

8-30-2021

## A note on the relationship between COVID-19 and stock market return: Evidence from South Asia

Md Arafat Rahman

Md Mohsan Khudri

Muhammad Kamran  
*Edith Cowan University*

Pakeezah Butt  
*Edith Cowan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013>



Part of the [Economics Commons](#), and the [Finance and Financial Management Commons](#)

---

10.1108/IMEFM-03-2021-0124

Rahman, M. A., Khudri, M. M., Kamran, M., & Butt, P. (2021). A note on the relationship between COVID-19 and stock market return: Evidence from South Asia. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMEFM-03-2021-0124>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.  
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013/11145>

This author accepted manuscript is deposited under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC) licence. This means that anyone may distribute, adapt, and build upon the work for non-commercial purposes, subject to full attribution. If you wish to use this manuscript for commercial purposes, please contact [permissions@emerald.com](mailto:permissions@emerald.com)

1       **A note on the relationship between COVID-19 and stock market return: Evidence**  
2       **from South Asia**

3  
4       Md Arafat Rahman<sup>1\*</sup>, Md Mohsan Khudri<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Kamran<sup>3</sup> and Pakeezah Butt<sup>4</sup>

5  
6       **Abstract**

7       The transformation of COVID-19 from a regional health crisis in a Chinese city to a global  
8       pandemic has caused severe damage not only to the natural and economic lives of human  
9       beings but also to the financial markets. The rapidly pervading and daunting consequences of  
10      COVID-19 spread have plummeted the stock markets to their lowest levels in many decades  
11      especially in South Asia. This motivated us to investigate the stock markets' response to the  
12      COVID-19 pandemic in four South Asian countries, namely Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, and  
13      Sri Lanka. To this end, we collected and analyzed the daily data on COVID-19 spread and  
14      stock market return over the period May 28, 2020, to October 01, 2020. Using Dumitrescu and  
15      Hurlin panel Granger non-causality test, our empirical results demonstrate that the COVID-19  
16      spread measured through its daily confirmed cases in a country significantly induces stock  
17      market return. We cross-validated the results using the pairwise Granger causality test and find  
18      the results robust. Our study delineates various policy implications and avenues for future  
19      research.

20  
21      **Keywords:** Causality; COVID-19; Cross-sectional dependence; South Asia; Stock markets.

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Economics, Macquarie Business School, Macquarie University, Australia (Email: arafat.rahman@hdr.mq.edu.au).

<sup>2</sup> Department of Economics, Fogelman College of Business and Economics, The University of Memphis, USA (Email: mkhudri@memphis.edu; mkhudri@isrt.ac.bd)

<sup>3</sup> School of Business and Law, Edith Cowan University, Australia (Email: kamran\_03@hotmail.com)

<sup>4</sup> School of Business and Law, Edith Cowan University, Australia (Email: pakeezahbutt89@hotmail.com)

## 1 **1. Introduction**

2           The novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) has caused economic upheaval by shutting  
3 down businesses, throwing the global supply chains into disarray, and placing millions of  
4 people under lockdown (Remko, 2020). Owing to the enormous scale of its disruptions, it is  
5 being considered a “once-in-a-century” pandemic (Gates, 2020; Horton, 2020). This global  
6 health crisis has caused a shock in both developed (McKee & Stuckler, 2020; Yarovaya,  
7 Elsayed, & Hammoudeh, 2020) and emerging economies (Hevia & Neumeyer, 2020), bringing  
8 economic activities to a standstill (Carlsson-Szlezak, Reeves, & Swartz, 2020; Buheji et al.,  
9 2020). As a result, the global economy is experiencing one of the worst economic shocks in  
10 many decades (World Bank, 2020; (Nicola et al., 2020). Since February 2020, several firms  
11 are involved in divestments due to massive panic and high levels of market volatility resulting  
12 from the virus. Dunford et al. (2020) reported that more than 100 countries had fully or partially  
13 imposed lockdowns by the end of March 2020 by restricting air and intercity travel. Prioritizing  
14 human lives over economic and social activities, all the major cultural, business and  
15 educational events around the world have either been canceled or postponed (Chinazzi et al.,  
16 2020; Hedgecoe et al., 2020). To curb this highly contagious disease and salvage the economic  
17 slowdown, several countries are offering different stimulus measures, including the reduced  
18 interest rate and direct monetary support (Ashraf, 2020).

19           Due to the non-availability of vaccines and targeted therapeutics for COVID-19  
20 treatment to date, this uncertainty and distress in the economic and financial markets are not  
21 expected to end very soon (Wang et al., 2020). Keeping in view the long-term implications of  
22 this pandemic, the Global Economic Prospects report (World Bank, 2020) projected a reduction  
23 by 2.5% and 7% in the per capita income of developing and advanced economies, making it  
24 the worst after 1870. Similarly, a 6.2 percent contraction is expected in the global gross  
25 domestic product per capita (GDPPC) which is more than twice what the world witnessed

1 during the global financial crisis (GFC). This sense of insecurity and volatility in the economic  
2 markets has spilled over to the financial markets as well prompting a synchronized sell-off in  
3 equities and commodities (Zhang, Hu, & Ji, 2020). Stock markets which are the backbone of  
4 the global financial system recorded huge losses and upheaval during this pandemic pushing  
5 investors to look for safe havens (Kinateder, Campbell, & Choudhury, 2021; Hassan et al.,  
6 2021). Such uncertainties in stock markets result in flight-to-safety (Adrian, Crump, & Vogt,  
7 2019; Baubeau et al., 2021) (Baubeau et al., 2021), flight-to-liquidity (Ben-Rephael, 2017;  
8 (Chulia et al., 2021) and flight-to-quality (Cho, Choi, Kim, & Kim, 2016; (Papadamou et al.,  
9 2021) episodes in a bid to safeguard the assets.

10 The rising number of COVID-19 cases around the world and the extreme susceptibility  
11 of stock markets to such externalities (Alber, 2020) motivated many recent researchers to study  
12 how the spread of this pandemic is affecting stock markets' performance. However, the  
13 findings on the response of the stock market to the number of COVID-19 cases are mixed.  
14 Using GARCH (1,1) on a dataset from April 8, 2019, to April 9, 2020, Onali (2020) found that  
15 the number of COVID-19 cases and related deaths in the seven countries majorly hit by this  
16 pandemic do not have a significant impact on the US stock market returns except for China.  
17 However, for some countries, the relationship turns either positive or negative when  
18 conditional heteroscedasticity and VAR models are employed. Similarly, based on a period  
19 from March 10 to April 30, 2020, Topcu and Gulal (2020) evidenced that COVID-19 spread  
20 initially had a negative impact on emerging stock markets in both Asia and Europe. But this  
21 negative relationship gradually started to fell and taper off by mid-April.

22 However, the majority of the studies on the stock markets' response to COVID-19  
23 concluded an adverse effect on stocks' returns. For example, Baker et al. (2020) stated that the  
24 stock market during COVID-19 experienced higher volatility than the period of any other  
25 recent infectious disease, including the Spanish flu of 1918. Zhang et al. (2020) also confirmed

1 the substantial rise in the volatility of ten stock markets in February 2020 due to COVID-19.  
2 Al-Awadhi et al. (2020) investigated the early impact of COVID-19 on share prices using the  
3 firm-level data from China and found that overall share prices ratcheted down due to the  
4 unfavorable economic outcomes of the disease. Using the daily data of 64 countries, Ashraf  
5 (2020) showed that the stock market returns declined as the number of new cases increased.  
6 Some other researchers (see e.g., Heyden & Heyden, 2021; Liu, Manzoor, Wang, Zhang, &  
7 Manzoor, 2020; (Pandey & Kumari, 2021) also confirmed the catastrophic impact of COVID-  
8 19 on stock markets using the event study approach. Alfaro, Chari, Greenland, and Schott  
9 (2020) concluded the same results on the relationship between the real-time changes in  
10 COVID-19 infection projections and US stock performance. While studying the implications  
11 of COVID-19 on the stock markets of China, Japan, Spain, Italy, Germany, South Korea,  
12 France, and the United States of America, He, Liu, Wang, and Yu (2020) argued that it had a  
13 negative impact on the stock markets although for short-term only.

14 On the other hand, Brueckner and Vespiganani (2020) showed that COVID-19  
15 infections in Australia and the USA have positively affected their respective stock markets'  
16 performance. Ramelli and Wagner (2020) observed that the US stock market recorded three of  
17 its worst performance from March 9 to March 16 this year. But it also observed one of its top  
18 10 upsurges during the same period as well. Similarly, He, Sun, Zhang, and Li (2020) while  
19 studying the impact of COVID-19 on Chinese stock markets found that it negatively affected  
20 stock prices on the Shanghai Stock Exchange, whereas its impact on stock returns listed on  
21 Shenzhen Stock Exchange was positive.

22 Keeping in view the indecisive results of previous studies, studying the stock markets'  
23 response to the COVID-19 pandemic in South Asia is justified for various reasons. Though a  
24 good number of studies are available which examined the impact of COVID-19 on stock  
25 market performance or return, their findings are mostly contradictory and inconclusive.

1 Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, there is a dearth of empirical evidence on the causal  
2 relationship between the number of COVID-19 cases and stock market returns in a panel  
3 setting. Only Wang and Enilov (2020) found evidence of unidirectional causality from the  
4 number of COVID-19 cases to stock market returns in the largest advanced economies of the  
5 world. They used the data of G7 countries covering the period from February 17, 2020, to April  
6 9, 2020, in their study.

7 Contrary to their study on G7, countries in South Asia are emerging economies that are  
8 facing additional challenges to combat COVID-19 due to their dense population, low  
9 surveillance system, highly fragile health systems, constrained financial resources, poor  
10 infrastructure and limited fiscal scope (Chalise, 2020; Sharma, Talan, Srivastava, Yadav, &  
11 Chopra, 2020). Therefore, these countries are expected to have a lingering impact of the virus  
12 on stock markets and investors' sentiment. Based on the event study approach, Harjoto, Rossi,  
13 and Paglia (2020) also confirmed that the WHO announcement on March 11 2020 that caused  
14 a negative shock to the global stock markets was more intense for emerging markets. Even  
15 among the emerging economies, the adverse effect was particularly evident in south Asian  
16 stock markets (Topcu & Gulal, 2020) where it generated comparatively higher negative  
17 abnormal returns (Liu et al., 2020). Hence, by examining the unexplored causal relationship  
18 between the number of COVID-19 cases and stock market returns in four south Asian countries  
19 i.e., Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka, our study fills a significant research gap in the  
20 literature. Using Dumitrescu and Hurlin panel Granger non-causality test, our empirical results  
21 demonstrate that COVID-19 spread significantly affects the stock market returns.

22 This study has two significant contributions to the growing literature on stock markets'  
23 response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Firstly, it adds to the existing literature on the impact of  
24 non-economic variables such as natural disaster, environment, and sports on financial markets  
25 by considering the effect of infectious disease (see e.g., Gangopadhyay et al., 2010; Hirshleifer

1 and Shumway, 2003; Lepori, 2016; Kowalewski and Śpiewanowski, 2020; Kaplanski and  
2 Levy, 2010; Edmans et al., 2007). Secondly, it adds to the emerging literature on stock markets'  
3 response to COVID-19 for South Asian countries' perspective by adopting the novel approach  
4 of panel causality test with a larger sample size (see, for example, Ashraf, 2020; Al-Awadhi et  
5 al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Baker et al., 2020).

6 We organize the remaining sections of the paper as follows. Section 2 describes the  
7 data briefly and the econometric techniques used in analyzing the data. Section 3 discusses  
8 results in the light of objectives. Finally, section 4 provides the concluding remarks with policy  
9 implications.

## 10 **2. Data and Methodology**

### 11 **2.1 Data**

12 We collect the number of daily confirmed COVID-19 cases from Worldometer (2020)  
13 and the daily stock market index value from DataStream. We consider four south Asian stock  
14 markets for this study, namely, Dhaka Stock Exchange (DSE), Bombay Stock Exchange  
15 (BSE), Pakistan Stock Exchange (PSX), and Colombo Stock Exchange (CSE). The sample  
16 period covers from May 28, 2020, to October 01, 2020. Next, we compute the daily nominal  
17 percentage stock market returns ( $r$ ) as follows.

$$18 \quad r_t = 100 * \ln \left( \frac{i_t}{i_{t-1}} \right) \quad (1)$$

19 where  $r_t$  represents the return on day  $t$ ,  $i_t$  and  $i_{t-1}$  indicate the market index on day  $t$  and  $t-1$ ,  
20 respectively.

21 [Insert Figure 1]

22 Figure 1 shows the dynamic spread of COVID-19 in Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, and  
23 Sri Lanka. India has ranked second in the number of confirmed COVID-19 cases globally as  
24 of November 6, 2020 (Worldometer, 2020). With over 1.3 billion people, India is the largest



1 and most populated country in the South Asia region, followed by 221 million people in  
2 Pakistan, 165 million in Bangladesh, and 21.67 million in Sri Lanka. This may be one of the  
3 reasons behind high COVID-19 cases experienced by India compared to the other three  
4 sampled countries, as depicted in Figure 1. Figure 2 shows the dynamics of the stock returns  
5 in Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. As can be seen, from the graph, that the volatility  
6 of stock returns for India is higher than that of any other sampled country. The return fluctuates  
7 between + 9% and -5.8% within our sample period. Besides, we notice that the stock return for  
8 Bangladesh remains more volatile at the onset of August 2020 in comparison with other  
9 periods. A potential reason could be seen from Figure 1 that the number of COVID-19 cases  
10 significantly increased in August 2020, following a more considerable drop before August.

11 [Insert Figure 2]

## 12 **2.2 Methodology**

13 We employ panel data analysis to determine the causal impact of COVID-19 cases on  
14 the stock market. We consider the stock market returns as a dependent variable and the number  
15 of confirmed COVID-19 cases as an independent variable and vice versa in causality analysis.

### 16 ***2.2.1 Cross-sectional dependence***

17 Before running the unit root test, we scrutinize the presence of dependence among the  
18 cross-sectional units in our data. The cross-sectional dependence among cross-sectional units  
19 indicates that a shock that originated from one cross-section may spill over the other cross-  
20 sections. To be more specific, we assume that the number of COVID-19 cases in one country  
21 may have a spillover effect on another country. We also make the same assumption for returns.  
22 Hence, we perform three cross-sectional dependence tests as a diagnostic check prior to  
23 performing panel data analysis. We utilize the Breusch and Pagan LM ( $BP_{LM}$  hereafter) test  
24 proposed by Breusch & Pagan (1980), Pesaran scaled LM ( $PS_{LM}$  hereafter) test and the Pesaran  
25 CD ( $P_{CD}$  hereafter) test introduced by Pesaran (2004) for examining the presence of cross-

1 sectional dependence in the data. One of the major limitations of the  $BP_{LM}$  test is that the test  
2 performs well only when there are relatively a small number of cross-sectional dimensions and  
3 fairly a large number of time dimensions. The  $PS_{LM}$  test can take care of this downside.  
4 Nevertheless, it cannot successfully deal with the situation when the time dimension is well.  
5 The  $P_{CD}$  test can overcome the limitations of the former two tests. All three tests consider the  
6 null hypothesis of no cross-sectional dependence, i.e.,  $H_0: Cov(\epsilon_{it}, \epsilon_{kt}) = 0$  for all  $t$  &  $i \neq k$   
7 against the alternative of cross-sectional dependence, i.e.,  $H_1: Cov(\epsilon_{it}, \epsilon_{kt}) \neq 0$  for at least  
8 one pair of  $i \neq k$  where  $\epsilon_{it}$  is an independent and identically distributed error term. See Tugcu  
9 and Tiwari (2016) for more details of these tests.

## 10 **2.2.2 Panel unit root test**

11 Two generations of tests are available in the literature within the panel unit root-testing  
12 framework. The first-generation panel unit root tests assume the cross-sectional independence  
13 among the cross-section units, whereas the second-generation tests allow for cross-sectional  
14 dependence.

### 15 **2.2.2.1 First generation panel unit root test**

16 We start with the first-generation panel unit root tests to determine if the corresponding  
17 series has a unit root. Three-panel unit root tests, namely Levin–Lin–Chu (LLC hereafter) test  
18 introduced by Levin, Lin, & Chu (2002), Im–Pesaran–Shin (IPS hereafter) test introduced by  
19 Im, Pesaran, & Shin (2003), and Phillips Perron -Fisher (PP-Fisher hereafter) test proposed by  
20 Maddala & Wu (1999) are employed to find out the order of integration for each variable. The  
21 LLC test investigates the model where lagged dependent variable is homogeneous across all  
22 panel units. In contrast, the IPS test includes heterogeneous adjustment processes and pools the  
23  $t$ -statistics from univariate independent ADF regression. They relax the restricted assumption  
24 of the first-order autoregressive coefficient across the region, which is constant in the LLC test  
25 and suggests that it varies across the countries.

### 1 **2.2.2.2 Second generation panel unit root test**

2 In the presence of cross-sectional dependence in panel data, the first-generation unit  
3 root tests results may not be robust. The second-generation panel unit root tests should be used  
4 instead (Tugcu, 2018). The second-generation tests consider the heterogeneity assumption and  
5 attempt to overcome the limitation of cross-sectional dependence faced by the first-generation  
6 tests. In accordance with the second-generation test, the series does not contain a standard  
7 autoregressive structure, and the panels are heterogeneous. In this paper, we perform two  
8 second-generation tests, such as Pesaran's cross-sectional augmented Dickey-Fuller (CADF)  
9 test and Pesaran's cross-sectional augmented IPS (CIPS) test (See Pesaran (2007) for details).

### 10 **2.2.3 Dumitrescu–Hurlin non-causality test**

11 We assess the causality between the stock market returns ( $r$ ) and the number of COVID-  
12 19 confirmed cases using a panel Granger non-causality test (hereafter DH) introduced by  
13 Dumitrescu and Hurlin (2012). The DH test provides consistent results in the presence of cross-  
14 sectional dependence and heterogeneity, unlike the traditional Granger causality test. The DH  
15 linear model is written as follows:

$$16 \quad r_{i,t} = \varphi_i + \sum_{j=1}^J \tau_i^j r_{i,t-j} + \sum_{j=1}^J \gamma_i^j x_{i,t-j} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N; t = 1, 2, \dots, T \quad (2)$$

17 where,  $r_{i,t}$  and  $x_{i,t}$  denote returns and the number of COVID-19 cases, respectively,  
18 for the cross-section dimensions (country in this study) over the time dimensions  $t$ ;  $J$  represents  
19 the optimal lag length;  $\varphi_i$  denotes the individual intercepts;  $\tau_i^j$  and  $\gamma_i^j$  are the lag and slope  
20 coefficients, respectively;  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  is the error term. The DH test's null hypothesis states that there  
21 is no causal relationship for any of the cross-section units, whereas the alternative hypothesis  
22 posits those causal relationships exist for at least one country.

#### 1 **2.2.4 Robustness checking: Pairwise panel Granger causality test**

2 This study implements another panel data analysis technique known as the pairwise  
3 panel Granger causality test to examine the robustness of the results further. This technique is  
4 widely used for checking the causality between the variables (see, for example, Jebli, Youssef,  
5 & Ozturk, 2014; Saud, Chen, & Haseeb, 2020). The bivariate model of the form:

$$6 \quad r_{i,t} = \alpha_i + \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{i,k} r_{i,t-k} + \sum_{k=1}^K \gamma_{i,k} x_{i,t-k} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (3)$$

7 where  $r_{i,t}$  and  $x_{i,t}$  denote returns and the number of COVID-19 cases for country  $i$  in  
8 period  $t$ . The pairwise panel Granger causality test null hypothesis states that there is no causal  
9 relationship for all the cross-section units in the panel.

### 10 **3. Empirical results**

11 This section begins with the summary statistics of the variables. Table 1 displays the  
12 summary statistics of stock market return and COVID-19 cases. The mean value of stock  
13 market returns is 0.256, which indicates that, on average, the sample countries experience a  
14 25.67 percent gain in stock market returns during the study period. India's stock has the highest  
15 return (34.9%), followed by Bangladesh (24.4%). From the standard deviation of returns, we  
16 observe that India is more volatile relative to other South Asian countries considered in this  
17 study. The more volatile the market, the higher the risk. Therefore, this is consistent with the  
18 philosophy of higher risk, higher return.

19 [Insert Table 1]

20 The returns are negatively skewed for Pakistan and Sri Lanka but positively skewed for  
21 India and Bangladesh. The stock return series of India appears symmetric and follows  
22 approximately normal distribution taking its skewness and kurtosis into account. The average  
23 daily cases in COVID-19 confirm that India has a higher number of confirmed cases followed  
24 by Bangladesh. In contrast, Sri Lanka has the lowest average daily cases that are about 15 cases.

1 It is one of the countries in the world that has successfully managed the coronavirus pandemic.  
2 The distributions of the number of confirmed cases look symmetric to some extent for all  
3 countries other than Sri Lanka. The cases for Sri Lanka are positively skewed and leptokurtic,  
4 i.e., more peaked with fatter tails, which strongly suggests that the series deviates from the  
5 normal distribution.

6 Table 2 reports the findings of cross-sectional dependence tests. As can be seen, we do  
7 not find evidence of cross-sectional dependence in stock market return ( $r$ ) at the 5%  
8 significance level, implying that the cross-sectional dependence across countries does not exist  
9 in the return series. On the other hand, all the results suggest the presence of cross-sectional  
10 dependence across countries in the series of COVID-19 cases at the 1% significance level. This  
11 finding leads to the evidence of the possible spillover effect of COVID-19 cases in one country  
12 on another country in the sample.

13 [Insert Table 2]

14 Table 2 reports the stationary property of returns and cases using the first-generation  
15 LLC, IPS, and PP-Fishers unit root tests. All three tests consider the null hypothesis of a unit  
16 root against the alternative of no unit root.

17 [Insert Table 3]

18 Results from all three tests reported in Table 3 show that both returns and COVID-19  
19 cases are integrated of order zero, i.e., stationary, suggesting the rejection of the null hypothesis  
20 at a 5% level of significance. This finding is consistent across the models with or without  
21 trends.

22 Table 4 presents results from the second-generation CADF and CIPS Unit Root Test. The null  
23 hypothesis that all panels contain unit roots is rejected at the 1% significance level. Being  
24 consistent with LLC, IPS, and PP-Fishers unit root tests, both returns and COVID-19 are found  
25 integrated of order zero ( $I(0)$ ) from CADF and CIPS test.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

[Insert Table 4]

Next, we run the Dumitrescu and Hurlin (2012) panel causality test that takes care of cross-sectional dependence in the analysis. The Dumitrescu and Hurlin (2012) panel non-causality test results reported in table 5 suggest that COVID-19 causes stock market returns, but not vice-versa. This finding leads to the evidence of a unidirectional causal link running from COVID-19 to stock market returns in the selected countries. This implies that COVID-19 happens to drive the financial markets in our sampled countries.

[Insert Table 5]

We apply the pairwise Granger causality test to check the robustness of our results. Results shown in table 6 demonstrate that COVID-19 does Granger cause  $r$  at a 1% significance level, while  $r$  does not Granger cause COVID-19 at all conventional significance levels, i.e., 1% and 5%. Results based on the Granger causality test again vouch that COVID-19 causes stock market return, but not vice-versa. These findings suggest that COVID-19 has an impact on the financial markets in the selected countries. Those findings are consistent with Wang and Enilov (2020), who find that COVID-19 cases significantly influence the stock returns for Group of Seven (G7) countries. Overall, our results are consistent irrespective of the techniques used. Therefore, we can conclude that the obtained results are robust.

[Insert Table 6]

#### 4. Conclusions and policy implications

We are in the midst of one of the most dreadful pandemics in history, COVID-19, which has plummeted the global economy and financial markets worldwide (Ramelli & Wagner, 2020). Its spread has posed an unprecedented risk to human lives and financial markets (Goodell, 2020), especially in south Asian countries with limited medical facilities and various financial constraints (Asian Development Bank, 2020; Sharma et al., 2020). To ensure the

1 stability of stock markets and safeguard the investors in South Asia, studying the stock markets’  
2 response to this pandemic is the need of the hour.

3 In response to the inconclusive findings and increasing uncertainty regarding the  
4 possible effect of COVID-19 on the stock market return, this study investigates the causal  
5 impact of the number of confirmed COVID-19 cases on stock market returns in four South  
6 Asian countries, namely Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. To this end, we used daily  
7 COVID-19 confirmed cases between May 28, 2020, and October 01, 2020. The empirical  
8 results suggest unidirectional causality from COVID-19 to stock market returns, indicating that  
9 the spread of COVID-19 has a dominant short-term influence on the stock movements. To the  
10 best of our knowledge, this study provides the first empirical insights into the impact of  
11 COVID-19 on the stock markets of selected South Asian countries taking the cross-sectional  
12 dependence into account. Our results are also in line with the findings of other existing  
13 literature on COVID-19. Moreover, the results are robust across the two tests used in this study.

14 During this unprecedented time of high uncertainty, our findings would be instructive  
15 for policymakers to deal with the financial challenges and adopt appropriate financial stability  
16 measures. Our findings demand rigorous, well-informed, and effective actions at the national  
17 level to avoid negative outcomes and propagations of the COVID-19 shock on stock market  
18 returns. Targeted stimulus packages from the governments for the deprived corporate sector  
19 (Harjoto et al., 2020) and appropriate adjustments in monetary policies by the central banks  
20 (Heyden & Heyden, 2021) can be employed to calm the stock markets. Other initiatives such  
21 as testing and quarantining policies, income support packages and public awareness programs  
22 can be very effective in sustaining and reviving the stock markets (Ashraf, 2020). Our findings  
23 are equally insightful to the fund managers and investors in South Asian countries. Taking into  
24 account the possible impact of COVID-19 on stock markets’ returns, investors can design their  
25 optimal portfolios more effectively (Kelly, 2020).

1           This study has another important implication in the sense that the impact of COVID-19  
2 on the stock markets of South Asian countries may have spillover effects on other developing  
3 or even developed countries as confirmed by others (Gunay, 2020; LE & TRAN, 2021; Okorie  
4 & Lin, 2021). Hence, our findings can also be generalized to other countries with caution, but  
5 this could also be a potential research question for future researchers to answer. Another area  
6 to explore could be the search for safe havens in South Asian countries that can help investors  
7 in safeguarding their investments from any future pandemic or financial turmoil.



1 **Reference**

- 2 Adrian, T., Crump, R. K., & Vogt, E. (2019). Nonlinearity and Flight-to-Safety in the Risk-  
3 Return Trade-Off for Stocks and Bonds. *The Journal of Finance*, 74(4), 1931-1973.  
4 doi:10.1111/jofi.12776
- 5 Al-Awadhi, A.M., Al-Saifi, K., Al-Awadhi, A., & Alhamadi, S. (2020). Death and contagious  
6 infectious diseases: impact of the COVID-19 virus on stock market returns. *Journal of*  
7 *Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 27, 100326.
- 8 Alber, N. (2020). The effect of coronavirus spread on stock markets: The case of the worst 6  
9 countries. Available at SSRN 3578080. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3578080>
- 10 Alfaro, L., Chari, A., Greenland, A. N., & Schott, P. K. (2020). *Aggregate and firm-level*  
11 *stock returns during pandemics, in real time (0898-2937)*. Retrieved from  
12 <https://www.nber.org/papers/w26950>
- 13 Ashraf, B. N. (2020). Economic impact of government interventions during the COVID-19  
14 pandemic: International evidence from financial markets. *Journal of Behavioral and*  
15 *Experimental Finance*, 27, 100371. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2020.100371>
- 16 Ashraf, B. N. (2020). Stock markets' reaction to COVID-19: cases or fatalities? *Research in*  
17 *International Business and Finance*, 5(4), 101-249.
- 18 Asian Development Bank. (2020). Accelerating Financial Inclusion in South-East Asia with  
19 Digital Finance.
- 20 Baker, S. R., Bloom, N., Davis, S.J., Kost, K., Sammon, M., & Viratyosin, T. (2020). The  
21 unprecedented stock market reaction to COVID-19. Covid Economics: Vetted and  
22 Real-Time Papers1. *The Review of Asset Pricing Studies*, 0, 1-17.  
23 <https://doi.org/10.1093/rapstu/raaa008>.

- 1 Baubeau, P., Monnet, E., Riva, A., & Ungaro, S. (2021). Flight-to-safety and the credit crunch:  
2 a new history of the banking crises in France during the Great Depression. *The*  
3 *Economic History Review*, 74(1), 223-250.
- 4 Ben-Rephael, A. (2017). Flight-to-liquidity, market uncertainty, and the actions of mutual  
5 fund investors. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 31, 30-44.  
6 doi:10.1016/j.jfi.2017.05.002
- 7 Breusch, T. S., & Pagan, A. R. (1980). The Lagrange multiplier test and its applications to  
8 model specification in econometrics. *Review of Economic Studies*, 47(1), 239-53.
- 9 Brueckner, M., & Vespignani, J. (2020). Covid-19 Infections and the Performance of the Stock  
10 Market: An Empirical Analysis for Australia, ANU Working Papers in Economics and  
11 Econometrics 2020-674, Australian National University, College of Business and  
12 Economics, School of Economics.
- 13 Buheji, M., da Costa Cunha, K., Beka, G., Mavric, B., De Souza, Y., da Costa Silva, S. S.,  
14 Hanafi, M., & Yein, T. C. (2020). The extent of covid-19 pandemic socio-economic  
15 impact on global poverty. a global integrative multidisciplinary review. *American*  
16 *Journal of Economics*, 10(4), 213-224.
- 17 Carlsson-Szlezak, P., Reeves, M., & Swartz, P. (2020). What coronavirus could mean for the  
18 global economy. *Harvard Business Review*, 3, 1-10.
- 19 Chalise, H. N. (2020). South Asia is more vulnerable to COVID-19 pandemic. *Arch*  
20 *Psychiatr Ment Health*, 4, 046-047.
- 21 Chinazzi, M., Davis, J. T., Ajelli, M., Gioannini, C., Litvinova, M., Merler, S., & Sun, K.  
22 (2020). The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus  
23 (COVID-19) outbreak. *Science*, 368(6489), 395-400.

- 1 Cho, J.-W., Choi, J. H., Kim, T., & Kim, W. (2016). Flight-to-quality and correlation  
2 between currency and stock returns. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 62, 191-212.
- 3 Chulia, H., Koser, C., & Uribe, J. M. (2021). Analyzing the Nonlinear Pricing of Liquidity  
4 Risk according to the Market State. *Finance Research Letters*, 38, 101515.
- 5 Dunford, D., Dale, Stylianou, N., Lowther, E. D., Ahmed, M., & Irene, D. L. T. A. (2020).  
6 Coronavirus: The world in lockdown in maps and charts. BBC News.  
7 <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-52103747>
- 8 Dumitrescu, E.I., & Hurlin, C. (2012). *Testing for Granger non-causality in heterogeneous*  
9 *panels. Economic Modelling*, 29(4), 1450-60.
- 10 Edmans, A., García, D., & Norli, Ø. (2007). Sports sentiment and stock returns. *Journal of*  
11 *Finance*, 62(4), 1967-98.
- 12 Gangopadhyay, P., Haley, J. D., & Zhang, L. (2010). An examination of share price behavior  
13 surrounding the 2005 hurricanes Katrina and Rita. *Journal of Insurance Issues*, 33(2),  
14 132-51.
- 15 Gates, B. (2020). Responding to Covid-19 — A Once-in-a-Century Pandemic? *The New*  
16 *England Journal of Medicine*, 382(18), 1677-1679. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2003762
- 17 Goodell, J. W. (2020). COVID-19 and finance: agendas for future research. *Finance Research*  
18 *Letters*, 35, 101512.
- 19 Gunay, S. (2020). A new form of financial contagion: Covid-19 and stock market responses.  
20 Available at SSRN 3584243.
- 21 Hadri, K. (2000). Testing for stationarity in heterogeneous panel data. *The Econometrics*  
22 *Journal*, 3(2), 148-161. Retrieved July 6, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23114886>
- 23

- 1 Harjoto, M. A., Rossi, F., & Paglia, J. K. (2020). COVID-19: Stock market reactions to the  
2 shock and the stimulus. *Applied Economics Letters*, 1-7.
- 3 Hassan, M. K., Djajadikerta, H. G., Choudhury, T., & Kamran, M. (2021). Safe havens in  
4 Islamic financial markets: COVID-19 versus GFC. *Global Finance Journal*, 100643.  
5 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfj.2021.100643>
- 6 He, Liu, J., Wang, S., & Yu, J. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on stock markets.  
7 *Economic and Political Studies*, 8(3), 275-288.
- 8 He, Sun, Y., Zhang, Y., & Li, T. (2020). COVID-19's impact on stock prices across  
9 different sectors—An event study based on the Chinese stock market. *Emerging*  
10 *Markets Finance and Trade*, 56(10), 2198-2212.
- 11 Hedgecoe, G., Lowen, M., Williamson, L., Hill, J., Holligan, A., Thorpe, N., & Bateman, T.  
12 (2020). Coronavirus Capital by Capital: How are Europeans Coping with Shutdown.  
13 BBC News.
- 14 Hevia, C., & Neumeyer, P. A. (2020). \*A perfect storm: COVID-19 in emerging economies.  
15 *COVID-19 in Developing Economies*, 25.
- 16 Heyden, K. J., & Heyden, T. (2021). Market reactions to the arrival and containment of  
17 COVID-19: an event study. *Finance Research Letters*, 38, 101745.
- 18 Hirshleifer, D., & Shumway, T. (2003). Good day sunshine: stock returns and the weather.  
19 *Journal of Finance*, 58(3), 1009-32.
- 20 Horton, R. (2020). Offline: A global health crisis? No, something far worse. *Lancet (London,*  
21 *England)*, 395(10234), 1410.
- 22 Im, K. S., Pesaran, M. H., & Shin, Y. (2003). Testing for unit roots in heterogeneous panels.  
23 *Journal of Econometrics*, 115(1), 53-74.

- 1 Jebli, M. B., Youssef S. B., & Ozturk, I. (2015). The role of renewable energy consumption  
2 and trade: environmental Kuznets curve analysis for Sub-Saharan Africa countries.  
3 *African Development Review*, 27(3), 288-300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8268.12147>
- 4 Kaplanski, G., & Levy, H. (2010). Sentiment and stock prices: The case of aviation disasters.  
5 *Journal of Financial Economics*, 95(2), 174-201.
- 6 Kelly, D. (2020). The investment implications of COVID-19: An update. Retrieved from  
7 [https://am.jpmorgan.com/au/en/asset-management/adv/insights/market-](https://am.jpmorgan.com/au/en/asset-management/adv/insights/market-insights/market-bulletins/the-investment-implications-of-covid-19/)  
8 [insights/market-bulletins/the-investment-implications-of-covid-19/](https://am.jpmorgan.com/au/en/asset-management/adv/insights/market-bulletins/the-investment-implications-of-covid-19/)
- 9 Kinateder, H., Campbell, R., & Choudhury, T. (2021). Safe haven in GFC versus COVID-  
10 19: 100 turbulent days in the financial markets. *Finance Research Letters*, 101951.
- 11 Kowalewski, O., & Śpiewanowski, P. (2020). Stock market response to potash mine disasters.  
12 *Journal of Commodity Markets* 100124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomm.2020.100124>
- 13 Le, T. P. T. D., & Tran, H. L. M. (2021). The Contagion Effect from US Stock Market to the  
14 Vietnamese and the Philippine Stock Markets: The Evidence of DCC-GARCH Model.  
15 *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics, and Business*, 8(2), 759-770.
- 16 Lepori, G. M. (2016). Air pollution and stock returns: evidence from a natural experiment.  
17 *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 35, 25-42.
- 18 Levin, A., Lin, C. F., & Chu, C. S. J. (2002). Unit root tests in panel data: asymptotic and finite  
19 sample properties. *Journal of Econometrics*, 108(1), 1-24.
- 20 Liu, H., Manzoor, A., Wang, C., Zhang, L., & Manzoor, Z. (2020). The COVID-19 outbreak  
21 and affected countries stock markets response. *International Journal of*  
22 *Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(8), 2800.
- 23 Maddala, G. S., & Wu, S. (1999). A comparative study of unit root tests with panel data and a  
24 new simple test. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 61(S1), 631-52.

- 1 McKee, M., & Stuckler, D. (2020). If the world fails to protect the economy, COVID-19 will  
2 damage health not just now but also in the future. *Nature Medicine*, 26(5), 640-642.  
3 doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0863-y
- 4 Nicola, M., Alsafi, Z., Sohrabi, C., Kerwan, A., Al-Jabir, A., Iosifidis, C., Agha, M., & Agha,  
5 R. (2020). The socio-economic implications of the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-  
6 19): A review. *International Journal of Surgery*, 78, 185-193.  
7 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijssu.2020.04.018>
- 8 Okorie, D. I., & Lin, B. (2021). Stock markets and the COVID-19 fractal contagion effects.  
9 *Finance Research Letters*, 38, 101640.  
10 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2020.101640>
- 11 Onali, E. (2020). Covid-19 and stock market volatility. Available at SSRN 3571453.
- 12 Pandey, D. K., & Kumari, V. (2021). Event study on the reaction of the developed and  
13 emerging stock markets to the 2019-nCoV outbreak. *International Review of*  
14 *Economics & Finance*, 71, 467-483.  
15 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2020.09.014>
- 16 Papadamou, S., Fassas, A. P., Kenourgios, D., & Dimitriou, D. (2021). Flight-to-quality  
17 between global stock and bond markets in the COVID era. *Finance Research Letters*,  
18 38, 101852.
- 19 Pesaran, M. H. (2004). General diagnostic tests for cross-sectional dependence in  
20 panels. *Empirical Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-020-01875-7>
- 21 Pesaran, M. H. (2007). A simple panel unit root test in the presence of cross-section  
22 dependence. *Journal of applied econometrics*, 22(2), 265-312.
- 23 Ramelli, S., & Wagner, A. F. Feverish Stock Price Reactions to COVID-19. June 16, 2020.  
24 Forthcoming, Review of Corporate Finance Studies, Swiss Finance Institute Research

1 Paper No. 20-12, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3550274> or  
2 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3550274>

3 Remko, V. H. (2020). Research opportunities for a more resilient post-COVID-19 supply  
4 chain—closing the gap between research findings and industry practice. *International*  
5 *Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 40(4), 341-355.

6 Saud, S., Chen, S., & Haseeb, A. (2020). The role of financial development and globalization  
7 in the environment: Accounting ecological footprint indicators for selected one-belt-  
8 one-road initiative countries. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 250, 119518.

9 Sharma, G. D., Talan, G., Srivastava, M., Yadav, A., & Chopra, R. (2020). A qualitative  
10 enquiry into strategic and operational responses to Covid-19 challenges in South  
11 Asia. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 20(4), e2195.

12 Topcu, M., & Gulal, O. S. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on emerging stock markets.  
13 *Finance Research Letters*, 36, 101691.

14 Tugcu, C. T., & Tiwari, A. K. (2016). Does renewable and/or non-renewable energy  
15 consumption matter for total factor productivity (TFP) growth? Evidence from the  
16 BRICS. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 65, 610-16.  
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.07.016>

18 Tugcu, C. T. (2018). *Panel Data Analysis in the Energy-Growth Nexus (EGN). The Economics*  
19 *and Econometrics of the Energy-Growth Nexus*, 255–  
20 271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812746-9.00008-0>

21 Wang, C., Li, W., Drabek, D., & Okba, N. M. A., et al. (2020). A human monoclonal antibody  
22 blocking SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature Communications*, 11, 2251.

23 Wang, W., & Enilov, M. (2020). The global impact of COVID-19 on financial markets.  
24 Retrieved from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3588021>

1 World Bank, G. (2020). Global economic prospects. June 2020 [1 online resource :  
2 illustrations (chiefly color)]. Retrieved from  
3 [http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/502991591631723294/Global-Economic-](http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/502991591631723294/Global-Economic-Prospects-June-2020)  
4 [Prospects-June-2020](http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/502991591631723294/Global-Economic-Prospects-June-2020)

5 Worldometer. Age, sex, existing conditions of covid-19 cases and deaths.  
6 (2020). <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/coronavirus-age-sex-demographics/>

7 Yarovaya, L., Elsayed, A. H., & Hammoudeh, S. M. (2020). Searching for Safe Havens  
8 during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Determinants of Spillovers between Islamic and  
9 Conventional Financial Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.  
10 [doi:10.2139/ssrn.3634114](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3634114)

11 Zhang, D., Hu, M., & Ji, Q. (2020). Financial markets under the global pandemic of COVID-  
12 19. *Finance Research Letters*, 36, 101528.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



1 **Table 1.** Summary statistics

Countries	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Jarque- Bera
Stock market returns						
Bangladesh	0.244	0.105	0.830	1.512	8.641	153.641
India	0.349	0.071	2.586	0.608	3.999	9.293
Pakistan	0.209	0.194	0.800	-0.670	3.774	8.990
Sri Lanka	0.225	0.137	0.718	-0.198	5.649	26.921
COVID-19 cases						
Bangladesh	2673.867	2756.500	720.341	-0.131	2.203	2.635
India	49031.110	50130.500	29356.130	0.060	1.607	7.323
Pakistan	1951.067	919.500	1760.707	0.847	2.321	12.496
Sri Lanka	15.011	8.500	33.092	7.291	62.627	14130.380

2 *Note: The Jarque–Bera statistic tests for the null hypothesis of normality in the distribution of sample returns and*  
3 *COVID-19 cases.*

5 **Table 2.** Cross-sectional dependence tests

Test	Return ( <i>r</i> )	COVID-19 cases
<b>BP<sub>LM</sub></b>	10.239	165.641***
<b>PS<sub>LM</sub></b>	1.223	46.084***
<b>P<sub>CD</sub></b>	0.841	-04.129***

6 *Note: The null hypothesis states that there is no cross-sectional dependence in the panel data. \*\*\* indicates*  
7 *significance at the 1% level. BP<sub>LM</sub>: Breusch and Pagan LM test, PS<sub>LM</sub>: Pesaran scaled LM test,*  
8 *P<sub>CD</sub>: Pesaran CD test.*

9 **Table 3.** Unit root test results

Test		Return ( <i>r</i> )	COVID-19 cases
LLC	Constant	I(0)	I(0)
	Constant & Trend	I(0)	I(0)
IPS	Constant	I(0)	I(0)
	Constant & Trend	I(0)	I(0)
PP-Fisher	Constant	I(0)	I(0)
	Constant & Trend	I(0)	I(0)

10 *Note: The results are reported at a 5% level of significance<sup>5</sup>. LLC: Levin–Lin–Chu panel root test, IPS: Im-*  
11 *Pesaran–Shin test, PP-Fisher: Phillips Perron -Fisher test*

12

<sup>5</sup> We use Newey–West bandwidth selection with Bartlett Kernel for performing the LLC and PP-Fisher tests. Also, we adopt the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) for determining the optimal lag length.

1 **Table 4.** CADF and CIPS Unit Root Test Results

	Return ( $r$ )		COVID-19 cases	
CADF Unit Root Test				
	Constant	Constant & Trend	Constant	Constant & Trend
Bangladesh	-6.595***	-8.718***	-3.941***	-3.924**
India	-6.552***	-6.620***	-3.144*	-3.376
Pakistan	-8.636***	-8.695***	-1.875	-2.137
Sri Lanka	-4.978***	-5.049***	-7.381***	-7.358***
CIPS Unit Root Test				
CIPS statistics	-6.690***	-7.270***	-4.085***	-4.199***

2 *Notes: \*, \*\*, and \*\*\* indicate significance at 10, 5, and 1 percent level of significance. The critical values for the*  
 3 *model with constant are -3.89 at 1%, -3.25 at 5%, and -2.92 at 10%. Also, the critical values for the model with*  
 4 *constant and trend are -4.38 at 1%, -3.74 at 5% and -3.42 at 10%.*

8 **Table 5.** Panel Granger non-causality tests: DH panel non-causality test

Null Hypothesis	W statistic	Z-bar statistic*	p-value
COVID-19 does not Granger cause $r$	7.415	5.108	0.000
$r$ does not Granger cause COVID-19	2.765	0.681	0.495

9 *Note: \*See Dumitrescu and Hurlin (2012) for the definition of Z-bar statistic.*

10

11

12 **Table 6.** Pairwise Granger Causality Tests

Null Hypothesis	F
COVID-19 does not Granger cause $r$	2.986***
$r$ does not Granger cause COVID-19	1.252

13 *Note: \*\*\* indicates significance at the 1% level*

14


15

16

17


18

1 **Figure 1:** Dynamic spread of confirmed COVID-19 total cases in selected South Asian  
2 countries.



3  
4

5 **Figure 2:** Dynamic of the stock market returns.



6  
7