

Supplement to “The demographic consequences of sex-selection technology”

(*Quantitative Economics*, Vol. 14, No. 1, January 2023, 309–347)

QI LI

Department of Economics, The Pennsylvania State University

JUAN PANTANO


Department of Economics, The University of Arizona

APPENDIX


See Figures [A.1](#) and [A.2](#).

Qi Li: qili@psu.edu


Juan Pantano: jpanta@arizona.edu




(a) Completed fertility by interview




(b) Age at first birth




(c) % Ever sterilized by age




(d) % Pursuing pregnancies by age



(e) % Temp. contraception by age



(f) $\Pr(\text{Unwanted Birth}|a, e = 0, j = 2)$




(g) % unwanted pregnancies by sex mix




(h) % wanted pregnancies by sex mix


FIGURE A.1. Model fit for women with low education.




(a) Completed fertility by interview




(b) Age at first birth




(c) % ever sterilized by age




(d) % pursuing pregnancies by age




(e) % temp. contraception by age



(f) $\Pr(\text{Unwanted Birth}|a, e = 1, j = 2)$



(g) % unwanted pregnancies by sex mix



(h) % wanted pregnancies by sex mix

FIGURE A.2. Model fit for women with high education.

Co-editor Peter Arcidiacono handled this manuscript.

Manuscript received 5 February, 2022; final version accepted 26 May, 2022; available online 17 June, 2022.