Do Agglomeration Externalities Form Service Clusters? Evidence from a Location Lottery

Yuki Higuchi, Ngan Bich Le and Mari Tanaka (2026)

Discussion by Martina Viarengo

Geneva Graduate Institute

ABFER Conference – Singapore, May 18, 2026

Plan of the Discussion

1. **Summary**
   Research question · Method · Main findings · Contributions

2. **Comments**
   Data · Empirical strategy · Mechanisms · Demand vs supply

3. **Related Work and Future Research**
   Related work and open questions

4. **Conclusion**

The Research Question

Why do competing firms cluster together in space, even when proximity intensifies competition?

- Clusters of similar firms are found everywhere in cities — fashion districts, electronics streets, wholesale apparel centers
- Theory (Marshall, 1890): agglomeration externalities — demand-side (customer pooling) and supply-side (knowledge spillovers)
- But externalities ≠ cluster formation: firms weigh benefits against competition and adjustment costs
- Are agglomeration externalities strong enough to generate and sustain clusters from a random starting point? This is the research question addressed in the paper

Setting, Lottery and Empirical Strategy

Setting and lottery

- Dong Xuan Market, Hanoi — one of Hanoi's largest wholesale markets for apparel and fabrics, 1,000+ shops across two floors
- Buyers: small retailers and tailors — examine samples, place bulk orders
- 1994 fire → reconstruction → public lottery, December 1996 → reopening January 1997
- Lottery segmented by floor, apparel/fabric zone, slot position rank
- Within each segment: random assignment — identification strategy of the paper

Data and specification

- Survey 2023: 73.8% response rate; ownership histories and products sold in 1994, 1997, 2010, 2023
- Neighborhood recall survey fills 91% of missing historical data; photographs of all slots
- Panel regression: Prod_ik^t = β^t × ProdNeigh(m)_ik^1994 + Strata×Prod FE + Slot FE
- Treatment: share of m-step neighbors selling product k before the fire — pre-lottery, exogenous
- β^1994 ≈ 0 → randomization confirmed; β^t > 0 → externalities drive cluster formation

Main Results

≈ 0	0.119***	0.147***	0.141***
β 1994 Randomization confirmed	β 1997 Rapid clustering	β 2010 Deepening clusters	β 2023 Persistent — 27 years

Key findings

- Simulation test (Duranton and Overman, 2005): 1,000 draws; 1994 distribution inside confidence band; 1997–2023 rise sharply above at short distances
- Externalities hyperlocal: only 1–3 step neighbors matter — interactions at the scale of two or three nearby booths
- Decomposition: early within-owner switching 28%; late ownership transfers 52% — more than half the clustering effect from owners not in the market at reopening

Contributions

1. **Rigorous causal evidence on cluster formation**
   Externalities are the active mechanism — strong enough to generate spatial organization from a random start

2. **Long-run lottery setting**
   One-time lottery 27 years ago makes full dynamic adjustment observable, including slow-moving ownership transfers

3. **Novel mechanism decomposition**
   Distinguishes timing and within- vs across-owner adjustments; separates demand-side from supply-side forces

4. **Policy implications**
   Retail clusters can self-organize without centralized coordination; restrictive zoning may be counterproductive

Comment 1 — The Data

Survey response rate: 73.8% — but some questions worth raising

- Recall bias: survey asks owners to remember product mix from 1994, nearly 30 years earlier. Neighborhood recall survey compounds this. Most plausible bias: owners anchor on current products and reconstruct the past more coherently than reality, biasing treatment and outcome in the same direction
- Survival bias: owners present in 2023 are survivors, those who adapted successfully. Owners who failed and exited are not observed. This could mechanically inflate within-owner product switching estimates
- Question for the authors: have you explored complementing the survey with administrative records from the Dong Xuan Corporation? Fee records and ownership registration logs could validate transfer dates
- Nature of ownership turnover: how much happened within families, that is parents passing slots to children who continue the same product line? Intergenerational succession would blur the distinction between within-owner and across-owner mechanisms

Comment 2 — Empirical Strategy

Some clarifying questions about the empirical strategy

The zoning constraint

Until 2012, owners in the fabric zone could not switch to apparel products and vice versa. This means the estimated coefficients for 1997 and 2010 reflect clustering that occurred under a binding product constraint.

An important question: is the 2023 coefficient directly comparable to 1997 and 2010, given that the feasible product set expanded after 2012?

Comment 3 — Mechanisms

The 52% ownership transfer result calls for further analysis

- Ownership transfers (52%): who are the new owners? Where do they come from? What made them choose a particular slot? This channel is treated as a residual — understanding the entry decision would substantially enrich the contribution
- Heterogeneity among sellers: the paper treats all sellers as equivalent units. Clusters have internal structure: anchor stores, followers, high-quality specialists, and low-cost generalists. Are aggregate effects driven by particular types of sellers? Gains from clustering look very different if concentrated among a few anchors or distributed broadly
- Technical note: 61 categories generate a sparse dependent variable (base probability ~3%). A robustness check under broader product category aggregations would be important

Comment 4 — Demand vs Supply and External Validity

Demand vs supply test

- Multi-slot owner test: some empirical questions
- Only 7–8% of owners; uses 1997 and 2023 data — not pre-lottery 1994, since almost no multi-slot lottery participants are observable with pre-fire product information
- If multi-slot owners select similar neighborhoods for their slots, cross-slot spillover ≈ 0 mechanically — not because knowledge diffusion is absent
- Suggestion: report geographic distribution of multi-slot owners' slots
- Wholesale ≠ consumer retail: Wolinsky (1983), Konishi (2005), Dudey (1990) describe consumer-facing markets. The relevant force here may be thick-market procurement externalities or cluster reputation: distinct mechanisms with testable predictions across the 61 product categories

External validity

- Enclosed wholesale market with professional buyers and explicit sourcing purpose — demand pooling unusually strong
- How far do findings travel to open street-level retail or settings with more casual consumers?
- Scope conditions would help assess generalizability

Related Work and Future Research

Related work

Barza, Glaeser, Hidalgo and Viarengo (2024, 2026): linked employer-employee data, Brazil, 900M+ observations. Workplace integration between skilled and unskilled workers drives upward mobility for low-income workers. Connection to Higuchi, Le and Tanaka: what matters is not how many agents come together but the nature of their interactions.

Faia, Glaeser, Simonelli and Viarengo (2026): Italy — segregation that limits interaction depresses location earnings significantly.

Open questions

- Stability under shocks: paper documents clustering through 2023 but does not discuss COVID-19 pandemic. Did clusters survive near-zero foot traffic? Did ownership turnover spike?
- E-commerce platforms: if buyers can source online, the demand-side externality weakens. Do physical clusters survive or transform toward goods where physical inspection remains essential?
- Welfare: clusters form, but are they welfare-improving and for whom? Ownership transfer results imply that slot prices rose in cluster areas. Who gains and who loses?

Conclusion

Main strengths

- Lottery design: rigorous and credibly random
- Long-run horizon: full dynamic adjustment
- Decomposition: channels and demand vs supply
- Policy relevance: self-organization of clusters

Main questions

- Data: recall, survival, administrative records
- Empirical strategy: zoning constraint comparability
- Mechanisms: ownership transfer channel underexplored
- Demand vs supply: wholesale setting needs richer theory