## APPENDIX

This appendix provides the technical coefficients of the yields of carcass, the share of food in domestic supply, and the gross calorific values used between 1916 and 1960. It also contains the specifications, outputs, and checks for the vector error correction models presented in the main text: "Food Security, Trade Specialization, and Violence in Colombia (1916-2016)".

## A TECHNICAL COEFFICIENTS (1916-60)

Bellow are presented the coefficients used to figure the estimations of meat, food, and gross calorific values before 1960 .

## A. 1 Carcass yields

Table 1: Carcass yields (kg of meat per head)

| Year | Cattle (sexweighted) | Pigs | Sheep | Goat | Method of obtaining meat | Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1918 | 193 | 59 | 21 | 14 | Cattle and pigs: in source. Sheep and goat: own calculation | DGE (1918) |
| 1928 | 198 | 60 | 18 | 15 | Cattle and pigs: in source. Sheep and goat: own calculation | Cattle and pigs: DGE (1928); Sheep, goat: Urrego-Mesa et al. (2019) |
| 1935 | 186 | 68 |  |  | Cattle: in source. Pigs, sheep and goat: own calculation | Cattle: <br> DGE (1935); Pigs, sheep, goat: Urrego-Mesa et al. (2019) |
| 1936 | 187 | 66 |  |  | Cattle and pigs: in source. Sheep and goat: own calculation | Cattle and pigs: DGE (1936); $\quad$ Sheep, goat: Urrego-Mesa et al. (2019) |
| 1937 | 179 | 85 |  |  | Cattle and pigs: in source. Sheep and goat: own calculation | Cattle and pigs: DGE (1937); Sheep, goat: Urrego-Mesa et al. (2019) |
| 1938 | 199 | 60 |  |  | Cattle and pigs: in source. Sheep and goat: own calculation | Cattle and pigs: DGE (1938); Sheep, goat: Urrego-Mesa et al. (2019) |
| 1949 | 195 | 68 |  |  | Cattle: in source. Pigs, sheep and goat: own calculation | Cattle: DGE (1949); <br> Pigs, Sheep, <br> goat: Urrego-Mesa et al. (2019) |
| 1950 | 201 | 77 |  |  | All yields in source | Varela Martínez, Palacio del Valle, Cañón, and Ramírez (1952) |
| 1961 | 175 | 59 | 14 | 15 | All yields in source | Balances sheets in FAOSTAT (2021) |

Note: Sometimes yields per head were in the sources, other times only the standing weight before slaughter was available. In the latter case, I use the yield coefficients in Table 2 to get the yield value. Meat production is the slaughter figure multiplied by the yields per head in the range of years available.

Table 2: Yield coefficients for 1950 from Varela (1952)

| Cattle (average of both sexes) | Pigs | Sheep Goat |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.52 | 0.85 | 0.57 | 0.57 |
| Note: Meat production is the slaughter figure multiplied by the yields per head in the range |  |  |  |
| of years available. |  |  |  |
| Source: Varela Martínez et al. (1952) |  |  |  |

## A. 2 Food in domestic supply

Table 3: The share of food in domestic supply for 1916-60

| Agricultural products | Share of food |
| :---: | :---: |
| Cereals | $53 \%$ |
| Pulses | $67 \%$ |
| Roots and Tubers | $51 \%$ |
| Vegetables | $91 \%$ |
| Fruits | $57 \%$ |
| Oil crops | $34 \%$ |
| Stimulants | $70 \%$ |
| Sugar \& Sweeteners | $56 \%$ |
| Meat | $83 \%$ |
| Dairy products | $40 \%$ |
| Animal others | $61 \%$ |

Note: This is the share of food in domestic supply from FAOs' balance sheets. From 1961 I use the percentage resulted in each year. See the methodology section in the main document for details.

## A. 3 Gross calorific value

Table 4: Gross calorific value coefficients for 1916-60

| Agricultural products | $(\mathbf{M J} / \mathbf{K g})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Barley | 15.37 |
| Cereals, nes | 17.3 |
| Maize | 15.77 |
| Rice, paddy | 15.63 |
| Wheat | 15.81 |
| Beans, dry | 15.72 |
| Pulses, nes | 16.2 |
| Cassava | 10.58 |
| Potatoes | 7.25 |
| Roots and tubers, nes | 9.84 |
| Vegetables, total | 5.46 |
| Fruits, other | 6.75 |
| Bananas | 3.99 |
| Plantains and others | 3.99 |
| Oil, Palm | 36.75 |
| Oilcrops, Other | 32.04 |
| Coconuts | 26.79 |
| Seed cotton | 32.97 |
| Cocoa, beans | 19.66 |
| Coffee, green | 19.63 |
| Tobacco, unmanufactured | 17.7 |
| Stimulants nes | 70.92 |
| Sugar cane | 16.76 |
| Sugar, Other | 16.66 |
| Meat | 14.8 |
| Dairy products | 12.36 |

Note: It is the average value of the categories involved in trade between 1961 and 1963. From 1961 I use specific coefficients to each product. See the methodological section in the main document for details and sources.

## B Vector Error Correction Model

Here I give the information on the specifications, the tests, and the different results of the variations of the main model according to the steps suggested in Lütkepohl (2005). I use the function tseries from package implemented by Trapletti and Hornik (2020) into the R Core Team (2020) system. To built a VECM we need non-stationary time series integrated in the same order. Therefore, I test for non-stationarity with the Augmented Dickey-Fuller test from adf.test() function and integration order with ndiffs(). Once I confirmed non-stationarity and $\mathrm{I}(1)$ for the time series, moved to estimate the optimal lag order of the model.

First, I looked at the dependency of each variable with acf() and the pacf() functions to choose the maximum lags and use this value in VARselect() function to for the to estimate the optimal lags. I run optimal order for constant specification terms and choose the AIC value as the optimal lag (10 years for the two models) in the Johansen co-integration test with the function co.jo(). I validate the number of co-integration relations at the $1 \%$ of confidence (Table 2 in the main document) and build the two VECMs with the function VECM() from the urca package.

Following the main notation of model 1 given in the main document (equations 6, 7, and 8), I estimate one variation of the model to test the intensity of violence $\bar{V}$, instead of the total number of victims $(V)$ : this is model 2. For tropical specialization $(S P)$ I use the interaction between the share of land under tropical crops and the amount of these crops in exports and relative prices $(P)$ are the ratio between the international prices for tropical products to cereals. The time series were modelled in logarithms (Section 2.2 for details on the variables and sources in the main text for details).

Although there were not so significant differences between the two models, I choosed the model 1 due to this model fit better the checks for normal distribution. To run the tests of robustness on the models, I transform the VECM to VAR in levels with vec2var () function and then check for serial correlation (serial.test()), autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity (arch.test()), and normality distribution of the residuals of the model and by each variable (normality.test() and shapiro.test()).

The following subsections present the outputs and the checks for each of these models.

## B. 1 Model 1

OUTPUT

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t} \\
\Delta V_{t} \\
\Delta P_{t}
\end{array}\right) \quad=\quad+\left(\begin{array}{c}
-0.35(0.13)^{*} \\
0.21(0.37) \\
0.59(0.52)
\end{array}\right) E C T_{-1}\left(\begin{array}{c}
9.79(3.58)^{*} \\
-6.43(10.21) \\
-16.26(14.50)
\end{array}\right) \\
& +\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.08(0.18) & -0.13(0.09) & -3.1 \mathrm{e}-03(0.06) \\
-0.39(0.52) & -0.75(0.24)^{* *} & 0.28(0.18) \\
-0.53(0.74) & 0.25(0.35) & -0.08(0.25)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-1} \\
\Delta V_{t-1} \\
\Delta P_{t-1}
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.10(0.18) & 8.1 \mathrm{e}-03(0.08) & -0.08(0.06) \\
-0.27(0.52) & -0.05(0.24) & 0.03(0.18) \\
0.08(0.74) & -0.05(0.34) & -0.18(0.25)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-2} \\
\Delta V_{t-2} \\
\Delta P_{t-2}
\end{array}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.29(0.17) & 0.01(0.07) & -0.06(0.06) \\
-0.29(0.47) & 0.42(0.20) \cdot & 0.56(0.18)^{* *} \\
-1.30(0.67)^{\cdot} & -0.27(0.28) & -0.11(0.26)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-3} \\
\Delta V_{t-3} \\
\Delta P_{t-3}
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0.03(0.19) & -0.02(0.07) & 0.11(0.07) \\
0.33(0.54) & 0.43(0.19)^{*} & 0.62(0.20)^{* *} \\
-0.74(0.76) & -0.12(0.27) & -0.22(0.28)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-4} \\
\Delta V_{t-4} \\
\Delta P_{t-4}
\end{array}\right)
$$

$$
+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.15(0.19) & -0.04(0.07) & 0.02(0.07) \\
0.29(0.55) & 0.68(0.19)^{* *} & 0.75(0.19)^{* * *} \\
0.10(0.78) & -0.04(0.26) & -0.20(0.26)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-5} \\
\Delta V_{t-5} \\
\Delta P_{t-5}
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.23(0.19) & -0.06(0.07) & -4.4 \mathrm{e}-03(0.07) \\
1.81(0.55)^{* *} & 0.73(0.20)^{* *} & 0.07(0.20) \\
-0.93(0.79) & -0.06(0.29) & -0.26(0.28)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-6} \\
\Delta V_{t-6} \\
\Delta P_{t-6}
\end{array}\right)
$$

$$
+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0.15(0.21) & -0.01(0.06) & -0.02(0.06) \\
2.27(0.61)^{* *} & 0.45(0.18)^{*} & 0.65(0.16)^{* * *} \\
-0.51(0.87) & 0.12(0.26) & -0.08(0.23)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-7} \\
\Delta V_{t-7} \\
\Delta P_{t-7}
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.13(0.23) & -0.12(0.06)^{*} & 1.9 \mathrm{e}-03(0.07) \\
2.08(0.64)^{* *} & 0.52(0.16)^{* *} & 0.60(0.19)^{* *} \\
0.33(0.91) & 0.15(0.22) & -0.10(0.26)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-8} \\
\Delta V_{t-8} \\
\Delta P_{t-8}
\end{array}\right)
$$

$$
+\quad\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.60(0.22)^{*} & -0.06(0.05) & 0.04(0.06) \\
-0.59(0.63) & 0.36(0.15)^{*} & 0.46(0.18)^{*} \\
0.32(0.89) & 0.11(0.21) & 4.3 \mathrm{e}-03(0.25)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-9} \\
\Delta V_{t-9} \\
\Delta P_{t-9}
\end{array}\right)
$$

## ROBUSTNESS CHECKS

Table 5: Checks for model 1

| Test | Chi-squared | df | p-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Portmanteau Test (asymptotic) | 53.12 | 3 | $1.72 \mathrm{e}-12$ |
| ARCH (multivariate) | 96 | 1080 | 1 |
| JB-Test (multivariate) | 1.61 | 6 | 0.95 |
| Skewness only (multivariate) | 0.33 | 3 | 0.95 |
| Kurtosis only (multivariate) | 1.28 | 3 | 0.73 |

Table 6: Shapiro-Wilk normality test for the residuals of the model 1 and for each variable

|  | Statistic | P-Value |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Model 1 | 0.98 | 0.05 |
| $S P$ | 0.97 | 0.39 |
| $V$ | 0.98 | 0.71 |
| $P$ | 0.98 | 0.80 |



Figure 1: Model 1: distribution for the residuals of $S P, V$, and $P$


Figure 2: Model 1: ACF and PACF of the residual of $S P$


Figure 3: Model 1: ACF and PACF of the residual of $V$


Figure 4: Model 1: ACF and PACF of the residual of $P$

## B. 2 Model 2

## NOTATION

$$
\begin{gather*}
\Delta S P_{t}=\theta_{1}+\sum_{i=1}^{p}+\left[\alpha_{1 i} \Delta S P_{t-i}+\beta_{1 i} \Delta \bar{V}_{t-i}+\psi_{1 i} \Delta P_{t-i}\right]+\mu E C T_{t-1}+\epsilon_{1 t}  \tag{1}\\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t}=\theta_{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{p}+\left[\alpha_{2 i} \Delta S P_{t-i}+\beta_{2 i} \Delta \bar{V}_{t-i}+\psi_{2 i} \Delta P_{t-i}\right]+\mu E C T_{t-1}+\epsilon_{2 t}  \tag{2}\\
\Delta P_{t}=\theta_{3}+\sum_{i=1}^{p}+\left[\alpha_{3 i} \Delta S P_{t-i}+\beta_{3 i} \Delta \bar{V}_{t-i}+\psi_{3 i} \Delta P_{t-i}\right]+\mu E C T_{t-1}+\epsilon_{3 t} \tag{3}
\end{gather*}
$$

## OUTPUT

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t} \\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t} \\
\Delta P_{t}
\end{array}\right) \quad=\quad+\left(\begin{array}{c}
-0.30(0.18) \\
-0.99(0.32)^{* *} \\
-0.67(0.58)
\end{array}\right) E C T_{-1}\left(\begin{array}{c}
10.68(6.55) \\
35.07(11.42)^{* *} \\
24.00(20.76)
\end{array}\right) \\
& +\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.08(0.24) & 0.34(0.20) & -0.04(0.09) \\
0.72(0.42) & 0.43(0.34) & -0.02(0.15) \\
0.16(0.76) & 0.39(0.62) & -0.07(0.28)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-1} \\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t-1} \\
\Delta P_{t-1}
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.04(0.22) & 0.25(0.18) & -0.08(0.08) \\
0.83(0.39)^{*} & 0.51(0.31) & -0.13(0.15) \\
0.13(0.71) & 0.31(0.56) & -0.58(0.27)^{*}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-2} \\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t-2} \\
\Delta P_{t-2}
\end{array}\right) \\
& +\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.13(0.24) & 0.19(0.14) & -0.08(0.09) \\
0.70(0.41) & 0.80(0.24)^{* *} & -0.13(0.16) \\
-0.55(0.75) & 0.16(0.43) & -0.08(0.30)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-3} \\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t-3} \\
\Delta P_{t-3}
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0.02(0.23) & 0.13(0.13) & -0.05(0.10) \\
0.78(0.40) & 0.81(0.22)^{* *} & -0.03(0.18) \\
-0.65(0.73) & 0.13(0.40) & -0.57(0.33)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-4} \\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t-4} \\
\Delta P_{t-4}
\end{array}\right) \\
& +\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.05(0.23) & 0.15(0.12) & -0.09(0.09) \\
0.53(0.40) & 0.56(0.21)^{*} & 0.09(0.15) \\
0.51(0.73) & 0.12(0.38) & -0.16(0.27)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-5} \\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t-5} \\
\Delta P_{t-5}
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-3.8 \mathrm{e}-03(0.23) & 0.09(0.10) & -0.06(0.09) \\
0.69(0.41) & 0.47(0.17)^{*} & -0.23(0.16) \\
-0.36(0.74) & -0.15(0.31) & -0.39(0.29)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-6} \\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t-6} \\
\Delta P_{t-6}
\end{array}\right) \\
& +\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.05(0.23) & 0.08(0.08) & -0.14(0.09) \\
1.08(0.40)^{*} & 0.24(0.15) & -0.16(0.16) \\
0.23(0.73) & 0.02(0.27) & -0.18(0.29)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-7} \\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t-7} \\
\Delta P_{t-7}
\end{array}\right)+\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0.01(0.26) & 0.12(0.06) & -0.02(0.08) \\
0.06(0.46) & 0.16(0.11) & -0.28(0.14) \\
1.05(0.84) & -0.20(0.20) & -0.18(0.25)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-8} \\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t-8} \\
\Delta P_{t-8}
\end{array}\right) \\
& + \\
& \left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.17(0.28) & 0.07(0.06) & -0.01(0.08) \\
-0.84(0.49) & 0.07(0.10) & -0.25(0.13) \\
0.06(0.89) & 0.07(0.18) & -0.14(0.24)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\Delta S P_{t-9} \\
\Delta \bar{V}_{t-9} \\
\Delta P_{t-9}
\end{array}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Table 7: Checks for model 1

| Test | Chi-squared | df | p-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Portmanteau Test (asymptotic) | 71.54 | 3 | $1.99 \mathrm{e}-16$ |
| ARCH (multivariate) | 96 | 1080 | 1 |
| JB-Test (multivariate) | 8.93 | 6 | 0.18 |
| Skewness only (multivariate) | 4.9 | 3 | 0.18 |
| Kurtosis only (multivariate) | 4.03 | 3 | 0.25 |

Table 8: Shapiro-Wilk normality test for the residuals of the model 2 and for each variable

|  | Statistic | P-Value |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Model 2 | 0.96 | 0.001 |
| $S P$ | 0.98 | 0.85 |
| $\bar{V}$ | 0.96 | 0.13 |
| $P$ | 0.97 | 0.34 |



Figure 5: Model 2: distribution for the residuals of $S P, \bar{V}$, and $P$


Figure 6: Model 2: ACF and PACF of the residual of $S P$


Figure 7: Model 2: ACF and PACF of the residual of $\bar{V}$


Figure 8: Model 2: ACF and PACF of the residual of $P$
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