

Factor Models for Alpha Streams

Zura Kakushadze^{§†1}

[§] *Quantigic[®] Solutions LLC*

*1127 High Ridge Road #135, Stamford, CT 06905*²

[†] *Department of Physics, University of Connecticut*

1 University Place, Stamford, CT 06901

(June 12, 2014)

Abstract

We propose a framework for constructing factor models for alpha streams. Our motivation is threefold. 1) When the number of alphas is large, the sample covariance matrix is singular. 2) Its out-of-sample stability is challenging. 3) Optimization of investment allocation into alpha streams can be tractable for a factor model alpha covariance matrix. We discuss various risk factors for alphas such as: style risk factors; cluster risk factors based on alpha taxonomy; principal components; and also using the underlying tradables (stocks) as alpha risk factors, for which computing the factor loadings and factor covariance matrices does not involve any correlations with alphas, and their number is much larger than that of the relevant principal components. We draw insight from stock factor models, but also point out substantial differences.

¹ Email: zura@quantigic.com

² DISCLAIMER: This address is used by the corresponding author for no purpose other than to indicate his professional affiliation as is customary in publications. In particular, the contents of this paper are not intended as an investment, legal, tax or any other such advice, and in no way represent views of Quantigic Solutions LLC, the website www.quantigic.com or any of their other affiliates.

1 Motivation and Summary

It appears to be a natural tendency that the number of investable alpha streams³ grows with time. In the olden days, alphas, which can be thought of as sets of instructions for taking predefined positions in underlying tradables at specified times, were built “by hand”. Nowadays, many thousands of alpha streams can be datamined in an automated fashion. With that comes an “embarrassment of the riches” of sorts – there are too many alpha streams and comparatively too few historical observations. As a result, making predictions about future performance of these alpha streams becomes challenging, not only in terms of out-of-sample stability, but also computing the alpha covariance matrix based on the alpha stream time series – the sample covariance matrix is badly singular, precisely due to too few observations.

As a result, allocating investment into a large number of alpha streams, *i.e.*, computing optimal weights for such allocation, becomes nontrivial. Even if one employs the simplest optimization criterion and maximizes the Sharpe ratio of the combined alpha stream portfolio, one runs into an issue: this optimization requires inverting the alpha covariance matrix, which is singular. And even if one somehow regularizes the covariance matrix, it is not all that stable out-of-sample. The question we ponder in this note is how to approach this issue in a systematic way.

We look to history for insight. When the number of underlying tradables – stocks – became too large, one had to deal with a conceptually similar problem. To reliably compute a sample covariance matrix for stock (daily) returns, one would need a prohibitively large number of observations (trading days),⁴ even for a universe of 2,000-2,500 tickers. And even if that much history existed, going back a decade or longer makes little sense for many practical applications, because the relevant time horizons are much shorter, and many strategies are much shorter lived. A way around this difficulty is to employ a multi-factor risk model,⁵ where one assumes that stock returns have some intrinsic specific risk, which must be measured empirically, plus factor risk, which is a linear combination of the underlying risk factors,⁶ whose number F_S is much smaller than then number of stocks N_S . The correlations between stocks then are attributed solely to their exposure to these risk factors, so the off-diagonal elements of the stock covariance matrix are determined by the $F_S \times F_S$ factor covariance matrix, computing which requires many fewer observations than computing the $N_S \times N_S$ stock covariance matrix, and it is also expected to be much more stable out-of-sample for a suitably chosen set of risk factors.

One can do essentially the same for alphas – build *factor models for alpha streams*.

³ For a partial list of hedge fund literature, see, *e.g.*, [1]-[20] and references therein.

⁴ There is always the issue of what to do with new tickers that have little to no history. This is not what we refer to here.

⁵ For a partial list of factor model and related literature, see, *e.g.*, [21]-[60] and references therein.

⁶ Examples of such risk factors are momentum, size, liquidity, volatility, growth, value, *etc.* (style risk factors), exposures to (sub-)industries (industry risk factors), principal components (“beta”-like risk factors), *etc.*

Out of thousands of alphas one may construct, many are closely correlated to each other for a variety of reasons, including how they are constructed. However, there are also substantial differences between alpha factor models and stock factor models. The purpose of this note is to set forth a framework for constructing factor models for alpha streams and discuss various approaches and intricacies arising therein.

One additional motivation for factor models for alpha streams is that, when a number of alpha streams is traded on the same execution platform, allocation weights are allowed to be negative. Furthermore, if trades are crossed between different alphas, portfolio turnover reduces [61, 62, 63], further complicating the weight optimization problem. With these additional challenges, the investment allocation problem into alpha streams becomes rather difficult to tackle for a general alpha covariance matrix,⁷ especially once linear and nonlinear costs are added and/or optimization criteria beyond maximizing the Sharpe ratio are considered,⁸ but can be tractable if the alpha covariance matrix has a factor model form [65, 66].

The remainder of this note is organized as follows. In Section 2 we set up our notations. In Section 3 we discuss optimization for singular alpha covariance matrix via its regularization and how it reduces to a (generalized) weighted regression in the singular limit. In Section 4 we set forth the framework for factor models for alpha streams. We discuss style risk factors for alphas, cluster risk factors based on alpha taxonomy and associated issues, and principal component risk factors that arise in the regression limit of Section 3. We then discuss using underlying tradables as risk factors for alphas and how to compute the corresponding factor loadings matrices. Appendix A discusses some aspects of capacity, which is one of the style factors one may choose to use. Appendix B discusses some aspects of constructing the factor covariance matrix and specific risk.

2 Definitions and Setup

We have N alphas α_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$. Each alpha is actually a time series $\alpha_i(t_s)$, $s = 0, 1, \dots, M$, where t_0 is the most recent time. Below α_i refers to $\alpha_i(t_0)$.

Let C_{ij} be the covariance matrix of the N time series $\alpha_i(t_s)$. Let Ψ_{ij} be the corresponding correlation matrix, *i.e.*,

$$C_{ij} = \sigma_i \sigma_j \Psi_{ij} \tag{1}$$

where $\Psi_{ii} = 1$.

If $M \ll N$, which is the case in most practical applications with $N \gg 1$, then C_{ij} is (nearly) degenerate with M “large” eigenvalues and the remainder having “small” values, which can be positive or negative. These small values are zeros distorted by computational rounding.⁹

⁷ Even if it is made positive-definite via a deformation (see, *e.g.*, [64, 62]).

⁸ *E.g.*, maximizing P&L with volatility bounded from above.

⁹ Actually, this assumes that there are no N/As in any of the alpha time series. If some or all

2.1 Alpha Weight Optimization

Suppose we wish to allocate investment I into our N alphas. We need to find the alpha weights w_i such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N |w_i| = 1 \quad (2)$$

where the modulus accounts for the fact that some weights can be negative if the alphas are traded on the same execution platform. For the sake of simplicity, let us assume no transaction costs – they are not important for the point we are trying to arrive at here. Portfolio P&L, volatility and Sharpe ratio are given by

$$P = I \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i w_i \quad (3)$$

$$R = I \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^N C_{ij} w_i w_j \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (4)$$

$$S = \frac{P}{R} \quad (5)$$

The simplest weight optimization criterion is to maximize the Sharpe ratio:

$$S \rightarrow \max \quad (6)$$

If the covariance matrix C is nonsingular, then the Sharpe ratio is maximized by the following alpha weights w_i :

$$w_i = \xi \sum_{j=1}^N C_{ij}^{-1} \alpha_j \quad (7)$$

where C_{ij}^{-1} is the inverse of C_{ij} , and ξ is a normalization constant fixed by (2).

3 Singular Covariance Matrix

When C is singular, one can regularize it by deforming it: $C \rightarrow \Gamma$. Such regularization can be parameterized as follows:

$$\Gamma \equiv C + \epsilon \Delta \quad (8)$$

where ϵ is a regularization parameter ($\Gamma \rightarrow C$ when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$), and Δ_{ij} is a nonsingular symmetric $N \times N$ matrix.¹⁰ Next, we discuss what the inverse of Γ looks like.

alpha time series contain N/As in non-uniform manner and the correlation matrix is computed by omitting such pair-wise N/As, then the resulting correlation matrix may have negative eigenvalues that are not “small” in the sense used above, *i.e.*, they are not zeros distorted by computational rounding. For the sake of simplicity, here we assume that there are no N/As.

¹⁰ More generally, there can be a vector of regularization parameters, and Δ need not be nonsingular for Γ to be nonsingular, but such additional intricacies do not change the conclusions drawn herein, so we will keep things simple.

3.1 Deformed Covariance Matrix

Let $V_i^{(a)}$ be N right eigenvectors of C_{ij} corresponding to its eigenvalues $\lambda^{(a)}$, $a = 1, \dots, N$:

$$C V^{(a)} = \lambda^{(a)} V^{(a)} \quad (9)$$

with no summation over a . Let U be the $N \times N$ matrix of eigenvectors $V^{(a)}$, *i.e.*, the a th column of U is the vector $V^{(a)}$:

$$U_{ij} \equiv V_i^{(j)} \quad (10)$$

Let Λ be the diagonal matrix of the eigenvalues $\lambda^{(a)}$:

$$\Lambda_{ij} \equiv \delta_{ij} \lambda^{(j)} \quad (11)$$

with no summation over j . Then

$$C = U \Lambda U^T \quad (12)$$

Note that, because C is symmetric, U can be chosen to be orthonormal: $U^T U = 1$.

Let J be the subset of large eigenvalues $\lambda^{(j)}$, $j \in J$. Let J' be the subset of small eigenvalues. (Note that $J \cup J' = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $|J| = M$.)¹¹ Let (no summation over j)

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_{ij} \equiv \delta_{ij} \tilde{\lambda}^{(j)} \quad (13)$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}^{(j)} \equiv \lambda^{(j)}, \quad j \in J \quad (14)$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}^{(j)} \equiv 0, \quad j \in J' \quad (15)$$

I.e., $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is obtained by setting the small eigenvalues in Λ to zero. Let

$$\tilde{C} \equiv U \tilde{\Lambda} U^T \quad (16)$$

Since the small eigenvalues are due to computational rounding, we can use \tilde{C} instead of C in the definition (8) of Γ :

$$\Gamma \equiv \tilde{C} + \epsilon \Delta \quad (17)$$

Note that \tilde{C} is exactly singular.

However, Δ is nonsingular and can also be decomposed as follows:

$$\Delta = X Z X^T \quad (18)$$

where $X^T X = 1$ and

$$Z_{ij} \equiv \delta_{ij} v_j \quad (19)$$

is a diagonal matrix of the eigenvalues v_i of Δ , which is assumed positive-definite.

¹¹ If some alphas were exactly 100% (anti-)correlated, then $|J|$ would be smaller than M . For the sake of simplicity, here we are assuming that no alphas are exactly 100% (anti-)correlated.

3.2 Inverse Γ

Note that

$$\Gamma = X \tilde{\Gamma} X^T \quad (20)$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma} \equiv \epsilon Z + \tilde{\Omega} \tilde{\Omega}^T \quad (21)$$

$$\tilde{\Omega} \equiv X^T \Omega \quad (22)$$

and Ω is an $N \times M$ matrix (recall that $|J| = M$) defined as follows (no summation over A):

$$\Omega_{iA} \equiv U_{iA} \sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}^{(A)}} \quad (23)$$

$$A \in J \quad (24)$$

We have

$$\Gamma^{-1} = X \tilde{\Gamma}^{-1} X^T \quad (25)$$

and

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{-1} = \epsilon^{-1} Z^{-1} - \epsilon^{-2} Z^{-1} \tilde{\Omega} Q^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}^T Z^{-1} \quad (26)$$

where Q_{AB}^{-1} is the inverse of Q_{AB} defined as

$$Q_{AB} \equiv \delta_{AB} + \tilde{Q}_{AB} \quad (27)$$

$$\tilde{Q} \equiv \epsilon^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}^T Z^{-1} \tilde{\Omega} \quad (28)$$

In the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have:

$$\Gamma^{-1} = \epsilon^{-1} [\Delta^{-1} - \Delta^{-1} \Omega (\Omega^T \Delta^{-1} \Omega)^{-1} \Omega^T \Delta^{-1}] + \mathcal{O}(1) \quad (29)$$

In fact, the eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}^A$ of C do not even enter. Indeed, let us restrict U such that it is an $N \times M$ matrix: $U \equiv (U_{iA})$. Then we have

$$\Gamma^{-1} = \epsilon^{-1} \Theta + \mathcal{O}(1) \quad (30)$$

where

$$\Theta \equiv \Delta^{-1} - \Delta^{-1} U (U^T \Delta^{-1} U)^{-1} U^T \Delta^{-1} \quad (31)$$

I.e., in the small ϵ (near-singular) limit, to the leading order the inverse of Γ is determined solely by the inverse of the regulator matrix Δ and the eigenvectors U_{iA} of C corresponding to its large eigenvalues. Furthermore, in this limit the weights are given by

$$w_i = \tilde{\xi} \sum_{j=1}^N \Theta_{ij} \alpha_j \quad (32)$$

where $\tilde{\xi}$ is a normalization constant fixed by the weight normalization condition (2). So, the weights for $S \rightarrow \max$ in the singular limit are controlled by the choice of the regulator matrix Δ .

3.3 Diagonal Δ : Weighted Regression

When Δ is diagonal, $S \rightarrow \max$ in the singular limit reduces to a simple weighted regression. Indeed, let

$$\Delta_{ij} = \delta_{ij} v_j \quad (33)$$

We then have

$$w_i = \frac{\tilde{\xi}}{v_i} \left(\alpha_i - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\alpha_j}{v_j} \sum_{A,B=1}^K U_{iA} U_{jB} \widehat{Q}_{AB}^{-1} \right) \equiv \frac{\tilde{\xi}}{v_i} \varepsilon_i \quad (34)$$

where \widehat{Q}_{AB}^{-1} is the inverse of

$$\widehat{Q}_{AB} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{v_i} U_{iA} U_{iB} \quad (35)$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N w_i U_{iA} \equiv 0 \quad (36)$$

In fact, ε_i are the residuals of a weighted regression (with weights $1/v_i$) of α_i over U_{iA} (without an intercept). For non-diagonal Δ we have a generalized matrix-weighted regression.

3.4 A Simple Regularization

A simple regularization is given by:

$$\Gamma \equiv (1 - q) D + q C \equiv q\Gamma_1 \quad (37)$$

$$D_{ij} \equiv \delta_{ij} C_{jj} \quad (38)$$

When $q \rightarrow 1$, we have $\epsilon \equiv (1 - q)/q \rightarrow 0$. The inversion of Γ_1 then produces the above weighted regression with $v_i = C_{ii}$, *i.e.*, the weights are inverse variances.

4 Factor Model

Looking at (16), one recognizes a multi-factor model – well, of a very special form, that is, as it has vanishing specific risk. Its deformed version, (17), with diagonal Δ , however, has non-zero specific risk. The factor loadings matrix is simply the $N \times M$ matrix U_{iA} , and the factor covariance matrix is a diagonal $M \times M$ matrix $\tilde{\Lambda}_{AB} = \delta_{AB} \tilde{\lambda}^{(B)}$, $A, B \in J$ (see Subsection 3.2 for definitions). The M risk factors comprising the columns of the factor loadings matrix U_{iA} are nothing but the first M principal components of the covariance matrix C_{ij} . This is essentially all in the spirit of the APT risk model.

Here we can ask if we can construct more general multi-factor risk models for alpha streams. There are two main reasons for doing so. The off-diagonal elements of C_{ij} are not expected to be particularly stable out-of-sample. This instability is inherited by the principal components and the factor loadings matrix U . Furthermore, here we have at most M risk factors, which typically is small because the number of observations is limited for alpha streams – including due to their ephemeral nature. So, we wish to increase the number of risk factors and improve their out-of-sample stability. How can we achieve this?

The key observation here is that, whatever we use as the risk factors, we cannot use the alpha correlations or correlations of other quantities with alphas to construct the factor loading matrix or compute the factor covariance matrix – if we do this, we will not get much beyond the M factors based on the principal components because the number of observations for alphas is limited to $M + 1$. So, we need to build risk factors that are not based on correlations with alphas and for which we can compute the factor covariance matrix based on a number of observations, call it M_F , such that $M_F \gg M$, or use risk factors for which the factor covariance matrix is readily available one way or another. Before we discuss some ways of approaching this problem, let us set up our notations first.

4.1 Generalities

Just as in the case of a stock multi-factor risk model, instead of N alphas, one deals with $F \ll N$ risk factors and the covariance matrix C_{ij} is replaced by Γ_{ij} given by

$$\Gamma \equiv \Xi + \Omega \Phi \Omega^T \quad (39)$$

$$\Xi_{ij} \equiv \xi_i^2 \delta_{ij} \quad (40)$$

where ξ_i is the specific risk for each α_i ; Ω_{iA} is an $N \times F$ factor loadings matrix; and Φ_{AB} is the factor covariance matrix, $A, B = 1, \dots, F$. *I.e.*, the random processes Υ_i corresponding to N alphas are modeled via N random processes z_i (corresponding to specific risk) together with F random processes f_A (corresponding to factor risk):

$$\Upsilon_i = z_i + \sum_{A=1}^F \Omega_{iA} f_A \quad (41)$$

$$\langle z_i, z_j \rangle = \Xi_{ij} \quad (42)$$

$$\langle z_i, f_A \rangle = 0 \quad (43)$$

$$\langle f_A, f_B \rangle = \Phi_{AB} \quad (44)$$

$$\langle \Upsilon_i, \Upsilon_j \rangle = \Gamma_{ij} \quad (45)$$

Instead of an $N \times N$ alpha covariance matrix C_{ij} we now have an $F \times F$ factor covariance matrix Φ_{AB} , which is expected to be more stable out-of-sample. Assuming all $\xi_i > 0$ and Φ_{AB} is positive-definite, then Γ_{ij} is also positive definite.¹²

¹² Strictly speaking, positive-definiteness of Γ_{ij} does not require, *e.g.*, positive-definiteness of Φ_{AB} , but considering the practical nature of our discussion here, we will not try to be most general.

4.2 Risk Factors

We have already discussed the principal component approach above. The question we wish to address is what other risk factors we can build for alphas. The analogy with the stock multi-factor models is a good starting point.

One approach to constructing a factor model for alphas is to have F_{style} style risk factors and F_{cluster} cluster risk factors. In the case of stocks, cluster risk factors are usually referred to as industry risk factors. Since here we are dealing with alphas, we will refer to such risk factors as cluster risk factors. In the case of alphas, the following style factors *a priori* appear to be appropriate: 1) volatility, 2) turnover,¹³ and 3) momentum. One may wish to add other style factors depending on how alphas are constructed, *etc.* One other (perhaps more difficult to implement) style factor one may wish to consider is capacity,¹⁴ *i.e.*, how much capital each alpha can absorb on its own; this requires modeling impact (*i.e.*, nonlinear trading costs). We comment on capacity in Appendix A.

In the case of stocks, cluster factors are (usually) based on industry classification. In the case of alphas, one can use a taxonomy of alphas, *i.e.*, one classifies alphas according to how they are constructed – if the required data is available, that is. Out of thousands of alphas one may construct, many are very similar to each other by construction. It is then clear that this similarity makes them more correlated, just as stocks belonging to the same industry are more correlated. Just as in the case of stocks, it therefore makes sense to treat clusters as risk factors and model correlations between alphas based on such risk factors as opposed to computing them directly based on a large number N of the time series corresponding to individual alphas. One difficulty with the alpha classification approach, however, is that the details of how each alpha is constructed must be known to those who build the factor model for alphas, and that is not always the case. Furthermore, in the case of stocks, the industry classification generally is a very stable construct – companies do not tend to jump industries often.¹⁵ Alphas, however, are ephemeral by nature.

So, the style risk factors we described above are more-or-less easy to implement, but the alpha classification not so much. Unfortunately, the number of style risk factors is not large enough to make substantial difference compared with M principal component risk factors, because M can be substantial (*e.g.*, if the time series is based on daily alphas with a 1-year look-back). One straightforward way to increase the number of style factors is to break up each style factor into quantiles. If the number of quantiles k is uniform over F_{style} style risk factors, then this way we increase

¹³ Turnover roughly can be thought of as being analogous to ADDV (average daily dollar volume, which can be viewed as a measure of liquidity) to market capitalization ratio in the case of stocks.

¹⁴ Capacity roughly can be thought of as being analogous to market capitalization (or size) in the case of stocks.

¹⁵ Here we do not consider ticker de-listings, M&As, ticker changes or new ticker additions as an “instability”. An instability in an industry classification would mean that it was based on some underlying aspects of companies that would make tickers change industries frequently. That would be a poorly constructed industry classification.

the number of such risk factors to F_{style}^k , which can be substantial. However, the *effective* number of the resulting style risk factors, while quite possibly larger than F_{style} , may not be as large as F_{style}^k because of high correlations between various quantiles. Nonetheless, the quantile method is a simple way of squeezing more juice out of style risk factors.

Another thought is to use the well-established risk factors for stocks as risk factors for alphas, at least for those alphas whose underlying tradables are stocks.¹⁶ If alphas themselves have no intrinsic risk management, then this is a sound approach – in fact, one may very well wish to do risk management in this way. However, normally alphas are expected to be hedged against most risk factors, so in this case risk factors for stocks are already (essentially) “factored” out of alphas.¹⁷

4.3 Underlying Tradables as Risk Factors

However, even if risk factors for stocks are factored out, specific risks for stocks are not. So, the idea is to use the underlying tradables – the stocks themselves – as risk factors.¹⁸ One needs to quantify this, *i.e.*, we need to construct the factor loadings matrix and the factor covariance matrix. Here is one way of doing this.

For concreteness, let the underlying tradables be U.S. equities (this is not a critical assumption), so A labels stocks in the universe traded by the combined alphas. In the 0th approximation the covariance matrix is diagonal: $\Phi_{AB} = v_A \delta_{AB}$, where v_A are the historical *variances* for stock returns R_A . To compute v_A even if, say, $F = 2,500$, there is no need to go back 10 years, because variances are substantially more stable than covariances. So, the look-back for computing v_A can be much shorter, *e.g.*, monthly or annual. Beyond the 0th approximation Φ_{AB} is not diagonal. The off-diagonal elements themselves need to be modeled via a factor model approach for stocks; however, as we discussed above, these are readily available (see footnote 16). No alpha correlations or correlations with alphas are needed to obtain Φ_{AB} .

The next step is to identify Ω_{iA} . As we mentioned above, the information about how individual alphas are constructed may not be available to us. However, the position data for each alpha had better be available to us if we are to trade them. Let this position data be P_{iAs} , which is the dollar holding of the alpha labeled by i

¹⁶ Here one can use one’s multi-factor risk model of choice, such as BARRA, Northfield, Ax-ioma, Quantigic, SunGard APT, *etc.* One can also use industry classifications, *i.e.*, use industries (or equivalent groupings, sometimes referred to as sub-industries) as risk factors, *e.g.*, based on Bloomberg, GICS, ICB, *etc.*

¹⁷ In case they are not, one can get a relatively large number of such risk factors for which the factor covariance matrix is either readily available if one uses a multi-factor risk model for stocks, or easily computable based on multi-year look-backs for daily stock returns. We will comment on how to build the corresponding factor loadings matrices below. Also, some alphas intentionally may have risk exposure, and care is needed not to suppress such alphas inadvertently.

¹⁸ The underlying tradables need not be stocks. They can be any instruments. The idea applies all the same. Also, this idea has much broader applicability beyond alpha streams (see below).

in the stock labeled by A at time labeled by t_s , normalized so that $\sum_A |P_{iAs}| = 1$ for each given pair i, s . We need to construct Ω_{iA} from P_{iAs} – assuming there is no other data available to us, that is. *I.e.*, we need to get rid of the time series index s . The obvious choice¹⁹ $\Omega_{iA} \equiv \sum_s P_{iAs}$ does not work as the sign of P_{iAs} flips over time frequently (assuming alphas have short holding periods). Basically, $\Omega_{iA} \equiv \sum_s P_{iAs}$ is essentially as unstable as $\text{Cor}(\alpha_i, R_A)$, which cannot produce more than M independent risk factors. It is clear that we need an *unsigned* quantity to define Ω_{iA} . We can use

$$\Omega_{iA} \equiv \sum_s |P_{iAs}| \quad (46)$$

This is no longer unstable or similar to $\text{Cor}(\alpha_i, R_A)$. However, there is a regime where this definition may not work or may produce the effective number of risk factors F_1 lower²⁰ (or even substantially lower) than F . If most alphas are trading most stocks at their trading bounds most of the time, and if these bounds are essentially uniform, then it is clear that in this case most Ω_{iA} defined this way will be close to each other – the extreme case being $\Omega_{iA} \equiv \gamma$, where γ is independent of i and A , in which case we would have only a single risk factor proportional to a unit vector (a.k.a. intercept). The in-between case is where the effective number of risk factors based on (46) is $1 < F_1 < F$. If $F_1 \ll F$, then most bounds are saturated, so we can still keep the F_1 risk factors based on (46)²¹ and add more risk factors based on a quadratic invariant. We cannot use any covariances w.r.t. s , so we can choose:

$$\Omega_{iA} \equiv \sqrt{\text{Var}(P_{iAs})} \quad (47)$$

where Var is the variance w.r.t. s for each given pair i, A . There is an alternative definition

$$\Omega_{iA} \equiv \sqrt{\text{Var}(|P_{iAs}|)} \quad (48)$$

which, however, is not expected to make a huge difference. Furthermore, one can use MAD instead of $\sqrt{\text{Var}}$, but these are minor details, which are not going to make it or break it. So, with (46), (47) and/or (48), one should be able to capture the F risk factors, or a substantial number of them much greater than M . And this can be done for alphas with overnight holdings and purely intraday alphas (as well as alphas that receive substantial contributions both from overnight holdings and intraday realized P&L). When dealing with intraday (components of) alphas, the variances in (47) and (48) are understood as appropriately defined intraday.

We have been cavalier with the normalization of Ω_{iA} as defined in (46), (47) and/or (48). This is because once Ω_{iA} are identified, they need to be properly

¹⁹ The sum over s can be, *e.g.*, monthly or annual for alphas with overnight holdings and shorter for intraday alphas (see below).

²⁰ F_1 is the number of nonzero (or, in practice, “non-small”) eigenvalues of the matrix $\Omega \Phi \Omega^T$.

²¹ In practice, when mixing non-uniformly defined risk factors, one must deal with the issue of how to define the factor covariance matrix for such mixed factors, including relative normalizations between non-uniformly defined risk factors. In this regard, sometimes it is simpler to have a uniformly defined set of risk factors.

normalized anyway in order to construct the specific risks, which will complete the risk model. This is a nontrivial step, which we will not delve into here.²²

The risk factors in (46), (47) and (48) are defined this way because the premise is that, whatever the risk factors one defines, the factor covariance matrix Φ_{AB} is either readily available or computable without using the alpha correlations or correlations with alphas²³. Basically, assuming the only information available is the position data P_{iAs} , there is not much of a choice in defining Ω_{iA} .

Also, let us emphasize that the idea of using underlying tradables as risk factors applies beyond alphas. If we have any N processes X_{is} , $i = 1, \dots, N$ determined by F processes Y_{As} , $A = 1, \dots, F$ via $X_{is} = \sum_{A=1}^F P_{iAs} Y_{As}$, where P_{iAs} are previsible, then we can use Y_{As} as risk factors for X_{is} so long as the P_{iAs} data is available to us. And this need not even be in the context of trading or finance.²⁴

Let us summarize by giving an outline for constructing risk factors for alphas. To simplify things, let us not mix different definitions of the factor loadings matrix. Let us focus on the definition (47) uniformly across all alphas. This gives the factor loadings *up to an overall normalization factor*. The factor covariance matrix Φ_{AB} then is just the covariance matrix for stocks labeled by $A = 1, \dots, F$. This covariance matrix Φ_{AB} can itself be modeled as a factor model (see footnote 16). In a simpler approximation one could use a diagonal $\Phi_{AB} = v_A \delta_{AB}$, where v_A are stock return variances. Also, if the risk management is done at the level of individual alphas, then one may wish to remove from the definition of the alpha risk factors the linear combinations of stocks corresponding to the stock risk factors. *I.e.*, in this case the factor loadings matrix Ω_{iA} is replaced by another factor loadings matrix $\Omega'_{iA'}$, where $A' = 1, \dots, F'$, and $F' = F - F_S$, where F_S is the number of stock risk factors. On the other hand, if the risk management is not done at the level of individual alphas, then, as mentioned above, one can use the stock risk factors themselves as the alpha risk factors. Let Λ_{Aa} be the factor loadings matrix for the stock risk factors, where $a = 1, \dots, F_S$. Then we can define $P_{ias} \equiv \sum_{A=1}^F P_{iAs} \Lambda_{Aa}$, and use this P_{ias} as above to define the corresponding F_S alpha risk factors Ω_{ia} (up to a normalization factor).

Finally, let us note that we can combine the aforementioned alpha factor loadings matrices Ω_{iA} or Ω_{ia} (or $\Omega'_{iA'}$ plus Ω_{ia}) with alpha style risk factors as well as the principal component risk factors, *etc.*, if desired. One then needs to deal with the aforementioned issue of proper relative normalization of non-uniformly defined risk factors. Another issue is that such non-uniformly defined risk factors generally have nonzero correlations. Even if the factor covariance matrix for each set is known, the factor covariance matrix across the sets is not necessarily known. Here one can take a factor model approach and treat each set as a “supercluster” and compute the factor covariance matrix between the “superclusters” using the alpha covariance

²² In fact, this step is the key ingredient to building a successful factor model and is treated as proprietary knowhow by factor model providers, including Quantigic.

²³ Using alpha variances is fine as they are much more stable than covariances and, unlike covariances, do not limit the number of risk factors to M .

²⁴ *E.g.*, health risk factors, *etc.*

matrix. Thus, let us assume that we have two (properly normalized) sets of risk factors $\Omega_{iA_1}^{(1)}$ and $\Omega_{iA_2}^{(2)}$ with the (properly normalized) factor covariance matrices $\Phi_{A_1B_1}^{(1)}$ and $\Phi_{A_2B_2}^{(2)}$, respectively, with $A_1, B_1 = 1, \dots, F_1$, and $A_2, B_2 = 1, \dots, F_2$. Let

$$f^{(1)} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{A_1=1}^{F_1} \alpha_i \nu_{A_1}^{(1)} \Omega_{iA_1}^{(1)} \quad (49)$$

$$f^{(2)} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{A_2=1}^{F_2} \alpha_i \nu_{A_2}^{(2)} \Omega_{iA_2}^{(2)} \quad (50)$$

where $\nu^{(1)}$ and $\nu^{(2)}$ are some weights – we can choose, *e.g.*, equal weighting. Then the covariance between $f^{(1)}$ and $f^{(2)}$ is given by

$$\langle f^{(1)}, f^{(2)} \rangle = \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{A_1=1}^{F_1} \sum_{A_2=1}^{F_2} C_{ij} \Omega_{iA_1}^{(1)} \Omega_{jA_2}^{(1)} \nu_{A_1}^{(1)} \nu_{A_2}^{(2)} \quad (51)$$

where C_{ij} is the sample alpha covariance matrix computed using the actual alpha time series. Since here we have a single (or a few, in case we have a few more risk factor sets) covariance and $M \gg 1$, this covariance can be acceptably stable. Then, *up to an overall normalization factor*, instead of the 0th approximation $\Phi_{A_1A_2} = 0$, in the first approximation we can set $\Phi_{A_1A_2} \approx \langle f^{(1)}, f^{(2)} \rangle$. Note that this method can be used in the case of quantiled style factors we discussed above as long as the number of such quantiled style factors F_{style}^k is not larger (and preferably – for stability reasons – is much smaller) than M . In this case instead of two sets as above we have F_{style}^k sets.²⁵ To reiterate, in the above discussion the (relative) normalizations of the factor loadings matrices corresponding to non-uniformly defined factor loadings can be tricky, and they are fixed when the specific risks are computed.²⁶

A Capacity

In Subsection 4.2 we mentioned capacity as a possible risk factor. Here we discuss capacity briefly. If there are no costs or only linear costs are present, portfolio capacity is unlimited. Once we introduce nonlinear costs (impact), portfolio capacity has a finite bound. Capacity is simply the value of the investment level $I = I_*$ at which the P&L (computed for optimized alpha weights) is maximized. Let $\alpha \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i w_i$ for the optimized weights. The P&L is given by

$$P = \alpha I - L D - \frac{1}{n} Q D^n = T \left(\widetilde{M} I - \frac{1}{n} Q T^{n-1} I^n \right) \quad (52)$$

²⁵ And this method also applies to the style risk factors themselves, when $k = 1$.

²⁶ Computation of the specific risks, which, as mentioned above, is a proprietary topic, is outside of the scope of this paper.

where $D = I T$ is the dollar amount traded, L is the linear cost per dollar traded, T is the turnover, the impact coefficient Q and power $n > 1$ are model-dependent (and can be measured empirically), and

$$\widetilde{M} \equiv \frac{\alpha}{T} - L \quad (53)$$

is the effective “profit margin”, which includes linear costs (but not impact).

The P&L is maximized at

$$I_* = \frac{1}{T} \left(\frac{\widetilde{M}}{Q} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \quad (54)$$

Note that the capacity I_* increases as the turnover T decreases. At the capacity bound we have the following P&L

$$P_* = M_* T I_* = \frac{n-1}{n} \left(\frac{\widetilde{M}^n}{Q} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \quad (55)$$

$$M_* \equiv \frac{n-1}{n} \widetilde{M} \quad (56)$$

Here M_* is the “profit margin” at capacity. Note that for $n = 1.5$, which is often assumed, we have $M_* = \widetilde{M}/3$, $I_* = \widetilde{M}^2/TQ^2$ and $P_* = \widetilde{M}^3/3Q^2$. Note that \widetilde{M} depends on the turnover T .

When we combine a large number N of alphas, we can use the spectral model of [62] to model turnover reduction due to the crossing of trades, according to which in the leading order in the $1/N$ expansion the portfolio turnover is given by

$$T \approx \rho_* \sum_{i=1}^N T_i |w_i| \equiv \rho_* \tau \quad (57)$$

where T_i are individual alpha turnovers, and $0 < \rho_* \leq 1$ is the turnover reduction coefficient, which can be computed using Eq. (34) of [62]. With the same caveats as in the case of the turnover, one can repeat the arguments of [62] for the impact coefficient Q and argue that in the large N limit we also have $Q \approx \rho_* \kappa$, where $\kappa \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N Q_i |w_i|$, and Q_i are the impact coefficients for individual alphas. Then the ρ_* dependence of the capacity bound is given by

$$I_* \approx \frac{1}{\tau \rho_*^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \left(\frac{\widetilde{M}}{\kappa} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \quad (58)$$

For $n = 1.5$ we have $I_* \sim 1/\rho_*^3$. Recalling from [62] that ρ_* is *roughly* an average correlation between the alphas, (58) gives the power-law for the capacity dependence on the average correlation of alphas in a portfolio.

In general n needs to be measured empirically. Measuring it directly for a portfolio is difficult. Below we give a simple method for measuring n for *individual stocks*. We can then approximate n for a portfolio as a weighted (these weights can be uniform) average of the impact powers n_A for individual stocks.

A.1 Measuring Impact

The following discussion, unless otherwise stated, applies to an individual stock. The notations in this subsection are self-contained and should not be confused with the notations in the rest of the paper. M , with an appropriate index, denotes midquote. P , with an appropriate index, denotes last print. Let us partition a trading day into N equal intervals I_i spanning time between T_{i-1} and T_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, where $T_0 = 9:30$ AM, and $T_N = 4:00$ PM.²⁷

For each interval I_i , let P_{ia} ($a = 1, \dots, K_i$) be all prints at times T_{ia} , where $T_{i-1} \leq T_{ia} < T_i$. Let V_{ia} be the corresponding volumes traded. Let A_{ia} and B_{ia} be the ask and bid prices at the times T_{ia} . For the sake of simplicity, we will exclude all times T_{ia} with $A_{ia} \leq B_{ia}$. That is, in the following, unless otherwise stated, summation over $a = 1, \dots, K_i$ is understood to exclude datapoints with crossed and locked markets ($A_{ia} \leq B_{ia}$).

Next, let

$$W_{ia} \equiv F \left(2 \frac{P_{ia} - B_{ia}}{A_{ia} - B_{ia}} \right) \quad (59)$$

where $F(x) \equiv \text{sign}(x) \min(|x|, 1)$. W_{ia} act as weights. For $P_{ia} = A_{ia}$ we have $W_{ia} = 1$, for $P_{ia} = B_{ia}$ we have $W_{ia} = -1$, and the weight is 0 if the print is at the midquote. The following method can also be implemented with simplified weights where one uses $\text{sign}(W_{ia})$ instead of W_{ia} .²⁸

Now we define

$$V_i \equiv \sum_{a=1}^{K_i} W_{ia} V_{ia} \quad (60)$$

$$U_i \equiv M_i - M_{i-1} \quad (61)$$

Here U_i is the change in the stock price (or, more precisely, in its midquote) during the interval I_i . We use midquotes at the endpoints of the interval as opposed to the prints because the prints have extra noise in them, *e.g.*, due to the fact that prints can occur at different pricepoints within the same bid-ask spread.

The impact model discussed earlier in this appendix assumes that the nonlinear cost of trading scales with the traded volume V as $|V|^n$. Here $V > 0$ for shares bought and $V < 0$ for shares sold. The impact on the price then scales as $n \text{sign}(V) |V|^{n-1}$, which is the first derivative of $|V|^n$ w.r.t. V . Our goal is to measure the power n .

This can be achieved by modeling impact using the datapoints (V_i, U_i) defined above. First, we exclude all such datapoints with $\text{sign}(U_i) \neq \text{sign}(V_i)$. Then in R

²⁷ One can choose these intervals to mimic real-life executions, *e.g.*, how VWAP is executed. In particular, they need not be uniform.

²⁸In general, one can utilize variations of the method described here. One can also look at bid and ask sizes and the (properly weighted) order book depth and add other bells and whistles, including $A_{ia} \leq B_{ia}$ cases, *etc.*

notations $n - 1$ can be determined as the coefficient of $\ln |V|$ in the linear model (with an intercept)

$$\ln |U_i| \sim \ln |V_i| \quad (62)$$

The datapoints used in the linear model can span different trading days.

A.1.1 Executions

The above method is based on intraday pricing and volume data and allows to estimate the expected value of n on average, without taking into account the actual executions in a given strategy. Better or worse executions could lead to a different realized value of n , which we will denote as ν . The challenge with determining ν is that it is difficult to determine the price change analogous to U_i above attributable solely to executions in a given strategy because this strategy is only one of many market participants affecting the price. Instead, what can be determined is the cost C of trading D dollars. Again, as above, one can break up the trading day into intervals I_i and calculate the actual cost of trading D_i dollars by comparing the fill prices F_{ia} ($a = 1, \dots, K_i$) for the corresponding numbers of shares V_{ia} during the interval I_i with the midquote M_{i-1} at the beginning of such interval. Then we have

$$C_i = \sum_{a=1}^{K_i} V_{ia} (F_{ia} - M_{i-1}) \quad (63)$$

$$D_i = M_{i-1} \left| \sum_{a=1}^{K_i} V_{ia} \right| \quad (64)$$

Here one can use a benchmark other than M_{i-1} , as applicable. Also, summation over $a = 1, \dots, K_i$ is not restricted here.

The cost C is modeled as

$$C = L D + \frac{1}{\nu} Q D^\nu \quad (65)$$

However, here we have three unknowns, linear slippage²⁹ L , the impact coefficient Q and the power ν . To circumvent this, one can scan values of ν (around the value of n , if the latter has been measured as outlined above) and fit the coefficients L and Q via a linear model. Thus, let $\tilde{Q} \equiv Q/\nu$. Then in R notations L and \tilde{Q} are the coefficients of the linear model (without an intercept)

$$C \sim -1 + D + I(D^\nu) \quad (66)$$

One can then pick the value of ν corresponding to the best fit. Finally, let us mention that the values of n and ν measured as outlined above will vary from stock to stock. For portfolios one can use a median or weighted average value.

²⁹ For our purposes here, L includes only linear slippage and excludes fixed trading costs (such as SEC fees, exchange fees, broker-dealer fees, *etc.*).

B Factor Covariance Matrix and Specific Risk

In this appendix we discuss a simple method for obtaining the factor covariance matrix for a set of risk factors based on the sample covariance matrix computed based on alpha time series. This approach is useful when the factor covariance matrix for a set of risk factors is not readily available or computable. An example of this kind of a situation is the case of style risk factors (or their quantiled versions discussed in Subsection 4.2. Another example is the case of alpha clusters based on alpha taxonomy – if one can be built, that is.

In the factor model approach we have (41)-(45) and (40). Let

$$Q_{AB} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \Omega_{iA} \Omega_{iB} \quad (67)$$

$$\tilde{Q}_{AB} \equiv Q_{AB}^{-1} \quad (68)$$

We have

$$\Phi_{AB} = \sum_{C,D=1}^F \tilde{Q}_{AC} \tilde{Q}_{BD} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^N \Omega_{iC} \Omega_{jD} \Gamma_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i^2 \Omega_{iC} \Omega_{iD} \right) \quad (69)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\xi_i^2 = \Gamma_{ii} - \sum_{A,B=1}^F \Phi_{AB} \Omega_{iA} \Omega_{iB} \quad (70)$$

Plugging (70) into (69) we get a matrix equations for Φ_{AB} :

$$\Phi_{AB} - \sum_{C,D,C',D'=1}^F \tilde{Q}_{AC} \tilde{Q}_{BD} T_{CDC'D'} \Phi_{C'D'} = \sum_{C,D=1}^F \tilde{Q}_{AC} \tilde{Q}_{BD} \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^N \Omega_{iC} \Omega_{jD} \Gamma_{ij} \quad (71)$$

where

$$T_{ABCD} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \Omega_{iA} \Omega_{iB} \Omega_{iC} \Omega_{iD} \quad (72)$$

is a totally symmetric 4-tensor. So, the idea is that, in cases where Φ_{AB} is not independently computable, one can fix it via (71) by replacing Γ_{ij} via the sample covariance matrix C'_{ij} .

B.1 Binary Factor Loadings

The above discussion simplifies substantially if the factor loadings Ω_{iA} are binary, *i.e.*, they take only two values, 0 or 1, and indicate if the alpha labeled by i belongs

to the alpha cluster labeled by F :

$$\Omega_{iA} = \delta_{G(i),A} \quad (73)$$

$$G : \{1, \dots, N\} \mapsto \{1, \dots, F\} \quad (74)$$

where G is the map between alphas and the alpha clusters. Also,

$$N_A \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{G(i),A} \quad (75)$$

is the number of alphas that belong to the cluster labeled by A . Note that

$$\sum_{A=1}^F N_A = N \quad (76)$$

We have:

$$Q_{AB} = N_A \delta_{AB} \quad (77)$$

$$\tilde{Q}_{AB} = \frac{1}{N_A} \delta_{AB} \quad (78)$$

$$T_{AAAA} = N_A \quad (\text{other components vanish}) \quad (79)$$

$$\Phi_{AB} = \frac{1}{N_A N_B} \sum_{i:G(i)=A} \sum_{j:G(j)=B} C_{ij}, \quad A \neq B \quad (80)$$

$$\Phi_{AA} = \frac{1}{N_A (N_A - 1)} \sum_{i,j:G(i)=A, G(j)=A, i \neq j} C_{ij} \quad (81)$$

$$\xi_i^2 = C_{ii} - \Phi_{G(i)G(i)} \quad (82)$$

Here one can immediately see the issue we mentioned in Section 4: ξ_i^2 are not guaranteed to be positive.³⁰

References

- [1] T. Schneeweis, R. Spurgin, and D. McCarthy, “Survivor Bias in Commodity Trading Advisor Performance”, *J. Futures Markets*, 1996, 16(7), 757-772.
- [2] C. Ackerman, R. McEnally and D. Revenscraft, “The Performance of Hedge Funds: Risk, Return and Incentives”, *Journal of Finance*, 1999, 54(3), 833-874.
- [3] S.J. Brown, W. Goetzmann and R.G. Ibbotson, “Offshore Hedge Funds: Survival and Performance, 1989-1995”, *Journal of Business*, 1999, 72(1), 91-117.

³⁰ As we mentioned in Section 4, the resolution of this issue is a proprietary topic, which is outside of the scope of this paper.

- [4] F.R. Edwards and J. Liew, “Managed Commodity Funds”, *Journal of Futures Markets*, 1999, 19(4), 377-411.
- [5] F.R. Edwards and J. Liew, “Hedge Funds versus Managed Futures as Asset Classes”, *Journal of Derivatives*, 1999, 6(4), 45-64.
- [6] W. Fung and D. Hsieh, “A Primer on Hedge Funds”, *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 1999, 6(3), 309-331.
- [7] B. Liang, “On the Performance of Hedge Funds”, *Financial Analysts Journal*, 1999, 55(4), 72-85.
- [8] V. Agarwal and N.Y. Naik, “On Taking the “Alternative” Route: The Risks, Rewards, and Performance Persistence of Hedge Funds”, *Journal of Alternative Investments*, 2000, 2(4), 6-23.
- [9] V. Agarwal and N.Y. Naik, “Multi-Period Performance Persistence Analysis of Hedge Funds Source”, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 2000, 35(3), 327-342.
- [10] W. Fung and D. Hsieh, “Performance Characteristics of Hedge Funds and Commodity Funds: Natural vs. Spurious Biases”, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 2000, 35(3), 291-307.
- [11] B. Liang, “Hedge Funds: The Living and the Dead”, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 2000, 35(3), 309-326.
- [12] C.S. Asness, R.J. Krail, and J.M. Liew, “Do Hedge Funds Hedge?”, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 2001, 28(1), 6-19.
- [13] F.R. Edwards and M.O. Caglayan, “Hedge Fund and Commodity Fund Investments in Bull and Bear Markets”, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 2001, 27(4), 97-108.
- [14] W. Fung and D. Hsieh, “The Risk in Hedge Fund Strategies: Theory and Evidence from Trend Followers”, *Review of Financial Studies*, 2001, 14(2), 313-341.
- [15] B. Liang, “Hedge Fund Performance: 1990-1999”, *Financial Analysts Journal*, 2001, 57(1), 11-18.
- [16] A.W. Lo, “Risk Management For Hedge Funds: Introduction and Overview”, *Financial Analysis Journal*, 2001, 57(6), 16-33.
- [17] C. Brooks and H.M. Kat, “The Statistical Properties of Hedge Fund Index Returns and Their Implications for Investors”, *Journal of Alternative Investments*, 2002, 5(2), 26-44.

- [18] D.-L. Kao, "Battle for Alphas: Hedge Funds versus Long-Only Portfolios", *Financial Analysts Journal*, 2002, 58(2), 16-36.
- [19] G. Amin and H. Kat, "Stocks, Bonds and Hedge Funds: Not a Free Lunch!", *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 2003, 29(4), 113-120.
- [20] N. Chan, M. Getmansky, S.M. Haas and A.W. Lo, "Systemic Risk and Hedge Funds", published in: Carey, M. and Stulz, R.M., eds., "The Risks of Financial Institutions" (University of Chicago Press, 2006), Chapter 6, 235-338.
- [21] W. Sharpe, "Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk", *Journal of Finance*, 1964, 19(3), 425-442.
- [22] J. Lintner, "The valuation of risky assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1965, 47(1), 13-37.
- [23] S. Black, "Capital market equilibrium with restricted borrowing", *Journal of Business*, 1972, 45(3), 444-455.
- [24] O. Blume and L. Friend, "A new look at the capital asset pricing model", *Journal of Finance*, 1973, 28(1), 19-33.
- [25] E. Fama and J. MacBeth, "Risk, return, and equilibrium: Empirical tests", *Journal of Political Economy*, 1973, 81(3), 607-636.
- [26] R. Merton, "An intertemporal capital asset pricing model", *Econometrica*, 1973, 41(5), 867-887.
- [27] S. Ross, "The arbitrage theory of capital asset pricing", *Journal of Economic Theory*, 1976, 13(3), 341-360.
- [28] S. Basu, "The investment performance of common stocks in relation to their price to earnings ratios: A test of the efficient market hypothesis", *Journal of Finance*, 1977, 32(3), 663-682.
- [29] R. Banz, "The relationship between return and market value of common stocks", *Journal of Financial Economics*, 1981, 9(1), 3-18.
- [30] W. DeBondt and R. Thaler, "Does the stock market overreact?", *Journal of Finance*, 1985, 40(3), 739-805.
- [31] N. Chen, R. Roll and S. Ross, "Economic forces and the stock market", *Journal of Business*, 1986, 59(3), 383-403.
- [32] J. Campbell, "Stock returns and the term structure", *Journal of Financial Economics*, 1987, 18(2), 373-399.

- [33] J. Campbell and R. Shiller, “The dividend-price ratio and expectations of future dividends and discount factors”, *Review of Financial Studies*, 1988, 1(3), 195-227.
- [34] G. Connor and R. Korajczyk, “Risk and return in an equilibrium APT: Application of a new test methodology”, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 1988, 21(2), 255-289.
- [35] B. Lehmann and D. Modest, “The empirical foundations of the arbitrage pricing theory”, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 1988, 21(2), 213-254.
- [36] A. Lo and A.C. MacKinlay, “Data-snooping biases in tests of financial asset pricing models”, *Review of Financial Studies*, 1990, 3(3), 431-468.
- [37] G. Schwert, “Stock returns and real activity: A century of evidence”, *Journal of Finance*, 1990, 45(4), 1237-1257.
- [38] W. Ferson and C. Harvey, “The variation in economic risk premiums”, *Journal of Political Economy*, 1991, 99(2), 385-415.
- [39] E. Fama and K. French, “The cross-section of expected stock returns”, *Journal of Finance*, 1992, 47(2), 427-465.
- [40] E. Fama and K. French, “Common risk factors in the returns of stock and bonds”, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 1993, 33(1), 3-56.
- [41] N. Jegadeesh and S. Titman, “Returns to buying winners and selling losers: Implications for stock market efficiency”, *Journal of Finance*, 1993, 48(1), 65-91.
- [42] R. Whitelaw, “Time variations and covariations in the expectation and volatility of stock market returns”, *Journal of Finance*, 1994, 49(2), 515-541.
- [43] A.C. MacKinlay, “Multifactor models do not explain deviations from the CAPM”, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 1995, 38(1), 3-28.
- [44] R. Jagannathan and Z. Wang, “The conditional CAPM and the cross-section of expected returns”, *Journal of Finance*, 1996, 51(1), 3-53.
- [45] E. Fama and K. French, “Multifactor explanations for asset pricing anomalies”, *Journal of Finance*, 1996, 51(1), 55-94.
- [46] S. Kothari and J. Shanken, “Book-to-market, dividend yield and expected market returns: A time series analysis”, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 1997, 44(2), 169-203.
- [47] W. Ferson and C. Harvey, “Conditioning variables and the cross section of stock returns”, *Journal of Finance*, 1999, 54(4), 1325-1360.

- [48] C. Fernández, E. Ley and M. Steel, “Benchmark priors for bayesian model averaging”, *Journal of Econometrics*, 2001, 100(2), 381-427.
- [49] A.D. Hall, S. Hwang and E.S. Satchell, “Using bayesian variable selection methods to choose style factors in global stock return models”, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 2002, 26(12), 2301-2325.
- [50] B.G. Malkiel, “The efficient market hypothesis and its critics”, *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2003, 17(1), 59-82.
- [51] L.K.C. Chan and L. Lakonishok, “Value and growth investing: Review and update”, *Financial Analysts Journal*, 2004, 60(1), 71-86.
- [52] O. Ledoit and M. Wolf, “Honey, I shrunk the sample covariance matrix”, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 2004, 30(4), 110-119.
- [53] D.J. Disatnik and S. Benninga, “Shrinking the covariance matrix”, *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 2007, 33(4), 55-63.
- [54] M.J. Cooper, H. Gulen and M.J. Schill, “Asset growth and the Cross-Section of stock returns”, *The Journal of Finance*, 2008, 63(4), 1609-1651.
- [55] S. Hwang and A. Rubesam, “Fishing with a licence: An empirical search for asset pricing factors”, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1297376> (SSRN Working Paper, 2008).
- [56] T. Adriana and F. Franzoni, “Learning about beta: Time-varying factor loadings, expected returns, and the conditional CAPM”, *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 2009, 16(4), 537-556.
- [57] W. He, Y.S. Lee and P. Wei, “Do option traders on value and growth stocks react differently to new information?”, *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*, 2010, 34(3), 371-381.
- [58] P. Maio and P. Santa-Clara, “Value, momentum, and short-term interest rates”, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1986787> (SSRN Working Paper, 2011).
- [59] J.G. Rangel and R.F. Engle, “The Factor-Spline-GARCH Model for High and Low Frequency Correlations”, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 2012, 30(1), 109-124.
- [60] M. Fliess and C. Join, “Systematic and multifactor risk models revisited”, [arXiv:1312.5271](https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.5271).
- [61] Z. Kakushadze and J.K.-S. Liew, “Is It Possible to OD on Alpha?”, SSRN Working Paper, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2419415> (April 2, 2014); [arXiv:1404.0746](https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.0746).

- [62] Z. Kakushadze, “Spectral Model of Turnover Reduction”, SSRN Working Paper, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2427049> (April 20, 2014); arXiv:1404.5050.
- [63] Z. Kakushadze, “Can Turnover Go To Zero”, SSRN Working Paper Series, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2444031> (May 30, 2014); arXiv:1406.0044.
- [64] R. Rebonato and P. Jäckel, “The most general methodology to create a valid correlation matrix for risk management and option pricing purposes” (1999), <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1969689> (December 7, 2011).
- [65] Z. Kakushadze, “Combining Alpha Streams with Costs”, SSRN Working Paper, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2438687> (May 19, 2014); arXiv:1405.4716.
- [66] Z. Kakushadze, “Notes on Alpha Stream Optimization”, SSRN Working Paper, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2446328> (June 4, 2014), arXiv:1406.1249.