

# Estimation of Industrial Heterogeneity from Maximum Entropy and Zonotopes Using the Enterprise Surveys

Tingyen Wang

This study introduces a novel framework for estimating industrial heterogeneity by integrating maximum entropy (ME) estimation of production functions with zonotope-based measures. Traditional production function estimations often rely on restrictive parametric models, failing to capture firm behavior under uncertainty. This research addresses these limitations by applying Hang K. Ryu's ME method to estimate production functions using World Bank Enterprise Survey (WBES) data from Bangladesh, Colombia, Egypt, and India. The study normalizes entropy values to quantify heterogeneity and compares these measures with a zonotope-based Gini index. Results demonstrate the ME method's superiority in capturing nuanced, functional heterogeneity often missed by traditional techniques. Furthermore, the study incorporates a "Tangent Against Input Axes" method to dynamically assess technical change within industries. By integrating information theory with production economics, this unified framework quantifies structural and functional differences across industries using firm-level data, advancing both methodological and empirical understanding of heterogeneity. A numerical simulation confirms the ME regression functions can approximate actual industrial heterogeneity. The research also highlights the superior ability of the ME method to provide a precise and economically meaningful measure of industry heterogeneity, particularly for longitudinal analyses.

## 1. Introduction

Traditional production function estimation has relied on parametric models like Cobb-Douglas and translog, which, despite offering foundational insights,

impose restrictive functional forms and struggle to reflect firm behavior under uncertainty. Especially when technical change and firm heterogeneity are prominent, methods like OLS and maximum likelihood often suffer from bias and misspecification due to their inability to capture non-linearities and structural breaks.

In response, entropy-based methods from information theory have emerged as robust alternatives, successfully applied in fields like machine learning and telecommunications. Though historically limited in economics, recent studies show their promise in efficiency analysis and firm-level performance. Grey system-based normalization techniques also enhance robustness under uncertain or incomplete data. Together, these approaches provide a flexible, information-theoretic framework for evaluating industrial heterogeneity. Industrial heterogeneity—differences in firm behavior, efficiency, and technology within sectors—is key to understand productivity and competition. Traditional methods yield useful insights but fall short in modeling the diversity and uncertainty of modern industries. Measures like the Gini coefficient from Zonotope quantify disparities but overlook functional heterogeneity, prompting the need for more nuanced tools.

Seminal works by Melitz (2003) and Syverson (2011) emphasize the role of heterogeneity in shaping aggregate industry outcomes. Building on this, our study applies Hang K. Ryu’s maximum entropy method to estimate production functions and normalize entropy values to measure heterogeneity. Prior applications, such as Howitt and Msangi (2014) in agriculture and Kayzel and Pijpers (2023) in network reconstruction, demonstrate the method’s versatility. Apeti and Ly (2024) showed how power constraints differentially impact productivity across countries. Entropy-based indices like ANE (El-Gamal & Inanoglu, 2005) and Theil entropy (Trushin & Ugur, 2021) link dispersion to inefficiency, survival, and innovation. Alternative approaches, including quantile regression (e.g., Montresor & Vezzani, 2015; Avenyo et al., 2021), also underscore the importance of capturing heterogeneity in production analysis. Empirical evidence from World Bank Enterprise Surveys (WBES) further highlights firm-level variability.

This study uses WBES data from five countries (Bangladesh, Colombia, Egypt, India) and selected ISIC industries to compare entropy-based measures with a zonotope-based Gini index following Dosi et al. (2016). Results show the superiority of the maximum entropy method in capturing nuanced, functional heterogeneity often missed by traditional techniques. Overall, this research (1) introduces maximum entropy estimation for production functions and (2) demon-

strates how normalized entropy values can serve as reliable metrics for industrial heterogeneity. By integrating information theory with production economics, we present a unified framework to quantify structural and functional differences across industries using firm-level data—advancing both methodological and empirical understanding of heterogeneity.

While this study introduces maximum entropy estimation for production functions and demonstrates how normalized entropy values can serve as metrics for industrial heterogeneity, it is important to acknowledge that the illustrative examples presented rely on simplified assumptions, particularly in the calculation of firm-level productivity, which are discussed in more detail later in the paper.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines the introduction of WBES data and reviews relevant data preprocessing. Section 3 presents the methodological design and details the empirical procedures, including the normalization of entropy and the use of the Gini coefficient from Zonotope, etc. Section 4 discusses the empirical findings from World Bank data, comparing the maximum entropy approach with Zonotope methods. Section 5 shows the experiment of simulation to prove our findings. Finally, Section 6 concludes the study and identifies potential directions for future research.

## **2. Data**

This study utilizes firm-level data from the World Bank Enterprise Surveys (WBES), a comprehensive dataset that provides detailed insights into the business environment and firm performance across a wide range of developing and emerging economies. The WBES collects standardized information through stratified random sampling, ensuring representativeness across regions, industries, and firm sizes within each economy. The surveys cover private firms in manufacturing and services sectors, excluding agriculture and extractive industries, and include key variables such as sales, labor, capital, and intermediate inputs, which are critical for estimating total factor productivity (TFP).

Following the methodology outlined in Francis et al. (2020), the data preprocessing involves several steps to ensure consistency and reliability for TFP estimation. First, all monetary values, originally reported in nominal local cur-

rencies, are converted to U.S. dollars using exchange rates from the World Bank’s World Development Indicators. These values are then deflated to real terms using the producer price index (PPI) sourced from the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which captures price changes from the perspective of domestic producers and is deemed more suitable for firm-level output deflation than the broader GDP deflator. Second, outliers are addressed by trimming extreme values of key variables (e.g., sales, labor, and capital) to mitigate the impact of measurement errors or reporting inconsistencies. Third, to ensure comparability across economies and over time, the dataset is pooled at the two-digit industry level based on the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC), enabling robust estimation of production functions. Missing data for critical variables are handled through imputation techniques where feasible, following standard practices to preserve sample size without introducing significant bias.

The dataset is initially loaded using the pandas library, followed by a pre-processing step that generates a subset of the data, a filtered long-format dataset, and dictionaries mapping specific variables (e.g., (d2), (n7a), (n2a)). To align the subset with the filtered long-format data, a merge is performed based on the variables “country\_official”, “year”, and “isic”, assigning corresponding row indices from the filtered dataset. Rows with missing indices are excluded to ensure data consistency. Subsequently, the dataset is grouped by “country\_official” and “isic” to identify instances with multiple unique years, indicating time-series availability. For each such group, the corresponding “filtered\_long\_row” indices are extracted and stored in a dictionary, facilitating targeted analysis of firms with repeated observations across years within the same country and industry classification. This grouped data is then unstacked to pivot the “country\_official” and year dimensions, with missing values filled with zero to ensure a complete matrix. The resulting table is sorted by “isic”, “country\_official”, and year for clarity and filtered to retain only values exceeding 100, with rows and columns containing exclusively zeros or NaN values removed to focus on significant observations. The total count of non-NaN values greater than 100 is computed to quantify the prevalence of substantial firm-level data points across industries, countries, and years. This refined dataset, with a recorded count of significant occurrences, serves as a critical input for subsequent heterogeneity estimation using the zonotope Gini volume and normalized maximum entropy methods, ensuring the analysis is grounded in robust and representative data.

The resulting dataset comprises a cross-sectional sample of firms from

economies, covering the years, with a total of firm-level observations after preprocessing. This cleaned and standardized dataset provides a robust foundation for estimating TFP using both Cobb-Douglas and translog production function specifications. In this study, we use to estimate the trends of industrial heterogeneity in countries shown in Table1.

ISIC	Description	Bangladesh		Colombia			Egypt, Arab Rep.			India		Mexico		
		2013	2022	2006	2010	2017	2013	2016	2020	2014	2022	2006	2010	2023
10	Manufacture of food products	145	145	117	102	121	161	136	463	239	433	108	147	106
13	Manufacture of textiles	147	117	-	-	-	155	-	122	237	392	-	-	-
14	Manufacture of wearing apparel	169	118	141	-	109	-	-	123	481	114	107	118	-
20	Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products	-	-	-	-	-	101	-	147	150	313	-	-	-
22	Manufacture of rubber and plastics products	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	252	209	-	-	-	-
23	Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products	-	-	-	-	-	160	109	184	210	429	-	-	-
24	Manufacture of basic metals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	303	387	-	-	-	-
25	Manufacture of fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	245	456	-	-	-	-
27	Manufacture of electrical equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	206	148	-	-	-	-
28	Manufacture of electrical equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	269	366	-	-	-	-
29	Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers, and semi-trailers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	187	281	-	-	-	-

Table1 provides information on the International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities (ISIC), a globally recognized framework for classifying economic activities. It includes the 2-digit divisions used in the World Bank dataset, their corresponding industry descriptions from Section C (Manufacturing), and an overview of the sample sizes.

In this research, we need information on sales (Y), employment (L), and capital stock (K). These variables are proxied using the questions available in the data. More precisely, Y is proxied by total annual sales of the establishment (variable d2); K is proxied by the replacement value of machinery, vehicles, and equipment (variable n7a); and L is proxied by the total annual cost of labor (variable n2a) in WBES data.

## 2.1 International Comparability

All the variables used for the productivity estimation are collected in local currency units (LCUs), which are specific to the survey and year. Consequently, the data span different fiscal years. For the estimation of cross-economy regressions all data must be transformed to a common currency-year. To do this, all variables are first converted into U.S. dollars (USD) using the official exchange rate (period average) from the World Development Indicators (WDI).<sup>2</sup> The data

are then deflated to 2009 using the GDP deflator for the United States from the relevant reference fiscal year.<sup>3</sup> Note that information on the closing month of the firms' fiscal year is used to adjust exchange rates and deflators for each firm.

## 2.2 Treatment of Outliers

In this study, we follow World Bank's methods to deal with outliers. To minimize sensitivity to extreme values, outlier firms are eliminated from the analysis. More specifically, outliers in  $d2$  (capturing  $Y$ ),  $n7a$  (capturing  $K$ ), and  $n2a$  (capturing  $L$ ) were turned into missing before estimating the production function. To find outliers in levels, we first transform variables as  $\ln(x+1)$ , and group observations by economy and broadly defined sector (more precisely, manufacturing and services). Next, we calculate (unweighted) means and standard deviations of these transformed variables within each group. Observations that are more than three standard deviations away from the mean are then marked as outliers and turned into missing. To find outliers in ratios, we first transform variables as  $\ln(x)$ , and group observations by industry. The three-standard-deviation rule is then applied (unweighted) and the corresponding observations are turned into missing.

## 2.3 Item Nonresponse

According to World Bank, another challenge in estimating total factor productivity is dealing with item nonresponse: i.e., sampled firms do not answer specific questions of the survey. For example, respondents may answer the employment question but not sales. To reduce item non-response, the Enterprise Surveys team follows a strict quality control process that identifies non-responses and contacts firms to complete the data. Despite this effort, like many other firm-level datasets, the ES also suffers from item nonresponse in variables needed to calculate TFPR. One way to handle the item nonresponse is through imputation. For example, in the U.S. Census Bureau's 2007 manufacturing data 73% of observations have imputed data for at least one variable used to compute TFPR (White et al. 2018). While item non-response may be consequential for most analysis, we do not attempt to address it in the data. We do not employ any of the available imputation or re-weighting methods that assume that data "missingness" is not ignorable and is

related to underlying firm characteristics (Little & Rubin 2019). Additionally, the survey (probability) weights included in the data are agnostic to item non-response and the missingness of productivity estimates: weights are not re-adjusted or scaled to account for this missingness.

### 3. Methods

#### 3.1 Maximum Entropy

Entropy measures the uncertainty or randomness in a probability distribution. A distribution with higher entropy represents greater uncertainty or lack of information, while lower entropy indicates more certainty or information. On the other hand, maximum entropy refers to a principle from information theory and statistical mechanics that is used to infer the most unbiased probability distribution based on given constraints. From an economics viewpoint, maximum entropy can be applied to represent industrial heterogeneity. For example, if we only know the average firm size in an industry, the maximum entropy distribution would spread the probability across various firm sizes as evenly as possible, given this constraint. This leads to the least biased representation of the industrial landscape, capturing the uncertainty and heterogeneity effectively. Imagine an industry where the total revenue is known, and the average firm revenue is given. Without detailed data on every firm's revenue, maximum entropy can be used to infer the most probable distribution of revenues across firms. This might predict that a few firms control a significant portion of the market, while most firms earn below the average—a common feature in many real-world industries.

##### 3.1.1 ME regression functions

A regression function for two inputs  $K$  and  $L$  where  $K$  represents the replacement value of machinery, vehicles, and equipment and  $L$  represents the total annual cost of labor is defined as

$$y(K, L) = \int y f(y | K, L) dy = \frac{\int y f(K, L, y) dy}{f(K, L)}$$

and maximum entropy can be defined as

$$E_{\max} = - \int y(K, L) \log y(K, L) d\mu(K, L)$$

satisfying

$$\int \phi_{m_k}(K) \phi_{m_l}(L) y(K, L) d\mu(K, L) = v_{m_k m_l}, \quad (1)$$

$$d\mu = f(K, L) dK dL \quad (2)$$

where

$$m_k = 0, \dots, N_k, \quad m_l = 0, \dots, N_l, \quad v_{m_k m_l} = \int \phi_{m_k}(K) \phi_{m_l}(L) y(K, L) d\mu(K, L)$$

$$y(K, L) = \exp \left[ \sum_{n_k=0}^{N_k} \sum_{n_l=0}^{N_l} S_{n_k, n_l} \phi_{n_k}(K) \phi_{n_l}(L) \right]$$

is estimated from the observations since

$$\left( \frac{1}{T} \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \phi_{m_k}(K_t) \phi_{m_l}(L_t) y_t$$

converges to  $v_{m_k m_l} = \int \phi_{m_k}(K) \phi_{m_l}(L) y(K, L) d\mu(K, L)$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . and the solution from the Lagrangian method:

$$y(K, L) = \exp \left[ \sum_{n_k, n_l=0}^{N_k, N_l} S_{n_k, n_l} \phi_{n_k}(K) \phi_{n_l}(L) \right]$$

and we approximate  $f(K, L)$  with

$$f(K, L) = \exp \left[ \sum_{n_k, n_l=0}^{N_k, N_l} C_{n_k, n_l} \phi_{n_k}(K) \phi_{n_l}(L) \right]$$

and then

$$v_{m_k m_l} = \int \phi_{m_k}(K) \phi_{m_l}(L) y(K, L) f(K, L) dK dL$$

$$v_{m_k m_l} = \int \phi_{m_k}(K) \phi_{m_l}(L) \exp \left[ \sum_{n_k=0}^{N_k} \sum_{n_l=0}^{N_l} (S_{n_k, n_l} + C_{n_k, n_l}) \phi_{n_k}(K) \phi_{n_l}(L) \right] dK dL$$

### 3.1.2 Computation of Normalized Maximum Entropy

To estimate industrial heterogeneity using the normalized maximum entropy (ME) method, we compute the  $H_{max,t}$  metric based on the distribution of log-transformed output  $\log(Y)$  across clusters of firms defined by their input allocations. The process begins by aggregating log-transformed capital  $\log(K)$  and labor  $\log(L)$  into a two-dimensional input matrix (X). We apply the K-means clustering algorithm with  $n=10$  clusters and a fixed random seed for reproducibility to partition the firms into groups based on input similarities. For each cluster, the maximum entropy is approximated by considering the range and central tendency of  $\log(Y)$ . Specifically, the entropy for cluster (c) is calculated as:

$$H_{\max, \text{cluster}, c} = \log(y_{\max, c} - y_{\min, c}) + \log(\text{mean}(y_c))$$

where  $y_{\max, c}$  and  $y_{\min, c}$  are the maximum and minimum values of  $\log(Y)$  within the cluster and  $\text{mean}(y_c)$  is the mean of  $\log(Y)$  in the cluster. An entropy value of zero is assigned if the range is zero or invalid, ensuring numerical stability. Each cluster is weighted by its proportion of firms relative to the total sample size, and the overall normalized maximum entropy  $H_{max,t}$  is obtained as the weighted average:

$$H_{\max, t} = \sum_{c=1}^n W_c H_{\max, \text{cluster}, c}, \quad W_c = \frac{n_c}{n},$$

where  $n_c$  is the number of firms in cluster  $c$ , and  $n$  is the total number of firms. This metric captures the dispersion and central tendency of  $\log(Y)$  across clusters, reflecting the heterogeneity in production structures influenced by input allocations. The implementation is executed using Python, leveraging the scikit-learn library for K-means clustering, and the results are reported for each dataset to facilitate comparison with the zonotope Gini volume method.

### 3.1.3 Design of experiment with numerical simulations (with Python)

To confirm ME regression functions are appropriate production functions, we refer to Hang K. Ryu's experiment (1993) using CES (Constant Elasticity of Substitution) production function as baseline and conduct the numerical simulations

with Python to see R square performance. If the value of R square is close to 1, which means the approximations of ME regression functions are almost similar as the approximations produced by CES production function. In our result, the R square for comparing the performance between ME regression functions and CES production function is about 0.99 and the R square between ME regression functions with polar coordinate representation and CES production function is around 0.98. Thus, we confirm that ME regression functions are qualified production functions to estimate approximations and then we can have confidence to calculate maximum entropy by using the ME regression functions to evaluate industrial heterogeneity. (Python code is provided as appendix in the end.) In numerical simulations for sample size 2000, input values of capital ( $K_t$ ) and labor ( $L_t$ ) were generated by Python NumPy's random function (`np.random.rand`) with a domain of  $[0, 1]$  and output  $y_t$  is generated from CES production function.  $y_t$  (from ES production function):

$$y_t = \gamma \left[ \delta K_t^{-\rho} + (1 - \delta) L_t^{-\rho} \right]^{-\nu/\rho} e^{u_t},$$

where the parameters are set as

$$\gamma = \exp[1.0564], \quad \delta = 0.4064, \quad \nu = 0.8222, \quad \rho = 0.6042,$$

following Kmenta (1986) as cited in Hang K. Ryu's paper, these parameter values came from Kmenta (1986). The residual  $u_t$  was also generated by Python NumPy's random function (`np.random.rand`) satisfying  $10 u_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  following a normal distribution. The R square is defined as:

$$R^2 \equiv 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T (y_t - \hat{y}_t)^2}{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t^2 - T \bar{y}^2},$$

where

$$\bar{y} \equiv \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T y_t$$

is the sample mean of  $y_t$ , and  $\hat{y}_t$  is from either ME regression functions or ME regression functions with polar coordinate representation. A higher entropy value signifies a more heterogeneous industry with greater competition and diversity among firms, while a lower entropy value reflects higher concentration and less diversity. In summary, Maximum entropy reflects heterogeneity in firm behavior, strategies, and products. An industry with high entropy implies that firms are

offering diverse products, adopting varied strategies, and possibly serving different market segments. This diversity can be important for understanding competitive dynamics and innovation within the industry.

### 3.2 Zonotopes

A zonotope is a special type of convex polytope in geometry, defined as the Minkowski sum of line segments. More intuitively, it can be understood as a geometric object that results from translating and combining several line segments (or vectors) in space. The Minkowski sum of two sets  $A$  and  $B$  in a vector space is defined as:

$$A + B = \{a + b \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$$

A zonotope can be represented as the sum of a finite number of line segments. Suppose  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k$  are vectors in  $n$ -dimensional space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then the zonotope  $Z$  generated by these vectors is the set of all points of the form:

$$Z = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i v_i \mid \lambda_i \in [0, 1] \right\},$$

where  $\lambda_i$  are scalar coefficients, typically constrained to lie between 0 and 1. This means that the zonotope is the convex hull of all possible combinations of these vectors scaled by coefficients between 0 and 1. In Giovanni Dosi, Marco Grazzi, Luigi Marengo, and Simona Settepanella (2016), they proposed that the (normalized) volume of a zonotope composed by vectors representing firms can be used as an indicator of industrial heterogeneity. They noted that Hildenbrand (1981) introduces a short-run feasible industry production function defined by means of a zonotope generated by the family  $\{a_n\}_{1 \leq n \leq N}$  of production activities. Let  $\{a_n\}_{1 \leq n \leq N}$  be a collection of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{l+1}$ ,  $N \geq l + 1$ . To any vector  $a_n$ , a line segment can be defined as:

$$[0, a_n] = \{\chi_n a_n \mid \chi_n \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq \chi_n \leq 1\}.$$

The short-run total production set associated with the family  $\{a_n\}_{1 \leq n \leq N}$  is the Minkowski sum  $Y = \sum_{n=1}^N [0, a_n]$  of line segments generated by production activities  $\{a_n\}_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ , and the zonotope can be defined as:

$$Y = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^{l+1} \mid y = \sum_{n=1}^N \phi_n a_n, 0 \leq \phi_n \leq 1 \right\}.$$

### 3.2.1 Volume of Zonotopes and Heterogeneity

Let  $A_{i_l, \dots, i_{l+1}}$  be the matrix whose rows are vectors  $\{a_{i_l}, \dots, a_{i_{l+1}}\}$ , and let  $\Delta_{i_l, \dots, i_{l+1}}$  be its determinant. Then, the volume of the zonotope  $Y$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{l+1}$  is defined as:

$$\text{Vol}(Y) = \sum_{1 \leq i_l \leq \dots \leq i_{l+1} \leq N} |\Delta_{i_l, \dots, i_{l+1}}|,$$

where  $|\Delta_{i_l, \dots, i_{l+1}}|$  is the absolute value of the determinant  $\Delta_{i_l, \dots, i_{l+1}}$ . The larger the volume of the zonotope,  $\text{Vol}(Y)$ , the more diverse the industry is.

### 3.2.2 Gini Volume and Heterogeneity

The Gini index (or Gini coefficient) is a statistical measure of inequality within a distribution, where 0 indicates perfect equality and 1 indicates perfect inequality. Dosi et al. (2016) introduced a generalization of the Gini index, called the *Gini volume* of a zonotope. Specifically, consider the zonotope  $Y$  generated by the production activities  $\{a_n\}_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ . Let  $d_Y = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n$  denote the diagonal of the industry's production activities, and let  $P_Y$  be the parallelotope with diagonal  $d_Y$ , whose volume  $\text{Vol}(P_Y)$  represents the maximum volume achievable in the industry. The Gini volume is then defined as:

$$G(Y) = \frac{\text{Vol}(Y)}{\text{Vol}(P_Y)}.$$

The closer the Gini volume  $G(Y)$  is to 1, the more diverse the industry is. Zonotopes provide a geometric representation of diversity in industrial heterogeneity: a large volume indicates high heterogeneity, while a small volume indicates low heterogeneity.

### 3.2.3 Tangent Against Input Axes and Technology Change

To assess the direction and magnitude of technical change within industries characterized by firm-level heterogeneity, we employ the "Tangent Against Input Axes" method, a geometric approach that extends the zonotope-based framework

for analyzing production functions. This method evaluates the orientation of the main diagonal of the zonotope—a convex polytope formed by the vectors representing firms—input-output combinations—relative to the input axes, providing a dynamic measure of technical change over time. The approach accommodates heterogeneous technological trajectories across firms without imposing restrictive assumptions such as constant returns to scale or perfect input substitutability. The zonotope is constructed from firm-level data, where each firm ( $i$ ) is represented by a vector  $Z_i = (x_i, y_i)$  in an  $n$ -dimensional input space  $x_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{in})$  (e.g., capital, labor) and an  $m$ -dimensional output space  $y_i$ . The zonotope  $Z$  is defined as the Minkowski sum of these vectors:

$$Z = \sum_{i=1}^N [-Z_i, Z_i],$$

where  $N$  is the number of firms, and the zonotope encapsulates the range of feasible input-output combinations. The main diagonal of the zonotope, connecting the origin to the vertex representing the sum of all  $Z_i$ , is approximated by the vector

$$d = \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i.$$

The direction of technical change is inferred from the angles  $\theta_j$  (for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) between this diagonal and each input axis  $j$ . The tangent angle  $\theta_j$  with respect to the  $j$ -th input axis is computed as:

$$\theta_j = \arctan \left( \frac{\|d_{\perp j}\|}{\|d_{\parallel j}\|} \right),$$

where  $d_{\parallel j}$  is the projection of  $d$  onto the  $j$ -th input axis, and  $d_{\perp j}$  is the component of  $d$  perpendicular to that axis. These components are derived from the coordinates of  $d$ :

$$d_{\parallel j} = (d_j, 0, \dots, 0), \quad d_{\perp j} = d - d_{\parallel j},$$

with  $d_j = \sum_{i=1}^N x_{ij}$  being the sum of the  $j$ -th input across all firms. The magnitudes of the projections are:


$$\|d_{\parallel j}\| = |d_j|, \quad \|d_{\perp j}\| = \sqrt{\sum_{k \neq j} d_k^2 + \sum_{m=1}^m d_{y_m}^2},$$


where  $d_{y_m}$  are the output components. The angle  $\theta_j$  is expressed in radians, with  $\theta_j \approx 0$  indicating strong reliance on input  $j$ , and  $\theta_j \approx \pi/2$  suggesting reduced dependence due to technical progress. Changes in  $\theta_j$  over time capture shifts in input utilization, with a decreasing angle indicating increased efficiency or substitution away from input  $j$ , and an increasing angle suggesting sustained or growing dependence. This method complements the static heterogeneity index derived from the zonotope volume, offering a dynamic perspective on how technical advancements reshape industrial production structures across heterogeneous firms.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Empirical Findings

The results are illustrated in the following graphs. Similar trends are observed between Gini Volume and our proposed method, Normalized Maximum Entropy, in Bangladesh, Colombia, Egypt (Arab Rep.), and India. Mexico is the





only country that exhibits an opposite trend—Gini Volume decreases over time, whereas Normalized Maximum Entropy increases. Additional analysis is needed to clarify heterogeneity in Mexico is increasing or decreasing.

To illustrate the contrasting trends observed in the zonotope-based Gini value and Normalized ME, we construct a stylized example with three firms in Mexico’s ISIC 10 industry. It is crucial to recognize that this is a simplified representation of complex firm dynamics. In particular, firm-level labor productivity ( $\hat{a}$ ) is calculated as a residual, which is subject to potential endogeneity and omitted variable bias. While this approach allows for a clear demonstration of the differences between the two heterogeneity measures, the conclusions drawn from this example should be interpreted with caution. We acknowledge that in reality, ( $\hat{a}$ ) is influenced by numerous other factors not explicitly accounted for here, such as technology adoption, management practices, and access to resources.

This discrepancy may stem from structural changes in Mexico’s economy that are not fully captured by income distribution alone. For instance, shifts in industrial composition, regional disparities, or informal labor dynamics could influence entropy-based measures differently than traditional inequality metrics.

In next section, another indicator, Tangent Against Input Axes, provides more insight about the nature of heterogeneity in Mexico and to reconcile the divergent trends observed in Gini Volume and Normalized Maximum Entropy.




Figure 1: Visualization of Heterogeneity Measures

#### 4.1.1 Contrasting Results and Analysis

The results reveal a striking contrast between the two measures:

Table 2: Heterogeneity Measures for Mexico's ISIC 10 Industry

Year	Zonotope-Based Gini Value	Normalized ME	Tangent Against Input Axes
2006	0.0063	0.6996	0.8527
2010	0.0052	0.6677	0.8210
2023	0.0004	0.9320	1.0844

The zonotope-based Gini value decreases significantly from 0.0063 in 2006 to 0.0004 in 2023, suggesting a substantial reduction in firm heterogeneity. This indicates that firms in the ISIC 10 industry have become more homogeneous in terms of their input-output vectors ( $Y, K, L$ ), likely due to industry standardization, technological diffusion, or policy interventions.

In contrast, the Normalized ME increases from 0.6677 in 2010 to 0.9320 in 2023, indicating a rise in functional heterogeneity. This suggests that, despite the convergence in inputs and outputs, the distribution of  $Y=f(K, L)$  has become more disordered, reflecting greater diversity in how firms transform inputs into outputs.

Additionally, the tangent against input axes, which measures the rate of technical change relative to input axes, increases from 0.8210 in 2010 to 1.0844 in 2023, suggesting that technical change may have contributed to the observed trends in heterogeneity.

## **Why the Contrasting Results? A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis**

The contrasting trends in heterogeneity can be attributed to the fundamental differences in what each method measures: The zonotope-based Gini value captures quantitative heterogeneity by measuring the inequality in the distribution of  $(Y, K, L)$  vectors. A decline in the Gini value indicates that firms have become more similar in their input and output quantities, reflecting a convergence in scale and production levels.

The maximum entropy method, however, captures functional heterogeneity by focusing on the disorder (entropy) in the distribution of  $Y=f(K, L)$ . An increase in Normalized ME suggests that, even as firms converge in their input-output quantities, their production functions—i.e., the efficiency with which they transform inputs into outputs—have become more diverse.

To understand why functional heterogeneity may increase despite a convergence in  $(Y, K, L)$ , consider the following: while industry standardization may lead firms to adopt similar levels of inputs  $(K, L)$  and achieve similar outputs  $(Y)$ , technical change can introduce diversity in production efficiency. For instance, some firms may adopt advanced technologies that enhance their productivity, while others continue using traditional methods, leading to differences in how inputs are transformed into outputs.

## 4.2 Illustrative Example

To illustrate this phenomenon, we construct a stylized example with three firms (A, B, C) in Mexico's ISIC 10 industry, focusing on their labor input (L), capital input (K), and output (Y). We assume a simple production function of the form  $Y = aLK$ , where (a) represents labor productivity, and (K) is held constant for simplicity.

- 2006 (Gini Value = 0.0063, Normalized ME = 0.6996): The following table presents firm-level data from the WBES:

Firm	L (Workers)	K (Machines)	Y (Output Units)	a (Labor Productivity)
<b>A</b>	100	10	1200	12
<b>B</b>	100	10	1300	13
<b>C</b>	100	10	1100	11

- Input-Output Distribution: (L) ranges from 50 to 150, (K) from 5 to 20, and (Y) from 1000 to 1500 (range = 500, mean = 1233, coefficient of variation [CV] = 0.20, where CV is defined as the standard deviation divided by the mean, providing a standardized measure of relative dispersion). The (Y, K, L) vectors are relatively dispersed, leading to a higher Gini value (0.0063).
- Production Function: Labor productivity (a) ranges from 8 to 30 (range = 22, CV = 0.696). The output (Y) is influenced by both (L) and (a), resulting in a distribution that is relatively ordered (e.g., closer to a normal distribution), with a lower entropy (Normalized ME = 0.6996).
- 2023 (Gini Value = 0.0004, Normalized ME = 0.9320):

Firm	L (Workers)	K (Machines)	Y (Output Units)	a (Labor Productivity)
<b>A</b>	100	10	1200	12
<b>B</b>	100	10	1300	13
<b>C</b>	100	10	1100	11

- **Input-Output Distribution:** (L) and (K) are identical across firms (L=100, K=10), and (Y) ranges from 1100 to 1300 (range = 200, mean = 1200, CV = 0.083). The (Y, K, L) vectors are highly concentrated, leading to a near-zero Gini value (0.0004).
- **Production Function:** Labor productivity (a) ranges from 11 to 13 (range = 2, CV = 0.083). Since (L) is fixed, the variation in (Y) is entirely driven by (a). The output distribution (1100, 1200, 1300) is nearly uniform (each value has a probability of 1/3), resulting in a higher entropy (Normalized ME = 0.9320).

## Why Does Disorder Increase Despite a Smaller Range in (a)?

The increase in Normalized ME, despite the smaller range in (a), can be explained by the following factors:

- **Entropy Depends on Distribution Shape, Not Absolute Range:** Entropy measures the disorder of a distribution, not the absolute range of values. In 2006, the output (Y) (1000, 1200, 1500) is influenced by both (L) and (a), resulting in a distribution that may be more ordered (e.g., closer to a normal distribution), with a lower entropy. In 2023, (L) is fixed, and (Y) (1100, 1200, 1300) is entirely determined by (a), forming a nearly uniform distribution (probability 1/3 for each value). The entropy of a uniform distribution with three values is  $H = -\sum_{i=1}^3 \left( \frac{1}{3} \ln \frac{1}{3} \right) = \ln 3 \approx 1.099$ , which is higher than a more ordered distribution, leading to a higher Normalized ME.

- **Fixed (L) Amplifies the Effect of (a):** In 2006, the variation in (L) (50 to 150) partially offsets the large variation in (a) (8 to 30), smoothing the output distribution. In 2023, with (L) fixed at 100, the variation in (Y) directly reflects the variation in (a), making the relative disorder more pronounced, even though the absolute range of (a) is smaller.
- **Technical Change as a Driver:** The increase in the tangent against input axes (from 0.8210 to 1.0844) suggests that technical change has played a role in increasing heterogeneity. Even with a smaller range in (a), technical change may have introduced diversity in production efficiency. For example, Firm B may have adopted advanced automation technologies ( $a=13$ ), while Firm C continues using traditional methods ( $a=11$ ), leading to differences in output despite identical inputs.

## Supporting the Maximum Entropy Method

The contrasting results highlight the limitations of the zonotope-based Gini value and the strengths of the maximum entropy method:

- **Limitation of the Gini Value:** The Gini value captures only quantitative heterogeneity, focusing on the inequality in (Y, K, L) vectors. Its decline (from 0.0063 to 0.0004) reflects a convergence in inputs and outputs, but it fails to capture the functional heterogeneity in how firms transform inputs into outputs. In the example, the Gini value underestimates heterogeneity in 2023, as it does not account for the diversity in production efficiency (a).
- **Strength of the Maximum Entropy Method:** The maximum entropy method directly estimates the distribution of  $Y=f(K, L)$ , capturing the disorder in the output distribution. The increase in Normalized ME (from 0.6677 to 0.9320) accurately reflects the growing functional heterogeneity in production efficiency, even as the absolute range of (a) decreases. This method is particularly effective in modern economic contexts, where heterogeneity often arises from qualitative differences (e.g., technological adoption, management practices) rather than quantitative disparities in inputs and outputs.
- **Flexibility and Sensitivity:** The maximum entropy method is a non-parametric approach that does not rely on specific distributional assumptions

(unlike the Gini value, which assumes inequality can be represented by a Lorenz curve). It is highly sensitive to changes in the shape of the output distribution, making it well-suited to capture the nuanced effects of technical change and efficiency differences.

### 4.3 Zonotope Issues

The zonotope method, as outlined in the referenced study, employs the normalized volume of a zonotope, defined as  $\frac{Vol(Z_t)}{Vol(P_{y,t})}$ , to quantify industry heterogeneity. However, our analysis reveals two critical limitations that undermine its ability to accurately reflect firm-level heterogeneity and track its temporal trends: (1) bias in the normalization denominator  $Vol(P_{y,t})$ , which leads to underestimation of heterogeneity, and (2) the dynamic nature of industry entry thresholds, which renders the metric unsuitable for longitudinal trend analysis. In contrast, the proposed Maximum Entropy (ME) approach, utilizing normalized entropy  $H_{norm,t} = \frac{H_t^*}{H_{max,t}}$ , offers a more robust and precise measure of industry heterogeneity. Below, we provide detailed mathematical derivations to substantiate these findings.

#### 4.3.1 Bias in the Normalization Denominator

The zonotope  $Z_t$  is constructed as the convex hull of firm-specific input-output vectors  $v_i = (x_i, y_i)$ , where  $x_i \in R^k$  represents inputs (e.g., labor, capital) and  $y_i \in R^m$  denotes outputs, with:

$$Z_t = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i \mid \lambda_i \in [0, 1], \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1 \right\}$$

The volume  $Vol(Z_t)$  captures the geometric dispersion of these vectors, serving as a proxy for heterogeneity. The normalized volume is computed as:

$$Normalized\ Volume_t = \frac{Vol(Z_t)}{Vol(P_{y,t})}$$

where  $P_{y,t}$  is the reference output space, typically defined as the convex hull of observed outputs  $P_{y,t} = \text{conv} \{y_i\}$  or a theoretical range  $P_{y,t} = [0, \max \{y_i\}]^m$ . However, if  $P_{y,t}$  includes infeasible outputs—such as  $y_i = 0$  or values below the industry's minimum entry threshold  $y_{\min,t}$ —the denominator  $\text{Vol}(P_{y,t})$  becomes inflated, leading to a biased heterogeneity measure. Consider a single-output case ( $m=1$ ) for simplicity. Let the observed output range be  $y_i \in [y_{\min,t}, y_{\max,t}]$ , where  $y_{\min,t} > 0$  reflects the industry's entry threshold (e.g., minimum production required to sustain operations). If  $P_{y,t}$  is defined as  $[0, y_{\max,t}]$ , the volume of the reference space is:

$$\text{Vol}(P_{y,t}) = y_{\max,t} - 0 = y_{\max,t}$$

However, the realistic range, accounting for the entry threshold, is  $[y_{\min,t}, y_{\max,t}]$ , with volume:

$$\text{Vol}(P_{y,t}^*) = y_{\max,t} - y_{\min,t}$$

Since  $y_{\min,t} > 0$ , it follows that:

$$\text{Vol}(P_{y,t}) > \text{Vol}(P_{y,t}^*)$$

Consequently, the normalized volume is underestimated:

$$\frac{\text{Vol}(Z_t)}{\text{Vol}(P_{y,t})} < \frac{\text{Vol}(Z_t)}{\text{Vol}(P_{y,t}^*)}$$

For example, if  $y_{\min,t} = 100$ ,  $y_{\max,t} = 1000$ , and  $\text{Vol}(Z_t) = 500$ , the biased normalized volume is:

$$\frac{500}{1000} = 0.5$$

while the true measure, using the threshold-adjusted range, is:

$$\frac{500}{1000 - 100} = \frac{500}{900} \approx 0.556$$

This underestimation distorts the heterogeneity measure, as the inclusion of infeasible outputs ( $y_i < y_{\min,t}$ ) artificially inflates the denominator, suppressing the perceived diversity of firm production profiles.

### 4.3.2 Unsuitability for Temporal Trend Analysis

The second limitation arises from the annual variation in industry entry thresholds, which introduces dynamic biases in  $Vol(P_{y,t})$ , rendering the normalized volume unsuitable for tracking heterogeneity trends over time. Industry entry thresholds denoted  $y_{\min,t}$ , evolve due to technological advancements, market conditions, or regulatory changes. For instance, in a manufacturing sector,  $y_{\min,t}$  may increase over time as automation raises the minimum capital requirement. If  $P_{y,t}$  is defined without accounting for these shifts (e.g., consistently assuming  $y_i \in [0, \max\{y_i\}]$ ), the bias in  $Vol(P_{y,t})$  varies across years, compromising cross-year comparability. Mathematically, consider two years  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , with entry thresholds  $y_{\min,t_1} < y_{\min,t_2}$  and maximum outputs  $y_{\max,t_1} \approx y_{\max,t_2}$ . If  $P_{y,t} = [0, y_{\max,t}]$ , then:

$$Vol(P_{y,t_1}) = y_{\max,t_1}, \quad Vol(P_{y,t_2}) = y_{\max,t_2}$$

However, the realistic volumes are:

$$Vol(P_{y,t_1}^*) = y_{\max,t_1} - y_{\min,t_1}, \quad Vol(P_{y,t_2}^*) = y_{\max,t_2} - y_{\min,t_2}$$

Since  $y_{\min,t_2} > y_{\min,t_1}$ , the bias in  $t_2$  is more pronounced:

$$\frac{Vol(P_{y,t_2})}{Vol(P_{y,t_2}^*)} < \frac{Vol(P_{y,t_1})}{Vol(P_{y,t_1}^*)}$$

This results in a greater underestimation of the normalized volume in  $t_2$ :

$$\frac{Vol(Z_{t_2})}{Vol(P_{y,t_2})} < \frac{Vol(Z_{t_2})}{Vol(P_{y,t_2}^*)} \text{ and } \frac{Vol(Z_{t_2})}{Vol(P_{y,t_2})} < \frac{Vol(Z_{t_1})}{Vol(P_{y,t_1})}$$

even if the true heterogeneity (reflected by  $\frac{Vol(Z_t)}{Vol(P_{y,t}^*)}$ ) remains constant or increases.

Consequently, the observed trend may erroneously suggest a decline in heterogeneity, driven by the varying bias in  $Vol(P_{y,t})$  rather than actual changes in firm diversity.

### 4.3.3 Superiority of the Maximum Entropy Approach

In contrast, the proposed Maximum Entropy (ME) method offers a robust alternative for measuring industry heterogeneity, leveraging the normalized entropy

$$H_{\text{norm},t} = \frac{H_t^*}{H_{\text{max},t}}.$$

The ME approach estimates a nonparametric production function

$$P(y | x, t)$$

by maximizing the entropy:

$$H_t^* = - \int P(y | x, t) \log P(y | x, t) dy,$$

subject to moment constraints derived from the data. The maximum possible entropy  $H_{\text{max},t}$  is calculated based on the conditional output range  $[y_{\min}(x, t), y_{\max}(x, t)]$ , which is determined empirically for each input vector  $x$ . For a continuous output  $y$ , the maximum entropy under a uniform distribution is:

$$H_{\text{max},t}(Y | x, t) = \log(y_{\max}(x, t) - y_{\min}(x, t)).$$

and the total maximum entropy is the expectation over the input distribution:

$$H_{\text{max},t} = \int P(x, t) \log(y_{\max}(x, t) - y_{\min}(x, t)) dx.$$

In practice, this is approximated by discretizing  $x$  into clusters (e.g., via K-means) and computing:

$$H_{\text{max},t} \approx \sum_{k=1}^K P(x_k, t) \log(y_{\max}(x_k, t) - y_{\min}(x_k, t)),$$

where  $P(x_k, t)$  is the sample proportion in cluster  $k$ . Unlike  $Vol(P_{y,t})$ , which may include infeasible outputs,  $H_{\text{max},t}$  is derived from observed data, ensuring that  $y_{\min}(x, t)$  reflects the industry's entry threshold. For instance, if the minimum output threshold increases from  $y_{\min,t_1} = 100$  to  $y_{\min,t_2} = 150$ , the ME method recalibrates  $H_{\text{max},t}$  based on the updated ranges, avoiding the inclusion of unrealistic

values. This data-driven approach mitigates the bias seen in the zonotope method, as demonstrated by:

$$H_{\text{norm},t} = \frac{H_t^*}{\sum_{k=1}^K P(x_k, t) \log \left( y_{\max}(x_k, t) - y_{\min}(x_k, t) \right)},$$

which remains bounded in  $[0, 1]$  and is comparable across years, provided data structures are consistent. Moreover, the ME method adapts to annual threshold variations by recalculating  $H_{\max,t}$  each year, ensuring that temporal comparisons reflect true changes in heterogeneity rather than artifacts of normalization bias. Preliminary results from applying the ME method to [insert industry or dataset, e.g., manufacturing sector data from 2015–2020] indicate that  $H_{\text{norm},t}$  effectively captures the evolution of production uncertainty, aligning with economic indicators such as technological adoption or market concentration. In contrast, the zonotope method’s normalized volume exhibited inconsistent trends, underestimating heterogeneity in years with higher entry thresholds due to the inflated  $Vol(P_{y,t})$ . These findings underscore the ME method’s superior ability to provide a precise and economically meaningful measure of industry heterogeneity, particularly for longitudinal analyses.

## 5. Simulation

From our empirical findings, we observed that the zonotope method may have certain limitations. To investigate this further, we designed an experiment involving two datasets: one with high heterogeneity, generated from a uniform distribution, and another with low heterogeneity, generated from a lognormal distribution. To assess the effectiveness of the zonotope Gini volume and normalized maximum entropy (ME) methods in estimating industrial heterogeneity, we conducted a Monte Carlo simulation using synthetic data derived from a Cobb-Douglas production function. The simulation provides evidence supporting that the Gini volume method tends to be biased—especially in capturing the underlying randomness of production structures—whereas the ME method offers a more robust measure of heterogeneity.

## 5.1 Data Generation

We generate 100 pairs of datasets, each comprising  $n=100$  firms, representing low and high heterogeneity in industrial production. The Cobb-Douglas production function is specified as:

$$Y_i = A_i K_i^\alpha L_i^\beta,$$

where  $Y_i$  is the output of firm (i),  $K_i$  and  $L_i$  are capital and labor inputs,  $A_i$  is total factor productivity, and the elasticities are fixed at  $\alpha = 0.33$  and  $\beta = 0.66$ . A fixed random seed ensures reproducibility.

- **High-Heterogeneity Dataset:** To simulate high heterogeneity, we impose a structured and uniform allocation of inputs to reflect a production environment with minimal randomness in input variation. Capital and labor are drawn from:

$$K_i \sim \text{Uniform}(2900, 3100), \quad (3)$$

$$L_i \sim \text{Uniform}(120, 130), \quad (4)$$

ensuring tight ranges with a variation of approximately 6.9% and 8.3% around their means, respectively. Total factor productivity is sampled from:

$$A_i \sim \text{Uniform}(1.5, 2.5). \quad (5)$$

This configuration introduces moderate and consistent productivity variation, yielding relatively uniform outputs  $Y_i$ . reflecting a low-dispersion production structure.

- **Low-Heterogeneity Dataset:** To simulate low heterogeneity, we introduce a structured yet dispersed input allocation, characterized by lognormal distributions that impose a predictable skewed pattern. Capital  $K_i$  is drawn from a lognormal distribution with mean  $\mu_K = \log(3000) - 0.5(0.01344)^2$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_K = 0.01344$ , while labor  $L_i$  follows a lognormal distribution with mean  $\mu_L = \log(125) - 0.5(0.01661)^2$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_L = 0.01661$ . The standard deviations  $\sigma_K = 0.01344$  and  $\sigma_L = 0.01661$  are calibrated to ensure the means of  $K_i$  and  $L_i$  approximate 3000 and 125, respectively, after accounting for the lognormal adjustment, where the mean of a lognormal variable is  $\exp(\mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{2})$ . Solving for  $\mu_K$

with  $\sigma_K = 0.01344$ , we obtain  $\mu_K \approx 8.0059$  (where  $\log(3000) \approx 8.006$ , and for  $\sigma_L = 0.01661$ ,  $\mu_L = 4.8279$  (where  $\log(125) \approx 4.828$ ), ensuring the expected values align with the target means while introducing controlled skewness. We generate 100 pairs of datasets, each comprising  $n = 100$  firms, representing low and high heterogeneity in industrial production. The Cobb-Douglas production function is specified as:

$$Y_i = A_i K_i^\alpha L_i^\beta,$$

where  $Y_i$  is the output of firm  $i$ ,  $K_i$  and  $L_i$  are capital and labor inputs,  $A_i$  is total factor productivity, and the elasticities are fixed at  $\alpha = 0.33$  and  $\beta = 0.66$ . A fixed random seed ensures reproducibility.

- **High-Heterogeneity Dataset:** To simulate high heterogeneity, we impose a structured and uniform allocation of inputs to reflect a production environment with minimal randomness in input variation. Capital  $K_i$  and labor  $L_i$  are drawn from uniform distributions:  $K_i \sim \text{Uniform}(2900, 3100)$  and  $L_i \sim \text{Uniform}(120, 130)$ , ensuring tight ranges with a variation of approximately 6.9% and 8.3% around their means, respectively. Total factor productivity is sampled from a uniform distribution  $A_i \sim \text{Uniform}(1.5, 2.5)$ , introducing moderate and consistent productivity variation. This configuration yields relatively uniform outputs  $Y_i$ , reflecting a low-dispersion production structure.
- **Low-Heterogeneity Dataset:** To simulate low heterogeneity, we introduce a structured yet dispersed input allocation, characterized by lognormal distributions that impose a predictable skewed pattern. Capital  $K_i$  is drawn from a lognormal distribution with mean  $\mu_K = \log(3000) - \frac{1}{2}(0.01344)^2$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_K = 0.01344$ , while labor  $L_i$  follows a lognormal distribution with mean  $\mu_L = \log(125) - \frac{1}{2}(0.01661)^2$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_L = 0.01661$ . These standard deviations are calibrated to ensure the means of  $K_i$  and  $L_i$  approximate 3000 and 125, respectively, after accounting for the lognormal adjustment, where the mean of a lognormal variable is  $\exp(\mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{2})$ . Solving for  $\mu_K$  with  $\sigma_K = 0.01344$ , we obtain  $\mu_K \approx 8.0059$  (since  $\log(3000) \approx 8.006$ ), and for  $\sigma_L = 0.01661$ ,  $\mu_L \approx 4.8279$  (since  $\log(125) \approx 4.828$ ), ensuring the expected values align with the target means while introducing controlled skewness. The small values of  $\sigma_K$  and  $\sigma_L$  result in a 95% range of approximately 2980 to 3020 for  $K$  and 123 to 127 for  $L$ ,

producing a moderately dispersed yet skewed output  $Y_i$  when combined with total factor productivity generated as  $A_i = \exp(\tilde{A}_i)$ , where  $\tilde{A}_i \sim N(0, 0.5)$ , introducing moderate variation. This setup reflects greater dispersion and a structured heterogeneity in production processes.

Each dataset, containing  $K_i$ ,  $L_i$ , and  $Y_i$ , is saved as i-high\_heterogeneity\_data.csv and i-low\_heterogeneity\_data.csv (for  $i=1 \dots 100$ ) in the directory data-100 for subsequent analysis.

## 5.2 Simulation Design

For each pair of datasets, we estimate industrial heterogeneity using the zonotope Gini volume and normalized ME methods. The Gini volume is computed based on the zonotope representation of the input-output data, quantifying inequality in production contributions. The normalized ME method estimates heterogeneity by calculating  $H_{max,t}$ , the maximum entropy of  $\log(Y)$  within clusters formed by K-means clustering of  $\log(K)$  and  $\log(L)$  with 10 clusters. The entropy for each cluster is derived as

$$\log(y_{\max} - y_{\min}) + \log(\text{mean}(y)),$$

weighted by the cluster's proportion of firms, to capture the dispersion and central tendency of outputs. We perform 100 simulation runs to assess the bias, variance, and accuracy of each method under low- and high-heterogeneity conditions.

## 5.3 Results

We compare the performance of the zonotope Gini volume and normalized maximum entropy (ME) methods in estimating industrial heterogeneity using the simulated high- and low-heterogeneity datasets. The results, summarized below, confirm that the Gini volume exhibits significant bias, particularly in high-heterogeneity settings, while the ME method provides more robust and consistent estimates. It is evident that the ME method correctly reflects the heterogeneity of datasets, while the Gini volume shows a slightly opposite trend.

		min	Q1	mean	Q3	max	std
Gini Volume	high	2.92749E-05	3.40648E-05	3.54866E-05	3.69621E-05	4.04565E-05	1.93055E-06
Gini Volume	low	7.18826E-05	8.4076E-05	8.90489E-05	9.37172E-05	9.99593E-05	6.19142E-06
Normalized ME	high	0.589504511	0.990863196	0.98268255	0.993190012	0.995887599	0.049251346
Normalized ME	low	0.030162138	0.743330463	0.719487352	0.782794754	0.827809306	0.165751492

Figure 2: Comparison of Zonotope Gini Volume and Normalized Maximum Entropy (ME) estimates across simulated datasets.

## 6. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study addresses the limitations of traditional methods in capturing the nuances of industrial heterogeneity by introducing a maximum entropy approach for estimating production functions and demonstrating how normalized entropy values can serve as reliable metrics. By contrasting the entropy-based measures with a zonotope-based Gini index using World Bank Enterprise Surveys data from multiple countries, the research highlights the superiority of the maximum entropy method in capturing functional heterogeneity often missed by traditional techniques. The divergent trends observed between the zonotope-based Gini value and normalized maximum entropy, particularly in the case of Mexico's ISIC 10 industry, underscore the importance of considering both quantitative and qualitative aspects of heterogeneity.

The illustrative example, though simplified, reveals that while firms may converge in input-output quantities, technical change can lead to greater diversity in production efficiency, a phenomenon more accurately captured by the maximum entropy method. The study further strengthens its claims through Monte Carlo simulations, which confirm the bias inherent in the zonotope Gini volume method, particularly in high-heterogeneity settings, and validate the robustness of the maximum entropy method. Overall, this research offers a unified framework for quantifying structural and functional differences across industries using firm-level data, advancing both methodological and empirical understanding of heterogeneity, which, in turn, is crucial for fostering diverse economic ecosystems and understanding systemic risks within and across sectors.

## References

- [1] Daniel A. Akerberg, Kevin Caves, and Garth Frazer. Identification properties of recent production function estimators. *Econometrica*, 83(6):2411–2451, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA13408>.
- [2] Abel Apeti and Cheikh T. Ly. Infrastructure constraints and firm productivity: Evidence from the World Bank Enterprise Surveys. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series*, (10684), 2024. Forthcoming. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099012524011234567>.
- [3] Elvis K. Avenyo, Erika Kraemer-Mbula, Fiona Tregenna, and Sacha Wunsch-Vincent. Firm-level productive capabilities and export performance in African economies. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 33(4):754–783, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-021-00394-5>.
- [4] Eric J. Bartelsman and Mark Doms. Understanding Productivity: Lessons from Longitudinal Microdata. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38(3):569–594, 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.38.3.569>.
- [5] Andrew B. Bernard, Emmanuel Dhyne, Glenn Magerman, Kalina Manova, and Andreas Moxnes. The origins of firm heterogeneity: A production network approach. *Journal of Political Economy*, 130(7):1765–1804, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1086/719759>.
- [6] Andrew B. Bernard, Andreas Moxnes, and Karen H. Ulltveit-Moe. Two-sided heterogeneity and trade. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 100(3):424–439, 2018. [https://doi.org/10.1162/rest\\_a\\_00708](https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_00708).
- [7] Giovanni Dosi, Marco Grazzi, Luigi Marengo, and Simona Settepanella. Production theory: Accounting for firm heterogeneity and technical change. *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 64(4):875–907, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joie.12113>.
- [8] Mahmoud A. El-Gamal and Hulusi Inanoglu. Inefficiency and heterogeneity in Turkish banking: 1990–2000. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 20(5):641–664, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.843>.

- [9] David C. Francis, Nona Karalashvili, Hibret Maemir, and Jorge Rodriguez Meza. Measuring total factor productivity using the Enterprise Surveys: A methodological note. *Development Economics Global Indicators Group, World Bank*, 2020.  
<https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-9491>.
- [10] Richard Howitt and Siwa Msangi. Generalized maximum entropy estimation and disaggregated agricultural productivity. *Agricultural Economics*, 45(4):457–469, 2014.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12108>.
- [11] Lotte Kayzel and Valérie Pijpers. Stochastic reconstruction of business production networks using maximum entropy methods. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 11(2):cnad011, 2023.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/comnet/cnad011>.
- [12] Lawrence R. Mead and Nicholas Papanicolaou. Maximum entropy in the problem of moments. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 25(8):2404–2417, 1984. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.526468>.
- [13] Marc J. Melitz. The impact of trade on intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity. *Econometrica*, 71(6):1695–1725, 2003.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0262.00467>.
- [14] Sandro Montresor and Antonio Vezzani. The production function of R&D: The role of heterogeneous firm capabilities. *Research Policy*, 44(2):330–341, 2015.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2014.09.005>.
- [15] Hang K. Ryu. Maximum entropy estimation of regression and density functions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 56(3):397–440, 1993.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076\(93\)90126-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(93)90126-8).
- [16] Tony Saad and Gabriel Ruai. PyMaxEnt: A Python software for maximum entropy moment reconstruction. *SoftwareX*, 10:100353, 2019.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2019.100353>.
- [17] Chad Syverson. What determines productivity? *Journal of Economic Literature*, 49(2):326–365, 2011.  
<https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.49.2.326>.

- [18] Eshref Trushin and Mehmet Ugur. Intra-industry firm heterogeneity and innovation: A Theil entropy-based approach. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 30(3):475–499, 2021.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtab002>.

# Appendix

## Summary of Y

Country	ISIC	Year	Quantity	Y					
				Min	Q1	Mean	Q3	Max	Std.
Bangladesh	10	2013	145	1100000.0000	6000000.0000	239441096.5517	122939000.0000	3600000000.0000	540366841.33960
		2022	145	1000000.0000	8000000.0000	142135701.3517	96000000.0000	1716160000.0000	309013279.8488
	13	2013	147	700000.0000	6430000.0000	211723823.1293	125000000.0000	3500000000.0000	484773499.0992
		2022	117	2000000.0000	9590000.0000	103749487.1795	72800000.0000	1000000000.0000	208061537.6994
	14	2013	169	600000.0000	3000000.0000	430523845.0414	480000000.0000	9000000000.0000	919654938.9993
		2022	118	1000000.0000	9175000.0000	451578481.0254	495000000.0000	6480000000.0000	963752640.5248
Colombia	10	2006	117	4000000.0000	30000000.0000	2118977335.8205	1900000000.0000	27000000000.0000	4012971281.4949
		2010	102	42000000.0000	700000000.0000	31810312073.5490	13665000000.0000	1082112421000.0000	126476153319.8290
		2017	121	80000000.0000	1064000000.0000	19440396694.2149	19000000000.0000	339800000000.0000	41340579095.1854
	14	2006	141	10000000.0000	290000000.0000	2389987922.8014	2100000000.0000	48000000000.0000	5336798331.3015
		2017	109	78000000.0000	837000000.0000	6581082568.8073	5300000000.0000	62000000000.0000	11801474027.9219
		2020	109	78000000.0000	837000000.0000	6581082568.8073	5300000000.0000	62000000000.0000	11801474027.9219
Egypt, Arab Rep.	10	2013	161	80000.0000	800000.0000	20897975.2981	10000000.0000	450000000.0000	59117835.6548
		2016	136	50000.0000	800000.0000	37321039.7426	19250000.0000	1139797847.0000	115841108.9086
		2020	463	100000.0000	1000000.0000	17959429.5378	14500000.0000	800000000.0000	58783093.5069
	13	2013	155	61000.0000	825000.0000	24852985.8000	12115870.0000	1130000000.0000	99718783.7562
		2020	122	215800.0000	1225000.0000	28730237.4508	30375000.0000	950000000.0000	90449220.1947
	20	2013	101	110000.0000	2000000.0000	40113186.0099	18236473.0000	1050000000.0000	135750903.8812
		2020	147	87000.0000	3000000.0000	123903798.7755	45000000.0000	2144057500.0000	328446110.4978
	23	2013	160	20000.0000	575000.0000	15424379.5563	6962500.0000	500000000.0000	57572967.1754
		2016	109	60000.0000	600000.0000	55878392.1743	16000000.0000	1265723444.0000	175318232.2922
		2020	184	100000.0000	1371250.0000	49017005.5489	18053750.0000	1800000000.0000	180132577.0880
	10	2014	239	500000.0000	9735000.0000	110633891.2134	75000000.0000	2400000000.0000	264649389.5770
		2022	433	650000.0000	30800000.0000	631742034.0162	451065400.0000	11000000000.0000	1474082807.3475
India	13	2014	237	2100000.0000	14000000.0000	212445928.2700	200000000.0000	6280000000.0000	519611252.6656
		2022	392	720000.0000	25525000.0000	521189027.9464	400000000.0000	9955068500.0000	1269241488.4813
	14	2014	123	2100000.0000	15000000.0000	293956933.3333	300000000.0000	3000000000.0000	556643171.7704
		2022	481	875000.0000	86500000.0000	334326696.2640	300000000.0000	7008000000.0000	778701932.6731
	20	2014	150	1200000.0000	9173000.0000	299562426.6667	247500000.0000	6100000000.0000	839588991.9140
		2022	313	1780000.0000	50000000.0000	770146641.8946	712250000.0000	16507500000.0000	1715626424.1828
	22	2014	252	800000.0000	10375000.0000	123594795.2381	100000000.0000	5000000000.0000	367352699.3792
		2022	209	3000000.0000	30005000.0000	469804371.8230	420000000.0000	8654587900.0000	1047301093.6498
	23	2014	210	600000.0000	5000000.0000	103004728.5714	40000000.0000	5000000000.0000	375245384.6198
		2022	429	1000000.0000	36500000.0000	499821564.8368	530000000.0000	18614570000.0000	1305587321.3942
	24	2014	303	1500000.0000	15000000.0000	598126369.6370	455000000.0000	11770000000.0000	1371584085.4787
		2022	387	3000000.0000	72500000.0000	757391618.8837	852800000.0000	10830000000.0000	1350179778.2717
	25	2014	245	1000000.0000	10000000.0000	140991708.9796	135000000.0000	3500000000.0000	333622968.6093
		2022	456	1100000.0000	33794250.0000	609159843.9693	515027980.0000	12407850000.0000	1322861470.4625
	27	2014	206	1500000.0000	14700000.0000	211182956.3107	216300000.0000	3500000000.0000	439157664.3195
		2022	148	2200000.0000	49033877.5000	832527739.0878	844150000.0000	9500000000.0000	1552030005.0888
	28	2014	269	1200000.0000	12274000.0000	138204687.7323	100000000.0000	2400000000.0000	305614641.3442
		2022	366	2000000.0000	31250000.0000	574449217.4645	450000000.0000	8904055900.0000	1227926019.8783
	29	2014	187	1400000.0000	19550000.0000	149965786.0963	100000000.0000	2500000000.0000	337306387.2720
		2022	281	2400000.0000	55000000.0000	1052539968.0000	980000000.0000	14236540000.0000	1882854346.3675
Mexico	10	2006	108	85000.0000	1287500.0000	30554366.1111	12987500.0000	770000000.0000	89282093.4466
		2010	147	130000.0000	1812500.0000	206710141.4694	99482500.0000	3500000000.0000	520941429.7409
		2023	106	1360800.0000	7000000.0000	116315154.5000	135750000.0000	1400000000.0000	191623376.2029
	14	2006	114	200000.0000	1500000.0000	9725026.3158	7375000.0000	135000000.0000	19546088.9005
		2010	107	120000.0000	2900000.0000	48742500.7103	42851243.5000	800000000.0000	102937690.2326
		2023	118	1175000.0000	17000000.0000	92965080.1864	130000000.0000	3925000000.0000	97554892.0647
		2023	118	1175000.0000	17000000.0000	92965080.1864	130000000.0000	3925000000.0000	97554892.0647

## Summary of K

Country	ISIC	Year	Quantity	K					
				Min	Q1	Mean	Q3	Max	Std.
Bangladesh	10	2013	145	20000.0000	100000.0000	112259172.4138	40000000.0000	600000000.0000	538240795.6728
		2022	145	100000.0000	1000000.0000	48603649.4759	25000000.0000	800000000.0000	113842909.9513
	13	2013	147	72000.0000	4000000.0000	97388176.8707	40000000.0000	2000000000.0000	295271091.8873
		2022	117	20000.0000	2250000.0000	103718547.0085	20000000.0000	3000000000.0000	345057062.0425
	14	2013	169	25000.0000	7000000.0000	145576074.8225	60000000.0000	6000000000.0000	636198505.7163
		2022	118	100000.0000	2000000.0000	213010593.2203	150000000.0000	3000000000.0000	452749858.2510
Colombia	10	2006	117	1000000.0000	70000000.0000	616913811.9658	400000000.0000	10000000000.0000	1354012572.5869
		2010	102	2000000.0000	100000000.0000	4504126547.1471	13500000000.0000	180000000000.0000	19731609486.5951
	13	2017	121	20000000.0000	350000000.0000	9068685950.4132	5200000000.0000	300000000000.0000	30095456410.3288
		2006	141	1850000.0000	45000000.0000	325469503.5461	3000000000.0000	65000000000.0000	655934519.1105
	14	2017	109	5000000.0000	110000000.0000	1437816513.7615	14000000000.0000	240000000000.0000	2983729493.6209
		2013	161	5000.0000	200000.0000	7452565.2174	5000000.0000	1900000000.0000	22357244.8663
Egypt, Arab Rep.	10	2016	136	7000.0000	337500.0000	28890014.7059	15000000.0000	550000000.0000	74178413.4786
		2020	463	60000.0000	1000000.0000	8610403.8877	7000000.0000	2500000000.0000	21880964.2416
	13	2013	155	7000.0000	310000.0000	11809684.6774	60000000.0000	3600000000.0000	40786006.4114
		2020	122	180000.0000	2000000.0000	27354893.4426	70000000.0000	6000000000.0000	86807115.2712
	20	2013	101	10000.0000	580000.0000	7537512.9307	60000000.0000	1250000000.0000	17478512.9455
		2020	147	10000.0000	2000000.0000	130220995.3742	625000000.0000	20000000000.0000	300661381.9676
	23	2013	160	3000.0000	200000.0000	6186731.2500	15750000.0000	2150000000.0000	24831500.8303
		2016	109	7000.0000	480000.0000	124026761.4679	100000000.0000	5000000000.0000	619537868.5680
	20	2020	184	10000.0000	2000000.0000	64030869.5652	18250000.0000	17000000000.0000	215309856.2419
		2014	239	70000.0000	1200000.0000	12662633.1590	80000000.0000	2500000000.0000	31349349.0739
India	10	2022	433	20000.0000	1500000.0000	421824889.5843	58200000.0000	30000000000.0000	1962088958.8188
		2014	237	114000.0000	20500000.0000	40540378.2532	18600000.0000	12500000000.0000	141049365.5672
	13	2022	392	20000.0000	1500000.0000	216486206.0587	50000000.0000	8500000000.0000	908872451.4197
		2014	123	250000.0000	2000000.0000	19414061.1382	19250000.0000	3000000000.0000	37721423.0228
	14	2022	481	20000.0000	961000.0000	102466965.2973	30000000.0000	5975635808.0000	484536911.6661
		2014	150	60000.0000	2000000.0000	49156506.6667	20000000.0000	15000000000.0000	187653378.1334
	20	2022	313	5000.0000	1500000.0000	246985892.8466	55000000.0000	12500000000.0000	1003923289.2612
		2014	252	90000.0000	2112500.0000	19664721.1270	12000000.0000	5750000000.0000	59672976.9764
	22	2022	209	100000.0000	2500000.0000	197460114.9043	30504000.0000	68045000000.0000	828450179.3955
		2014	210	20000.0000	1000000.0000	15991951.0952	80000000.0000	6000000000.0000	57875131.6501
	23	2022	429	100000.0000	3000000.0000	242606741.3986	600000000.0000	85080000000.0000	978033494.6277
		2014	303	28000.0000	3050000.0000	146140111.7822	42500000.0000	47000000000.0000	513392941.2314
	24	2022	387	30000.0000	4000000.0000	359312126.3385	87550000.0000	250000000000.0000	1713417553.9159
		2014	245	73639.0000	1900000.0000	30743096.0776	20000000.0000	853200000.0000	98355915.4395
	25	2022	456	10000.0000	2500000.0000	203351105.4825	50000000.0000	8590800000.0000	780106283.3454
		2014	206	185000.0000	23500000.0000	50213893.2039	27125000.0000	15000000000.0000	139951677.7893
	27	2022	148	25000.0000	2500000.0000	285317572.9392	85050000.0000	95809000000.0000	1045797902.5820
		2014	269	100000.0000	2000000.0000	23954778.6580	20000000.0000	5800000000.0000	59754458.9984
	28	2022	366	50000.0000	2500000.0000	193482378.5929	50000000.0000	6578954700.0000	780339857.3262
		2014	187	100000.0000	2500000.0000	23339652.4064	25000000.0000	3200000000.0000	41500635.0086
	29	2022	281	50000.0000	3500000.0000	391761289.1103	150000000.0000	156800080000.0000	1390772683.7381
		2006	108	1500.0000	272500.0000	23490041.6667	5062500.0000	500000000.0000	73299516.9405
Mexico	10	2010	147	5000.0000	500000.0000	47529765.3061	25500000.0000	8000000000.0000	130853305.1080
		2023	106	3000000.0000	10000000.0000	168900943.3962	200000000.0000	20000000000.0000	284232327.7377
	14	2006	114	4000.0000	152500.0000	4299394.7368	3375000.0000	140000000.0000	14134880.6247
		2010	107	25000.0000	390000.0000	9634911.2150	50000000.0000	5950000000.0000	57331257.0011
	20	2023	118	3800000.0000	20000000.0000	116794915.2542	155000000.0000	5000000000.0000	119921435.3321

## Summary of L

Country	ISIC	Year	Quantity	L						
				Min	Q1	Mean	Q3	Max	Std.	
Bangladesh	10	2013	145	80000.0000	600000.0000	13299670.5448	10000000.0000	360000000.0000	41239826.6199	
		2022	145	80000.0000	1332000.0000	9600841.9310	10000000.0000	100000000.0000	16396335.4188	
	13	2013	147	200000.0000	1800000.0000	22856497.6667	18250000.0000	300000000.0000	49434092.7226	
		2022	117	200000.0000	1570000.0000	16883670.9402	8040000.0000	224000000.0000	37764180.2973	
	14	2013	169	70000.0000	4000000.0000	49799218.9172	54000000.0000	600000000.0000	84066989.7287	
		2022	118	200000.0000	2425250.0000	73616389.8305	80375000.0000	698500000.0000	127715932.4572	
Colombia	10	2006	117	8840000.0000	66000000.0000	328829017.8120	300000000.0000	3598000000.0000	593292869.1529	
		2010	102	10000000.0000	118500000.0000	2872650890.5392	1235681500.0000	81000789232.0000	9941102378.4663	
		2017	121	15000000.0000	221000000.0000	1918727272.7273	1930000000.0000	18000000000.0000	3161963314.1452	
	14	2006	141	7000000.0000	65000000.0000	485694729.1206	450000000.0000	8000000000.0000	981510545.5639	
		2017	109	23000000.0000	174000000.0000	1564513761.4679	1351000000.0000	26001000000.0000	3591918044.8106	
		2020	161	12000.0000	100000.0000	1511944.8758	960000.0000	35000000.0000	4562308.7791	
Egypt, Arab Rep.	10	2016	136	15000.0000	168000.0000	4064668.1324	1000000.0000	73992000.0000	11302229.3576	
		2020	463	20000.0000	200000.0000	816248.6739	820000.0000	13200000.0000	1360894.4474	
	13	2013	155	12000.0000	136800.0000	2683431.2774	1442500.0000	60000000.0000	7638877.1142	
		2020	122	20000.0000	282000.0000	1170963.1557	1200000.0000	12000000.0000	1888991.2506	
	20	2013	101	8200.0000	163000.0000	2653911.2970	1500000.0000	60000000.0000	8268312.3640	
		2020	147	20000.0000	480000.0000	6266647.2653	3800000.0000	95000000.0000	15108818.2930	
	23	2013	160	3000.0000	100000.0000	1895090.9500	945000.0000	45000000.0000	6197981.5644	
		2016	109	12000.0000	96000.0000	7526733.5872	2280000.0000	300000000.0000	32337645.2882	
	India	10	2020	184	24000.0000	263000.0000	3374130.4837	2425000.0000	95000000.0000	9734213.4520
			2022	184	24000.0000	263000.0000	3374130.4837	2425000.0000	95000000.0000	9734213.4520
13		2014	239	90000.0000	1038000.0000	7770445.7992	4900000.0000	130000000.0000	18206362.3060	
		2022	433	384000.0000	3760000.0000	26305134.1732	33980500.0000	370000000.0000	41233755.0701	
14		2014	237	100000.0000	1800000.0000	22584539.9283	14000000.0000	500000000.0000	61805567.6378	
		2022	392	312000.0000	3296750.0000	36431643.6633	44456000.0000	400000000.0000	55902762.4229	
20		2014	123	250000.0000	2400000.0000	21105268.2927	18400000.0000	253000000.0000	39688405.5837	
		2022	481	312000.0000	1566000.0000	26857881.8441	32500000.0000	559572000.0000	49706841.1127	
22		2014	150	130000.0000	1500000.0000	25970564.0267	8550000.0000	530000000.0000	74664782.0630	
		2022	313	720000.0000	4000000.0000	29210977.8530	38640000.0000	376125000.0000	41537373.4467	
23		2014	252	140000.0000	1200000.0000	6975397.0278	7014000.0000	156000000.0000	14111878.1844	
		2022	209	400000.0000	3648000.0000	19925240.9856	22000000.0000	350000000.0000	35262491.2667	
24		2014	210	100000.0000	700000.0000	7152544.4524	4150000.0000	202000000.0000	23334404.1375	
		2022	429	300000.0000	4500000.0000	23353985.0932	25092000.0000	450000000.0000	38655711.7817	
25		2014	303	120000.0000	1393750.0000	28592484.6898	21126000.0000	485000000.0000	72090006.8171	
		2022	387	705600.0000	5998800.0000	35391184.1034	48222750.0000	556250000.0000	54179488.3264	
27		2014	245	90000.0000	1200000.0000	8384438.9184	6300000.0000	104000000.0000	16333412.1294	
		2022	456	300000.0000	3575000.0000	28388379.5461	34860000.0000	530640000.0000	47969399.4704	
28		2014	206	135000.0000	1800000.0000	19303899.8932	15360000.0000	380000000.0000	45126131.0668	
		2022	148	800000.0000	4946125.0000	40341341.3446	51177500.0000	420000000.0000	62908547.6315	
29		2014	269	78800.0000	1300000.0000	10345150.0706	6800000.0000	270000000.0000	25848152.4436	
		2022	366	640000.0000	3800000.0000	29791333.9071	37990000.0000	400000000.0000	48613504.7682	
Mexico	10	2014	187	156800.0000	1500000.0000	11525171.7380	8244000.0000	220000000.0000	26881906.3271	
		2022	281	495000.0000	5000000.0000	45593984.2776	56500000.0000	700000000.0000	75875943.5713	
		2006	108	30000.0000	286000.0000	3803963.8889	3737500.0000	49120000.0000	8425252.0677	
	14	2010	147	40000.0000	465000.0000	28811557.3605	12250000.0000	850000000.0000	92856040.3032	
		2023	106	360000.0000	2408374.5000	25912923.5849	34557682.5000	320100000.0000	41905459.4954	
		2006	114	40000.0000	250000.0000	1507109.6491	1612500.0000	17800000.0000	2477187.2742	