	Chemicals, rubber, and plastic
bph	Basic pharmaceutical products	chemicals	Chemicals, rubber, and plastic
rpp	Rubber and plastic products	chemicals	Chemicals, rubber, and plastic
nmm	Mineral products nec	ferrous	Ferrous metals
i_s	Ferrous metals	ferrous	Ferrous metals
nfm	Metals nec	metal	Metal products
fmp	Metal products	metal	Metal products
ele	Computer, electronic and optic	mqequip	Machinery and equipment
eeq	Electrical equipment	mqequip	Machinery and equipment
ome	Machinery and equipment nec	mqequip	Machinery and equipment
mvh	Motor vehicles and parts	motor	Motor vehicles and parts
otn	Transport equipment nec	motor	Motor vehicles and parts

continue on next page

GTAP 10 Data Base Sectors

Original GTAP classification		Aggregate classification*	
Code	**Description**	**Code**	**Description**
omf	Manufactures nec	mnfc	Miscellaneous manufacturing
ely	Electricity	services	Services
gdt	Gas manufacture, distribution	services	Services
wtr	Water	services	Services
cns	Construction	services	Services
trd	Trade	services	Services
afs	Accommodation, Food and servic	services	Services
otp	Transport nec	services	Services
wtp	Water transport	services	Services
atp	Air transport	services	Services
whs	Warehousing and support activi	services	Services
cmn	Communication	services	Services
ofi	Financial services nec	services	Services
ins	Insurance	services	Services
rsa	Real estate activities	services	Services
obs	Business services nec	services	Services
ros	Recreational and other service	services	Services
osg	Public Administration and defe	services	Services
edu	Education	services	Services
hht	Human health and social work a	services	Services
dwe	Dwellings	services	Services

Note: *This classification has been used to aggregate the sectoral results, such as the trade balance changes.