

# Comments on “The Distribution of Crisis Credit and Firm Indebtedness” \*

Gustavo Leyva<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Banco de México, Research Department

CEMLA-FRBNY-ECB Conference, July 2021

\* The views expressed here are my own and do not necessarily reflect those of Banco de México or its Board of Governors.

## What I like about the Paper

---

- Touches upon a relevant topic
- Fantastic job at constructing and merging data
- Data could be “readily” updated
- It is a bold paper

Argument is straightforward:

- ① PGP attracted risky firms
- ② These firms increased their debt (beyond the obvious)
- ③ Therefore, ready credit but at a cost of exposing the economy

## PGP attracted risky firms ...

- How good is your default model at predicting? What is a risky firm?
- One standard deviation may tell something of the default rate distribution, but what does it mean?
- Looking at the results differently, the supply-side did play a crucial role:
  - Policy easing the provision of cheap/generous credit (incentives matter after all)
  - Exploit the link between firm's size (the smaller, the higher the guarantee) with the approval ratio
- In some sense results not surprising. Cheap credit now and expectation of cheap credit in the next 1 or 2 years (still low policy rates plus inflation slightly above the target by the end of 2021 - IPoM June 2021)
- What is the average default rate in 2019 of firms applying and not getting the credit and those applying and getting the credit?
- Want to carry these findings beyond COVID-19
  - Not persuaded. Was not the size of the guarantee (60 percent for larger and 85 for smaller firms) unprecedented?
  - Comparison with the EP program seems off unless it is used to stress the adverse selection induced by PGP. EP attracted less risky borrowers. Fine, so?

## These firms increased their debt (beyond the obvious) ...

- Beyond the obvious
  - Of course, firms increased their debt (obvious)
  - Beyond the obvious: debt measured relative to sales
  - But now, this requires taking a **stand** on the role played by sales
  - Implicit story: easy financing led to higher sales and profits. Then we should not expect a large excess in debt in 2020/2019. But
    - PGP as an insurance (designed to finance working capital)
    - What if sales did not increase (as you *expected*) because of weak aggregate demand? - But Chile already close the output gap (IPoM June 2021), so why would not sales follow suit? domestic versus external demand playing a role here?
    - Why is a 6 percent increase in this ratio alarming? Compared to what? - The smallest firm among the largest that did not get the credit actually saw this ratio *decrease*
  - Exploit different phases of the recovery to shed light on the role of sales
- RDD
  - Be aware that the “causal effect” is localized at very large firms (not representative)
- Comparison with EP is again off
  - EP did not increase firms' debt. But why would it in the first place?

Therefore, ready credit but at a cost of exposing the economy ...

---

- It *may be* ... it is still a “maybe” after reading the paper
- Looking forward to the new version