

# Discussion of “Are Financially Constrained Firms More Sensitive to Shocks?”

Thomas King

FRB Chicago

WRIEC Conference 2020

The views expressed here do not reflect official positions of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago or the Federal Reserve System.

*Question:* Are firms exposed to idiosyncratic shocks?

- If markets are complete, they should not be.
- But financial frictions could stand in the way of perfect risk sharing.
- The effect could even be *positive*, through a creative-destruction channel.
  
- How do we identify idiosyncratic shocks?
  - Data: claims at a large Swedish insurer, matched with insured firm characteristics.
  - Focus on property damage – fires, etc.
  - The authors successfully show that such claims are unpredictable and not systematic.

# Main results and conclusions

- All else equal, 1% higher claims lowers firm output by about 0.004%.
  - This seems small, but claims are much smaller than output--translates into about 39 cents lost per dollar of claim.
  - Also lower value added and profits.
  - The reduced output comes entirely from a reduction in TFP.
    - Firms must rebuild capital quickly.
    - Losses must come from “business interruption.”
  - Firms cover losses by reducing cash, not taking out debt.
- Results are stronger at high-growth firms.
  - Claims are large relative to liquid assets, so authors conclude that insurance relieves financial constraints.

# Minor Comments

- Something strange in summary statistics:
  - Mean claim is 110% of physical assets. Doesn't seem possible.
  - Some claims/sales ratios are negative.
- Sample firms differ significantly from other firms.
  - Generally smaller.
  - Potential selection issues? Maybe use model to control for this.
- Log-log specification leads to some difficulties of interpretation.
  - Absolute size of losses should be similar to absolute size of claims – maybe scale by assets?
- Would be interesting to see how effects persist over time.

# Potentially Bigger Comments

- The fact that capital rebuilds quickly is taken as evidence of no financial constraints.
  - But why couldn't this just be insurance payouts being used to buy new machines?
- Most of the significance seems to be driven by high-growth firms.
  - Authors interpret this as evidence of financial constraints, but these firms could be different in other ways.
  - For example, maybe fast-growing firms have smaller inventories or other buffers that make them less resilient to temporary shocks.
- More broadly, there is not much evidence on the question in the title. Authors could do more to measure financial constraints.
  - Use initial levels of debt, liquidity, etc.

Nice paper – thanks!