

Air Pollution and Under-5 Child Mortality: Evidence from China's Coal Power Plant Phase-out Policy

By XIAOYING LIU AND HENG YU*

This paper evaluates the impact of a mandatory shutdown policy of small-capacity coal power plants during China's 11th Five-Year Plan (2006–2010) on under-5 mortality. We collect information on 2181 coal power plants that operated during 2000–2010 and compile a unique dataset combining coal power plants, county-level under-5 mortality and socioeconomic variables, high spatial resolution data of PM_{2.5} and SO₂ and meteorological conditions. We model the impacts of air pollution on under-5 mortality using IV-Lasso method, with distance-weighted sums of retired capacity and high altitude wind conditions as instrument candidates for air pollutants. Our estimates imply the phase-out policy saved around 46,000 lives during the 11th Five-Year Plan period. We also find heterogeneity in policy effects across regions. (JEL I10, I18)

The United Nations sustainable development growth (SDG) Target 3.2 is to end preventable deaths of newborns and children under 5 years of age by 2030 and all countries aiming to reduce the under-5 mortality to at least as low as 25 per 1,000 live births (UNECE, 2024). However, many developing countries and under-developed countries are still far from this target. UNICEF estimates at least 66 countries in the world had under-5 mortality rate higher than 25 per 1,000 in 2022, with geographic distribution mainly concentrated in the populated Sub-Saharan Africa, Central and Southern Asia, South-Eastern Asia. According to a study which examines the causes of under-5 mortality using global data in 2015, pneumonia accounts for nearly 1/6 of the deaths and is the leading cause of death among children who died in the 1-59 month period (Liu et al., 2016), killing more children than diarrhoea and malaria combined (Watkins and Sridhar, 2018).

On the other hand, coal remains the main source of energy and provides over 1/3 of global electricity generation (IEA, 2024). Coal demand in 5 fastest growing economics in Asia - China, India, Indonesia, Viet Nam and the Philippines - has been consistently increasing during the last two decades, and represents more than 70% of global coal demand (IEA, 2024). Figure 1 shows how the use of coal in the above 5 countries increases over time during the past few decades. Burning coal emits various toxic pollutants including mercury, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, particulates and various heavy metals into air (Gasparotto and Da Boit Martinello, 2021). As a matter of fact, air quality in 4 of these 5 countries are among the worst in the world. According to annual mean PM_{2.5} concentration in 2023, India, Indonesia, China and Viet Nam separately rank as the 3rd,

* Xiaoying Liu: Visiting scholar at Population Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, United States, xiaoyliu@sas.upenn.edu. Heng Yu: University of Chicago, 5757 S University Ave, Chicago, IL 60637, hyu8@uchicago.edu. Acknowledgements




FIGURE 1. STACKED ELECTRICITY GENERATION BY COAL (TWH)

Source: EMBER (<https://ember-climate.org/data/data-tools/data-explorer/>).

14th, 19th, 22nd most polluted countries in the world (IQAir Foundation, 2024). Especially India, as the home to 17 of the 20 most polluted cities in the world in 2024 (IQAir Foundation, 2024), has overtaken China as the country with the most polluted cities. Air pollution exposure has been well recognized as being associated with respiratory infection (i.e. pneumonia) in all population, especially among vulnerable people including children and elderly. Air pollutants such as particular matters (PM), sulfur dioxide, nitrate dioxide have been found increasing human's susceptibility to respiratory infections by disrupting immune barrier functions, causing macrophage dysfunction, modifying cellular receptors used by pathogens, or disrupting the microbiome (see Monoson et al. (2023) for an extensive review of epidemiological evidences and laboratory mechanism).

Although under-5 mortality rates in these 5 countries (China, India, Indonesia, Viet Nam and the Philippines) have been steadily decreasing during the past several decades, the differences between these countries and those in Europe and Northern America remain high, except for China, of which under-5 mortality rate is similar to that of the most developed countries (as indicated in Figure III.B). Moreover, India and Philippines are still yet to meet the SDG target of having under-5 mortality to be lower than 25 per thousand.

What is the contribution of coal consumption to the under-five mortality in these developing countries? On the one hand, coal remains the cheapest and most available source of energy that powers the economy in the world. Economic development can fund investment in public health and reduce under-5 mortality due to malnutrition or lack of medication; on the other hand, coal consumption may contribute to increase in under-5 mortality as the air pollutants emitted from coal may cause preterm delivery and infectious disease such as pneumonia (Gasparotto and Da Boit Martinello, 2021). Given the steady increase in the demand for coal to power the economy growth in the 4 countries of India, Indonesia, Viet Nam, the Philippines, is it still feasible to reduce the under-5




FIGURE 2. COUNTRY-SPECIFIC UNDER-5 MORTALITY RATE (%cc)

Source: UNICEF Data, 2024. <https://data.unicef.org/topic/child-survival/under-five-mortality/>.

mortality in these 4 countries? What is the experience of China as the biggest consumer of coal and once the most polluted country in the world, which however reached the very low under-5 mortality rate?

This paper examines the impact of coal power plants on under-5 mortality in China, by exploiting a policy that mandates replacement of the low efficiency (i.e., low capacity) coal power plants with the high efficiency power plants with super capacity that were enforced by the central government during the 11th five-year plan (FYP) period (2006-2010). The so-called "Big-up, small-down" policy requires local governments to phase out the power generators that were of low efficiency, and especially those of under 50 megawatts (MW) capacity during the five-year period. Our identification strategy exploits the exogenous shocks in the air pollution levels (SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$) as a result of this top-down command from the central government. More specifically, we geocode all the power plants that were operating or shut down between 2001 and 2010 and calculate the total capacities of the power plant units that had been shut down during the year within a certain radius from geographic center for each county. We also obtain the annual under-5 mortality rate at county level and calculate monthly mean concentration of SO_2 , $PM_{2.5}$ at county level based on spatially and temporally high resolution remote sensing data. We further examine the impact of the air pollution on under-5 mortality rate, using the closed-down capacities and high altitude wind speeds and directions as instrumental variables to create exogenous variation in air pollution.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section I, we introduce the background of air quality control policies in the 11th five-year plan in China and review the literature on

power plants and air quality, power plants and mortality; Section II introduces the empirical model and identification strategy, which is followed by Section III that introduces the data and measurements of the variables used in model estimation; Section IV presents our main results; Section V presents heterogeneity analysis results by subsamples; Section VI concludes.

I. Background

A. The air quality control policies in the 11th five-year plan in China

Since China joined the World Trade Organization in 2001, China's economy entered another stage of rapid growth, with average annual GDP growth rate at 10.55% during the first decade in 21st century and a peak at 14.2% in 2007 (World Bank Group, 2024). To meet the soaring high demand for electricity, a large number of coal power plants of small capacities that could be quickly built with little investment were put into use. As a result, total energy consumption in China increased by 70 percent between 2000 and 2005, with coal consumption increased by 75 percent (World Bank, 2007). Moreover, total capacities of the power plant units with no more than 100 MW reached 115 GW in 2005, accounting for over 27% of the capacities of coal power plant units in total (Tang, 2009). These small coal power plants are low in combustion efficiency, and emit a lot of air pollutants including CO , SO_2 , NO_X , Particulates (which contribute to smog, haze), CO_2 (which is the primary greenhouse gas), mercury and other heavy metals that are hazardous to human health (EIA, 2024). The emission of SO_2 from the energy industry was responsible for 53% of the total emission of SO_2 in the country (Geng et al., 2016). In 2005, 16 of the world's 20 most air-polluted cities were in China (World Bank, 2007).

To improve air quality, the Chinese government introduced a series of plans for air quality control. First of all, Chinese central government set a target to reduce energy intensity by 20% in its 11th Five-Year Plan (5YP) period, i.e., between 2006 and 2010 (NDRC, 2006). Among a series of regulations that have been enforced to fulfill this target¹, one is called "Big Up and Small Down" (or Small Plants Closure program), with an aim to set up a "more rational structure of industries, products, and industrial organization". It was planned to close 50,000 MW total capacity of small coal powered plants, and the overarching goal for sulfur dioxide (SO_2) controls was to cut the total emissions of SO_2 by 10% between 2005 and 2010 (China's National People's Congress, 2006).

In 2004, the National Development and Reform Commission issued "a notice on the relevant requirements for the planning and construction of coal-fired power station

¹The programs at central government level include Ten Key Energy Conservation Projects (The Ten Key Projects focus on coal-fired industrial boiler (kiln) retrofits, district cogeneration projects, waste heat and pressure utilization projects, petroleum conservation and substitution projects, motors energy efficiency projects, energy system optimization projects, building energy conservation projects, green lighting projects, government agency energy conservation projects, and energy saving monitoring and testing and technology service system building projects), Buildings Energy Efficiency, Top-1000 Energy Consuming Enterprises Program (The goal of Top-1000 Energy Consuming Enterprises Program is to significantly improve the energy efficiency of the Top-1000 enterprises in nine major energy-consuming industries), Structural Adjustments/Small Plant Closures, and Appliance Standards and Energy-Efficiency Labels.

projects” (NEA, National Energy Administration, 2004), which recommends replacing the small coal power plants with higher efficiency plants². New power plant units should have capacities over 600 MW, and coal consumption for per unit power generation should be no more than 286 grams of standard coal per 10,000 hours. It also required newly constructed or extended coal power plants should install flue gas desulfurization (FGD) facilities and encouraged the existing power plants to install FGD. In 2007, State Council issued a notice on several suggestions to accelerate the shutdown of small thermal plant units. The notice specifically required to close down thermal power plant units that meet any of the following conditions: 1) unit capacity under 50 MW, 2) unit capacity under 100 MW and have been operated for at least 20 years, 3) unit capacity under 200 MW and have exceeded service period; 4) units with standard coal consumption for power supply being 10% higher than the provincial (regional, municipal) average level or 15% higher than the national average level in 2005; 5) units that fail to meet environmental protection emission standards. The notice also required no new power plants should be constructed before the closure of small plant units in the region. The new units with high capacity (over 300 MW) and that replace more retired plants have the priority in getting state financial support. The notice also gives direction on properly relocating employees’ jobs after closing down old power plants (The State Council, 2007).

As a result, the share of supercritical and ultra-supercritical capacity in China increased rapidly since the mid 2000s, from less than 5% in 2004 to around 28% in 2010 (IEA, 2012). Aggregate closed capacity from 2006-2008 was 34,210 MW (Price et al., 2011), and reached around 70,000 to 80,000 MW till 2010. According to Ministry of Environmental Protection, emissions of SO_2 decreased from 2005 to 2010 by 14.3% (MEP, 2011).

During the 11th FYP, the air quality control policy mainly focused on sulfur dioxide. Although a similar nitrogen oxides (NOx) emissions control plan was also under development, it was enforced mainly during the 12th FYP (2011-2015).

B. West-to-east power transfer program

In 1999, China Central Government initiated China Western Development strategy. The objective is to address the regional disparity in economic development between the east and west China, by increasing investment in infrastructure including transportation, hydropower, fossil fuel, and telecommunications, and other policies. In this context, the West-to-East Power transfer Program was launched to transfer electricity generated in western China to the eastern regions. The purposes of the west-to-east power transfer program are two folds: improving economic development of the West China and reducing air pollutants in the already polluted East. Three major power grid networks were formed: the northern network that transmits electricity generated from hydropower on the upper and middle reaches of the Yellow River and from coal-fired power plants in the mid-

²The high efficiency power plants may use supercritical or ultra-supercritical technology, with steam being generated at a pressure above the critical pressure (22.1 MPa) or even higher temperature and pressure of water. The thermal efficiency can reach 42%-45%. As a comparison, the conventional pulverised coal combustion (PC) - most commonly used- technology can only reach maximum 38% thermal efficiency. Although the capital costs for supercritical and ultra-supercritical technology are much higher due largely to the alloys used and the welding techniques required for operation at higher steam pressures and temperatures, it saves fuel.

West China (Shanxi, Shaanxi and Inner Mongolia) to the North China (Beijing, Tianjin, Hebei, Shandong); the central network that transports hydropower from the Three Gorges Dam and the Jinsha River and its tributaries to the eastern China region (Shanghai, Zhejiang, Jiangsu etc); and the southern network that develops and transmits electricity from hydropower and coal-fired power plants in the Southwest (Yunnan, Guizhou), to Guangdong and Guangxi (Grid, 2016). For the southern transfer network alone, transfer capacity and electricity amount increased by 10 times from 2000 to 2010. By 2010, the maximum power capacity of electricity to Guangdong transmitted from the west reached 18.55 gigawatt (GW), accounting for 27% of the maximum load in Guangdong (Zeng et al., 2013).

C. Literature on power plants closure policy and air quality

Several environmental studies have evaluated the effectiveness of environmental regulation in China during 11 FYP on air quality. Xia, Zhao and Nielsen (2016) examine the impacts of national air pollution control policies during 11th and 12th five year plan periods by analyzing emissions of SO_2 , NO_X , CO and CO_2 from various sources, complemented by satellite observations of vertical column densities (VCDs). The paper finds CO was reduced substantially during 11th FYP as energy efficiency improved more significantly during the period attributed to closures of small industrial plants. SO_2 emissions increased from 18.2 million metric tons (Mt) in 2000 to 30 Mt in 2006 and decreased to 26.4 Mt in 2010. They also find the share of thermal power plants in contribution to total SO_2 emissions decreased from 62.7% in 2005 to 38.4% in 2014 while its share of CO_2 emissions varied little. They argue it was because of improved use of FGD in the power sector³ and implementation of new emission standards in key industrial sources. They further find SO_2 VCDs match well with SO_2 emissions accounted from sources for certain period (for example, both were found to decline in 2008-2009), but SO_2 VCDs increased by 4% during 2005-2011 (instead of decrease by 7% during the same period accounted from emission sources)⁴. On the contrary, NO_X emissions increased from 2000 to 2011 (affirmed by NO_2 VCDs which increased by 71% from 2005 to 2011), but decreased after 2011 due to the installation of selective catalytic/non-catalytic reduction systems in the power sector. Moreover, Xia, Zhao and Nielsen (2016) find regional heterogeneity in SO_2 reduction. More specifically, they find SO_2 emissions and VCDs in North China Plain (Beijing-Hebei-Henan) and Yangtze River delta has decreased faster than those in western China (Sichuan), while SO_2 VCDs even increased in western China.

Wang et al. (2017) review the spatio-temporal distribution of $PM_{2.5}$ in China and evaluate the effect of control policies on $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations between 2005-2015. They find ambient $PM_{2.5}$ concentration decreased between 2000-2010 in three megacities (Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou). They also have an extensive review of studies that evaluate air quality benefits from SO_2 control measures in 11th FYP - both SO_2 and the

³The share of installed capacity with FGD systems in power sector increased from 13% in 2005 to 86% in 2010

⁴Xia 2016 provides several explanations on this discrepancy. First, as emissions were accounted by sources based on the installed capacity with FGD, operation of FGD remains unclear; second, densities through the whole atmospheric column can not fully represent the anthropogenic emissions

secondary pollutant sulfate - SO_4^{2-} (a composite of $PM_{2.5}$). However, using satellite AOD data, Peng et al. (2016) show a slowly increasing trend from 1999 to 2011, especially in the central and east China. Meng et al. (2023) build a machine learning model to predict particulate sulfate concentrations across China from 2005 to 2018. They find annual mean sulfate concentration was relatively stable before 2013.

D. Literature on power plants and mortality

Although there is a large literature on air pollution and health, especially in the public health realm, the literature evaluating the specific impacts of power plants is limited. The previous studies have mainly studied the power plants in the US, western Europe such as Germany, and India.

Greenstone and Hanna (2014) exploits regional differences in implementing environmental regulation on improving air quality in India and examines the contribution of these regulations on reducing infant mortality. However, the policies studied in the paper do not specifically focus on power plants. Gupta and Spears (2017) examine the health impacts of expansion of coal plants in India on respiratory health by studying a household level panel data - the India Human Development Survey. They find increased exposure to coal plants is associated with worse respiratory health, but not diarrhea or fever which is less likely to be directly related with air pollution. Furthermore, they find new non-coal plants have no impact on respiratory health. However, this paper does not evaluate the impact on children's mortality. More recently, Cropper, Cui and Guttikunda (2021) estimate emissions of air pollutants SO_2 , NO_x , $PM_{2.5}$ from each power plant in India and use a chemical transport model to estimate the impact of power plant emissions on ambient $PM_{2.5}$. The paper further projects the impact of change in $PM_{2.5}$ on premature mortality based on concentration-response functions from the 2019 Global Burden of Disease.

Luechinger (2014) estimates the effect of SO_2 pollution on infant mortality in Germany, by exploiting the mandated policy of installations of scrubbers at power plants during the last 20 years in the 20th century. This study is the closest to what we do in this study. Variation comes from power plants' location and prevailing wind directions. The study finds the observed reduction in pollution saves 826–1460 infant lives every year.

DeCicca and Malak (2020) evaluate the impacts of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) that reduces exposure to fine particulate matter in states neighboring other states in the US with coal fired power plants on infant health outcomes, including infant mortality. This paper explores the difference in exposure between "attainment" and "non-attainment" area before and after the implementation of the CAIR. They find CAIR reduced premature birth and infant mortality for newborns whose mothers experienced "risky" pregnancies.

There have been some studies in China examining the impacts of a specific power plants on health. For example, Perera et al. (2008) examine the long term impacts of prenatal exposure to coal burning pollutants on children's neuro-development by comparing a birth cohort born after a coal power plant was shut down with a counterpart before the plant was shut down. However, as far as we know, there have been no published studies from China evaluating the specific impacts of coal power plants on health at national level. Our study tries to fill the gap in this field.

II. Empirical Method

We model under-5 mortality as an outcome of both economic development and ambient environment. On one hand, economic development can increase public health investment by building more hospitals and taking more preventable measures, which contribute to the decrease in mortality. On the other hand, air pollution generated from economic activities is hazardous to human health and increases mortality. This is especially true in many developing countries that are undergoing industrialization, where environmental regulations are often lax and economic growth is usually accompanied by air pollution. In other words, air pollution is strongly correlated with economic development indicators, such as GDP. How to disentangle the two in the contribution to mortality remains a challenge. Our empirical method outlined as follows can disentangle the two by exploiting an exogenous change in air quality brought by a mandatory policy of shutdown of inefficient coal power plants. As coal power plants closure is a top-down policy that was commanded by the central government, which sets clear criteria for retirement and clear cutoff of generating capacity at 50 MW under which coal power plants must be shut down during the 11th 5YP, we argue closure of coal power plants is an exogenous event. We show this exogenous change is not related to economic growth, therefore the estimated impacts on mortality can be deemed as causal.

In this Method section, we first present an empirical model that evaluates the effectiveness of coal power plants closure on under-5 mortality in China in section II.A, and then introduce our empirical estimation strategy in section II.B. We calculate the distance-weighted sum of capacities of closed coal power plants within a certain radius from a county's geographic center and use them and high altitude wind direction and speed to serve as instrument candidates for the air pollutants' concentrations. By applying the Lasso-IV methodology in estimation, we use machine learning process to select a set of most efficient instrumental variables from the candidate list to be used in the second stage mortality estimation.

A. Empirical Model

The empirical model includes two stages. At the first stage, we estimate the effectiveness of power plants closure on air quality within a certain radius at county level; and then at the second stage, we estimate the impact of change in air quality induced by closed power plants on under-5 mortality. The following two equations represent the first and second stages separately.

$$(1) \quad P_{pcy} = \beta_X X_{pcy} + \sum_{m=1}^{12} \gamma_m W_{cym} + \sigma \sum_{r \geq 0}^R w_r C_{yr} + u_p + v_y + e_{cy}$$

$$(2) \quad Mort_{cpy} = \alpha_Z Z_{cpy} + \alpha_{Me} Me_{cym} + \theta P_{cpy} + p * y + u_{cp} + \epsilon_{cpy}$$

Equation (1) is the first-stage estimation of concentration P_{pcy} of air pollutant in county c of province p in year y . Air quality P_{pcy} is a function of the county socio-economic development that is described by a vector X_{pcy} (for example, a county's GDP), and a vector of instrumental variables, as well as province fixed effects u_p , year fixed effects

v_y , and the time-varying county level unobserved characteristics e_{cy} . The candidates of the instrumental variables may include the policy-related variables that directly affects air pollutants emission, for example, the total capacities of coal power plants that were shut down in year y within a certain radius R from a county center C_{yr} . They may also include a set of vectors (W_{cym}) that reflect high altitude wind speed and direction that have direct impacts on air pollutants diffusion but do not have direct impacts on human health, especially after controlling for near-ground meteorological conditions. Given a fairly large list of potential instrumental variables, we implement the Lasso method to select the most efficient IVs, as introduced in the next subsection.

Equation 2 outlines our second stage regression of outcome variable of interest - under-5 mortality at county/city level M_{cpy} , as a function of socio-economic indicators Z_{cpy} , meteorological conditions characterised by a vector M_{cym} that includes monthly mean temperature and rainfall for county c in year y at month m , air pollutant concentrations P_{cpy} , as well as province and year fixed effects and time-varying county effects. θ is the coefficient of interest, which measures the effect of reduced air pollution induced by coal power plants closure on under-5 mortality during 2001-2010.

B. Lasso-IV Optimal Instrument Estimation Method

Different from the usual 2-stage IV estimation with predetermined instrumental variables, we apply Lasso Method (Belloni, Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2014) to select the statistically significant IVs among a set of candidates, and then use the selected instrument variables for estimation. Lasso method has been applied in several recent studies estimating the impacts air pollution on health. For example, Deryugina et al. (2019) use changes in local wind direction as instruments for air pollution and applies Cox-Lasso machine learning model to select variables from Medicare health histories and survey data to predict the remaining life expectancy. Godzinski and Suarez Castillo (2021) apply Lasso-IV model to select optimal instruments from a large set of altitude-weather instrumental variables for five air pollutants.

Our estimation method is similar to Godzinski and Suarez Castillo (2021). The IV candidates can be categorized into three groups: coal power plant phase-out policy-related variables, power plant desulphurization policy-related variables, and high altitude wind conditions. The phase-out policy-related instruments include distance-weighted and unweighted sums of closed capacities within a certain radius (25km, 50km, 100km) from a county's geographical center for the current year or with a lag of up to 3 years. Similarly, the desulphurization policy-related instrument variables include the sum of capacities of coal power plant units that were required to install FGD, as well as the total reduction in sulfate emission from the plants after installing FGD. As a third set of instrumental variable candidates, we also include a set of high altitude wind variables - u and v components of wind at 100 meters above ground⁵, since wind, especially at higher altitude, can help to diffuse air pollution.

⁵A positive u vector denotes wind coming from west and a positive v vector denotes wind coming from south. From the u and v vectors of NASA's daily averaged data we are able to calculate the monthly mean wind direction and wind speed for each county.

Given a large set of instrumental variable candidates (120 in total), Lasso method is applied to self select a small set of optimal instrumental variables from all the candidates⁶, according to the theoretical framework outlined in Belloni, Chernozhukov and Hansen (2014). The key assumption of the Lasso-based IV estimation, i.e., Approximately Sparse Optimal Instrument, requires that, given known support of the instrumental variables available, there exist at most s instrument variables in a setting of high-dimensional metrics, such that the approximation error of the expectations of endogenous variables is bounded above by the estimation error, $\sqrt{s/n}$, of the oracle estimator (the estimator on the true support without penalization we would apply in the Lasso approach). One corollary of the condition is that different instruments could be selected for different endogenous variables and the total number of instruments selected for each specification is unknown.

III. Data and Measurements

We compile a unique panel data set at county level across China over the period 2001-2010 that consists of 1) under-5 mortality; 2) monthly average of SO_2 VCDs; 3) monthly average of $PM_{2.5}$ VOCs; 4) distance weighted total capacity of the coal power plant units within 25km, 50km and 100km radius from the geographic center that were shut down during the year; 5) distance weighted total capacity of the coal power plants units within 25km, 50km and 100km radius from the geographic center that were required to install FGD; 6) monthly mean of meteorological data including temperature and humidity; 7) social-economic development indicators including per capita GDP and number of doctors by per 1000 people. In this section, we introduce the sources of data and the construction of the measurements that will be used in model estimation.

A. Under-5 Mortality Data

The under-5 mortality data used in our study is the estimated mortality at county level from 1996 to 2012 by the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) of University of Washington in the United States (Wang et al., 2015). For estimating county level under-5 mortality, IHME uses a combination of a small area mortality estimation model, spatiotemporal smoothing and Gaussian process regression to synthesise data of individual records, aggregate birth and death numbers at county level, and other data including "maternal mortality, management rate during pregnancy, visits for children younger than 7 years, pregnancy wellness checks, hospital deliveries, and newborn check-up rate" from Annual Report System on Maternal and Child Health, county level per capita GDP, as well as maternal education level (Wang et al., 2015).

Figure III.B visualizes the change in under-5 mortality rate at province level in 1996, 2001, 2006, and 2012. It is visually clear that throughout the whole country, the under-5 mortality decreased over time. According to Wang et al. (2015), the under-5 mortality rate in China decreased by 70% from 46.0 per 1000 live births in 1990 to about 13.7

⁶We use the R package **hdm** developed by Chernozhukov, Hansen and Spindler (2016) for Lasso estimation.

per 1000 live births in 2012. Our data also display the same trend for the study period: National average under-5 mortality decreases from 35.56 per 1000 live births in 2001, to 18.19 per 1,000 in 2010. Moreover, there exists a big regional difference. For example, under-5 mortality can be as low as 3.3 per 1000 live births in the urban east, but as high as 104.4 per 1000 live births in the rural west. There is also a significant difference within provinces across counties.

For the analysis in this paper, we use the under-5 mortality rate at county level between 2001 and 2010 as dependent variable. We document the summary statistics of county-level mortality rates in tables 1 and 2.

B. China Coal Power Plants Directory

Global coal plant tracker (GCPT) by Global Energy Monitor⁷ publishes a list of existing and retired coal power plants as well as the ones in construction or planned around the world⁸. GCPT catalogues every operating coal-fired generating unit, every new unit proposed since 2010 and every unit retired since 2000. For each power unit, it includes the name, exact location and geocode, generated power capacity, status (either operating, retired, or in construction, or proposed), the year it started to be in operation for those that are operating or retired, the year of retirement for those that have retired, combustion technology, coal source, heat rate, SO_2 emission factor, annual CO_2 emission etc. We extracted the complete list for China up to the year of 2018⁹. However, as GCPT only tracks coal-fired power units generating 30 megawatts (MW) and above, it does not provide information for those power units that have capacities lower than 30 MW, which however are the main targets of the power plants closure policy in 11th 5YP. To get a complete list of the power plants, we obtain the lists of 2486 small thermal power plant units in total¹⁰ that were closed down in each year during 2006-2010. The lists are publicly available on the website of Ministry of Ecology and Environment of the People's Republic of China (Ministry of Ecology and Environment of the People's Republic of China, 2009; National Energy Administration of the People's Republic of China, 2007; Ministry of Ecology and Environment of the People's Republic of China, 2011, 2010). This list of retired coal power units includes the name of the power plants units, the province and city where they are located, the generating capacities and the year and

⁷Website: <https://globalenergymonitor.org/projects/global-coal-plant-tracker/>

⁸According to the website of Global Energy Monitor, Preliminary lists of plants in each country were gathered from public and private data sources including Global Energy Observatory, CARMA, BankTrack's "Dirty Deals" list, Wikipedia, Enipedia, WRI's "Global Coal Risk Assessment" report (2012), Platts World Energy Power Plant database, Industcards "Power Plants Around the World Photo Gallery", national-level trackers developed by environmental organizations (Sierra Club (USA), Kara Atlas (Turkey), and Deutsche Umwelthilfe (Germany)), as well as various company and government sources. Coal plant data is validated and updated through five main sources: 1) Government data on individual power plants, country energy and resource plans, and government websites tracking coal plant permits and applications; 2) Reports by state-owned and private power companies; 3) News and media reports; 4) Local non-governmental organizations tracking coal plants or permits; 5) On the ground contacts who can provide first-hand information about a project or plant. The data has also been reviewed by local experts where possible.

⁹The GCPT catalogue provides comprehensive and complete documentation of coal power plants in mainland China (Cui et al., 2019, 2021; Lu et al., 2022) and overseas (Gao et al., 2021; Springer, Evans and Teng, 2021; Montrone, Steckel and Nemet, 2023; Wu et al., 2024).

¹⁰We also compiled a list of 366 other plant units over 50 MW closed within the same policy period, some of which due to retirement concerns.

month when they were retired. To get more precise measurements of distances between power plants and nearby counties used for analysis, we geocode these power plants based on their exact locations - a task that proves to be quite challenging. As China experienced its fastest economic growth and urbanization in the first decade of 2000s, cities expanded significantly, leading to profound changes in the urban plan. We searched for the exact locations of these retired power plants on internet, went through various sources including local newspapers, government bulletin, and time-preserved information sources such as the names of bus stops¹¹ and grocery stores. In the end, we manually geocode these power plants using Google Map¹². We also tried to document the year a plant unit started operating via online search as much as we could. For those we could not find the exact start year information, we assume they were put into operation before 2000, which is the first year of our analysis data. We document the summary statistics of closed capacities variables in tables 1 and 2.




FIGURE 3. COMMISSIONED AND RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT FROM 2000 TO 2010

We calculate the total capacities closed and commissioned for each year from 2000 to 2010, as shown in Figure 3. Although the coal power plants phasing-out plan was initially proposed in the first half of 2000s, implementation was lagged behind, as the supply of electricity could not meet the demand which soared high after China joined WTO in 2001. Instead, majority of the plants were closed after 2005. Closure was accelerated in 2007 and 2008 right before Beijing hosted 2008 Olympic Games. We calculate that the

¹¹Bus stops in China often take names from that of nearby roads, villages, and other notable sites such as hospitals, factories back in the early 2000s and 1990s. Although China has gone through dramatic change in urban plan during the past 30 years, the bus stop names were mostly preserved throughout time.

¹²For some retired small-unit power plants, we were not able to find detailed documentation on capacities and precise locations, for which we approximated the closed capacity using documentation of other closed power plants in the same prefecture city in the same period. For a plant that we can not find the precise location, we assume it is located at the geographical center of the district or town.




FIGURE 4. RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT (UNDER 50 MW) FROM 2000 TO 2010

total capacities shut down during this period in our data was 71,315 MW, which is very close to the National Energy Administration record of 72,100 MW (National Energy of Administration, 2012).

We also calculate the total capacities of closed power plants units each with capacity under 50 MW at county level for the same period, as shown in Figure 4. In the first half of 11th 5YP period, majority of the retired plants were under 50MW, as these were the least efficient power plants that got the highest priority to be retired. The peak of closure of coal power units with capacity under-50MW appeared in 2007 and 2008, accounting for roughly 2/3 of total under-50 capacities closed.

To measure the exposure of each county to the policy that regulates SO_2 emission and retires coal power plants, we calculate the distance weighted sum of capacities of all the coal power plants within a given radius from a county's geographic centroid that retired in a year. In the empirical analysis, we calculate the weighted sum within 3 radii, i.e., at 25 km, 50 km, and 100 km separately. We also calculate the distance weighted sum of capacities at or under 50 MW within each of radii from a county's center.

Figure III.B visualize the geographic distribution of operating and retired coal-powered plant units in our database in a specific year. The red triangles represent plants operating in each of the selected years and the green circles represent the plants retired by the year of observation. The two figures show the following patterns: 1) most of power plants are distributed mainly in east and central China, especially Yangtze River Delta region (YRD), North China plain (NCP), and Pearl River Delta (PRD) where industry and economy is much more developed¹³; 2) closed power plant units from 2006 to 2010 also concentrated in the east and central China, especially around NCP and YRD.

¹³We display the distribution of county-level nominal GDP in 2000 in appendix Figure B1




FIGURE 5. UNDER-5 MORTALITY AND POWER PLANT CLOSURE IN 1996 AND 2001

Note: The figure shows the trend in province-level under-5 mortality from 1996 to 2012 in mainland China. We also show the spatial distribution of operating (in red triangle) and retired (in green circle) coal power plants from our compiled directory.

C. Air Quality Data

Following Xia, Zhao and Nielsen (2016), we obtain daily observation of SO_2 VCDs in the Planetary Boundary Layer from NASA's Ozone Monitoring Instrument on Aura Satellite for the period between 2005 and 2010¹⁴. This is a gridded data at 0.25 degree by 0.25 degree, with best pixel selected from all good pixels in orbital swath data that overlap this grid and have Coordinated Universal Time (UTC) time between UTC times of 00:00:00 and 23:59:999 (Li, Krotkov and Leonard, 2020). Although SO_2 VCDs data can not completely reflect ground level human exposure, its spatial and temporal variation has been found to be consistent with ground emission data, as we discussed in the findings of Xia, Zhao and Nielsen (2016) summarized in I.C. We calculate the arithmetic mean for each county using daily observation at all the grids within a county and then calculate the monthly mean and annual mean for the county. Heat maps of annual mean of SO_2 VCDs at county/city level for 2005 and 2010 are displayed in Figure 6(a) and 6(b). The spatial and temporal trends are consistent with the findings in Xia, Zhao and Nielsen (2016), i.e., 1) NP, YRD, PRD and Sichuan basin (SB) have the most severe pollution of SO_2 ; 2) The average concentration of SO_2 VCDs decreased from 2005 to 2010 throughout China (the average increased from 0.241 Dobson Units(DU)¹⁵ in 2005 to 0.287 DU in 2007 first and decreased to 0.184 DU in 2010), especially in NP, YRD, PRD, except in SB where SO_2 concentration was increased during the whole 11th 5YP period.

Besides SO_2 VCDs data, we also obtain high spatial and temporal resolution density data of $PM_{2.5}$ (2000-2010). As China only included $PM_{2.5}$ as a critical pollutant for the first time in 2012 when it released a new ambient air quality standard that was effective on January 1st 2016 (Jiang et al., 2015), the ground level observations of $PM_{2.5}$ were sparse for our study period (2001-2010). The ChinaHigh $PM_{2.5}$ is dataset of daily $PM_{2.5}$ concentration at a 1 km resolution estimated based on long-term high-spatial-resolution aerosol optical depths (AOD) generated by Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Multi-Angle implementation of Atmospheric Correction algorithm (Wei et al., 2021). As ground monitoring $PM_{2.5}$ observations in China are sparse and only made public since 2012, the $PM_{2.5}$ estimates converted from AOD provides important spatial and temporal variation for the time period that is essential for this study. Same as SO_2 , we calculate the monthly mean and annual mean of the concentration of these pollutants for each county. Figure 6c-Figure 6e show the annual mean of county-level $PM_{2.5}$ for 2000, 2005 and 2010 separately. Different from SO_2 VCDs, average $PM_{2.5}$ presents slightly different temporal patterns. The national mean of $PM_{2.5}$ persistently increased from 47.63 $\mu g/m^3$ in 2001 to 56.86 $\mu g/m^3$ in 2007 before it fell slowly to 52.96 $\mu g/m^3$ in 2010. The summary statistics of SO_2 VCDs and $PM_{2.5}$ densities are shown in table 1 and 2.

¹⁴Since Aura satellite was put into use in October 2004, data on SO_2 is only available since then.

¹⁵Dobson Unit is a unit of measurement of the amount of a trace gas in a vertical column through the Earth's atmosphere. 1 Dobson Unit includes 2.69×10^{26} molecules per km^2 at standard conditions for temperature and pressure (STP) (NASA, 2018)




FIGURE 6. SO_2 AND $PM_{2.5}$ DENSITY HEAT MAPS

Note: The figure shows the density of SO_2 VCDs (in DU) and $PM_{2.5}$ (in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) throughout China in 2000, 2005 and 2010. Since SO_2 VCDs are only available from 2014, SO_2 density heatmaps are only shown for 2005 and 2010.

D. Meteorological data

We obtain meteorological data from ERA5 (previously known as ERA-Interim Reanalysis) by the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (Hersbach et al., 2023) (ECMWF). The ERA5 data provides reanalyzed observational meteorological data with hourly estimated atmospheric, ocean-wave, and land-surface quantities at $0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$ level. We obtain monthly averaged meteorological data such as 10-meter above-ground wind speed, 2-meter above-ground temperature, total precipitation, and 100-meter above-ground wind speed and wind direction¹⁶ from 1950 to 2012. We also calculate relative humidity from 2-meter above-ground temperature and dew point temperature.

We standardize monthly 2-meter above-ground temperature and humidity (calculated from dew point data from the same source) data during 2000 and 2010 against the historical trend defined by the 50-year period (1950-1999) for each month. We use the standardized temperature and precipitation as controls in mortality function. The 100-meter above-ground high altitude wind direction and wind speed variables remain unstandardized to be used as potential instrumental variables in the IV-Lasso analysis.

¹⁶Wind speed and wind directions are calculated from the u and v components of wind with a positive u component coming from the west and a positive v component coming from the south.

TABLE 1—SUMMARY STATISTICS OF KEY VARIABLES

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	35.56 (23.01)	33.89 (22.60)	31.01 (20.86)	28.78 (19.14)	26.48 (17.47)
Pollutant Density					
SO_2 (DU)					0.241 (0.275)
$PM_{2.5}$ ($\mu g/m^3$)	47.63 (14.27)	48.12 (16.06)	51.75 (16.50)	51.72 (16.02)	51.51 (16.30)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.332 (5.756)	3.524 (33.85)	0 (0)	1.958 (14.76)	0.879 (6.571)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.0369 (1.922)	1.294 (20.47)	0 (0)	0.654 (8.676)	0.269 (3.658)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.0369 (1.922)	0.629 (14.83)	0 (0)	0.209 (4.976)	0.126 (2.503)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.295 (5.428)	2.229 (25.84)	0 (0)	1.304 (12.01)	0.610 (5.489)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.295 (5.428)	2.895 (30.49)	0 (0)	1.748 (13.92)	0.753 (6.092)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.610 (5.489)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.753 (6.092)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.879 (6.571)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.269 (3.658)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.126 (2.503)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.00756 (0.204)	0.109 (1.647)	0 (0)	0.0439 (0.429)	0.0522 (1.343)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.00367 (0.191)	0.0774 (1.597)	0 (0)	0.0257 (0.394)	0.0443 (1.341)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.00367 (0.191)	0.0601 (1.555)	0 (0)	0.0138 (0.342)	0.0403 (1.339)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.00388 (0.0727)	0.0312 (0.371)	0 (0)	0.0183 (0.172)	0.00795 (0.0733)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.00388 (0.0727)	0.0484 (0.549)	0 (0)	0.0301 (0.261)	0.0120 (0.105)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.00795 (0.0733)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0120 (0.105)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0522 (1.343)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0443 (1.341)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0403 (1.339)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 for the whole-country sample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE 2—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES – CONT'D

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	24.22 (15.82)	22.49 (14.78)	20.91 (13.84)	19.44 (12.97)	18.19 (12.17)
Pollutant Density					
SO_2 (DU)	0.256 (0.283)	0.287 (0.305)	0.255 (0.264)	0.182 (0.202)	0.184 (0.215)
$PM_{2.5}$ ($\mu g/m^3$)	55.58 (19.39)	56.86 (19.47)	54.67 (17.51)	54.70 (18.48)	52.96 (17.48)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	29.69 (114.9)	163.4 (250.3)	175.4 (343.5)	79.08 (187.3)	134.7 (264.2)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	9.917 (51.75)	53.75 (122.6)	54.51 (165.1)	24.58 (94.63)	42.20 (127.8)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	3.661 (27.02)	21.88 (73.28)	19.68 (86.36)	9.468 (58.04)	17.08 (75.61)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	19.78 (82.15)	109.7 (194.5)	120.8 (251.1)	54.50 (152.1)	92.48 (199.2)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	26.03 (104.4)	141.5 (229.5)	155.7 (310.9)	69.61 (176.0)	117.6 (237.7)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	2.820 (12.44)	9.138 (22.09)	26.19 (68.67)	1.866 (8.335)	16.59 (39.93)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	3.615 (14.45)	11.81 (26.77)	33.51 (87.43)	2.610 (10.20)	21.11 (47.87)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	4.259 (16.40)	13.15 (28.92)	37.08 (94.23)	2.888 (10.82)	23.48 (51.62)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	1.439 (7.969)	4.158 (14.04)	11.03 (33.65)	1.023 (6.153)	6.969 (22.75)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.644 (4.581)	1.414 (7.521)	3.598 (14.39)	0.278 (3.100)	2.396 (11.65)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.856 (4.310)	4.843 (12.96)	4.660 (15.39)	2.288 (9.631)	3.646 (10.43)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.588 (3.773)	3.373 (12.34)	3.037 (14.31)	1.560 (9.369)	2.405 (9.491)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.418 (3.449)	2.520 (11.93)	2.119 (13.52)	1.149 (9.082)	1.712 (8.861)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.268 (1.137)	1.470 (2.657)	1.624 (3.439)	0.727 (2.041)	1.241 (2.709)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.437 (1.840)	2.324 (3.967)	2.541 (5.383)	1.139 (3.016)	1.934 (4.108)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0.0382 (0.170)	0.123 (0.300)	0.351 (0.928)	0.0245 (0.111)	0.223 (0.541)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0.0599 (0.251)	0.194 (0.466)	0.549 (1.491)	0.0441 (0.187)	0.341 (0.804)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0.140 (0.728)	0.343 (1.240)	0.960 (3.029)	0.0772 (0.478)	0.603 (2.058)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.102 (0.653)	0.223 (1.168)	0.613 (2.486)	0.0527 (0.457)	0.382 (1.905)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.0802 (0.592)	0.152 (1.101)	0.413 (2.217)	0.0331 (0.436)	0.262 (1.792)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0.400 (1.330)	0.485 (1.298)	0.667 (1.743)	0.364 (1.149)	0.165 (0.651)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	107.3 (310.7)	114.2 (298.3)	173.7 (519.4)	97.49 (279.1)	61.67 (222.2)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2006 to 2010 for the whole-country sample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO_2 VCDs and $PM_{2.5}$ density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

E. Socioeconomic Data

Socio-economic development data are obtained from county-level Statistical Yearbooks from 2000 to 2010. As the statistics collected in Yearbooks varied between years during the time periods in this study, we only managed to get a small set of variables that were consistently available across the whole study period that may affect the public health: GDP per capita (or primary industrial outputs and secondary industrial outputs from the County Statistical Yearbooks), number of hospital beds per 10,000 people.

Figure B1 presents the county-level nominal GDP (in million CNY) in 2000 for all Chinese provinces and municipalities. Compared with the power plant retirement and mortality maps (figures III.B, we find the overlap of counties with higher density of coal power plant distribution and counties with higher GDP in 2000. We observe the same overlapping patterns when comparing the pollutant density heat maps in figure 6 with the GDP distribution.

IV. Results

A. Instruments Selected by Lasso Method

Using the iteration-based IV-Lasso process described above, we conduct the Lasso-based IV selection analysis for a single-pollutant model first. We document the first stage results for the single-pollutant model (SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ separately) in Table 3 using the whole country data based on equation 1. We present the first stage coefficients of all selected instruments with SO_2 (Column (1)) and $PM_{2.5}$ (Column (2)) density as the endogenous pollutant variable of interest. For each model specification we document the number of instruments selected, the sample size, the F-statistics of the first stage regression and the adjusted R^2 from the first stage regression. Only coefficients of the instrumental variables are listed in the tables.

Lasso method has successfully selected a set of instrumental variables that are statistically significantly related with both air pollutants (as shown by F-statistics). For SO_2 , the distance-weighted sum of retired capacities of power plants within 25-100km from the county center that are closed in the previous year is negatively correlated with SO_2 VCDs. That is to say, more/bigger power plants are closed within 25-100 km from a county center, the average SO_2 VCDs of the counties are lower. Moreover, the desulphurization policy is also shown lagging effectiveness in SO_2 control, as we find capacities of power plants that are required to install FGDs in the previous 2 years are also negatively correlated with SO_2 VCDs (i.e., higher capacities of units of power plants required to install FGD in previous 2 years, lower SO_2 VCDs in the present year). However, contrary to our expectations, the weighted sum of capacities of coal power plant units under 50 MW capacities within 100km from a county center is positively correlated with SO_2 in the same period.

Several more policy-related instrumental variables are selected for $PM_{2.5}$. Most of the selected instruments are significantly negatively correlated with $PM_{2.5}$, including distance-weighted sum of retired capacities under 50 MW within 25-100 km from a

county center that are closed in the same year or in the past 3 years; the capacities that are required to install FGDs in the past 2 years. Exceptions include the weighted sum of capacities of units retired within 25-100km from a county center in the current year or 2 years ago that are found positively correlated with $PM_{2.5}$. In addition, the sum of operating capacities that are required to install FGD is positively correlated with $PM_{2.5}$.

High altitude wind seems to play different role in pollutants diffusion for SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$. In our model, we use continuous monthly averaged wind direction variables, with a minimum value of 0 denoting north wind (wind coming from north), 90 denotes east wind, 180 denotes south wind and 270 denotes west wind¹⁷. For SO_2 , higher wind speed in May, September, October and December increases concentration of SO_2 , and wind coming from the west increases SO_2 concentration compared to wind coming from the east in most time of the year except in December. However, for $PM_{2.5}$, higher wind speed 100 m above ground generally decreases $PM_{2.5}$, especially in the late spring (May and June) and winter months (November and December). Moreover, in most time of the year, wind from the west decreases $PM_{2.5}$ concentration.

¹⁷In the next version of the paper, we will provide results with categorical wind direction variables

TABLE 3—FIRST STAGE RESULTS BY LASSO METHOD (COUNTY LEVEL)

VARIABLES	(1) SO ₂	(2) PM _{2.5}
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100km)	-0.000187 (0.000809)	0.0516*** (0.0138)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50MW (25 to 100km)	0.000359 (0.00299)	-0.369*** (0.0545)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100km, 1-year lag)	-0.00196*** (0.000606)	0.00667 (0.0112)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100km, 2-year lag)		0.0359** (0.0171)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100km, 3-year lag)		-0.0668*** (0.0166)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50MW (25 to 100km, 1-year lag)		-0.0621 (0.0938)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50MW (25 to 100km, 2-year lag)		-0.264*** (0.0619)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50MW (25 to 100km, 3-year lag)	-0.0103 (0.00642)	-0.781*** (0.120)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100km)	0.000874 (0.00108)	0.00993 (0.0191)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100km, 1-year lag)		
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100km, 2-year lag)		-0.0230 (0.0236)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100km)		
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100km, 1-year lag)		0.275* (0.149)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100km)	0.000348 (0.000254)	
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100km, 1-year lag)	-0.000432* (0.000252)	0.00290 (0.00450)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100km)	0.00377** (0.00154)	-0.0100 (0.0276)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100km, 2-year lag)		-0.00658 (0.0288)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization		0.000419*** (9.88e-05)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0.00145 (0.00131)	
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton, 1-year lag)	-0.00460*** (0.00130)	-0.00481 (0.0228)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton, 2-year lag)	-0.00750*** (0.00149)	-0.0872*** (0.0261)
100m Wind Speed (Jan)	0.00573* (0.00309)	
100m Wind Speed (Feb)	0.000807 (0.00303)	
100m Wind Speed (May)	0.00671** (0.00334)	-0.333*** (0.0441)
100m Wind Speed (Jun)		-0.535*** (0.0531)
100m Wind Speed (Aug)		
100m Wind Speed (Sep)	0.0258*** (0.00388)	
100m Wind Speed (Oct)	0.0390*** (0.00373)	
100m Wind Speed (Nov)	-0.00288 (0.00351)	-0.493*** (0.0460)
100m Wind Speed (Dec)	0.0128*** (0.00352)	-0.738*** (0.0420)
100m Wind Direction (Feb)		0.00359*** (0.000299)
100m Wind Direction (Mar)		-0.00353*** (0.000299)
100m Wind Direction (Apr)	5.93e-05*** (2.28e-05)	-0.00114*** (0.000333)
100m Wind Direction (May)	1.52e-05 (2.41e-05)	
100m Wind Direction (Aug)	-1.19e-05 (1.82e-05)	-0.00197*** (0.000252)
100m Wind Direction (Oct)	5.54e-05** (2.70e-05)	0.000512 (0.000406)
100m Wind Direction (Nov)	1.51e-05 (3.14e-05)	-0.00264*** (0.000441)
100m Wind Direction (Dec)	-8.45e-05** (4.19e-05)	
# Instruments Selected	24	27
Sample Size	7,275	10,723
Aggregation Level	County	County
Fixed Effect	Year & County	Year & County
R-squared	0.861	0.986
F-Stat	26.81	476.0

Standard Errors in Parenthesis
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Only instrumental variables selected are included. Column (1) and (2) are the results of instruments selected for SO₂ and PM_{2.5}, respectively. We control for year and county fixed effects and the same set of monthly standardized meteorological variables (2-meter temperature and humidity) in each model.

B. County Level Whole Sample Results

Table C2 presents the county-level post-Lasso estimation results for single-pollutant model and multi-pollutant model with the instrumental variables selected by Lasso method for the whole country. Single-pollutant results are listed in columns (1) and (2) and multi-pollutant results in column (3) which includes both SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ as air pollutants. All three models control for year fixed effects and county fixed effects, as well as a set of socio-economic covariates, meteorological variables as introduced in III. Standard errors are clustered at province level. For comparison, we also present fixed-effects model results, without including IVs (columns (4)-(6)).

As expected, per capita GDP growth of a county decreases under-5 mortality. In the baseline fixed effects model, only primary industry output decreases under-5 mortality. Although secondary industry output also has negative coefficients in Column (4)-(6), they are not statistically significant. This is likely due to collinearity between secondary industry output and the concentrations of air pollutants. As a result, the coefficients on SO_2 are negative and insignificant in both single-pollutant model and multi-pollutant model, and the coefficient on $PM_{2.5}$ is also negative and significant in single-pollutant model. In the multi-pollutant model $PM_{2.5}$ increases under-5 mortality rate in column (6), with significance at 10%.

On the contrary, in the Lasso-IV model, primary and secondary industry outputs increase under-5 mortality throughout all specifications (column (1)-(3)), except that primary industry output increases under-5 mortality in the single pollutant model with SO_2 as the single pollutant (Column (1) in Table C2). In Column (3), a 10,000 RMB increase in county's primary and secondary industry output per capita population decreases under-5 mortality by 2.40‰ and 1.34‰ separately.

Different from the fixed effects model, Lasso-IV estimation models give positive and significant effects of both SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ on under-5 mortality at county level throughout column (1)-(3). More specifically, one standard deviation increase of column SO_2 VCDs (around 0.3 DU) would lead to an increase in under-5 mortality by 3 per 1,000,000 while one standard deviation increase in concentration of $PM_{2.5}$ (around $18 \mu\text{g}^{-3}$) would result in an increase of under-5 mortality by 1.8 per 1,000, assuming other control variables remain unchanged. As the units between column SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ concentration are different, it is hard to compare the scales of the effects between these two pollutants. Moreover, total column SO_2 is a measurement of vertical column densities of the sulfur dioxide in the atmosphere. Although it reflects emission by volcanic eruptions and anthropogenic pollution especially by coal power plants, it can not be directly translated into ambient SO_2 concentration. When interpreting the results, it is cautioned that the estimated coefficient can not be directly interpreted as the dose-response relationship between ambient SO_2 and under-5 mortality.

TABLE 4—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (COUNTY LEVEL)

Variables	IV-Lasso			Baseline Fixed Effects		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SO_2 (DU)	0.0106*** (0.001430)		0.00132*** (0.0002770)	-0.347 (0.679)		-0.405 (0.728)
$PM_{2.5}$ (μg^{-3})		0.0993** (0.044500)	0.171*** (0.038600)		-0.457*** (0.128)	0.108* (0.0654)
Hospital Bed (per 10,000 population)	0.0116*** (0.004870)	0.00477 (0.004070)	0.00993 (0.0142)	-0.00418** (0.00188)	-0.0118** (0.00549)	-0.00407** (0.00176)
Prim GDP (10,000 CNY per capita)	4.41** (2.22)	-6.71*** (1.58)	-2.40** (1.24)	-7.05*** (2.07)	-1.75*** (6.16)	-6.82*** (1.95)
Sec GDP (10,000 CNY per capita)	-1.83*** (0.24)	-2.65*** (0.30)	-1.34*** (0.342)	-0.001 (0.181)	-0.233 (0.339)	-0.0001 (0.179)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant	Multi-pollutant	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant	Multi-pollutant
Sample Size	7275	10723	7275	7275	10723	7275
Aggregation Level	County	County	County	County	County	County
Fixed Effect	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Note: We document the IV-Lasso results (post-Lasso estimation) in columns (1), (2) and (3). Columns (1) and (2) document single-pollutant post-Lasso results for SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$, respectively. Column (3) documents the multi-pollutant post-Lasso results. The baseline Fixed Effect estimates for the two single-pollutant models are documented in columns (4) and (5) for SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$, respectively. The baseline Fixed Effect estimates for the multi-pollutant model is documented in column (6). We control for year and county fixed effects and the same set of monthly standardized meteorological variables (2-meter temperature and humidity) in all the documented results above. Both variables Hospital bed is measured as per capita term. Primary and Secondary GDP are per capita measures in 10,000 CNY.

C. Validity of Instruments

We achieve identification through the Lasso-IV method introduced in Section II.B. In this subsection, we establish the validity of the instruments selected for our Lasso-IV approach. First, we establish the relevance assumption from the first stage results in Table 3 that most of our instruments selected are significantly correlated with the pollutant density variable of interest. Second, we conduct a balance test on the correlations between our policy instrumental variables and two county-level economic growth variables significantly correlated with the outcome variable under-5 mortality. Figure 7 presents the p-values of correlation tests between yearly (2001 to 2010) county-level distance-weighted sums of retired capacities (unlagged within 25, 50 and 100 km range, and separately for plants under 50 MW) and yearly economic growth rates (primary and secondary GDP per capita) at county level. From the figure, we observe that our policy-related instruments do not reject the null hypothesis that all instruments are not correlated with yearly growth rates in primary and secondary GDP per capita at all three ranges. We interpret the above findings as the identification assumptions being satisfied for our IV-Lasso models.




FIGURE 7. CORRELATION: WEIGHTED SUM OF RETIRED CAPACITY AND PER CAPITA PRIMARY & SECONDARY GDP

Note: This figure presents the p-values of correlation tests between our unlagged instrumental variables (distance-weighted sums of retired capacities within 25, 50 and 100 km range, and separately for plants under 50 MW) and economic growth rates of primary and secondary per capita GDP from 2001 to 2010 with the null hypothesis that the correlation equals 0.

In addition to the exogeneity established from the balance test results, we argue that we fully exploit relevant information from air pollution control policies from 2001 to 2010. In Appendix Table A1 we document relevant air pollution control policy legislation passed

by the central government from 1973 to 2010. The latest legislation we observation on air pollution is the 2003 release of Emission Standard of Air Pollutants for Thermal Power Plants which was further modified in 2012. The phase-out policy of small-unit power plants is an extension of the air quality standards and 2003 emission standard as China prepared for its transition to clean energy and for the 2008 Beijing Olympics. As the major source of SO_2 emission, we observe an aligning trend of massive closures of less efficient small-unit power plant closures and the sharp decrease of SO_2 density from 2006 to 2010. Hence, we argue that instrumenting pollution density (especially SO_2) with both power-plant closure and desulphurization policy instruments and atmosphere dispersion parameters results in causal identification of the effect of air pollutants (especially SO_2) on under-5 mortality based on the 2001 to 2010 data.

V. Heterogeneity Analysis

In the heterogeneity analysis, we further examine if there exist displacement effects and spill over effects across regions. More specifically, we estimate the multi-pollutant model by two sets of subsamples according to two different policies: west-east power transfer program and sulfur control zoning policy. In the first exercise, we divide all the counties throughout China into 3 subsamples according to west-east power transfer program: East (including provinces that receive electricity transmitted), Southwest (including 5 provinces in the southwest of China from which electricity generated from coal power plants has been transmitted to Guangdong), and Northwest (including 4 provinces in the north and northwest of China from which electricity generated from coal power plants has been transmitted to the North Plain of China). In this exercise, we would like to test if there exist displacement effects. Given that most closed power plants are in the East, the counties in the Southwest and Northwest which transmit electricity to the East may face higher air pollution in the 11th FYP and increased impacts on mortality.

In the second exercise, we define the subsamples according to sulfur control zoning policy, which designates the counties into Acid Rain Control Zones (ARCZ) and the Sulphur Dioxide Pollution Control Zones (SO₂CZ). The two types of control zones were delimited in 1998 by Ministry to Ecology and Environment, with the targets to control the total amount of discharged sulphur dioxide and the density of sulphur dioxide in cities as well as to significantly decrease the area of the acid rain control zones with precipitation pH value below 4.5 (of Ecology and Environment, 1998). 192 counties and cities located in the south part of China were included into the Acid Rain Control Zone based on the pH value and frequencies of precipitation while excluding the poorest counties for which economic development took priority. Most high-sulfur coal (with more than 3% sulfur) in China was produced in this area in the time period, with 6.4% of China's coal output while accounting for over 20% of SO_2 emission in 1998 (Liu et al., 1998). For comparison, we also define a Non-sulfur policy subsample (NSP), i.e., the counties that are out of both control zones. Since NSP is not subject to sulfur control policies, we expect the instrumental variables may not be valid in this subsample.

In the following, we first compare the results of subsamples divided by geographic locations, and then we compare the results of subsamples under different sulfur control

policy zones in Section. Documentation of summary statistics by subsamples can be found in Appendix Section D.

DISPLACEMENT EFFECTS? - HETEROGENEITY ANALYSIS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS

The East China subsample includes all the provinces and municipalities in the east and middle China including Beijing, Tianjin, Hebei, Henan, Shanxi, Shandong, Jiangsu, Anhui, Shanghai, Hubei, Hunan, Jiangxi and Zhejiang. These provinces are mainly the recipients of west-east power transfer program, characterized by high population and industry densities which create the high demand for electricity supply. The Northwest China subsample includes four northwestern provinces/autonomous regions that transfer electricity through the north power grid network: Shanxi¹⁸, Shaanxi, Ningxia, and Inner Mongolia. These provinces/regions are characterized by relatively low population density (especially in Ningxia and Inner Mongolia) and rich coal deposits, as well as densely distributed thermal power plants (see Figure III.B). Our third regional subsample, the Southwest China subsample, consists of 5 provinces (Sichuan, Yunnan, Guangxi, Hunan and Guizhou) and 1 metropolitan city (Chongqing) in the southwest part of China with both rich coal deposits and hydropower deposits that transfer electricity through the south power grid network¹⁹ Because of the west-east power transfer program, we expect there would be displacement effects. In other words, we hypothesize that the provinces in the southwest and northwest would have higher air pollution as the exporter of electricity after coal power plants were shut down in the east, and the estimated impacts on mortality would be higher.

We document the summary statistics of key variables for each subsample in Table D.D1, D.D2 and D.D3. One interesting finding from the capacity distribution figures is that, after increasing investments in thermal power plants in 2006 and 2007, we observe a huge cascade in the thermal capacity commissioned in 2008 for the southwest subsample in comparison with our other subsamples and the preceding year within the same subsample. From the breakdown statistics of total capacity closed, we also observe a concentration of under-50 capacity retired in 2007 for the southwest subsample that greatly distinguished from the other years during the policy period accounting for nearly half of total under-50 capacity closed from 2001 to 2010. The Northwest China subsample and the East China subsample show similar patterns in terms of retired and commissioned capacity distributions.

Table 5 compares the multi-pollutant model results between the three geographical subsamples²⁰. Columns (1), (2), (3) show results for the East, Northwest and Southwest subsamples, respectively. For comparison, we document the baseline fixed effect estimates (with county and year fixed effects) in columns (4), (5) and (6) for the three

¹⁸Shanxi appears in both the northwest subsample and the east subsample because of its high power generation capacities and high energy usage.

¹⁹According to the government of Sichuan, one of the provinces selected in the Southwest China sample, by the end of 2021, 81.6% of the yearly electricity production came from hydro-powered plants with another province in our subsample Yunnan recorded 73.6% of hydro-powered plant share in the same year.

²⁰The rest of the results in Appendix Section D

geographic subsamples. The results show heterogeneous effects across geographic regions for both SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$: The partial effect estimates of SO_2 is highest in the Southwest China subsample, with a magnitude more than 20 times bigger than in the east and northwest subsamples. Differently, the marginal impact of $PM_{2.5}$ on under-5 mortality is at the same magnitude across three subsamples, with the Northwest having the highest effect, followed by Southwest and East subsample. These results are in line with our hypotheses, that the impacts of air pollution on under-5 mortality is higher in the Southwest and Northwest China than in the East China.

TABLE 5—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (COUNTY LEVEL, GEOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES)

Variables	IV-Lasso			Baseline Fixed Effects		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SO_2 (DU)	0.00117*** (0.000178)	0.0024*** (0.000109)	0.0529*** (0.010600)	-0.704 (0.694)	-2.228 (2.028)	1.304 (1.405)
$PM_{2.5}$ (μg^{-3})	0.147*** (0.024400)	0.367*** (0.016400)	0.243** (0.127000)	0.161** (0.0715)	0.278*** (0.0695)	-0.333 (0.239)
Hospital Bed (per 10,000 population)	-0.0619*** (0.018700)	-0.0145 (0.023200)	-0.00775** (0.003950)	-0.0793*** (0.0211)	-0.000259 (0.0413)	-0.000739* (0.000489)
Prim GDP (10,000 CNY per capita)	-1.06 (1.74)	18.7*** (1.63)	-33.6*** (1.44)	-4.13 (3.68)	-11.6** (3.21)	12.6 (7.90)
Sec GDP (10,000 CNY per capita)	-0.729*** (0.26)	-0.534*** (0.16)	-2.64*** (0.608)	0.310 (0.311)	-0.096 (0.089)	1.91 (1.79)
Subsample	East	Northwest	Southwest	East	Northwest	Southwest
Sample Size	4653	1258	1274	4653	1258	1274
Aggregation Level	County	County	County	County	County	County
Fixed Effect	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Note: We document the multi-pollutant model IV-Lasso results (post-Lasso estimation) in columns (1), (2) and (3) for our three geographical subsamples: the East China subsample, the Northwest China subsample and the Southwest China subsample, respectively. The baseline Fixed Effect multi-pollutant estimates for the three subsamples are documented in columns (4), (5) and (6), respectively. We control for year and county fixed effects and the same set of monthly standardized meteorological variables (2-meter temperature and humidity) in all the documented results above. Only multi-pollutant post-Lasso estimation results are documented in the main text for comparison and heterogeneity analysis purposes. Hospital bed is measured as per capita term. Primary and Secondary GDP are per capita measures in 10,000 CNY.

SPILL OVER EFFECTS? - HETEROGENEITY ANALYSIS BY SULFUR CONTROL POLICY-SPECIFIC
SUBSAMPLES

In this subsection, we would like to see if there are spill-over effects of air pollution regulations in the acid rain control zones (ARCZ) and SO₂ control zones (SO₂CZ) on mortality of the zones that are outside of these two control zones (i.e., NPS). As we can see from the density heat maps of $PM_{2.5}$ and SO_2 for each subsample (Appendix B13, B16, B19), ARCZ consists of regions in the south (south to Huai river) where acid rain is a significant problem. SO₂CZ contains areas in the north and northeastern of China, which was the traditional center of heavy industry in China centered on coal and steel. Although SO₂CZ has high emission of SO_2 , acid rain is not prominent because wind-blown, alkaline soil dust commonly existing in the northern China can neutralizes rain acidity (Larssen et al., 1999). NPS is interwoven closely with ARCZ and SO₂CZ, especially in the east and middle China. It consists of mainly poor counties for which economic development took priority, and therefore was not subject to sulfur control regulations at that time. If there exist spill over effects, we may find the air pollution in this region would be improved and we would also expect to see adverse effects of air pollution in NPS regions, although it is not the target region of the regulations.

It is visually significant that SO_2 VCDs decreases from 2005 to 2010 in most places in ARCZ (except in Southwest China) and SO₂CZ, but not for NPS. $PM_{2.5}$ in all 3 subsamples show similar trend along time as with the whole country data, i.e., increases significantly from 2000 to 2005, and then stabilizes from 2005 to 2010.

Coal power plants closure policy was rigorously enforced during 11th FYP in ARCA and SO₂CZ. Comparing Figure B12 with the whole country Figure 4, we find that the under-50 capacity closed at the start of the policy period (2006) in ARCZ accounted for more than half of the total under-50 capacity closed in 2006 countrywide. The share of under-50 capacity retired remained high for the ARCZ subsample until 2008, during which the under-50 share remained much higher than the country average.

Although no substantial policy-related closures took place in 2006 in SO₂CZ, under-50 capacity closed in 2007 and 2008 were at the same level as in the ARCZ. On the other hand, capacity of commissioned coal power plants shows a steady growth between 2005 and 2007, followed by a significant drop in 2008 and rapid growth after (Figures B14 and B15). With very different meteorological conditions (with much lower humidity and precipitation levels in the north), we expect different health impacts of SO_2 between these two control zones.

Although NPS is not restrict to sulfur related control policy, there are still significant amount of capacities closed down in this area (Figures B17 and B18). Large scale of closure started in 2007 and showed similar trend as in SO₂CZ.

We perform similar single-pollutant and multi-pollutant analyses of $PM_{2.5}$ and SO_2 for the three policy-specific subsamples. We document the county-level multi-pollutant results in Table 6 and the rest of the results in Appendix Section D. Columns (1), (2), (3) document results for the ARCZ, SO₂CZ and NPS, respectively. For comparison, we document the baseline fixed effect estimates (with county and year fixed effects) in columns (4), (5) and (6) for the three policy-specific subsamples. We observe that the

partial effect estimates of SO_2 from the NPS differ significantly from the other two subsamples, with the other two subsamples in a similar ballpark as the whole-country results. The impacts of SO_2 on under-5 mortality is found to be higher in SO2CZ than in ARCZ, while it is the opposite for $PM_{2.5}$. Moreover, we find negative impacts of SO_2 on under-5 mortality in NPS, while insignificant coefficient on $PM_{2.5}$ in multipollutants model²¹.

²¹As part of the heterogeneity analysis, we performed similar analysis on the NPS subsample by removing counties from the 4 western provinces (Tibet, Xinjiang, Gansu and Qinghai) with lower economic development and industrial activities, the results are robust to the sample change in both magnitude and direction of partial effects.

TABLE 6—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (COUNTY LEVEL, POLICY SUBSAMPLES)

Variables	IV-Lasso			Baseline Fixed Effects		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SO_2 (DU)	0.00127*** (0.000085)	0.00333** (0.001750)	-0.0182*** (0.003080)	-0.713 (0.780)	-0.612 (0.473)	-0.732 (0.818)
$PM_{2.5}$ (μg^{-3})	0.191*** (0.012700)	0.116*** (0.009450)	0.0978 (0.080900)	0.0946 (0.155)	0.104 (0.0861)	0.141* (0.0774)
Hospital Bed (per 10,000 population)	0.0200 (0.021400)	-0.0606*** (0.019000)	0.0106*** (0.003640)	-0.114*** (0.0328)	-0.0367** (0.0138)	-0.00268*** (0.000518)
Prim GDP (10,000 CNY per capita)	-8.7*** (1.10)	-0.439 (0.55)	1.67 (3.23)	-3.97* (0.000234)	-5.61*** (0.000121)	-7.53** (0.000275)
Sec GDP (10,000 CNY per capita)	-2.42*** (0.21)	-0.833*** (0.21)	-1.24*** (0.377)	0.955*** (0.264)	-0.0442 (0.277)	-0.516*** (0.175)
Subsample	ARCZ	SO2CZ	Non-policy	ARCZ	SO2CZ	Non-policy
Sample Size	2559	1884	3417	2559	1884	3417
Aggregation Level	County	County	County	County	County	County
Fixed Effect	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County	Year & County

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: We document the multi-pollutant model IV-Lasso results (post-Lasso estimation) in columns (1), (2) and (3) for our three policy-specific subsamples; the Acid Rain Control Zones (ARCZ) Policy subsample, the Sulphur Dioxide Pollution Control Zones (SO2CZ) Policy subsample and the Non-policy subsample, respectively. The baseline Fixed Effect multi-pollutant estimates for the three subsamples are documented in columns (4), (5) and (6), respectively. We control for year and county fixed effects and the same set of monthly standardized meteorological variables (2-meter temperature and humidity) in all the documented results above. Only multi-pollutant post-Lasso estimation results are documented in the main text for comparison and heterogeneity analysis purposes. Hospital bed is measured as per capita term. Primary and Secondary GDP are per capita measures in 10,000 CNY.

VI. Discussion and Conclusion

China's economic developments and efforts in air pollution control since its economic reform in 1978 serve as a valuable lesson to developing countries with large energy consumption and needs for economic development like Vietnam and India. Environmental concerns such as pollution usually arise as the by-product of fast economic development. China witnessed significant improvements in public health statistics rate since the 1990s with a series of healthcare and environmental policy reforms. To establish a causal relationship between decreased air pollution and improved public health statistics, this paper examines the role of mandatory coal power plant phase-out policy and desulphurization policy during 2005-2010 in reducing under-5 child mortality. We calculate the distance weighted capacities of coal power plants closed or required to install FGDs within a certain radius from a county centroid and use it to serve as instrumental variable candidates, along with high-altitude wind information. We use Lasso-IV estimation to select a small set of efficient instrumental variables and estimate the causal impacts on under-5 mortality using data from 1314 counties throughout China.

Our analysis shows that the coal power plant phase-out policy the Chinese government carried out during the Eleventh Five-Year Plan period significantly reduced densities of two major air pollutants – SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ – which contributed to the reduction in under-5 mortality. Since the average decrease in SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ densities at the end of the policy period compared with peak values was 0.1 DU for SO_2 and $3.9 \mu g^{-3}$ for $PM_{2.5}$, and the under-5 population in China was 68,978,374 according to the 2000 census (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2001), we estimate the yearly under-5 lives saved during the period of 2006-2010 was 46,012. We also find evidence of displacement effects by conducting heterogeneity analysis on subsamples defined according to the West-to-east Power Transfer Program.

This paper is the first to evaluate the impacts of air pollution regulations during 11th Five-Year Plan period on population health in China. We contribute to the literature by disentangling the air pollution from economic growth in the contribution to human health in a fast developing country. One innovation of this paper is to apply the Lasso-based IV selection model and draw inference evidence for each pollutant separately from a wide range of instruments on retired plant capacities. We conclude by providing the following avenues for future research. First, our current analysis centers on annual under-5 mortality as the population health outcome due to the unavailability of detailed mortality data in China. The estimates would be even more accurate to apply the instrumental variable approach to breakdown data of age-specific and cause-specific mortality. Secondly, due to lack of data, we can not estimate the general impacts of the coal power plants regulation on other factors in economy (for example, unemployment rate and public health investment) which may also have an impacts on under-5 mortality. Finally, our study has strong policy implications for other nations with significant economic growth and high demand for coal consumption and electricity like India. The findings can support cost-benefit analysis in making coal power plants related policies.

REFERENCES

- Belloni, Alexandre, Victor Chernozhukov, and Christian Hansen.** 2014. “High-Dimensional Methods and Inference on Structural and Treatment Effects.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 28(2): 29–50.
- Chernozhukov, Victor, Chris Hansen, and Martin Spindler.** 2016. “hdm: High-Dimensional Metrics.”
- China’s National People’s Congress.** 2006. “Guidelines of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan for National Economic and Social Development.”
- Cropper, M, R Cui, and S et al. Guttikunda.** 2021. “The mortality impacts of current and planned coal-fired power plants in India.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118.
- Cui, Ryna Yiyun, Nathan Hultman, Diyang Cui, Haewon McJeon, Sha Yu, Morgan R Edwards, Arijit Sen, Kaihui Song, Christina Bowman, Leon Clarke, et al.** 2021. “A plant-by-plant strategy for high-ambition coal power phaseout in China.” *Nature communications*, 12(1): 1468.
- Cui, Ryna Yiyun, Nathan Hultman, Morgan R Edwards, Linlang He, Arijit Sen, Kavita Surana, Haewon McJeon, Gokul Iyer, Pralit Patel, Sha Yu, et al.** 2019. “Quantifying operational lifetimes for coal power plants under the Paris goals.” *Nature communications*, 10(1): 4759.
- DeCicca, Philip, and Natalie Malak.** 2020. “When good fences aren’t enough: The impact of neighboring air pollution on infant health.” *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 102.
- Deryugina, Tatyana, Garth Heutel, Nolan H. Miller, David Molitor, and Julian Reif.** 2019. “The Mortality and Medical Costs of Air Pollution: Evidence from Changes in Wind Direction.” *American Economic Review*, 109(12): 4178–4219.
- EIA.** 2024. “Coal and the Environment.”
- Gao, Xue, Michael Davidson, Joshua Busby, Christine Shearer, and Joshua Eisenman.** 2021. “The challenges of coal phaseout: coal plant development and foreign finance in Indonesia and Vietnam.” *Global Environmental Politics*, 21(4): 110–133.
- Gasparotto, Juciano, and Kátia Da Boit Martinello.** 2021. “Coal as an energy source and its impacts on human health.” *Energy Geoscience*, 2(2): 113–120. Coal energy and environmental impacts.
- Geng, Jing, Yong-Long Lv, Bing-nan Ren, and Tie-yu Wang.** 2016. “Effects of Eliminating Backward Production Capacities on Reduction of Dioxin Emissions in Key Industries.” *Environmental Science (Chinese)*, 37(3).

- Godzinski, Alexandre, and Milena Suarez Castillo.** 2021. “Disentangling the effects of air pollutants with many instruments.” *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 109: 102489.
- Greenstone, Michael, and Rema Hanna.** 2014. “Environmental Regulations, Air and Water Pollution, and Infant Mortality in India.” *American Economic Review*, 104: 3038–72.
- Grid, China Southern Power.** 2016.
- Gupta, Aashish, and Dean Spears.** 2017. “Health externalities of India’s expansion of coal plants: Evidence from a national panel of 40,000 households.” *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 86: 262–276.
- Hersbach, H., B. Bell, P. Berrisford, G. Biavati, A. Horányi, J. Muñoz Sabater, J. Nicolas, C. Peubey, R. Radu, I. Rozum, D. Schepers, A. Simmons, C. Soci, D. Dee, and J.-N. Thépaut.** 2023. “ERA5 monthly averaged data on single levels from 1940 to present.” *Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) Climate Data Store (CDS)*.
- IEA.** 2012. “Technology Road Map: High-Efficiency, Low-Emissions, Coal-Fired Power Generation.” International Energy Agency.
- IEA.** 2024. “Global coal consumption.”
- IQAir Foundation.** 2024. “2018-2023 World’s most polluted countries & regions.”
- Jiang, J.K., W. Zhou, Z. Cheng, S.X. Wang, K.B. He, and J.M. Hao.** 2015. “Particulate matter distributions in China during a winter period with frequent pollution episodes (January 2013).” *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.*, 15: 494–503.
- Larsen, Thorjörn, Hans Martin Seip, Arne Semb, Jan Mulder, Ivar P. Muniz, Rolf D. Vogt, Espen Lydersen, Valter Angell, Tang Dagang, and Odd Eilertsen.** 1999. “Acid deposition and its effects in China: an overview.” *Environmental Science & Policy*, 2(1): 9–24.
- Li, Can, Nickolay A. Krotkov, and Peter Leonard.** 2020. “OMI/Aura Sulphur Dioxide (SO₂) Total Column Daily L3 1day Best Pixel in 0.25 degree x 0.25 degree V3 (OMSO2e).”
- Liu, Bingjiang, Jiming Hao, Kebin M He, Fahe Chai, Zhigang Xue, Yuansheng Fan, Zi Liu, and Zhao Weijun.** 1998. “Study on designation of acid rain and SO₂ pollution control areas and policy implementation.” *China Environmental Science*, 18(1): 1–7.
- Liu, L., S. Oza, D. Hogan, Y. Chu, J. Perin, J. Zhu, J. E. Lawn, S. Cousens, C. Mathers, and R. E. Black.** 2016. “Global, regional, and national causes of under-5 mortality in 2000-15: an updated systematic analysis with implications for the Sustainable Development Goals.” *Lancet*, 388(10063): 3027–3035.

- Luechinger, Simon.** 2014. “Air pollution and infant mortality: A natural experiment from power plant desulfurization.” *Journal of Health Economics*, 37: 219–231.
- Lu, Yangsiyu, Francois Cohen, Stephen M Smith, and Alexander Pfeiffer.** 2022. “Plant conversions and abatement technologies cannot prevent stranding of power plant assets in 2 C scenarios.” *Nature communications*, 13(1): 806.
- Meng, Xia, Yun Hang, Xiuran Lin, Tiantian Li, Tijian Wang, Junji Cao, Qingyan Fu, Sagnik Dey, Kan Huang, Fengchao Liang, Haidong Kan, Xiaoming Shi, and Yang Liu.** 2023. “A satellite-driven model to estimate long-term particulate sulfate levels and attributable mortality burden in China.” *Environment International*, 171.
- MEP.** 2011. “2010 Report on the State of Environment in China.” Ministry of Environment Protection, China.
- Ministry of Ecology and Environment of the People’s Republic of China.** 2009. “The lists for closed power plants during 2006, November-December 2007 and 2008.”
- Ministry of Ecology and Environment of the People’s Republic of China.** 2010. “The lists for closed power plants during January-July 2010.”
- Ministry of Ecology and Environment of the People’s Republic of China.** 2011. “The lists for closed power plants during September-December 2009 and August-December 2010.”
- Monoson, A., E. Schott, K. Ard, B. Kilburg-Basnyat, R. M. Tighe, S. Pannu, and K. M. Gowdy.** 2023. “Air pollution and respiratory infections: the past, present, and future.” *Toxicological sciences : an official journal of the Society of Toxicology*, 192(1): 3–14.
- Montrone, Lorenzo, Jan Christoph Steckel, and Gregory Nemet.** 2023. “The Fifth National Population Census of the People’s Republic of China.” *Environmental Research Letters*, 18(5): 054013.
- NASA.** 2018. “The Relationship Between OMI Sulfur Dioxide Data & Known Emissions Creates A Multi-Decade Record.”
- National Bureau of Statistics of China.** 2001. “Cost of pollution in China: economic estimates of physical damages.”
- National Energy Administration of the People’s Republic of China.** 2007. “The lists for closed power plants during January-October 2007.”
- National Energy of Administration.** 2012. “Overview of China’s Energy Development during the 11th Five-Year Plan Period.”
- NDRC.** 2006. “Overview of the 11th Five Year Plan for National Economic and Social Development.” Beijing (in Chinese).

- NEA, National Energy Administration.** 2004. “A Notice on the Relevant Requirements for the Planning and Construction of Coal-fired Power Station Projects.”
- of Ecology, Ministry, and The People’s Republic of China Environment.** 1998. “Official Reply of the State Council Concerning Acid Rain Control Zones and Sulphur Dioxide Pollution Control Zones.”
- Peng, Jian, Sha Chen, Huiling Lü, Yanxu Liu, and Jiansheng Wu.** 2016. “Spatiotemporal patterns of remotely sensed PM2.5 concentration in China from 1999 to 2011.” *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 174: 109–121.
- Perera, Frederica, Tin-yu Li, Zhi-jun Zhou, Tao Yuan, Yu-hui Chen, Lirong Qu, Virginia A Rauh, Yiguan Zhang, and Deliang Tang.** 2008. “Benefits of reducing prenatal exposure to coal-burning pollutants to children’s neurodevelopment in China.” *Environmental health perspectives : EHP.*, 116(10).
- Price, Lynn, Mark D. Levine, Nan Zhou, David Fridley, Nathaniel Aden, Hongyou Lu, Michael McNeil, Nina Zheng, Yining Qin, and Ping Yowargana.** 2011. “Assessment of China’s energy-saving and emission-reduction accomplishments and opportunities during the 11th Five Year Plan.” *Energy Policy*, 39(4): 2165–2178.
- Springer, Cecilia Han, Samuel Evans, and Fei Teng.** 2021. “An empirical analysis of the environmental performance of China’s overseas coal plants.” *Environmental Research Letters*, 16(5): 054062.
- Tang, Jie.** 2009. “Evaluation Report for Global Environment Facility- China Coal Power Plants Efficiency Improvement Project.” World Bank AB4191.
- The State Council.** 2007. “Notice on Several Suggestions on Accelerating the Shutdown of Small Thermal Plant Units.”
- UNECE.** 2024. “Neonatal mortality rate, per 1,000 live births.”
- Wang, Jiandong, Bin Zhao, Shuxiao Wang, Fumo Yang, Jia Xing, Lidia Morawska, Aijun Ding, Markku Kulmala, Veli-Matti Kerminen, Joni Kujansuu, et al.** 2017. “Particulate matter pollution over China and the effects of control policies.” *Science of the total environment*, 584: 426–447.
- Wang, Yanping, Xiaohong Li, Maigeng Zhou, Shusheng Luo, Juan Liang, Chelsea A Liddell, Matthew M Coates, Yanqiu Gao, Linhong Wang, Chunhua He, Chuyun Kang, Shiwei Liu, Li Dai, Austin E Schumacher, Maya S Fraser, Timothy M Wolock, Amanda Pain, Carly E Levitz, Lavanya Singh, Megan Coggeshall, Margaret Lind, Yichong Li, Qi Li, Kui Deng, Yi Mu, Changfei Deng, Ling Yi, Zheng Liu, Xia Ma, Hongtian Li, Dezhi Mu, Jun Zhu, Christopher J L Murray, and Wang Haidong.** 2015. “Under-5 mortality in 2851 Chinese counties, 1996–2012: a subnational assessment of achieving MDG 4 goals in China.” *Lancet*, 387: 273–283.
- Watkins, Kevin, and Devi Sridhar.** 2018. “Pneumonia: a global cause without champions.” *The Lancet*, 392(10149): 718–719. Publisher: Elsevier.

- Wei, J., Z. Li, A. Lyapustin, L. Sun, Y. Peng, W. Xue, T. Su, and M. Cribb.** 2021. “Reconstructing 1-km-resolution high-quality PM_{2.5} data records from 2000 to 2018 in China: spatiotemporal variations and policy implications.” *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 252.
- World Bank.** 2007. “Cost of pollution in China: economic estimates of physical damages.” 1–151.
- World Bank Group.** 2024. “GDP growth (annual %) - China.”
- Wu, Xinran, Tracey Holloway, Paul Meier, and Morgan Edwards.** 2024. “Characterizing multi-pollutant emission impacts of sulfur reduction strategies from coal power plants.” *Environmental Research Letters*, 19(8): 084009.
- Xia, Yinmin Xia, Yu Zhao, and Chris P. Nielsen.** 2016. “Benefits of China’s efforts in gaseous pollutant control indicated by the bottom-up emissions and satellite observations 2000–2014.” *Atmospheric Environment*, 136: 43–53.
- Zeng, Ming, Honglin Li, Mingjuan Ma, Na Li, Song Xue, Liang Wang, and Lilin Peng.** 2013. “Review on transaction status and relevant policies of southern route in China’s West–East Power transfer.” *Renewable Energy*, 60: 454–461.

APPENDIX A: OVERVIEW OF CHINA’S AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Since the start of the first Five-year Plan, China’s heavy investment in industry achieved great successes which paved the way for fast economic development after the well-know economic reform in 1979. However, the development of heavy industry brought serious environmental concerns in terms of pollutant and wastewater emissions. Since the early 1970s, the Chinese government actively engaged in environmental protection by setting discharge standards and enacting pollution control legislation. We summarize the climate control legislation passed by the Chinese government in table A1 from the early 1970s to the end of the Tenth Five-year Plan period (2005). The discharge standard released in 1973 was the first official environmental standard passed by the Chinese government which set the emission standards for wastewater, waste gas, and waste residual (the three industrial wastes). The 1987 Atmospheric Pollution Prevention and Control Law targeted specifically air pollution from industrial production and coal combustion which made prevention and control of air pollution a legal obligation. In the 1990s the key focus of the Chinese government was to control the emission of SO_2 which is the main contributor of acidic rain and PM_{2.5}. Hence, the government included controlling the levels of SO_2 and PM_{2.5} in the amendment of the Atmospheric Pollution Prevention and Control Law in 1995 and later introduced the Acid Rain Control Zones (ARCZ) and Sulphur Dioxide Pollution Control Zones (SO₂CZ) in 1998 to control the SO_2 and PM_{2.5} density according to the amended Air Quality Standard in 1996²². In 2000, the

²²The control area policy prohibited the construction of coal power plants in mid and large cities while limiting the construction and evacuation of coal mine with high sulfur concentration (>3%). We include the two control areas as part of our sensitivity subsample analysis in section V.

government made further amendments to the prevention and control law and air quality standards by limiting the SO_2 emission amount for the whole country and controlling the emission from mobile vehicles and dust. To prepare for the 2008 Beijing Olympics, 2010 Shanghai EXPO and 2010 Asian Games, the government released further pollutant control instructions, which included the targeted phase-out policy of coal power plants and desulphurization policy studied in this paper.

TABLE A1—TIMELINE OF CHINA'S AIR POLLUTION CONTROL LEGISLATION.

1973	Release of the Discharge Standard for Three Industrial Wastes.
1982	Release of Ambient Air Quality Standards.
1987	Enactment of the Atmospheric Pollution Prevention and Control Law.
1995	Amendment of the Atmospheric Pollution Prevention and Control Law.
1996	Amendment of Ambient Air Quality Standards.
1998	Enactment of Acidic Rain Pollution Control Area and Sulfur Dioxide Pollution Control Area Partition Plan.
2000	Second Amendment of the Atmospheric Pollution Prevention and Control Law.
2000	Second Amendment of Ambient Air Quality Standards.
2001	Release of Emission Standard of Air Pollutants for Coal-burning and Oil-burning Gas-fired Boiler.
2003	Release of Emission Standard of Air Pollutants for Thermal Power Plants.

APPENDIX B: DENSITY MAPS OF OTHER POLLUTANTS AND SUBSAMPLES

In this section, we present density heat maps of pollutants by subsample. Before proceeding on to the subsections, we present the overview of China's county-level nominal GDP in 2000 which is the year before our policy period of interest (2001 to 2010). Compared with the density heatmaps shown in the following subsections, we find, as expected, a high degree of overlap between counties with higher nominal GDP and counties with high pollutant density.




FIGURE B1. COUNTY-LEVEL GDP IN 2000

Note: We map the nominal yearly county-level GDP (in million CNY) in all mainland provinces and municipalities in 2000 in the figure above.

Source: 2001 China Statistical Yearbook for Regional Economy

B1. East China subsample

In this subsection we present the summary figures of the East China subsample. The bar chart in Figure B2 presents the sum of yearly retired and commissioned capacities with Figure B3 breaking down the total yearly capacity retired into capacity closed under 50 MW (the smaller-unit plant units forced to shut down by the phase-out policy). We present the density heat maps of the East China subsample in Figure B4.




FIGURE B2. COMMISSIONED AND RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT FROM 2000 TO 2010 (EAST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)






FIGURE B3. RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT (UNDER 50 MW) FROM 2000 TO 2010 (EAST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)


(a) SO_2 2005




(b) SO_2 2010



(c) $PM_{2.5}$ 2000



(d) $PM_{2.5}$ 2005



(e) $PM_{2.5}$ 2010




FIGURE B4. SO_2 AND $PM_{2.5}$ DENSITY HEAT MAPS (EAST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

Note: The figure shows the density of SO_2 (in DU) and $PM_{2.5}$ (in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in East China Subsample. Due to data availability, we document SO_2 density heatmaps in 2005 and 2010 while documenting $PM_{2.5}$ density heatmaps in 2000, 2005 and 2010.

B2. Northwest China subsample

In this subsection we present the summary figures of the Northwest China subsample. The bar chart in Figure B8 presents the sum of yearly retired and commissioned capacities with Figure B9 breaking down the total yearly capacity retired into capacity closed under 50 MW (the smaller-unit plant units forced to shut down by the phase-out policy). We present the density heat maps of the Northwest China subsample in Figure B7.




FIGURE B5. COMMISSIONED AND RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT FROM 2000 TO 2010 (NORTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)






FIGURE B6. RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT (UNDER 50 MW) FROM 2000 TO 2010 (NORTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)


(a) SO_2 2005




(b) SO_2 2010



(c) $PM_{2.5}$ 2000



(d) $PM_{2.5}$ 2005



(e) $PM_{2.5}$ 2010




FIGURE B7. SO_2 AND $PM_{2.5}$ DENSITY HEAT MAPS (NORTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

Note: The figure shows the density of SO_2 (in DU) and $PM_{2.5}$ (in $\mu g/m^3$) in Northwest China Subsample. Due to data availability, we document SO_2 density heatmaps in 2005 and 2010 while documenting $PM_{2.5}$ density heatmaps in 2000, 2005 and 2010.

B3. Southwest China subsample

In this subsection we present the summary figures of the Southwest China subsample. The bar chart in Figure ?? presents the sum of yearly retired and commissioned capacities with Figure ?? breaking down the total yearly capacity retired into capacity closed under 50 MW (the smaller-unit plant units forced to shut down by the phase-out policy). We present the density heat maps of the Southwest China subsample in Figure B10.




FIGURE B8. COMMISSIONED AND RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT FROM 2000 TO 2010 (SOUTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)






FIGURE B9. RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT (UNDER 50 MW) FROM 2000 TO 2010 (SOUTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)


(a) SO_2 2005




(b) SO_2 2010



(c) $PM_{2.5}$ 2000



(d) SO_2 2005



(e) $PM_{2.5}$ 2010




FIGURE B10. SO_2 AND $PM_{2.5}$ DENSITY HEAT MAPS (SOUTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

Note: The figure shows the density of SO_2 (in DU) and $PM_{2.5}$ (in $\mu g/m^3$) in Southwest China Subsample. Due to data availability, we document SO_2 density heatmaps in 2005 and 2010 while documenting $PM_{2.5}$ density heatmaps in 2000, 2005 and 2010.

B4. Acid Rain Control Zones Subsample

In this subsection we present the summary figures of the Acid Rain Control Zones policy subsample. The bar chart in Figure B11 presents the sum of yearly retired and commissioned capacities with Figure B12 breaking down the total yearly capacity retired into capacity closed under 50 MW (the smaller-unit plant units forced to shut down by the phase-out policy). We present the density heat maps of the ARCZ Policy subsample in Figure B13.




FIGURE B11. COMMISSIONED AND RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT FROM 2000 TO 2010 (ARCZ SUBSAMPLE)






FIGURE B12. RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT (UNDER 50 MW) FROM 2000 TO 2010 (ARCZ SUBSAMPLE)


(a) SO_2 2005




(b) SO_2 2010



(c) $PM_{2.5}$ 2000



(d) $PM_{2.5}$ 2005



(e) $PM_{2.5}$ 2010




FIGURE B13. SO_2 AND $PM_{2.5}$ DENSITY HEAT MAPS (ARCZ SUBSAMPLE)

Note: The figure shows the density of SO_2 (in DU) and $PM_{2.5}$ (in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in ARCZ Subsample. Due to data availability, we document SO_2 density heatmaps in 2005 and 2010 while documenting $PM_{2.5}$ density heatmaps in 2000, 2005 and 2010.

B5. Sulphur Dioxide Pollution Control Zones Subsample

In this subsection we present the summary figures of the Sulphur Dioxide Pollution Control Zones policy subsample. The bar chart in Figure B14 presents the sum of yearly retired and commissioned capacities with Figure B15 breaking down the total yearly capacity retired into capacity closed under 50 MW (the smaller-unit plant units forced to shut down by the phase-out policy). We present the density heat maps of the SO2CZ Policy subsample in Figure B16.




FIGURE B14. COMMISSIONED AND RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT FROM 2000 TO 2010 (SO2CZ SUBSAMPLE)






FIGURE B15. RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT (UNDER 50 MW) FROM 2000 TO 2010 (SO2CZ SUBSAMPLE)


(a) SO_2 2005




(b) SO_2 2010



(c) $PM_{2.5}$ 2000



(d) $PM_{2.5}$ 2005



(e) $PM_{2.5}$ 2010




FIGURE B16. SO_2 AND $PM_{2.5}$ DENSITY HEAT MAPS (SO2CZ SUBSAMPLE)

Note: The figure shows the density of SO_2 (in DU) and $PM_{2.5}$ (in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in SO2CZ Subsample. Due to data availability, we document SO_2 density heatmaps in 2005 and 2010 while documenting $PM_{2.5}$ density heatmaps in 2000, 2005 and 2010.

B6. Non-policy Area Subsample

In this subsection we present the summary figures of the subsample outside the two aforementioned subsamples. The bar chart in Figure B17 presents the sum of yearly retired and commissioned capacities with Figure B18 breaking down the total yearly capacity retired into capacity closed under 50 MW (the smaller-unit plant units forced to shut down by the phase-out policy). We present the density heat maps of the Non-policy subsample in Figure B19.




FIGURE B17. COMMISSIONED AND RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT FROM 2000 TO 2010 (NON-POLICY SUBSAMPLE)






FIGURE B18. RETIRED THERMAL CAPACITY COUNT (UNDER 50 MW) FROM 2000 TO 2010 (NON-POLICY SUBSAMPLE)


(a) SO_2 2005




(b) SO_2 2010



(c) $PM_{2.5}$ 2000



(d) $PM_{2.5}$ 2005



(e) $PM_{2.5}$ 2010




FIGURE B19. SO_2 AND $PM_{2.5}$ DENSITY HEAT MAPS (NON-POLICY SUBSAMPLE)

Note: The figure shows the density of SO_2 (in Dobson Unit (DU)) and $PM_{2.5}$ (in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) in Non-policy Subsample. Due to data availability, we document SO_2 density heatmaps in 2005 and 2010 while documenting $PM_{2.5}$ density heatmaps in 2000, 2005 and 2010.

APPENDIX C: CITY LEVEL AND SINGLE POLLUTANT WHOLE SAMPLE RESULTS

In this section, we present the results using city-level whole sample. As city level data have different socioeconomic variables from the county level data, we do not pool the two samples. We present the results using county-level data in the main text, while presenting the results using city-level data in Appendix. We first document the first stage results in Table C1 with instruments selected by the SO_2 model in column (1) and the instruments selected by the $PM_{2.5}$ model in column (2). We observe relatively low significance levels of city-level selected instruments in the first stage compared with the county-level instruments, especially for $PM_{2.5}$. We attribute the difference in significance level to the huge difference in sample size, with county-level around 6 times the sample size of the city level sample. Also, the highly aggregated data at city level might be affecting the correlations between instrumental variables and aggregated pollutant density variable of interest.

We present the city-level single-pollutant and multi-pollutant model results in Table C2 with columns (1) and (2) documenting single-pollutant results and column (3) documenting multi-pollutant results. We find that the post-Lasso second stage result of SO_2 at county level is around 50% larger than the city-level result while the city level partial effect of $PM_{2.5}$ is almost 3.5 times the effect at county level. For the multi-pollutant model, while the partial effects of SO_2 at city and county levels are similar, at city level we still observe much larger partial effect of $PM_{2.5}$ compared with county-level results.

TABLE C1—FIRST STAGE RESULTS BY LASSO METHOD (CITY LEVEL)

VARIABLES	(1) <i>S</i> O ₂	(2) PM _{2.5}
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100km)	-0.000552** (0.000235)	-0.00398 (0.00606)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50MW (25 to 100km)		
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100km, 1-year lag)		
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100km, 2-year lag)		
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100km, 3-year lag)		
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50MW (25 to 100km, 1-year lag)		
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50MW (25 to 100km, 2-year lag)		
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50MW (25 to 100km, 3-year lag)		
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100km)	0.00108*** (0.000378)	0.0148 (0.00970)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100km, 1-year lag)		0.00322 (0.00662)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100km, 2-year lag)		-0.00787* (0.00475)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100km)		-0.0417* (0.0264)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100km, 1-year lag)		0.0254 (0.0204)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100km)		
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100km, 1-year lag)		0.00106 (0.00154)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100km)	0.000365* (0.000212)	0.00729 (0.00805)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100km, 2-year lag)		
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization		
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0.00559** (0.00228)	
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton, 1-year lag)		
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton, 2-year lag)		
100m Wind Speed (Jan)	-0.00498 (0.00607)	
100m Wind Speed (Feb)	0.00216 (0.00606)	
100m Wind Speed (May)	-0.00712 (0.00688)	-1.105*** (0.118)
100m Wind Speed (Jun)		-0.832*** (0.140)
100m Wind Speed (Aug)		0.656*** (0.122)
100m Wind Speed (Sep)	0.0190** (0.00736)	
100m Wind Speed (Oct)	0.0344*** (0.00773)	1.067*** (0.119)
100m Wind Speed (Nov)	-0.000260 (0.00659)	-0.225* (0.122)
100m Wind Speed (Dec)		-1.408*** (0.114)
100m Wind Direction (Feb)		
100m Wind Direction (Mar)	7.78e-05 (5.01e-05)	
100m Wind Direction (Apr)		
100m Wind Direction (May)		
100m Wind Direction (Aug)		-0.00109 (0.000753)
100m Wind Direction (Oct)	9.97e-05* (6.00e-05)	0.00185 (0.00125)
100m Wind Direction (Nov)	0.000108 (6.98e-05)	-0.00484*** (0.00132)
100m Wind Direction (Dec)	-0.000151 (0.000107)	0.00351* (0.00198)
# Instruments Selected	14	18
Sample Size	1,336	2,171
Aggregation Level	City	City
Fixed Effect	Year & City	Year & City
R-squared	0.897	0.976
F-Stat	33.3	278

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: We document the whole-country city-level first stage results of instruments selected in the table above, with the county-level first stage results documented in Table 3. Only instrumental variables selected at either city or county level are documented. Columnw (1) and (2) document the results of instruments selected for *S*O₂ and PM_{2.5}, respectively. We control for year and city fixed effects and the same set of monthly standardized meteorological variables (2-meter temperature and humidity) in all the documented results above.

TABLE C2—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (CITY LEVEL)

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)
SO_2	0.00659*** (0.000198)		0.00119*** (0.000037)
$PM_{2.5}$		0.32*** (0.008770)	0.258*** (0.008070)
Doctor	0.338*** (0.009520)	0.187*** (0.042700)	0.101*** (0.009410)
Hospital Bed	0.615*** (0.017300)	0.178*** (0.027300)	0.179*** (0.016300)
GDP	-0.000355*** (0.000021)	-0.000321*** (0.000021)	-0.000209*** (0.000017)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant	Multi-pollutant
Sample Size	1336	2171	1336
Aggregation Level	City	City	City
Fixed Effect	Year & City	Year & City	Year & City

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

APPENDIX D: SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

D1. East China subsample

In this subsection we present the summary statistics and the estimation results of our IV-Lasso model from equations 1 and 2 for the East China subsample. We present the summary statistics of our key variables of interest. Tables D1 and D2 document the mean and standard deviations of our key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 and from 2006 to 2010, respectively for the East China subsample. We document the county-level single-pollutant models in Table D3. We document the city-level single-pollutant and multi-pollutant model results in Table D4. Single-pollutant results are documented in columns (1), (2) while multi-pollutant results are documented in column (3). We observe that both single and multi-pollutant results are in the same ballpark as the whole-county results thus adding robustness to our model specification.

CITY LEVEL AND SINGLE POLLUTANT RESULTS

TABLE D1—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (EAST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	27.97	25.99	23.73	22.02	20.27
	(11.97)	(11.02)	(10.27)	(9.374)	(8.528)
Pollutant Density					
<i>SO</i> ₂ (DU)	0	0	0	0	0.403
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.304)
PM2.5 (μg/m ³)	55.61	58.05	62.62	62.79	62.36
	(13.31)	(15.27)	(15.16)	(14.06)	(14.23)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0	0	0	2.339	1.973
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(15.12)	(9.737)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0	0	0	0.645	0.604
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(8.009)	(5.464)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0	0	0	0.161	0.282
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(4.014)	(3.745)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0	0	0	1.694	1.369
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(12.91)	(8.162)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0	0	0	2.177	1.691
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(14.60)	(9.041)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	1.369
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(8.162)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	1.691
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(9.041)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	1.973
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(9.737)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0	0	0	0	0.604
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(5.464)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0	0	0	0	0.282
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(3.745)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0.0511	0.117
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.482)	(2.011)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0	0	0	0.0279	0.0994
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.448)	(2.009)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0	0	0	0.0163	0.0904
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.416)	(2.006)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0.0232	0.0178
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.181)	(0.109)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0.0348	0.0269
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.245)	(0.157)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0.0178
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.109)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0.0269
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.157)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0.117
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2.011)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0	0	0	0	0.0994
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2.009)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0	0	0	0	0.0904
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2.006)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 for the East China sample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), *SO*₂ and PM_{2.5} density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D2—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (EAST CHINA SUBSAMPLE) –CONT'D

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	18.56 (7.688)	17.14 (6.843)	15.84 (6.264)	14.69 (5.871)	13.73 (5.422)
Pollutant Density					
SO_2 (DU)	0.416 (0.315)	0.491 (0.320)	0.407 (0.292)	0.276 (0.240)	0.271 (0.242)
$PM_{2.5}$ ($\mu g/m^3$)	68.18 (17.75)	70.01 (17.19)	66.48 (14.90)	67.22 (16.70)	64.47 (15.72)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	27.98 (72.77)	261.7 (308.7)	260.8 (381.6)	112.6 (205.4)	229.8 (350.8)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	8.215 (39.97)	82.50 (153.1)	79.65 (184.2)	34.24 (107.6)	72.94 (173.7)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	3.463 (26.15)	32.34 (91.08)	29.94 (98.42)	13.39 (64.37)	28.95 (102.8)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	19.76 (62.28)	179.2 (245.6)	181.2 (282.1)	78.39 (176.0)	156.9 (264.8)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	24.51 (68.48)	229.4 (286.1)	230.9 (344.1)	99.24 (198.7)	200.9 (315.7)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	1.880 (7.154)	12.80 (26.79)	48.59 (93.46)	1.838 (8.074)	26.99 (49.64)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	2.433 (7.988)	16.41 (32.31)	61.56 (118.6)	2.476 (9.228)	33.89 (59.53)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	2.860 (8.586)	18.00 (34.71)	68.16 (127.9)	2.788 (9.752)	37.46 (64.15)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.980 (4.940)	5.390 (16.22)	19.62 (44.58)	0.951 (5.692)	10.66 (27.14)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.428 (3.412)	1.671 (8.179)	6.612 (19.85)	0.313 (3.371)	3.620 (14.27)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.696 (2.494)	7.609 (17.03)	7.059 (19.37)	3.051 (8.798)	6.134 (13.80)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.433 (2.362)	5.212 (16.37)	4.627 (18.30)	2.005 (8.594)	4.036 (12.55)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.300 (2.205)	3.882 (15.91)	3.332 (17.64)	1.434 (8.192)	2.820 (11.69)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.263 (0.846)	2.397 (3.364)	2.431 (3.868)	1.046 (2.381)	2.098 (3.604)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.396 (1.210)	3.727 (4.932)	3.727 (5.848)	1.617 (3.410)	3.315 (5.484)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0.0250 (0.0963)	0.171 (0.363)	0.650 (1.263)	0.0237 (0.105)	0.358 (0.662)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0.0398 (0.135)	0.267 (0.555)	1.001 (2.009)	0.0405 (0.160)	0.539 (0.986)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0.0822 (0.405)	0.461 (1.535)	1.766 (4.177)	0.0703 (0.368)	0.966 (2.724)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.0572 (0.396)	0.293 (1.453)	1.117 (3.440)	0.0466 (0.355)	0.612 (2.544)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.0424 (0.386)	0.195 (1.362)	0.766 (3.095)	0.0298 (0.335)	0.428 (2.433)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0.528 (1.189)	0.719 (1.448)	1.010 (2.137)	0.443 (1.041)	0.223 (0.805)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	171.2 (354.0)	191.2 (392.3)	288.8 (706.1)	123.0 (297.2)	85.81 (274.3)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2006 to 2010 for the East China subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D3—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (COUNTY LEVEL SINGLE POLLUTANT, EAST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)
SO ₂	0.00289*** (0.000677)	
PM _{2.5}		0.122*** (0.037300)
Hospital Bed	-0.114*** (0.037800)	-0.0461** (0.023200)
Prim GDP	0.00117*** (0.000171)	-0.000611** (0.000296)
Sec GDP	-5.17e-05* (0.000040)	-0.000143*** (0.000048)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant
Sample Size	4653	6948
Aggregation Level	County	County
Fixed Effect	Year & County	Year & County

Standard Errors in Parenthesis
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

TABLE D4—CITY LEVEL POST-LASSO RESULTS (CITY LEVEL, EAST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)
SO ₂	0.00814*** (0.000287)		0.00126*** (0.000026)
PM _{2.5}		0.271*** (0.007990)	0.234*** (0.006950)
Doctor	0.348*** (0.011600)	0.138*** (0.013100)	0.0907*** (0.010700)
Hospital Bed	0.579*** (0.019300)	0.223*** (0.019900)	0.143*** (0.015200)
GDP	-0.000343*** (0.000023)	-0.000327*** (0.000020)	-0.000194*** (0.000014)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant	Multi-pollutant
Sample Size	803	1319	803
Aggregation Level	City	City	City
Fixed Effect	Year & City	Year & City	Year & City

Standard Errors in Parenthesis
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

D2. Northwest China subsample

In this subsection we present the summary statistics and the estimation results of our IV-Lasso model from equations 1 and 2 for the Northwest China subsample. We present the summary statistics of our key variables of interest. Tables D5 and D6 document the mean and standard deviations of our key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 and from 2006 to 2010, respectively for the Northwest China subsample. We document the county-level single-pollutant models in Table D7. We document the city-level single-pollutant and multi-pollutant model results in Table D8. Single-pollutant results are documented in columns (1), (2) while multi-pollutant results are documented in column (3). We observe a decreased magnitude in the effects of SO_2 at county level for the single-pollutant model. At city level, our results are in the same ballpark as the whole-country results.

CITY LEVEL AND SINGLE POLLUTANT RESULTS

TABLE D5—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (NORTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	38.53 (14.43)	35.94 (13.62)	32.75 (12.70)	30.18 (11.73)	27.60 (10.53)
Pollutant Density					
SO_2 (DU)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.256 (0.271)
$PM_{2.5}$ ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	46.80 (9.309)	46.96 (10.51)	49.81 (9.433)	46.19 (10.45)	48.54 (11.87)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2.071 (14.26)	0.746 (6.072)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.592 (7.681)	0 (0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1.479 (12.09)	0.746 (6.072)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2.071 (14.26)	0.746 (6.072)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.746 (6.072)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.746 (6.072)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.746 (6.072)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0318 (0.226)	0.00854 (0.0703)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0120 (0.156)	0 (0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0198 (0.165)	0.00854 (0.0703)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0318 (0.226)	0.00854 (0.0703)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.00854 (0.0703)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.00854 (0.0703)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.00854 (0.0703)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 for the Northwest China subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D6—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (NORTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)—CONT'D

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	25.04 (9.243)	23.05 (8.237)	21.08 (7.526)	19.54 (7.146)	18.11 (6.505)
Pollutant Density					
SO_2 (DU)	0.271 (0.270)	0.293 (0.297)	0.267 (0.252)	0.233 (0.233)	0.223 (0.225)
PM _{2.5} ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	53.83 (13.77)	53.05 (13.04)	50.03 (11.07)	51.03 (12.27)	47.67 (10.83)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	4.108 (13.54)	121.0 (178.6)	99.54 (180.7)	29.78 (68.76)	155.6 (238.4)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	1.347 (8.145)	37.95 (83.23)	24.67 (56.29)	8.878 (37.93)	42.91 (93.32)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.748 (6.103)	16.65 (57.34)	10.06 (36.19)	4.128 (26.20)	15.77 (52.10)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	2.761 (11.16)	83.06 (151.1)	74.88 (157.8)	20.90 (58.08)	112.7 (194.2)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	3.361 (12.30)	104.4 (171.2)	89.48 (170.7)	25.65 (64.14)	139.8 (227.7)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	1.248 (7.292)	8.896 (20.84)	11.38 (46.68)	1.586 (7.524)	35.40 (57.45)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	1.545 (8.199)	12.66 (24.30)	13.00 (52.77)	1.991 (8.448)	44.30 (70.60)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	1.990 (9.379)	15.07 (26.35)	13.45 (53.15)	2.027 (8.465)	49.40 (76.87)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.742 (6.054)	6.349 (18.88)	2.074 (9.851)	0.440 (4.056)	14.00 (32.52)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.445 (4.703)	2.547 (11.78)	0.454 (2.784)	0.0357 (0.655)	5.094 (15.59)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.0967 (0.406)	3.458 (8.837)	2.327 (5.307)	0.690 (2.149)	3.876 (7.991)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.0578 (0.378)	2.383 (8.573)	1.360 (4.543)	0.409 (2.024)	2.374 (7.283)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.0429 (0.353)	1.821 (8.476)	0.969 (4.432)	0.289 (1.861)	1.632 (6.925)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.0388 (0.163)	1.075 (1.936)	0.967 (2.041)	0.280 (0.802)	1.503 (2.595)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.0538 (0.211)	1.637 (2.680)	1.358 (2.557)	0.401 (1.076)	2.245 (3.682)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0.0173 (0.106)	0.119 (0.286)	0.147 (0.607)	0.0196 (0.0950)	0.473 (0.766)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0.0252 (0.147)	0.222 (0.485)	0.188 (0.777)	0.0290 (0.134)	0.711 (1.196)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0.0521 (0.321)	0.510 (1.770)	0.237 (0.900)	0.0322 (0.146)	1.185 (2.370)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.0348 (0.305)	0.395 (1.770)	0.0900 (0.440)	0.0126 (0.113)	0.713 (2.014)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.0270 (0.287)	0.295 (1.734)	0.0487 (0.327)	0.00319 (0.0586)	0.474 (1.759)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0.594 (1.431)	0.335 (1.086)	0.980 (1.473)	0.861 (2.319)	0.219 (0.746)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	169.6 (495.5)	98.64 (307.2)	239.1 (373.6)	168.5 (392.9)	54.12 (162.1)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2006 to 2010 for the Northwest China subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO_2 and PM_{2.5} density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D7—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (COUNTY LEVEL SINGLE POLLUTANT, NORTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)
SO_2	0.000582** (0.000325)	
$PM_{2.5}$		0.343*** (0.080600)
Hospital Bed	0.151* (0.095200)	-0.0463** (0.024700)
Prim GDP	0.00328*** (0.000528)	0.00142*** (0.000239)
Sec GDP	-0.000155*** (0.000048)	-0.000161*** (0.000023)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant
Sample Size	1258	1875
Aggregation Level	County	County
Fixed Effect	Year & County	Year & County

TABLE D8—CITY LEVEL POST-LASSO RESULTS (CITY LEVEL, NORTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)
SO_2	0.00472*** (0.000341)		-0.0000967 (0.000163)
$PM_{2.5}$		0.539*** (0.030400)	0.492*** (0.028100)
Doctor	0.118 (0.096300)	-0.0107 (0.082300)	-0.233*** (0.068200)
Hospital Bed	0.537*** (0.073000)	-0.0233 (0.059800)	-0.0128 (0.0479)
GDP	-0.000149*** (0.000027)	-9.77e-05*** (0.000034)	3.99e-05*** (0.0000166)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant	Multi-pollutant
Sample Size	181	283	181
Aggregation Level	City	City	City
Fixed Effect	Year & City	Year & City	Year & City

D3. Southwest China subsample

In this subsection we present the summary charts of total capacity retired and commissioned by year and the estimation results of our IV-Lasso model from equations 1 and 2 for the Southwest China subsample. We present the summary statistics of our key variables of interest. Tables D9 and D10 document the mean and standard deviations of our key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 and from 2006 to 2010, respectively for the Southwest China subsample. We document the county-level single-pollutant models in Table D11. We document the city-level single-pollutant and multi-pollutant model results in Table D12. Single-pollutant results are documented in columns (1), (2) while multi-pollutant results are documented in column (3). We observe that single-pollutant results are in the same ballpark as the whole-county results at city level. The county-level single pollutant results show a decreased significance level and much larger partial effect of SO_2 . Multi-pollutant results at city level differ by the sign and significance level of the partial effect of SO_2 while at county level it is in the same ballpark as our whole country results. The changes in significance level and sign are explained in Section V. Overall, the subsample results aligns with our whole country results which adds robustness to our model specification.

CITY LEVEL AND SINGLE POLLUTANT RESULTS

TABLE D9—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (SOUTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	43.36	42.31	38.40	35.09	32.02
	(22.04)	(24.30)	(21.82)	(19.53)	(17.90)
Pollutant Density					
<i>SO</i> ₂ (DU)	0	0	0	0	0.158
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.154)
PM _{2.5} ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	41.28	39.92	42.83	45.74	46.31
	(10.40)	(11.61)	(13.07)	(13.40)	(14.59)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	1.528	0	0	3.926	0
	(12.28)	(0)	(0)	(22.09)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.170	0	0	1.571	0
	(4.120)	(0)	(0)	(14.10)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.170	0	0	0.589	0
	(4.120)	(0)	(0)	(8.669)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	1.358	0	0	2.356	0
	(11.58)	(0)	(0)	(17.22)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	1.358	0	0	3.337	0
	(11.58)	(0)	(0)	(20.41)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.0347	0	0	0.0907	0
	(0.437)	(0)	(0)	(0.584)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.0169	0	0	0.0567	0
	(0.410)	(0)	(0)	(0.530)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.0169	0	0	0.0280	0
	(0.410)	(0)	(0)	(0.412)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.0179	0	0	0.0340	0
	(0.155)	(0)	(0)	(0.253)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.0179	0	0	0.0627	0
	(0.155)	(0)	(0)	(0.418)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 for the Southwest China subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), *SO*₂ and PM_{2.5} density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D10—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (SOUTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE) –CONT'D

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	28.98 (15.95)	26.79 (14.91)	24.74 (13.90)	22.77 (12.96)	21.15 (12.19)
Pollutant Density					
SO_2 (DU)	0.191 (0.184)	0.195 (0.172)	0.183 (0.177)	0.132 (0.122)	0.170 (0.191)
$PM_{2.5}$ ($\mu g/m^3$)	47.92 (15.18)	49.87 (15.76)	48.93 (15.87)	47.50 (14.92)	46.81 (14.89)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	6.037 (31.46)	75.58 (138.1)	70.34 (141.3)	24.92 (86.99)	38.87 (86.52)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.994 (8.911)	26.88 (84.28)	22.10 (74.70)	5.751 (39.22)	10.13 (42.39)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.153 (2.763)	10.55 (53.57)	7.243 (41.93)	1.072 (14.33)	3.798 (25.20)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	5.044 (29.70)	48.71 (115.7)	48.24 (121.7)	19.17 (74.81)	28.74 (75.07)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	5.885 (31.12)	65.03 (129.9)	63.10 (136.5)	23.85 (84.48)	35.07 (83.28)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	3.135 (15.95)	4.470 (12.12)	6.896 (13.31)	0.690 (3.240)	4.185 (11.06)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	3.976 (18.55)	5.560 (13.90)	8.770 (16.17)	0.818 (3.836)	5.515 (14.11)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	4.128 (19.13)	6.207 (15.43)	9.736 (17.35)	0.882 (4.120)	5.959 (15.08)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.994 (8.911)	1.806 (7.911)	3.039 (8.820)	0.193 (1.698)	1.774 (7.416)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.153 (2.763)	0.675 (4.580)	1.018 (5.097)	0.0642 (0.776)	0.444 (3.359)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.106 (0.633)	2.250 (7.526)	1.814 (5.508)	0.506 (2.337)	1.121 (5.113)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.0417 (0.511)	1.598 (7.433)	1.162 (5.325)	0.254 (2.001)	0.727 (5.022)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.0181 (0.390)	1.150 (7.225)	0.758 (4.981)	0.134 (1.725)	0.553 (4.941)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.0645 (0.358)	0.652 (1.580)	0.652 (1.670)	0.252 (1.002)	0.395 (1.053)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.0881 (0.434)	1.100 (2.378)	1.056 (2.352)	0.372 (1.402)	0.568 (1.439)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0.0425 (0.220)	0.0609 (0.168)	0.0923 (0.182)	0.00920 (0.0423)	0.0582 (0.158)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0.0661 (0.331)	0.0895 (0.239)	0.144 (0.284)	0.0125 (0.0620)	0.0937 (0.265)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0.0843 (0.568)	0.160 (0.713)	0.260 (0.776)	0.0203 (0.124)	0.131 (0.436)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.0417 (0.511)	0.100 (0.667)	0.172 (0.737)	0.0111 (0.107)	0.0731 (0.361)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.0181 (0.390)	0.0736 (0.647)	0.119 (0.707)	0.00777 (0.0982)	0.0375 (0.309)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0.574 (2.031)	0.636 (1.644)	0.415 (1.553)	0.101 (0.402)	0.0791 (0.386)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	75.46 (203.5)	88.27 (191.8)	56.72 (199.8)	37.29 (165.1)	24.15 (110.9)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2006 to 2010 for the Southwest China subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D11—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (COUNTY LEVEL SINGLE POLLUTANT, SOUTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)
S0 ₂	0.104** (0.058600)	
PM _{2.5}		0.206* (0.136000)
Hospital Bed	-0.00406 (0.003580)	-0.0105** (0.004600)
Prim GDP	-0.00148** (0.000655)	-0.00373** (0.001650)
Sec GDP	-0.000163*** (0.000065)	-0.000296*** (0.000070)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant
Sample Size	1274	1860
Aggregation Level	County	County
Fixed Effect	Year & County	Year & County

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

TABLE D12—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (CITY LEVEL, SOUTHWEST CHINA SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)
SO ₂	0.0432*** (0.004900)		-0.000375 (0.001900)
PM _{2.5}		0.445*** (0.030900)	0.291*** (0.030500)
Doctor	0.136** (0.072100)	-0.0564 (0.130000)	0.0465 (0.085600)
Hospital Bed	1.17*** (0.104000)	0.841*** (0.125000)	0.652*** (0.117000)
GDP	-0.00117*** (0.000144)	-0.00145*** (0.000214)	-0.000961*** (0.000153)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant	Multi-pollutant
Sample Size	247	395	247
Aggregation Level	City	City	City
Fixed Effect	Year & City	Year & City	Year & City

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

D4. Acid Rain Control Zones Subsample

In this subsection we present the summary statistics and the estimation results of our IV-Lasso model from equations 1 and 2 for the Acid Rain Control Zones policy subsample. We present the summary statistics of our key variables of interest. Tables D13 and D14 document the mean and standard deviations of our key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 and from 2006 to 2010, respectively for the ARCZ subsample. We document the county-level single-pollutant models in Table D15. We document the city-level single-pollutant and multi-pollutant model results in Table D16. Single-pollutant results are documented in columns (1), (2) while multi-pollutant results are documented in column (3). We observe that both single and multi-pollutant results are in the same ballpark as the whole-county results thus adding robustness to our model specification.

CITY LEVEL AND SINGLE POLLUTANT RESULTS

TABLE D13—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (ARCZ SUBSAMPLE)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	29.34	27.05	24.68	22.68	20.78
	(17.04)	(15.45)	(14.06)	(12.71)	(11.37)
Pollutant Density					
SO ₂ (DU)	0	0	0	0	0.216
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.191)
PM _{2.5} (μg/m ³)	43.44	43.91	48.22	51.12	50.62
	(9.882)	(11.03)	(11.57)	(11.30)	(12.14)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.711	0	0	2.101	0
	(8.406)	(0)	(0)	(16.27)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.118	0	0	1.200	0
	(3.442)	(0)	(0)	(12.34)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.118	0	0	0.450	0
	(3.442)	(0)	(0)	(7.582)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.592	0	0	0.900	0
	(7.679)	(0)	(0)	(10.70)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.592	0	0	1.651	0
	(7.679)	(0)	(0)	(14.45)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.0197	0	0	0.0551	0
	(0.358)	(0)	(0)	(0.484)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.0118	0	0	0.0433	0
	(0.342)	(0)	(0)	(0.464)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.0118	0	0	0.0214	0
	(0.342)	(0)	(0)	(0.360)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.00794	0	0	0.0118	0
	(0.106)	(0)	(0)	(0.144)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.00794	0	0	0.0338	0
	(0.106)	(0)	(0)	(0.326)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 for the ARCZ subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO₂ and PM_{2.5} density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D14—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (ARCZ SUBSAMPLE)—CONT'D

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	18.93	17.44	16.01	14.74	13.71
	(9.840)	(8.643)	(7.616)	(6.795)	(6.159)
Pollutant Density					
<i>SO</i> ₂ (DU)	0.226	0.291	0.222	0.140	0.161
	(0.191)	(0.242)	(0.196)	(0.132)	(0.183)
PM _{2.5} (μg/m ³)	52.45	55.33	54.05	52.54	51.16
	(12.88)	(13.25)	(13.68)	(13.41)	(13.56)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	77.97	204.6	171.6	134.5	123.5
	(193.9)	(282.0)	(333.2)	(278.1)	(239.9)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	26.38	78.51	55.08	42.98	47.22
	(87.77)	(149.4)	(162.1)	(140.5)	(158.9)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	9.523	34.15	17.40	16.58	20.21
	(45.63)	(88.24)	(68.73)	(85.55)	(93.57)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	51.59	126.1	116.5	91.57	76.32
	(137.7)	(208.7)	(241.8)	(223.0)	(177.0)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	68.44	170.4	154.2	118.0	103.3
	(176.1)	(252.2)	(307.1)	(260.7)	(205.7)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	6.161	9.269	26.69	2.585	11.09
	(20.12)	(19.34)	(48.81)	(10.27)	(32.09)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	7.807	11.84	35.31	3.800	14.69
	(23.38)	(23.59)	(61.88)	(13.34)	(38.08)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	9.142	13.20	39.55	4.141	16.35
	(26.67)	(25.56)	(65.22)	(14.17)	(40.97)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	2.982	4.121	13.24	1.556	5.463
	(12.41)	(12.04)	(30.44)	(8.101)	(21.68)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	1.335	1.450	4.324	0.342	1.682
	(6.505)	(6.730)	(14.70)	(3.589)	(10.03)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	2.140	6.498	4.283	3.727	3.620
	(6.916)	(13.12)	(10.90)	(11.53)	(9.976)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	1.444	4.815	2.715	2.522	2.593
	(5.932)	(12.55)	(9.637)	(11.05)	(9.700)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.988	3.585	1.706	1.793	1.831
	(5.331)	(11.78)	(7.900)	(10.44)	(8.352)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.695	1.683	1.569	1.205	1.027
	(1.908)	(2.862)	(3.293)	(2.964)	(2.358)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	1.152	2.913	2.577	1.934	1.789
	(3.114)	(4.576)	(5.479)	(4.469)	(3.722)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0.0834	0.124	0.358	0.0347	0.153
	(0.273)	(0.262)	(0.659)	(0.141)	(0.456)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0.129	0.192	0.592	0.0673	0.249
	(0.407)	(0.406)	(1.113)	(0.257)	(0.676)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0.328	0.324	1.052	0.115	0.458
	(1.194)	(0.894)	(2.624)	(0.673)	(1.887)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.244	0.203	0.703	0.0802	0.308
	(1.058)	(0.802)	(2.437)	(0.642)	(1.816)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.198	0.135	0.465	0.0476	0.209
	(0.947)	(0.766)	(2.301)	(0.613)	(1.686)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0.574	0.790	0.817	0.284	0.131
	(1.824)	(1.763)	(2.405)	(0.872)	(0.595)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	104.8	184.2	221.7	103.8	56.80
	(245.2)	(414.7)	(808.5)	(329.5)	(259.5)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2006 to 2010 for the ARCZ subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), *SO*₂ and PM_{2.5} density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D15—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (COUNTY LEVEL SINGLE POLLUTANT, ARCZ POLICY SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)
SO ₂	0.00264*** (0.000969)	
PM _{2.5}		0.180*** (0.013500)
Hospital Bed	0.123*** (0.020400)	0.0233 (0.021500)
Prim GDP	-0.0000638 (0.000107)	-0.00155*** (0.000131)
Sec GDP	-0.000277*** (0.000023)	-0.000287*** (0.000024)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant
Sample Size	2559	3808
Aggregation Level	County	County
Fixed Effect	Year & County	Year & County
Standard Errors in Parenthesis		
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1		

TABLE D16—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (CITY LEVEL, ARCZ POLICY SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)
SO ₂	0.00555*** (0.000219)		0.000865*** (0.000064)
PM _{2.5}		0.354*** (0.019500)	0.291*** (0.017800)
Doctor	0.393*** (0.014100)	-0.0404 (0.084800)	0.105*** (0.020700)
Hospital Bed	0.682*** (0.024400)	0.34*** (0.060000)	0.170*** (0.027700)
GDP	-0.000415*** (0.000027)	-0.000349*** (0.000028)	-0.000227*** (0.000020)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant	Multi-pollutant
Sample Size	533	857	533
Aggregation Level	City	City	City
Fixed Effect	Year & City	Year & City	Year & City
Standard Errors in Parenthesis			
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1			

D5. Sulphur Dioxide Pollution Control Zones Subsample

In this subsection we present the summary statistics and the estimation results of our IV-Lasso model from equations 1 and 2 for the Sulphur Dioxide Pollution Control Zones policy subsample. We present the summary statistics of our key variables of interest. Tables D17 and D18 document the mean and standard deviations of our key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 and from 2006 to 2010, respectively for the SO2CZ subsample. We document the county-level single-pollutant models in Table D19. We document the city-level single-pollutant and multi-pollutant model results in Table D20. Single-pollutant results are documented in columns (1), (2) while multi-pollutant results are documented in column (3). We observe that both single-pollutant and multi-pollutant results are in the same ballpark as the whole-county results. Single-pollutant results at county level differ by the significance level of the partial effect of SO_2 other results are in the same ballpark as our whole country results. The change in significance level are explained in Section V. Overall, the subsample results aligns with our whole country results which adds robustness to our model specification.

CITY LEVEL AND SINGLE POLLUTANT RESULTS

TABLE D17—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (SO2CZ SUBSAMPLE)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	27.05	25.24	23.23	21.78	20.19
	(11.62)	(10.66)	(9.856)	(9.222)	(8.523)
Pollutant Density					
SO ₂ (DU)	0	0	0	0	0.492
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.361)
PM _{2.5} (μg/m ³)	57.78	60.26	64.89	61.31	61.85
	(14.00)	(16.75)	(16.39)	(17.06)	(17.16)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0	14.38	0	4.795	2.389
	(0)	(66.90)	(0)	(21.38)	(10.67)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0	5.565	0	1.370	1.024
	(0)	(42.02)	(0)	(11.63)	(7.087)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0	2.997	0	0.342	0.427
	(0)	(32.27)	(0)	(5.847)	(4.603)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0	8.818	0	3.425	1.365
	(0)	(49.99)	(0)	(18.20)	(8.155)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0	11.39	0	4.452	1.962
	(0)	(59.18)	(0)	(20.64)	(9.718)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	1.365
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(8.155)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	1.962
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(9.718)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	2.389
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(10.67)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0	0	0	0	1.024
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(7.087)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0	0	0	0	0.427
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(4.603)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0	0.471	0	0.107	0.218
	(0)	(3.528)	(0)	(0.697)	(2.919)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0	0.352	0	0.0592	0.200
	(0)	(3.452)	(0)	(0.652)	(2.918)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0	0.286	0	0.0347	0.183
	(0)	(3.386)	(0)	(0.606)	(2.915)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0	0.119	0	0.0474	0.0188
	(0)	(0.692)	(0)	(0.258)	(0.115)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0	0.185	0	0.0720	0.0352
	(0)	(1.043)	(0)	(0.351)	(0.189)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0.0188
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.115)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0.0352
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0.189)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0	0	0	0	0.218
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2.919)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0	0	0	0	0.200
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2.918)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0	0	0	0	0.183
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2.915)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	0	0	0	0	0
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 for the SO2CZ subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO₂ and PM_{2.5} density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D18—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (SO2CZ SUBSAMPLE) —CONT'D

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	18.53	17.23	16.12	15.05	14.14
	(7.811)	(7.139)	(6.686)	(6.288)	(5.959)
Pollutant Density					
SO ₂ (DU)	0.520	0.504	0.481	0.370	0.346
	(0.348)	(0.378)	(0.315)	(0.255)	(0.265)
PM _{2.5} (μg/m ³)	69.93	69.86	64.82	67.27	63.88
	(20.53)	(20.53)	(17.87)	(19.32)	(18.33)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	7.889	246.4	348.9	80.78	289.7
	(20.25)	(281.2)	(456.8)	(131.6)	(338.7)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	2.848	75.15	120.8	26.34	89.73
	(11.04)	(137.9)	(237.5)	(77.97)	(158.4)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	1.370	30.29	48.80	11.09	35.45
	(8.251)	(84.90)	(143.9)	(47.97)	(97.79)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	5.041	171.3	228.1	54.45	200.0
	(17.69)	(234.6)	(340.9)	(113.3)	(254.3)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	6.520	216.1	300.1	69.69	254.3
	(18.95)	(271.9)	(412.6)	(126.8)	(313.7)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	2.894	17.72	39.79	3.371	44.28
	(9.371)	(33.20)	(102.7)	(10.74)	(58.55)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	3.954	23.58	52.10	4.694	56.85
	(10.83)	(39.08)	(134.6)	(12.34)	(70.59)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	4.833	26.94	57.39	5.357	63.83
	(12.03)	(42.06)	(143.9)	(13.05)	(76.22)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	1.939	9.474	17.69	1.986	19.68
	(8.024)	(21.89)	(48.22)	(8.137)	(36.17)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.879	3.562	5.316	0.663	7.064
	(5.814)	(12.61)	(17.56)	(4.888)	(20.14)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.363	7.454	9.726	2.568	7.781
	(2.849)	(19.13)	(20.17)	(11.99)	(13.29)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.297	5.133	6.649	1.845	5.096
	(2.847)	(18.52)	(19.12)	(11.97)	(12.33)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.258	3.982	4.787	1.429	3.602
	(2.844)	(18.25)	(18.50)	(11.86)	(12.02)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.0666	2.320	3.077	0.723	2.685
	(0.223)	(3.228)	(4.731)	(1.461)	(3.515)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.106	3.472	4.938	1.139	4.180
	(0.293)	(4.559)	(7.114)	(2.297)	(5.628)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0.0391	0.238	0.537	0.0434	0.599
	(0.130)	(0.448)	(1.405)	(0.138)	(0.792)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0.0675	0.397	0.874	0.0782	0.924
	(0.196)	(0.681)	(2.321)	(0.219)	(1.208)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0.143	0.798	1.443	0.142	1.670
	(0.581)	(2.193)	(3.778)	(0.523)	(3.423)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.104	0.565	0.908	0.0982	1.073
	(0.573)	(2.133)	(2.693)	(0.513)	(3.242)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.0752	0.408	0.571	0.0633	0.747
	(0.556)	(2.044)	(2.052)	(0.485)	(3.110)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	1.007	0.805	1.442	0.771	0.402
	(1.640)	(1.354)	(1.973)	(1.599)	(1.047)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	319.8	194.6	321.8	187.4	118.2
	(524.5)	(328.0)	(392.5)	(335.0)	(278.2)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2006 to 2010 for the SO2CZ subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO₂ and PM_{2.5} density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D19—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (COUNTY LEVEL, SO2CZ POLICY SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)
SO ₂	0.00105 (0.001750)	
PM _{2.5}		0.0887*** (0.009870)
Hospital Bed	-0.0668*** (0.020100)	-0.0403** (0.020600)
Prim GDP	0.000278** (0.000123)	-0.000173*** (0.000045)
Sec GDP	-2.71e-05* (0.000020)	-0.000199*** (0.000033)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant
Sample Size	1884	2793
Aggregation Level	County	County
Fixed Effect	Year & County	Year & County

Standard Errors in Parenthesis
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

TABLE D20—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (CITY LEVEL, SO2CZ POLICY SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)
SO ₂	0.0051*** (0.000315)		0.00145*** (0.000219)
PM _{2.5}		0.252*** (0.012300)	0.196*** (0.012400)
Doctor	0.263*** (0.104000)	0.254*** (0.068500)	0.128** (0.069200)
Hospital Bed	0.41*** (0.064700)	0.155*** (0.040000)	0.176*** (0.042000)
GDP	-0.000184*** (0.000029)	-0.000294*** (0.000033)	-0.000169*** (0.000029)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant	Multi-pollutant
Sample Size	338	536	338
Aggregation Level	City	City	City
Fixed Effect	Year & City	Year & City	Year & City

Standard Errors in Parenthesis
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

D6. Non-policy Area Subsample

In this subsection we present the summary statistics and the estimation results of our IV-Lasso model from equations 1 and 2 for the subsample outside the aforementioned two policy subsamples. We present the summary statistics of our key variables of interest. Tables D21 and D22 document the mean and standard deviations of our key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 and from 2006 to 2010, respectively for the Non-policy subsample. We document the county-level single-pollutant models in Table D23. We document the city-level single-pollutant and multi-pollutant model results in Table D24. Single-pollutant results are documented in columns (1), (2) while multi-pollutant results are documented in column (3). We observe that both single-pollutant and multi-pollutant results are in the same ballpark as the whole-county results. Single-pollutant results at county level differ by the significance level of the partial effect of $PM_{2.5}$ other results are in the same ballpark as our whole country results. The change in significance level is explained in Section V. Overall, the subsample results aligns with our whole country results which adds robustness to our model specification.

CITY LEVEL AND SINGLE POLLUTANT RESULTS

TABLE D21—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (NON-POLICY SUBSAMPLE)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	43.56 (27.32)	41.95 (26.99)	38.39 (25.03)	35.63 (22.92)	32.78 (20.97)
Pollutant Density					
SO_2 (DU)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.148 (0.199)
$PM_{2.5}$ ($\mu g/m^3$)	45.73 (14.66)	45.53 (15.88)	48.26 (16.31)	47.95 (16.41)	47.59 (16.31)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.235 (4.841)	1.039 (19.05)	0 (0)	0.642 (8.927)	0.777 (6.185)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0 (0)	0.260 (9.536)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.111 (2.354)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0740 (1.922)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.235 (4.841)	0.780 (16.51)	0 (0)	0.642 (8.927)	0.666 (5.733)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.235 (4.841)	1.039 (19.05)	0 (0)	0.642 (8.927)	0.703 (5.888)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.666 (5.733)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.703 (5.888)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.777 (6.185)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.111 (2.354)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0740 (1.922)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.00299 (0.0617)	0.0197 (0.375)	0 (0)	0.00975 (0.138)	0.0130 (0.126)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0 (0)	0.00710 (0.260)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.00480 (0.104)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.00361 (0.0942)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.00299 (0.0617)	0.0126 (0.271)	0 (0)	0.00975 (0.138)	0.00823 (0.0727)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.00299 (0.0617)	0.0197 (0.375)	0 (0)	0.00975 (0.138)	0.00942 (0.0847)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.00823 (0.0727)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.00942 (0.0847)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0130 (0.126)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.00480 (0.104)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.00361 (0.0942)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2001 to 2005 for the Non-policy subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D22—SUMMARY STATS OF KEY VARIABLES (NON-POLICY SUBSAMPLE)—CONT'D

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Under-5 Mortality					
Mortality (per 1000)	30.01 (19.09)	27.96 (18.00)	26.04 (16.95)	24.27 (15.97)	22.74 (15.03)
Pollutant Density					
SO_2 (DU)	0.160 (0.222)	0.190 (0.253)	0.178 (0.219)	0.128 (0.161)	0.128 (0.169)
$PM_{2.5}$ ($\mu g/m^3$)	51.31 (19.35)	52.17 (19.80)	50.69 (17.76)	50.64 (18.48)	49.36 (17.39)
Policy Instruments					
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	8.946 (36.98)	101.4 (192.4)	102.6 (255.0)	44.10 (116.5)	74.40 (209.6)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	2.607 (19.46)	28.79 (86.73)	25.47 (112.1)	12.87 (59.70)	18.40 (73.23)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.960 (11.63)	10.47 (52.89)	8.522 (54.44)	4.304 (36.01)	7.124 (43.54)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	6.339 (31.72)	72.65 (153.6)	77.16 (190.2)	31.23 (97.53)	55.99 (166.2)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	7.986 (35.32)	90.98 (176.3)	94.11 (231.7)	39.80 (110.8)	67.27 (191.1)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0.680 (3.840)	5.320 (15.69)	19.98 (59.54)	0.763 (4.966)	8.029 (27.01)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0.822 (4.077)	6.674 (19.46)	24.33 (72.70)	0.961 (5.621)	9.610 (30.69)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0.928 (4.250)	7.111 (20.69)	26.73 (79.97)	1.034 (5.872)	10.43 (31.84)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.248 (1.790)	1.864 (9.499)	6.765 (26.58)	0.271 (2.664)	2.398 (10.59)
Unweighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.106 (1.178)	0.455 (4.032)	2.397 (12.44)	0.0724 (1.136)	0.817 (5.350)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 100 km)	0.262 (1.791)	2.664 (8.358)	2.705 (14.92)	1.283 (6.614)	1.866 (8.640)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 50 km)	0.174 (1.742)	1.696 (7.804)	1.676 (14.08)	0.854 (6.470)	1.118 (7.483)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (0 to 25 km)	0.129 (1.690)	1.210 (7.632)	1.224 (13.61)	0.623 (6.346)	0.815 (7.292)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (50 to 100 km)	0.0881 (0.445)	0.968 (2.074)	1.029 (2.573)	0.429 (1.385)	0.748 (2.260)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity (25 to 100 km)	0.133 (0.622)	1.454 (2.954)	1.480 (3.925)	0.659 (1.956)	1.050 (3.063)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (50 to 100 km)	0.00930 (0.0552)	0.0713 (0.217)	0.266 (0.793)	0.00989 (0.0638)	0.104 (0.348)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (25 to 100 km)	0.0130 (0.0658)	0.107 (0.343)	0.383 (1.185)	0.0148 (0.0900)	0.146 (0.471)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 100 km)	0.0209 (0.122)	0.156 (0.676)	0.694 (2.871)	0.0256 (0.252)	0.231 (0.882)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 50 km)	0.0116 (0.108)	0.0866 (0.602)	0.428 (2.409)	0.0157 (0.237)	0.127 (0.761)
Weighted Sum of Retired Capacity Under 50 MW (0 to 25 km)	0.00791 (0.103)	0.0501 (0.528)	0.311 (2.227)	0.0109 (0.229)	0.0852 (0.712)
Yearly Desulphurization Capacity (10k ton)	0.0275 (0.269)	0.156 (0.717)	0.239 (0.705)	0.239 (1.022)	0.0844 (0.381)
Sum of Operating Capacity Under Desulphurization	16.73 (119.2)	35.52 (129.7)	80.13 (245.1)	54.63 (196.3)	40.14 (155.2)

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

Note: This table documents the mean and standard deviation of key variables of interest from 2006 to 2010 for the Non-policy subsample at county level. Variables documented are: under-5 mortality (outcome variable), SO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ density (endogenous variable of interest), weighted and unweighted sums of capacities (coal plant phase-out policy instruments), and desulphurization capacities (desulphurization policy instruments).

TABLE D23—POST-LASSO ESTIMATION RESULTS (COUNTY LEVEL SINGLE POLLUTANT, NON-POLICY SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)
SO_2	0.0131*** (0.003820)	
$PM_{2.5}$		0.0779 (0.097300)
Hospital Bed	0.0112*** (0.004570)	0.0065* (0.004590)
Prim GDP	0.000884* (0.000562)	-0.000835** (0.000503)
Sec GDP	-0.000138*** (0.000056)	-0.000207*** (0.000062)
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant
Sample Size	1884	3417
Aggregation Level	County	County
Fixed Effect	Year & County	Year & County

TABLE D24—CITY LEVEL POST-LASSO RESULTS (CITY LEVEL, NON-POLICY SUBSAMPLE)

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)
SO_2	0.00767*** (0.000396)		-0.00101*** (0.000249)
$PM_{2.5}$		0.217*** (0.012700)	0.184*** (0.012000)
Doctor	0.606*** (0.113000)	0.614*** (0.107000)	0.377*** (0.087600)
Hospital Bed	0.634*** (0.072900)	0.275*** (0.073100)	0.262*** -0.0652
GDP	-0.000396*** (0.000048)	-0.000417*** (0.000066)	-0.00025*** -0.0000462
Model	Single-pollutant	Single-pollutant	Multi-pollutant
Sample Size	471	748	471
Aggregation Level	City	City	City
Fixed Effect	Year & City	Year & City	Year & City