West Virginia University
THE RESEARCH REPOSITORY @ WVU

Regional Research Institute Working Papers | Regional Research Institute

2011

Accounting foundations for interregional commodity-by-industry input-output models

Randall Jackson
West Virginia University, randall.jackson@mail.wvu.edu

Walter R. Schwarm

Follow this and additional works at: https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/rri_pubs

Part of the Regional Economics Commons

Digital Commons Citation

Jackson, Randall and Schwarm, Walter R., "Accounting foundations for interregional commodity-by-industry input-output models" (2011). *Regional Research Institute Working Papers*. 56.
https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/rri_pubs/56

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Regional Research Institute at The Research Repository @ WVU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Regional Research Institute Working Papers by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Lett Spat Resour Sci (2011) 4:187–196
DOI 10.1007/s12076-011-0066-8

ORIGINAL PAPER

Accounting foundations for interregional commodity-by-industry input-output models

Randall W. Jackson · Walter R. Schwarm

Received: 6 January 2008 / Accepted: 26 August 2011 / Published online: 22 September 2011
© Springer-Verlag 2011

Abstract Several procedures for generating interregional commodity flow matrices have been developed in the U.S. in recent years (see, e.g., Canning and Wang in J. Reg. Sci. 45, 539–563, 2005, Jackson et al. in Ann. Reg. Sci. 40, 909–920, 2006, Lindall et al. in J. Reg. Anal. Policy 36, 76–83, 2006). Despite the fact that these methods derive from the commodity-by-industry framework, very little attention has been given recently to the fundamental conceptual issues that must be confronted to generate a consistently defined interregional model or to conduct an interregional impacts assessment using an appropriate interregional framework. This paper revives the focus on interregional modeling issues initiated by Oosterhaven in Reg. Sci. Urban Econ. 14, 562–582 (1984), identifies and elaborates on these and additional issues, and traces the development of the accounting foundations from single-region inter-industry through interregional commodity-by-industry accounts. Its contribution lies in the provision of a high-level perspective on these frameworks that in the process both clarifies and simplifies key conceptual issues and operational decisions.

Keywords Interregional · Input-output · Commodity-by-industry

JEL Classification C67 · D57 · R15

The authors gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments and suggestions of Christa Jensen, Ronald Miller, and an anonymous reviewer.

R.W. Jackson (✉)
Regional Research Institute, 886 Chestnut Ridge Rd, Room 501, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506, USA
e-mail: Randall.Jackson@mail.wvu.edu

W.R. Schwarm
Demographic Research, California Department of Finance, 915 L St, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814, USA

1 Introduction

Regional and interregional input-output (IO) models have long occupied central positions in regional science research. From its inception, IO modeling at the regional level has been dominated by a focus on industry-based analysis. This has been the case especially in the United States, despite the 1972 shift from industry-based to commodity-by-industry-based data reporting. The understandable reluctance of regional analysts to shift emphasis is due in large part to the preponderance of industry-based data on national and regional employment, income, hours worked, and the paucity of similar commodity-based data. Nevertheless, regional IO analysts rarely, if ever, rely on primary data, resorting instead to regionalizing national accounts via one of a number of methods. Hence, unless one purchases commercial IO data or works with the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis's multiplier-only RIMS data, working with the national industry and commodity data is a practical necessity for regional IO modelers.

One option in dealing with the national commodity-by-industry accounts is to first assume either commodity- or industry-based technology and construct a national industry by industry table from the Make and Use tables, then regionalize using industry-based regional data and a location quotient, supply-demand pool, regional purchase coefficient, GRIT, or similar method (e.g., Kuehn et al. 1985; West 1990; Stevens et al. 1983, 1988). An alternative is to use region-specific data to generate regionalized versions of the national Make and Use tables, then construct the desired commodity-by-industry, industry-by-industry, or other format using either the commodity or industry technology assumption. Jackson (1998) and Lahr (2001) have addressed such a regional accounts construction approach.

In a US interregional context, Canning and Wang (2005) presented a method for generating interregional IO data, Jackson et al. (2006) described an approach to estimating interregional commodity flows, Lindall et al. (2006) discussed multi-region models in the IMPLAN framework, and Schwarm et al. (2006) and Robinson and Liu (2006) provided comparisons of the results of selected techniques to published flow data and to one another. Yet no works to date focus directly on the conceptual implications of modeling decisions and assumptions in the context of the interregional IO and the commodity-by-industry format of the U.S. national benchmark accounts (U.S. Department of Commerce 2007).

Curiously, with the notable exceptions of Hoffman and Kent (1976) and Oosterhaven (1984), a comprehensive approach to constructing *interregional* IO accounts from the commodity-by-industry framework and basic interregional commodity flow data is lacking from the literature. Hoffman and Kent (1976) developed an algorithm that could be used to solve an input-output system and an extension to "regional disaggregation" in commodity and industry space but laid out no unified interregional accounting frameworks. Oosterhaven's family of square and rectangular models identified and addressed a number of issues that also surface in this paper and provided some very specific and highly detailed approaches to interregional model implementation. It is perhaps because of the detailed approach of Oosterhaven's paper that it has received less than its due attention. Indeed, the recently published Second Edition of Miller and Blair describes interregional models only in industry-by-industry

Table 1 National and regional accounting frameworks

National Framework

	Industries	Final Demand with Imports
Industries		
Value Added		

Regional Framework

	Industries	Final Demand no Imports
Industries		
Value Added		
Imports		

Table 2 Conventional commodity-by-industry framework (Source: Jackson 1998)

	Commodity	Industry	Final Demand	Total
Commodity		U	$E = F \mid x \mid (\text{-}m)$	q
Industry	V			g
Value Added		W		
Total	q'	g'		

settings and states in a chapter footnote that "In a commodity-by-industry accounting setting, one would deal with Use matrices" (2009, pg. 375), implying that this is a straightforward and transparent switch. To our knowledge, however, there is little in the literature that provides a concise, comprehensive high-level presentation of relevant accounts and their interrelationships for analysts constructing such models. The purpose of this letter is to fill this gap. Rather than focus on methods for estimating the interregional interaction, *per se*, this paper attempts a clear and concise description of basic data organization for interregional commodity-by-industry settings.[1]

2 National models, regional models, and extensions of single-region assumptions for interregional models

To lay necessary groundwork, we first very briefly revisit the historically conventional national inter-industry IO framework, focusing only on aspects critical to the subsequent discussion and assuming reader familiarity with conventional IO modeling notation.

The first of these concerns the accounting of imports in terms of data organization. In the familiar $X - AX = Y$, the RHS term is final demand, modified by negative values corresponding to imports. Matrix A thus comprises inter-industry technical coefficients. However, when moving to a subnational regional context, a matrix of trade coefficients, R, is estimated such that $a_{ij} = r_{ij} + m_{ij}$, where the coefficients m_{ij} are import coefficients. Table 1 represents the shift in accounting framework diagrammatically.

The shift to a commodity-by-industry accounting framework follows an analogous pattern. The conventional framework shown in Table 2 is the one used by most statistical reporting agencies worldwide, with the domestic (F), export (X), and import

[1] Space constraints preclude a point-by-point comparison with Oosterhaven (1984). There is considerable, but not complete, overlap in content; but the two papers have much less in presentation-level comparability and, therefore, broader purpose.

Table 3 Commodity-by-industry framework with imports as a commodities source (Source: Jackson 1998)

	Commodity	Industry	Final Demand	Total
Commodity		U	$F \mid x$	$s = q + m$
Industry	V			g
Value Added		W		
Output	q'	g'		
Imports	m'			
Total	s'			

(m) components of commodity final demand shown explicitly.[2] Matrices U, V, W and E are Use, Make, Value Added and Final Demand, respectively, and q and g are commodity and industry total output, and the prime symbol denotes transpose. The Use matrix depicts column industry use (purchases) of each row commodity; the Make matrix depicts the column commodity output of each row industry; value added includes all payments sectors; Final Demand depicts row commodity final demand by column activity, such as consumption, investment, government expenditures, and exports (which are zero in a closed system). For simplicity, we will assume in the discussion that follows that a) final demand columns have been aggregated to a single column, likewise that b) the rows of W have been aggregated to a single row, and c) the number of commodities is equal to the number of industries.

This framework, and indeed the model solution equations that derive from this organizational data structure (e.g., Miller and Blair 1985, 2009), corresponds conceptually to the national framework in Table 1, in which the final demand partition includes negative elements corresponding to commodity imports. The foundation for a regionalized commodity-by-industry framework developed by Jackson (1998) is presented in Table 3, with imports shown as a commodity input source.

In Table 3, the Use matrix corresponds to technical relationships, and the final demands are those that stem from local sources and from export demand. The commodity row sums now equal total commodities used (domestically and for exports) and are equal to total regional commodity supply, s. Total regional commodity supply also equals the commodity column sums. If we define $\tilde{D} = V\hat{s}^{-1}$ we can then generate an inter-industry counterpart to R, for example, by using $\tilde{D}B = V\hat{s}^{-1}U\hat{g}^{-1}$ rather than the standard $DB = V\hat{q}^{-1}U\hat{g}^{-1}$. The effect of D in the latter is to reallocate commodities used by industries to the industries that produced them irrespective of geographic origin. The effect of $\tilde{D}$ in the former is to reallocate commodities used by industries to the industries that produced them by respective domestic or rest-of-world (import) sources.[3]

However, Table 3 does not correspond directly to the regional framework of Table 1. To approximate that framework requires additional reorganization of the data

[2]Note that the domestic component of final demand refers to demand from regional households, governments, etc., irrespective of the source of the commodities that satisfy this demand.

[3]Although there has been a great deal of debate in the literature concerning one versus the other technology assumption (see *inter alia*, de Mesnard 2004), we will not engage in such debate here, though what follows may eventually contribute to the basis for that discussion. We arbitrarily adopt here the industry-based technology assumption, and further, use only the industry-by-industry form of the possible solutions. A parallel presentation of the issues below using the commodity-based assumption is left to future research.

Table 4 Regional commodity-by-industry framework

	Commodity	Industry	Final Demand	Total
Commodity		U	$F \mid x$	$q = s - m$
Industry	V			g
Value Added		W		
Imports (a)		Um		
Total Output	q'	g'		
Imports (b)	m'			
Total Supply	s'			

as shown in Table 4. Here, both U and final demand in the Commodity row are purged of imports, which now appear in the 'Imports (a)' row (or row partition if commodity detail is retained) of industry use. The m suffix on U or V distinguishes between Use-compatible and Make-compatible imports, e.g., Use table import cells are the values of commodities imported by column industries, whereas cells in an imports row of a Make table are the values of column commodities imported by all industries. Computing $DB = V\hat{q}^{-1}U\hat{g}^{-1}$ from the accounts in Table 4 would now generate a counterpart to the regional trade coefficients matrix, R.

2.1 Many-region IO

Two approaches to handling many-region models are well entrenched in the literature. The first is the interregional model, or IRIO, (Isard 1951) in which there is a complete enumeration of all flows among all sectors.[4] In the IRIO, the coefficients are regional trade coefficients, not regional technical coefficients. The second approach to many-region models is the multiregional IO model, or MRIO. Often called the Chenery-Moses model, this formulation is attributed to Chenery (1953) and Moses (1955), who developed essentially the same structure independently.

The MRIO approach begins with regional *technical* coefficients tables as the basic building blocks, as opposed to the regional input coefficients tables of the IRIO. To take advantage of the data most commonly available, trade tables are developed by first estimating trade flows by region, then ascribing the general flow relationships to individual industries. Of particular relevance to the current discussion is that the final demand vectors in the IRIO and MRIO specifications also are not identical. For the IRIO approach, region-specific final demand is explicitly identified, while in the MRIO approach, final demand for each region's output is determined by using the trade tables to allocate final demands to regions of origin.[5]

2.2 Commodity-by-industry interregional issues

The construction of interregional IO models most commonly involves the combination of interregional commodity flow (trade) data with production accounts in the form of commodity-by-industry frameworks. Methods are devised to merge the information in the two datasets. The most fundamental issue to be addressed in making

[4]There are numerous sources describing most of the established frameworks referenced in this paper.

[5]In conventional notation, CY in MRIO approximates Y in IRIO.

Table 5 Rudimentary closed two-region commodity-by-industry framework

	Commodity	Commodity	Industry	Industry	Final Demand	Total Output
Commodity			$U1$		$E1$	$q1$
Commodity				$U2$	$E2$	$q2$
Industry	$V1$					$g1$
Industry		$V2$				$g2$
Value Added			$W1$	$W2$		
Total Output	$q1'$	$q2'$	$g1'$	$g2'$		

Table 6 Closed two-region commodity-by-industry framework with Use origins and destinations

	Commodity	Commodity	Region 1 Industry	Region 2 Industry	Final Demand	Total
Region 1 Commodity			$U11$	$U12$	$F1 \mid x1$	$s1 = q1 + x2$
Region 2 Commodity			$U21$	$U22$	$F2 \mid x2$	$s2 = q2 + x1$
Region 1 Industry	$V1$					$g1$
Region 2 Industry		$V2$				$g2$
Value Added			$W1$	$W2$		
Total Output	$q'1$	$q'2$	$g'1$	$g'2$		
Imports	$x2'$	$x1'$				
Total Supply	$s1'$	$s2'$				

the accounting framework transition to a many-region model is that neither the Make nor the Use tables, in their conventional single-region formats, nor indeed any aspect of the production accounts beyond mere imports and exports, are geographically specific. Consider a rudimentary two-region, closed-system accounting framework that simply reflects the addition of a second region, as shown in Table 5.

Although Table 5 is correct, in the sense that its row and column sums retain consistency, it provides very little information about the *interregional* flows of commodities, which is, of course, critically important, if not the *raison d'être*, for interregional modeling. Were there trade between these two regions, it would be embedded in the final demand entries, both exports and imports. Given the trade flow, not only by commodity but by industry of destination, we could begin to account for interregional flows by reallocating the interregional inter-industry portions of export final demands to the Use partitions of the receiving regions *and* removing them from the initial receiving region's Use tables, such that, for example, $U_{12} + U_{22} = U_2$. The partitioned Use table effectively represents interregional commodity-by-industry flow. For consistency in the commodity output balance, final demand will include domestic final demand, exports to the other region, and $(-)$ imports from the other region. In this example, exports from one region are final demand imports to the other. The result will be the accounts presented in Table 6.

Since this formulation parallels that of Table 3, the Make and Use block matrices could be standardized by their column sums and an interregional R computed as their DB product. This coefficients matrix would be appropriate in conjunction with final demands for each region's commodity output, as in the historical IRIO modeling framework.

In transforming the accounts in Table 5 to those in Table 6, we modified the technical Use tables to represent trade relationships. However, it would have been equally feasible to modify the Make data to correspond to industry of origin and destination of commodity. Adding destination-specific information to the Make table accounts would result in the framework shown in Table 7. In this framework, V_{11} and V_{12} now denote commodities produced by Region 1 industries that are available in Regions 1

Table 7 Closed two-region commodity-by-industry framework with Make origins and destinations

	Region 1 Commodity	Region 2 Commodity	Region 1 Industry	Region 2 Industry	Final Demand	Total
Region 1 Commodity			$U1$		$F1 \mid x1$	$s1 = q1 + m1$
Region 2 Commodity				$U2$	$F2 \mid x2$	$s2 = q2 + m2$
Region 1 Industry	$V11$	$V12$				$g1$
Region 2 Industry	$V21$	$V22$				$g2$
Value Added			$W1$	$W2$		
Total Output	$s1$	$s2$	$g1'$	$g2'$		

Table 8 Open two-region commodity-by-industry framework with Use origins and destination

	Region 1 Commodity	Region 2 Commodity	Region 1 Industry	Region 2 Industry	Final Demand	Total Output
Region 1 Commodity			$U11$	$U12$	$F1 \mid x1$	$q1 = s1$ - $Vm1$ - $x2$
Region 2 Commodity			$U21$	$U22$	$F2 \mid x2$	$q2 = s2$ - $Vm2$ - $x1$
Region 1 Industry	$V1$					$g1$
Region 2 Industry		$V2$				$g2$
Value Added			$W1$	$W2$		
Total Output	$q1$	$q2$				
Imports	$Vm1' + x2'$	$Vm2' + x1'$	$Um1$	$Um2$		
Total	$s1'$	$s2'$	$g1'$	$g2'$		

Table 9 Open two-region commodity-by-industry framework with Make origins and destinations

	Region 1 Commodity	Region 2 Commodity	Region 1 Industry	Region 2 Industry	Final Demand	Total
Region 1 Commodity			$U1$		$F1 \mid x1$	$s1 = q1$ - $Vm1$
Region 2 Commodity				$U2$	$F2 \mid x2$	$s2 = q2$ - $Vm2$
Region 1 Industry	$V11$	$V12$				$g1$
Region 2 Industry	$V21$	$V22$				$g2$
Value Added			$W1$	$W2$		
Total Output	$q1$	$q2$				
Imports	$Vm1$	$Vm2$				
Total Supply	$s1'$	$s2'$	$g1'$	$g2'$		

and 2. The Use partitions are technical relationships, and final demands include imports. A column-standardized partitioned Make pre-multiplying the industry output-standardized partitioned-Use table will generate an interregional inter-industry trade coefficients table analogous to single region R.

Opening either system to the rest of the world is conceptually straightforward, although it will become clear that simpler changes are required to the geographically specific Make-based framework (Make-regionalized). The Use-regionalized framework of Table 6 opened to the rest of the world is shown in Table 8. The imports row in column partitions 1 and 2 represents commodities produced by the rest of the world (including the other region), available for use in each region. The imports row in column partitions 3 and 4 are the values of all imports available for use in production. Excluding imports from final demand and adding them to the row total output transforms regional output q into regional supply, s. Commodity row sums equal commodity output, and relationships among supply and output are shown in the Total column.

The first two (commodity) block rows of the Make-regionalized system in Table 9 report commodities used by intermediate and final demand in each region during the accounting period. Some of the commodities will come from outside each region, either from the other region or from the rest of the world. Final demands for commodities for the respective regions include a negative entry for imports, such that row sums equal total commodity output, q. The Make matrix will be standardized by total regional supply, resulting in a D matrix that reallocates commodity demand to geographically specific sources.

3 Modeling decisions

Given these accounting systems, how does the development of modeling solutions parallel the single-region framework solutions? Again for the sake of simplicity in exposition, we focus here only on the industry-based technology assumption. To clarify the choice of approach, consider the following formulations.

Let

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} U_1 & 0 \\ 0 & U_2 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \tilde{U} = \begin{bmatrix} U_{11} & U_{12} \\ U_{21} & U_{22} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & V_2 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \tilde{V} = \begin{bmatrix} V_{11} & V_{12} \\ V_{21} & V_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$

and $s = [s_1, s_2]$, $q = [q_1, q_2]$, $g = [g_1, g_2]$, then $B = U\hat{g}^{-1}$, $\tilde{B} = \tilde{U}\hat{g}^{-1}$, $D = V\hat{q}^{-1}$ and $\tilde{D} = \tilde{V}\hat{s}^{-1}$. The use of transformation matrices D and $\tilde{D}$ as pre-multipliers for commodity column vectors or for matrices with commodity rows transforms commodity space into industry space. The use of the latter (D) will transform within blocks of rows corresponding to the partitions, while the former transformation matrix ($\tilde{D}$) can operate within and across blocks.

Specifically, the pre-multiplication by $\tilde{D}$ has the effect of allocating each commodity used to its industry and geographical source (including ROW sources for open systems). Hence, matrix $\tilde{D}B$ is an interregional inter-industry trade table whose transactions are derived by transforming aspatial production function specifications (B) using system-wide market shares ($\tilde{D}$). Pre-multiplication by D has the effect of allocating each commodity supplied to a region to its source industry, based on the supplying region's own market share structure. Matrix $D\tilde{B}$ is thus an interregional inter-industry trade table whose transactions are derived by allocating commodities appearing in spatial production function specifications ($\tilde{B}$) using region-specific market shares (D). Clearly, one must elect to use $\tilde{D}$ or $\tilde{B}$, but not both, since each rests on different assumptions about the distribution of inputs over space. The decision as to which of the formulations is appropriate should be made on conceptual and theoretical grounds, but also in recognition of potential data constraints. Again, we have addressed only the industry technology assumption and industry-by-industry target dimensions. Additional issues will no doubt arise from the assumption of commodity technology or alternative target dimensions, which are left to others to develop.

Given that IO models ultimately assume constant structure, the Use-regionalized formulation represents a system in which region-specific industrial production functions are the driving force behind the interregional frameworks generated. In a demand driven framework, it seems likely that establishments that have identified extra-regional sources of imports would indeed increase the size of their existing input orders according to increased production demands. The Use-regionalized system can thus be argued to correspond more closely to a demand rather than supply driven system. The Make-regionalized formulation, in contrast, implies a system in which increases in an industry's total output will result in proportional increases in each purchasing industry and region. Hence, it can be argued to more closely approximate a supply-driven system.

However, we also note that the use of the consolidated Make matrix applies the aggregate region-specific industrial commodity output distribution (irrespective of destination) to regional industry production used in all regions. For the two-region closed system example, this is of little consequence, but could potentially take on greater importance, and hence introduce more error, as the number of regions and corresponding intervening distances—and thus spatial variations in production—increase. It might also be the case, for example, that a large portion of an industry's primary commodity output is exported great distances, while its secondary commodities are produced and sold to a more localized market. Nevertheless, from the standpoint of rational economic behavior, the relationships in the Use-regionalized framework rest on the foundation of production and demand relationships and support it over the alternative.

Partly countermanding the conceptual advantages of Use-regionalized frameworks are practical considerations. The Use-regionalized framework requires more extensive data, including an imports matrix,[6] for which additional assumptions and modeling mechanisms may be needed for allocating these across sub-national regions.[7] Further, the difficulties of estimating industry-based final demands for accounts construction should not be underestimated.

4 Summary

This letter has provided a high-level perspective on frameworks underlying many-region IO models founded on commodity-by-industry data. Building on conventional single-region inter-industry frameworks and extending to many-region commodity-by-industry frameworks identify the workable options. The discussion of modeling decisions lends moderate support to the Use-regionalized approach, provided that the necessary supporting data are available and that suitable mechanisms can be identified for allocating national industry imports to subnational regions. The preference is based on the foundation of production behavior consistent with the demand-driven IO model rather than market share behavior, which appears to be more consistent with a supply-driven IO model. The paper identifies a set of relevant issues and implications of alternative approaches to the construction of interregional models, some

[6] Dietzenbacher et al. (2005) critique the US-type Make-Use systems with embedded imports. Note that criticisms they raised can be at least partly addressed by reformulating the U.S. accounts as shown in Table 3, above.

[7] While the discussion to this point has implied that modelers must choose one of two technology assumptions, hybrid, or mixed-technology methods also have been developed. Introducing these additional formulations and their additional layers of notational complexity are beyond the scope of the current paper but might well result in more appealing solutions to compromises necessitated by data availability considerations.

of which underscore those introduced in Oosterhaven (1984)[8] and provides an initial set of mechanisms and protocol for moving forward.

References

Canning, P., Wang, Z.: A flexible mathematical programming model to estimate interregional input-output accounts. J. Reg. Sci. **45**, 539–563 (2005)

Chenery, H.B.: Regional analysis. In Chenery, H.B., Clark, P.G., Pinna, V.C. (eds.) The Structure and Growth of the Italian Economy, pp. 97–129. US Mutual Security Agency, Rome (1953)

de Mesnard, L.: Understanding the shortcomings of commodity-based technology in input-output models: An economic-circuit approach. J. Reg. Sci. **44**, 125–141 (2004)

Dietzenbacher, E., Albino, V., Kuhtz, S.: The fallacy of using US-type input-output tables. In: 15th International Input-Output Association Conference, Beijing, China (2005)

Isard, W.: Interregional and regional input-output analysis: A model of a space economy. Rev. Econ. Stat. **33**, 318–328 (1951)

Jackson, R.W.: Regionalizing national commodity-by-industry accounts. Econ. Syst. Res. **10**(3), 223–238 (1998)

Jackson, R.W., Schwarm, W.R., Okuyama, Y., Islam, S.: A method for constructing commodity-by-industry flow matrices. Ann. Reg. Sci. **40**, 909–920 (2006)

Hoffman, R.B., Kent, J.N.: Design for commodity-by-industry interregional input-output models. In: Polenske, K.R., Skolka, J. (eds.) Advances in Input-Output Analysis: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Input-Output Techniques, Vienna, April 22–26, 1974, pp. 251–262. Ballinger, Cambridge (1976)

Kuehn, J.A., Procter, M.H., Braschler, C.H.: Comparisons of multipliers from input-output and economic base models. Land Econ. **61**, 129–135 (1985)

Lahr, M.L.: Reconciling domestication techniques, the notion of re-exports and some comments on regional accounting. Econ. Syst. Res. **13**, 165–179 (2001)

Lindall, S., Olsen, D., Alward, G.: Deriving multi-regional models using the IMPLAN national trade flows model. J. Reg. Anal. Policy **36**, 76–83 (2006)

Miller, R.E., Blair, P.D.: Input-Output Analysis: Foundations and Extensions. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs (1985)

Miller, R.E., Blair, P.D.: Input-Output Analysis: Foundations and Extensions, 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2009)

Moses, L.N.: The stability of interregional trading patterns and input-output analysis. Am. Econ. Rev. **45**, 803–832 (1955)

Oosterhaven, J.: A family of square and rectangular interregional input-output models. Reg. Sci. Urban Econ. **14**, 562–582 (1984)

Robinson, D.P., Liu, Z.: The effects of interregional trade flow estimating procedures on multiregional social accounting matrix multipliers. J. Reg. Anal. Policy **36**, 94–104 (2006)

Schwarm, W.R., Jackson, R.W., Okuyama, Y.: An evaluation of method for constructing commodity-by-industry flow matrices. J. Reg. Anal. Policy **36**, 84–93 (2006)

Stevens, B.H., Treyz, G.I., Ehrlich, D.J., Bower, J.R.: A new technique for the construction of non-survey regional input-output models and comparison with two survey-based models. Int. Reg. Sci. Rev. **8**, 271–286 (1983)

Stevens, B.H., Treyz, G., Lahr, M.: On the Comparative Accuracy of RPC Estimating Techniques. Regional Science Research Institute, Peace Dale (1988)

U.S. Department of Commerce. U.S. Benchmark Input-Output Accounts, 2002. Washington DC: Bureau of Economic Analysis, US Department of Commerce (2007)

West, G.R.: Regional trade estimation—a hybrid approach. Int. Reg. Sci. Rev. **13**, 103–118 (1990)

[8] More formal theoretical development at greater levels of detail should begin with a review of Oosterhaven (1984). However, the optional use of total commodity supply rather than total commodity output may require some extensions and modifications of findings presented there.