



EDUSCHOOL JOURNAL OF TRADE AND FINANCE (EJTF)

(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)

ISSN Online:



Financial Frictions and the Fragility of Global Trade: A Review of Trade Finance, Credit Constraints, and Policy Responses

Vinitha M V

Assistant Professor, School of Commerce and Professional Studies, Marian College Kuttikkanam (Autonomous), Kerala, India

Article information

Received: 4th June 2026

Received in revised form: 9th July 2026

Accepted: 13th August 2026

Available online: 11th September 2026

Volume: 1

Issue: 2

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22684123>

Abstract

International trade depends on finance at every stage of the transaction cycle, yet the financial dimension of trade has historically received far less attention than tariffs, transport costs, or comparative advantage. This article reviews the theoretical and empirical literature on the relationship between finance and trade, with a particular focus on how credit constraints and the availability of trade finance shape export participation, transaction structure, and the resilience of trade flows during crises. Drawing on a narrative synthesis of peer-reviewed research, working papers from international financial institutions, and industry surveys, the review documents three central findings. First, financial development and firm-level access to credit are significant determinants of who exports, what they export, and to whom. Second, the collapse of trade during the 2008–2009 global financial crisis was driven primarily by demand and compositional effects, but trade finance frictions played a measurable and heterogeneous amplifying role, particularly for smaller firms and for transactions intermediated by bank instruments. Third, a persistent global trade finance gap, concentrated among small and medium-sized enterprises in emerging and developing economies, remains a structural barrier to inclusive trade. The article concludes by discussing the dollar-based invoicing system, the digitalization of trade documents, and the policy architecture of export credit agencies and multilateral guarantee programs, and identifies directions for future research.

Keywords: - Trade Finance, Credit Constraints, Letters of Credit, Global Financial Crisis, Trade Collapse, Export Credit Agencies, Dominant Currency Paradigm

I. INTRODUCTION

Cross-border trade is inherently more finance-intensive than domestic exchange. The physical distance between exporter and importer lengthens the interval between production and payment, legal enforcement across jurisdictions is costlier and less certain, and counterparties frequently lack the repeated interaction that sustains trust in domestic markets. Every one of these features generates a demand for working capital, for risk mitigation, and for financial intermediation. The Bank for International Settlements has estimated that roughly one-third of world merchandise trade is supported by some form of bank-intermediated trade finance, with the remainder financed through inter-firm credit or firms' own resources (Committee on the Global Financial System [CGFS], 2014). Trade and finance are therefore not separate domains that occasionally intersect; they are jointly determined.

For much of the twentieth century, mainstream trade theory abstracted from finance entirely. The Heckscher–Ohlin and Ricardian traditions explained trade patterns through relative factor endowments and technology, while the new trade theory of the 1980s emphasized increasing returns and product differentiation. Finance entered the picture only gradually, first through models in which credit market imperfections function as a source of comparative advantage (Kletzer & Bardhan, 1987), and later through the heterogeneous-firm framework of Melitz (2003), which made it natural to ask whether financial constraints determine which firms can bear the fixed costs of exporting (Manova, 2013). The global financial crisis of 2008–2009, during

which world trade fell far more sharply than world output, transformed this niche literature into a central research agenda (Bems et al., 2013).

This article reviews that literature. It has three objectives. The first is to synthesize the theoretical mechanisms through which finance affects trade, distinguishing between finance as a determinant of comparative advantage, finance as a constraint on firm-level export participation, and finance as a determinant of transaction structure. The second objective is to assess the empirical evidence, with special attention to episodes of financial stress. The third is to connect the academic literature to contemporary policy debates surrounding the global trade finance gap, the dominance of the U.S. dollar in trade invoicing, and the digitalization of trade documentation. The remainder of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the scope and method of the review. Section 3 presents the theoretical foundations. Section 4 reviews the empirical evidence. Section 5 discusses policy and structural developments. Section 6 identifies limitations and directions for future research, and Section 7 concludes.

II. SCOPE AND METHOD

This study is a narrative literature review rather than a systematic review or meta-analysis. The choice reflects the heterogeneity of the underlying research, which spans theoretical modelling, firm-level econometrics, cross-country panel studies, and institutional surveys that do not share a common outcome metric amenable to quantitative pooling. Sources were identified through searches of major economics journals, working paper series of the National Bureau of Economic Research, and reports issued by the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Asian Development Bank (ADB), and the Bank for International Settlements. Inclusion emphasized studies that :

- Address the causal or structural relationship between financial conditions and trade outcomes
- Have been published in peer-reviewed outlets or by recognized international institutions
- Contribute either a distinct theoretical mechanism or an identification strategy for isolating financial effects from demand and supply shocks.

The review is organized thematically rather than chronologically, so that the theoretical mechanisms of Section 3 can be mapped directly onto the empirical tests of Section 4.

III. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

3.1. Finance as a Source of Comparative Advantage

The earliest formal treatment of finance in trade theory is Kletzer and Bardhan (1987), who show that when sectors differ in their reliance on external finance, differences in the quality of credit markets across countries generate comparative advantage in the same way that differences in factor endowments do. A country with a deeper financial system will specialize in sectors that require more working capital or more up-front investment. Beck (2002) provides the first broad empirical support for this proposition, finding that financially developed economies export a larger share of manufactured goods and run trade surpluses in manufacturing. The mechanism parallels the influential finding of Rajan and Zingales (1998) that industries dependent on external finance grow faster in countries with better developed financial markets: finance is a productive input whose supply varies across countries and whose demand varies across sectors.

3.2. Heterogeneous Firms and Credit Constraints

The Melitz (2003) model established that exporting entails fixed costs that only sufficiently productive firms can profitably incur. Manova (2013) extended this framework by assuming that firms must finance a share of these fixed costs, and of their variable production costs, from external sources, and that lenders limit credit because of imperfect contract enforcement. Two predictions follow. First, credit constraints raise the productivity cutoff for exporting, so that fewer firms export than would be efficient. Second, constrained firms that do export sell less than they otherwise would, and are especially disadvantaged in sectors with high external finance dependence and low asset tangibility. Credit constraints therefore operate on both the extensive margin of trade (which firms export and to how many destinations) and the intensive margin (how much each exporter sells). Manova's calibration suggests that credit constraints reduce world trade substantially below its frictionless level, with the burden falling disproportionately on financially underdeveloped countries.

Related work emphasizes that the relevant constraint may be the importer's rather than the exporter's finances. Feenstra et al. (2014) model a bank that cannot observe the exporter's productivity and therefore rations credit to exporters more tightly than to domestic sellers, because export revenue is realized with longer delay. This provides a micro-foundation for the widely documented observation that exporters, not merely firms in general, face particular financing difficulty.

3.3. The Choice of Trade Finance Instruments

A third strand of theory addresses not whether firms trade, but how a given transaction is financed and who bears its risk. In an international sale the exporter can demand cash in advance, in which case the importer finances the transaction and bears the risk of non-delivery; the exporter can sell on open account, financing the transaction itself and bearing the risk of non-payment; or the two parties can interpose a bank through a letter of credit or documentary collection, which shifts risk to the intermediary at a fee. Schmidt-Eisenlohr (2013) formalizes this trade-off, showing that the optimal payment form depends on the relative cost of finance and the quality of contract enforcement in the two countries. Open account is preferred when the exporter has cheap finance and the importer's country enforces contracts well; cash in advance is preferred in the reverse case; and letters of credit become attractive when enforcement is weak in both directions and the bank's fee is lower than the expected loss from counterparty default.

Niepmann and Schmidt-Eisenlohr (2017a) extend this model to incorporate destination-country risk explicitly and derive the prediction, later confirmed empirically, that the use of bank instruments is non-monotonic in risk: letters of credit are rare when risk is very low (open account suffices) and when risk is very high (banks will not issue them), but common in the intermediate range. Together, these models establish that trade finance instruments are endogenous responses to enforcement frictions, and therefore that shocks to the banking sector should affect precisely those trade flows that rely most on bank intermediation.

IV. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

4.1. Firm-Level Evidence on Credit Constraints and Exporting

Firm-level studies have consistently found that financial health predicts export participation. Minetti and Zhu (2011) exploit survey data on Italian manufacturers reporting credit rationing and find that rationed firms are significantly less likely to export and, conditional on exporting, sell smaller volumes abroad; the effect is stronger than the corresponding effect on domestic sales, consistent with the theoretical view that exports are more finance-intensive. Muûls (2015) uses Belgian firm data linked to credit scores and finds that better-rated firms are more likely both to export and to import, and that they serve more destinations and more products. Manova et al. (2015) show that foreign-owned firms and joint ventures in China, which have access to parent-company financing, outperform domestic firms in sectors with high external finance dependence, indicating that multinational internal capital markets substitute for local credit.

The central identification challenge in this literature is reverse causality: successful exporters may attract credit rather than credit enabling exports. The most persuasive responses exploit exogenous shocks to bank lending. Amiti and Weinstein (2011) match Japanese exporters to their main banks and show that deteriorations in bank health during Japan's financial crises of the 1990s reduced the exports of client firms, accounting for roughly one-third of the decline in Japanese exports during those episodes. Paravisini et al. (2015) link Peruvian exporters to their banks and exploit the differential exposure of banks to the 2008 reversal of foreign capital flows. They find that a reduction in credit supply reduces the intensive margin of exports and the probability of continuing to export to a given destination, but that credit shocks explain only a modest share of the aggregate decline in Peruvian exports during the crisis. Foley and Manova (2015) provide a comprehensive survey of this firm-level literature and conclude that the causal effect of finance on trade is now well established even if its aggregate magnitude remains debated.

4.2. Trade Finance in the Great Trade Collapse

Between the third quarter of 2008 and the second quarter of 2009, global trade fell by roughly 30 percent in nominal terms and by considerably more than world output, an episode that came to be known as the Great Trade Collapse (Baldwin, 2009). Early commentary attributed a large role to a seizure in trade finance, and international organizations responded with substantial guarantee and liquidity programs (Auboin, 2009). Subsequent academic research has produced a more nuanced picture.

On one side, several studies find limited evidence for a dominant trade finance channel. Eaton et al. (2016) decompose the collapse using a multi-country general equilibrium model and attribute most of it to a decline in demand for tradable goods, especially durable manufactures, rather than to trade-specific frictions. Levchenko et al. (2010) reach a similar conclusion using U.S. import and export data, finding that sectors with greater vertical linkages experienced larger declines, consistent with an inventory and supply-chain amplification mechanism rather than a financial one. Bricongne et al. (2012) show that among French exporters, firms in sectors with high external finance dependence reduced exports more, but that this channel accounted for a small fraction of the overall decline.

On the other side, evidence of a significant financial channel is also robust. Chor and Manova (2012) exploit monthly U.S. import data and cross-country variation in interbank rates, finding that countries with tighter credit conditions exported less to the United States during the crisis, and that this effect was concentrated in sectors with high external finance dependence and few collateralizable assets. Ahn et al. (2011) document that the prices of goods shipped by sea rose relative to goods shipped by air during the crisis, which they interpret as evidence that the longer payment lags associated with sea freight became more costly as trade finance tightened. The weight of evidence therefore suggests that trade finance was an amplifier rather than the primary cause of the collapse, with heterogeneous effects across firms, sectors, and instruments.

4.3. Banks, Guarantees, and Export Patterns

A distinctive contribution of the past decade is the use of confidential bank-level data on trade finance instruments. Niepmann and Schmidt-Eisenlohr (2017a) use data on U.S. banks' letters of credit and documentary collections to estimate that these instruments cover on the order of one-tenth to one-seventh of world trade by value, with usage concentrated among destinations of intermediate risk, as their model predicts. In a companion paper, Niepmann and Schmidt-Eisenlohr (2017b) show that reductions in the supply of letters of credit by U.S. banks reduce U.S. exports to the affected destinations, with effects that are larger for small countries and during periods of financial stress. Antràs and Foley (2015) analyze the transaction-level records of a large U.S. poultry exporter and find that cash in advance and open account dominate, that letters of credit are used primarily for new relationships in countries with weak institutions, and that payment terms shift toward open account as relationships mature. Their evidence highlights the role of relationship-specific trust in substituting for formal intermediation.

Two further studies complicate the picture. Demir and Javorcik (2018) show that Turkish exporters responded to increased competitive pressure by extending more generous open-account terms, effectively becoming lenders to their customers. Crozet et al. (2022) find that letters of credit are a double-edged sword: they facilitate trade with risky destinations in normal times, but trade intermediated by letters of credit contracted more sharply during the global financial crisis when issuing banks came under stress. The instrument that mitigates counterparty risk thus introduces bank risk in its place.

4.4. Invoicing Currency and the Dollar

A related literature emphasizes the currency dimension of trade finance. Boz et al. (2022) assemble a global dataset of invoicing currencies and document that the U.S. dollar accounts for roughly 40 percent of world trade invoicing, about four times the U.S. share of world trade, and that the dollar's share has been remarkably stable. Gopinath et al. (2020) formalize the implications in the dominant currency paradigm: when most trade is invoiced in dollars, exchange rate movements against the dollar, rather than bilateral exchange rates, govern trade adjustment. This has direct consequences for finance, because firms invoicing in dollars also tend to borrow in dollars. Bruno and Shin (2023) show that a stronger dollar tightens the balance sheets of dollar-borrowing exporters and their banks, reducing exports, particularly for firms in emerging markets reliant on long supply chains and working-capital finance. The global financial cycle described by Rey (2015) and Bruno and Shin (2015) is therefore transmitted to trade not only through demand but through the availability and cost of dollar credit.

V. DISCUSSION: STRUCTURAL GAPS, RESILIENCE, AND POLICY

5.1. The Global Trade Finance Gap

The academic evidence that finance constrains trade is mirrored in institutional surveys documenting unmet demand. The ADB's periodic survey of banks estimated the global trade finance gap, defined as the value of requested trade finance that is rejected, at approximately 1.7 trillion U.S. dollars in 2020, equivalent to about 10 percent of global merchandise trade, an increase from 1.5 trillion in 2018 (Kim et al., 2021). Rejections fall disproportionately on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and on firms in developing Asia and Africa, and the most frequently cited reasons include insufficient collateral, the cost of know-your-customer compliance, and low profitability of small-ticket transactions for correspondent banks. The gap illustrates the theoretical prediction of Manova (2013) that financial frictions bind most tightly for smaller, less collateralized firms in financially underdeveloped economies, and it reveals a regulatory dimension: the retreat of global banks from correspondent relationships in higher-risk jurisdictions following the tightening of anti-money-laundering rules has withdrawn intermediation capacity from precisely the markets where it is scarcest.

5.2. Resilience Lessons from Crises

The literature reviewed above yields a consistent lesson about resilience. Trade flows that rely on bank intermediation, on long payment lags, and on dollar funding are most exposed to financial shocks, whereas trade embedded in established relationships and financed through inter-firm credit is comparatively robust. Antràs (2020) argues that the pandemic-era disruption of 2020 reinforced rather than reversed the logic of global value chains, but also that firms have become more attentive to the financial fragility of their suppliers. The evidence in Crozet et al. (2022) suggests that policymakers seeking to stabilize trade during banking crises should target the supply of bank guarantees and letters of credit, where the contraction is concentrated, rather than trade finance in general. The multilateral response to the 2008–2009 crisis, which expanded the guarantee programs of the International Finance Corporation and regional development banks and mobilized export credit agencies (Auboin, 2009), is consistent with this prescription, and the persistence of those programs suggests that they have become a permanent component of the trade finance architecture.

5.3. Digitalization of Trade Documentation

A structural development with potentially large consequences for trade finance costs is the digitalization of trade documents. Letters of credit and documentary collections rely on the physical transfer of bills of lading, invoices, and certificates, a process that is slow, error-prone, and expensive to reconcile. Ganne (2018) surveys the potential of distributed ledger technologies to digitize this process and concludes that the principal obstacles are legal rather than technical: in most jurisdictions, a bill of lading has legal effect only in paper form. The adoption of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law's Model Law on Electronic Transferable Records (UNCITRAL, 2017) by a growing number of jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom through its Electronic Trade Documents Act 2023, addresses this obstacle directly. If digitalization reduces the fixed costs of bank intermediation, the theory of Schmidt-Eisenlohr (2013) predicts that letters of credit will become viable for smaller transactions and riskier destinations, narrowing the trade finance gap at its most acute margin. Empirical evaluation of this prediction remains an open task.

5.4. Policy Implications

Four implications follow from the review. First, because finance affects the extensive margin of trade, financial sector development is a trade policy instrument in its own right, and the gains from improving credit access are likely to be concentrated in export entry by smaller firms. Second, bank regulation has trade consequences: capital and compliance requirements that raise the cost of small-ticket or high-risk trade finance transactions reduce trade with developing economies, and the CGFS (2014) has noted that the historically low default rates on trade finance instruments justify differentiated regulatory treatment. Third, crisis-response programs should be instrument-specific, targeting guarantee capacity where private supply contracts most sharply. Fourth, the dominance of the dollar in invoicing and funding means that U.S. monetary conditions constitute a global trade finance shock, an externality that national policies can mitigate through foreign-currency liquidity facilities but cannot eliminate.

VI. LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Several limitations of the existing literature, and of this review, warrant acknowledgement. The most compelling causal

evidence derives from a small number of countries with rich matched firm–bank data, notably Japan, Peru, France, Belgium, Italy, Turkey, and the United States, and its external validity for low-income economies, where the trade finance gap is largest, is uncertain. Studies using transaction-level data on payment terms, such as Antràs and Foley (2015), are informative about mechanisms but drawn from single firms. The aggregate magnitude of the trade finance channel during crises remains contested, in part because demand shocks, inventory adjustments, and financial frictions are correlated and difficult to disentangle. Finally, as a narrative review, this article does not quantify effect sizes across studies and may reflect selection toward published, statistically significant results.

Three directions for future research appear especially promising. First, the diffusion of electronic trade documents and legal reforms enabling them provides quasi-experimental variation that could identify the causal effect of intermediation costs on instrument choice and on the trade finance gap. Second, the integration of supply-chain finance platforms, in which large buyers arrange financing for their suppliers' receivables, raises questions about the redistribution of financial risk within value chains that existing models of bilateral payment terms do not address. Third, the interaction between the dominant currency paradigm and trade finance, including the consequences of any gradual diversification of invoicing away from the dollar, would benefit from firm-level studies that jointly observe invoicing currency, funding currency, and payment terms.

VII. CONCLUSION

This review has argued that finance is a constitutive element of international trade rather than a peripheral facilitator. Theory establishes three mechanisms: financial development shapes comparative advantage, credit constraints determine which firms can export and how much, and enforcement frictions determine how individual transactions are financed. Empirical research, particularly studies exploiting exogenous variation in bank lending, confirms that credit supply causally affects both the extensive and intensive margins of trade, while research on the Great Trade Collapse indicates that trade finance amplified rather than caused the decline, with the sharpest effects on bank-intermediated and dollar-financed flows. Persistent unmet demand for trade finance among smaller firms in developing economies, together with the concentration of invoicing and funding in the U.S. dollar, means that the fragility identified in the crisis literature remains a structural feature of the global trading system. Digitalization of trade documentation and targeted guarantee programs offer the most promising avenues for reducing that fragility, and evaluating their effects should be a priority for the next generation of research on trade and finance.

REFERENCES

- Ahn, J., Amiti, M., & Weinstein, D. E. (2011). Trade finance and the great trade collapse. *American Economic Review*, 101(3), 298–302. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.101.3.298>
- Amity, M., & Weinstein, D. E. (2011). Exports and financial shocks. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(4), 1841–1877. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjr033>
- Antràs, P. (2020). *De-globalisation? Global value chains in the post-COVID-19 age* (NBER Working Paper No. 28115). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w28115>
- Antràs, P., & Foley, C. F. (2015). Poultry in motion: A study of international trade finance practices. *Journal of Political Economy*, 123(4), 853–901. <https://doi.org/10.1086/681592>
- Auboin, M. (2009). *Restoring trade finance during a period of financial crisis: Stock-taking of recent initiatives* (WTO Staff Working Paper ERSD-2009-16). World Trade Organization.
- Baldwin, R. (Ed.). (2009). *The great trade collapse: Causes, consequences and prospects*. Centre for Economic Policy Research.
- Beck, T. (2002). Financial development and international trade: Is there a link? *Journal of International Economics*, 57(1), 107–131. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1996\(01\)00131-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1996(01)00131-3)
- Bems, R., Johnson, R. C., & Yi, K.-M. (2013). The great trade collapse. *Annual Review of Economics*, 5, 375–400.
- Boz, E., Casas, C., Georgiadis, G., Gopinath, G., Le Mezo, H., Mehl, A., & Nguyen, T. (2022). Patterns of invoicing currency in global trade: New evidence. *Journal of International Economics*, 136, 103604. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2022.103604>
- Bricongne, J.-C., Fontagné, L., Gaulier, G., Taglioni, D., & Vicard, V. (2012). Firms and the global crisis: French exports in the turmoil. *Journal of International Economics*, 87(1), 134–146.
- Bruno, V., & Shin, H. S. (2015). Capital flows and the risk-taking channel of monetary policy. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 71, 119–132.
- Bruno, V., & Shin, H. S. (2023). Dollar and exports: The effects of currency strength on international trade. *Review of Financial Studies*, 36(8), 2963–2996. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhad005>
- Chor, D., & Manova, K. (2012). Off the cliff and back? Credit conditions and international trade during the global financial crisis. *Journal of International Economics*, 87(1), 117–133.
- Committee on the Global Financial System. (2014). *Trade finance: Developments and issues* (CGFS Papers No. 50). Bank for International Settlements.
- Crozet, M., Demir, B., & Javorcik, B. (2022). International trade and letters of credit: A double-edged sword in times of crises. *IMF Economic Review*, 70(1), 185–211. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41308-021-00155-3>
- Demir, B., & Javorcik, B. (2018). Don't throw in the towel, throw in trade credit! *Journal of International Economics*, 111, 177–189.
- Eaton, J., Kortum, S., Neiman, B., & Romalis, J. (2016). Trade and the global recession. *American Economic Review*, 106(11), 3401–3438. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20101557>
- Feenstra, R. C., Li, Z., & Yu, M. (2014). Exports and credit constraints under incomplete information: Theory and evidence from China. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 96(4), 729–744. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00405
- Foley, C. F., & Manova, K. (2015). International trade, multinational activity, and corporate finance. *Annual Review of Economics*, 7, 119–146. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080614-115453>
- Ganne, E. (2018). *Can blockchain revolutionize international trade?* World Trade Organization.
- Gopinath, G., Boz, E., Casas, C., Diez, F. J., Gourinchas, P.-O., & Plagborg-Møller, M. (2020). Dominant currency paradigm. *American Economic Review*, 110(3), 677–719. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20171201>
- Kim, K., Beck, S., Tayag, M. C., & Latoja, M. C. (2021). *2021 trade finance gaps, growth, and jobs survey* (ADB Briefs No. 192). Asian Development Bank. <https://doi.org/10.22617/BRF210379-2>

- Kletzer, K., & Bardhan, P. (1987). Credit markets and patterns of international trade. *Journal of Development Economics*, 27(1–2), 57–70.
- Levchenko, A. A., Lewis, L. T., & Tesar, L. L. (2010). The collapse of international trade during the 2008–09 crisis: In search of the smoking gun. *IMF Economic Review*, 58(2), 214–253. <https://doi.org/10.1057/imfer.2010.11>
- Manova, K. (2013). Credit constraints, heterogeneous firms, and international trade. *Review of Economic Studies*, 80(2), 711–744. <https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rds036>
- Manova, K., Wei, S.-J., & Zhang, Z. (2015). Firm exports and multinational activity under credit constraints. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97(3), 574–588. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00480
- Melitz, M. J. (2003). The impact of trade on intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity. *Econometrica*, 71(6), 1695–1725. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0262.00467>
- Minetti, R., & Zhu, S. C. (2011). Credit constraints and firm export: Microeconomic evidence from Italy. *Journal of International Economics*, 83(2), 109–125.
- Muûls, M. (2015). Exporters, importers and credit constraints. *Journal of International Economics*, 95(2), 333–343.
- Niepmann, F., & Schmidt-Eisenlohr, T. (2017a). International trade, risk and the role of banks. *Journal of International Economics*, 107, 111–126.
- Niepmann, F., & Schmidt-Eisenlohr, T. (2017b). No guarantees, no trade: How banks affect export patterns. *Journal of International Economics*, 108, 338–350.
- Paravisini, D., Rappoport, V., Schnabl, P., & Wolfenzon, D. (2015). Dissecting the effect of credit supply on trade: Evidence from matched credit-export data. *Review of Economic Studies*, 82(1), 333–359. <https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdu028>
- Rajan, R. G., & Zingales, L. (1998). Financial dependence and growth. *American Economic Review*, 88(3), 559–586.
- Rey, H. (2015). *Dilemma not trilemma: The global financial cycle and monetary policy independence* (NBER Working Paper No. 21162). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w21162>
- Schmidt-Eisenlohr, T. (2013). Towards a theory of trade finance. *Journal of International Economics*, 91(1), 96–112.
- United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. (2017). *UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Transferable Records*.