CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Predicting hedge fund performance when fund returns are skewed
Authors	Heuson, Andrea J.;Hutchinson, Mark C.;Kumar, Alok
Publication date	2019-11-19
Original Citation	Heuson, A. J., Hutchinson, M. C. and Kumar, A. (2019) 'Predicting hedge fund performance when fund returns are skewed', Financial Management, 49(4), pp.877-896. https://doi.org/10.1111/fima.12304
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/fima.12304 - 10.1111/fima.12304
Rights	© 2019, John Wiley & Sons Inc. This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Heuson, A. J., Hutchinson, M. C. and Kumar, A. (2019) 'Predicting hedge fund performance when fund returns are skewed', Financial Management, doi: 10.1111/fima.12304, which has been published in final form at https://doi.org/10.1111/fima.12304. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.
Download date	2026-11-06 06:47:34
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/9273

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Accepted Article

Predicting Hedge Fund Performance When Fund Returns Are Skewed

Andrea J. Heuson, Mark C. Hutchinson and Alok Kumar*

October 2019

Abstract

We show that fund-specific return skewness is associated with managerial skill and future hedge fund performance. Specifically, skewness in fund returns reflects managerial skill in avoiding large drawdowns. Using a new measure of investment skill that accounts for this managerial ability, we demonstrate that traditional performance measures under-estimate (over-estimate) managerial performance when returns exhibit positive (negative) fund-specific skewness. Our new measure is particularly valuable during periods of economic crisis, when the annual risk-adjusted out-performance is 5.5%.

Keywords: Performance measurement, hedge funds, fund-specific skewness, performance persistence, investment skill.

JEL Classification: G10, G19, G20.

We are grateful to an anonymous referee, Vikas Agarwal, Sandro Andrade, Brad Barber, Indraneel Chakraborty, Liam Gallagher, Mila Getmansky-Sherman, Bing Han (the Editor), Kyung-So Im, Bing Liang, Narayan Naik and Richard Taffler for helpful comments. Mark Hutchinson is grateful for financial support from the Science Foundation Ireland under Grant Number 18/SPP/3459. All remaining errors and omissions are ours.

*Andrea Heuson is Professor of Finance at Miami Herbert Business School, University of Miami. Mark Hutchinson is Professor of Finance at Cork University Business School, University College Cork, Ireland. Alok Kumar is Gabelli Asset Management Professor of Finance at Miami Herbert Business School, University of Miami.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/fima.12304.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

The returns of more than 90% of the hedge funds in the TASS database exhibit considerable skewness. The skewness in fund returns could reflect managerial attempts to cater to the skewness preferences of fund investors. Alternatively, fund-specific skewness in returns can arise from manager-specific skills such as dynamic trading or superior risk management to minimize large losses. In particular, fund-specific skewness in returns is more likely to appear during periods of financial crisis since skilled fund managers are more likely to employ specialized investment and risk management strategies during those periods when there is greater potential for large losses.

If fund return skewness is more likely to reflect managerial skill, higher fund-specific skewness should be associated with higher future performance. In contrast, if high fund skewness reflects managerial desire to cater to known skewness preferences of hedge fund investors, higher fund skewness is likely to be associated with lower future performance because idiosyncratic skewness is known to be associated with lower average returns (for example, Boyer et al. (2009) and Conrad et al. (2013)). While investor preference for skewness is well-documented, previous hedge fund studies have not identified a clear relation between historical skewness and future fund returns (Agarwal et al. (2009) and Bali et al. (2012)). Given this inconclusive evidence, fund-level skewness is likely to reflect both managerial skill and skewness preferences of investors.

In this paper, we propose an improved performance measurement framework to characterize the relation between fund-specific skewness and future hedge fund returns more accurately. Specifically, we develop a fund skewness-adjusted alpha (ADJ alpha or α_{ADJ}) measure for predicting managerial performance. Our new performance measure is an improvement over the traditional factor-model alphas, which do not explicitly account for

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

skewness in observed returns. Consequently, these factor models are unable to accurately evaluate positive fund return skewness strategies that limit downside risk.

Our measure of skewness-adjusted alpha for rating managerial performance is motivated by Leland (1999) and Glode (2011).[1] Specifically, Leland (1999) posits that investors should evaluate a fund's alpha relative to its factor model risk exposure *and* information on fund-specific skewness because fund investment strategies that generate positive skewness limit downside risk. Comparing a fund manager who can generate a certain alpha to another who can generate the same alpha with more positive fund-specific skewness, the latter is likely to be preferred by a fund investor because the manager may protect the portfolio from extreme negative returns. In fact, Glode (2011) shows that mutual fund managers generate incremental utility for investors through their skill in reducing losses in bad market states, despite appearing to underperform when assessed by unconditional alpha.[2]

Our new performance measure captures this economic intuition and reflects both a fund's traditional alpha relative to its factor model exposures and fund-specific skewness. Specifically, it assigns a higher performance ranking to fund managers with both high alpha and positive fund-specific skewness. We validate this new performance measure (ADJ alpha) using both simulated and actual hedge fund returns data, and then show that ADJ alphas are better than traditional alphas for predicting future hedge fund returns.

[1] The findings in Goetzmann et al. (2007) provide another motivation for our paper. They show that performance measures estimated using standard statistical techniques inappropriately are at risk of manipulation by managers and cite hedge funds as a specific example of investments whose returns "can deviate substantially from normality" (p. 1505).

[2] Similarly, more recently, Barroso and Santa-Clara (2015) show that higher skewness at the portfolio-level, through hedging or dynamic risk management, is associated with reduced drawdowns and enhanced future performance.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

In particular, using a large sample of hedge fund returns from the Lipper/TASS database, we first decompose total return skewness into systematic skewness and fund-specific skewness. We find that fund-specific skewness is persistent and is positively associated with future hedge fund returns. This evidence is consistent with Leland's (1999) conjecture that positive fund-specific skewness is likely to reflect managerial skill in avoiding large losses. In addition, we demonstrate that funds that have *both* high alpha and greater fund-specific skewness exhibit superior future performance. This result supports the view that traditional performance measures systematically under-rate (over-rate) performance when returns have positive (negative) skewness. Consequently, accounting for fund-specific skewness in returns improves performance accuracy and allows us to better identify skilled hedge fund managers on an *ex ante* basis.

To further demonstrate the superiority of our new performance measure, we use the Fung and Hsieh (2004) factor model specification as the benchmark and compare our ADJ and standard alpha estimates. We find economically significant differences. Repeating this analysis on sub-samples of returns drawn from crisis and non-crisis periods, we show that the ability of our new performance measure to identify superior managerial performance *ex ante* is particularly valuable during periods of economic crisis when hedge fund returns are more likely to have skewness. During these periods, portfolios formed using traditional performance measures under-estimate fund alpha by up to 5.50%. This evidence suggests that adjusting for fund-specific skewness is particularly valuable for assessing hedge fund performance during crisis periods.

These findings contribute to the growing hedge fund literature that attempts to identify skilled hedge fund managers *ex ante* and cross-sectional determinants of hedge fund performance. Specifically, Aragon (2007) and Agarwal et al. (2009) show that greater

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

incentives, more discretion and more stringent lockups are associated with higher future returns. Empirical evidence also suggests that higher exposure to macroeconomic factors, higher systematic risk and exposure to macro-economic uncertainty are all associated with higher future returns (Bali et al. (2011, 2012, 2014)). Our results extend this literature and establish that managerial ability to limit drawdowns, as reflected in fund-specific return skewness, has incremental predictive power for future hedge fund returns.

We also contribute to the literature on non-traditional performance measurement methods. In particular, Chan and Lakonishok (1992), Barber and Lyon (1997), Knez and Ready (1997), and Dell'Aquila et al. (2003) show that methods that account for deviations from normality improve the accuracy of empirical results.[3] Amin and Kat (2003) control for non-normality in returns through a non-parametric payoff distribution pricing model while other related studies use bootstrapping.[4] Similarly, Gupta and Liang (2005) propose value-at-risk type risk measures to account for non-normality in hedge fund returns while Liang and Park (2010) show that risk measures that account for potential non-normality are better able to predict hedge fund failure.[5]

In related studies, Kosowski et al. (2007) and Avramov et al. (2011) use a Bayesian method to demonstrate that forward-looking portfolios formed using their more precise estimates of historical alphas outperform standard alpha portfolios. Jagannathan et al.

[3] Our method is also related to the well-established "robust statistics" literature (see Huber and Ronchetti (2009) for a summary), which demonstrates that the classical regression model's assumption of normally distributed error terms is inefficient when the underlying error distributions exhibit skewness.

[4] Bootstrapping, which has been applied to mutual fund returns (Kosowski et al. (2005)), hedge fund returns (Kosowski et al. (2007)), and fund of funds returns (Fung et al. (2008)), differs from our approach as it focuses on the statistical significance of OLS alpha estimates. An ordinary OLS alpha and a bootstrapped OLS alpha will be identical when applied to the same underlying data but the standard error of the bootstrapped OLS alpha will be measured more precisely. In contrast, our ADJ alpha measure explicitly accounts for fund-specific skewness and will be larger (smaller) than an OLS alpha if returns exhibit positive (negative) skewness.

[5] While not focusing on hedge funds, Kadan and Liu (2014) demonstrate the importance of including higher moment information when evaluating the performance of private equity funds, mutual funds and momentum strategies.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

(2010) use weighted least squares to reduce measurement errors in estimated alphas and develop a GMM model to assess the persistence of managerial over- or under-performance. More recently, Buraschi et al. (2014) find large differences in skill estimates and improved out-of-sample performance when performance measures are corrected for endogenous risk-taking by hedge fund managers.

We extend this line of research and show that hedge fund performance evaluation can be improved if fund-specific return skewness is explicitly taken into account. Our skewness-adjusted alpha measure is also related to Back et al. (2018), who examine the relation between skewness and fund performance for mutual funds. They show theoretically as well as empirically that alpha and residual (co)skewness are negatively correlated in the cross-section of returns. In contrast, we demonstrate that hedge funds with greater fund-specific skewness have superior future performance.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section I describes the data and factor models specifications used in the empirical sections. Sections II to IV present the main empirical results. We conclude in section V with a brief discussion.

I. Data and Benchmark Factors

A. Hedge Fund Data

We rank the performance of hedge funds using monthly net-of-fee returns of live and dead funds in the Lipper/TASS database. Our sample period is from January 1994 to April 2015. This period includes several extreme market conditions including the LTCM collapse in 1998, the dot-com crash in 2000 and 2001 and the sub-prime and credit crises in 2007 and 2008. As of the second quarter of 2015, the TASS database contains 5,512 live and 14,496 dead hedge funds, including fund of funds.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Hedge fund returns are self-reported to TASS which may lead to some inaccuracies.[6] TASS does not keep information on funds that died before December 1993 which may lead to survivorship bias. Our sample of fund returns runs from January 1994 to April 2015 to ensure that our results are not affected by survivorship bias.[7] We also remove funds with less than two years of returns data, funds that report only gross returns, funds that do not report monthly returns or investment style information and fund of funds.

We group funds according to the TASS classifications: Convertible Arbitrage (CA), Event Driven (ED), Equity Market Neutral (EMN), Emerging Markets (EM), Fixed Income Arbitrage (FIA), Global Macro (GM), Long Short Equity Hedge (LSEH), Managed Futures (MF) and Multi Strategy (MS).[8] Our final sample consists of 3,044 live hedge funds and 4,774 dead hedge funds.

B. Summary Statistics

Table I contains the summary statistics for the funds in our sample. The table lists the number of funds and the equal-weighted cross sectional mean of each fund's mean monthly return, its standard deviation, Sharpe ratio and skewness. Altogether, 92% of the funds can be classified as having significantly negatively- or positively-skewed returns. Funds are then separated into the following six categories based on the significance level of their sample skewness *t*-statistics: (i) live negative-skewness (1,695 funds), (ii) live no-skewness (255 funds), (iii) live positive-skewness (1,094 funds), (iv) dead negative-skewness (2,417 funds), (v) dead no-skewness (571 funds), and (vi) dead positive-skewness (1,786 funds).

[6] Evidence suggests that in some cases funds may misreport returns to the database vendors (see, for example, Bollen and Pool (2009) and Agarwal et al. (2011)).
[7] See Brown et al. (1999) for a discussion on survivorship bias in hedge fund performance estimates.
[8] We do not report separate results for the Dedicated Short Bias style because there are only 114 of those funds in the sample. However, they are included in the full sample results.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Among the various fund groups, Convertible Arbitrage, Event Driven, Equity Market Neutral, Emerging Markets, Fixed Income Arbitrage and Multi-Strategy funds have more negative-skewness than positive-skewness, while Long Short Equity Hedge and Global Macro funds are more balanced. More Managed Futures funds exhibit positive rather than significant negative skewness.

Comparing funds classified as negative-skewness, no-skewness, and positive-skewness, the Sharpe ratios improve with skewness for both live funds (0.38, 0.90, and 0.73, respectively) and dead funds, (0.42, 0.45, and 0.94, respectively). This evidence gives us the first hint that fund skewness and performance may be positively correlated.

C. Choice of Benchmark Factors

To assess a manager's risk-adjusted performance, we estimate the following factor model:

$$r_{it} = \hat{\alpha}_i + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{\beta}_k^i F_{k,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathrm{r_{it}}$ is the net-of-fees excess return on hedge fund *i* at time *t,* $\widehat{\alpha}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the estimated abnormal performance of the hedge fund, $\hat{\beta}_k^i$ is the estimated factor loading of hedge fund *i* for risk factor *k*, $\mathrm{F_{k,t}}$ is the return of factor *k* in month *t*, and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ is the estimated residual.

The variety of strategies used by hedge fund managers makes it difficult to choose factors that can accurately characterize the return generating process across the universe of hedge funds. In our main empirical analysis, we focus on the Fung and Hsieh (2004) factor model that performs particularly well for characterizing hedge fund returns.

The Fung and Hsieh (2004) model specifies three trend-following risk factors, including Bond (*PTFSBD*), Currency (*PTFSFX*) and Commodity (*PTFSCOM*). This set is augmented by the following two equity-oriented risk factors: *SNPRF*, which is the excess

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

total return on the Standard & Poor's 500 index, and *SCMLC*, which is the size spread factor (Wilshire Small Cap 1750 – Wilshire Large Cap 750 monthly total return). The model also contains the following two bond-oriented risk factors: *BD10RET*, the monthly change in the 10-year treasury constant maturity yield (month end-to-month end), and *BAAMTSY*, which is a credit spread factor (the monthly change in the Moody's Baa yield less 10-year treasury constant maturity yield (month end-to-month end)).[9]

The hedge fund literature also contains evidence on the importance of macroeconomic variables for predicting hedge fund returns (see, for example, Avramov et al. (2011), Avramov et al. (2013), Bali et al. (2011), Bali et al. (2014) and Caglayan and Ulutas (2014)). Motivated by these findings, we use a macroeconomic factor model as an alternative. Specifically, hedge fund portfolio returns are benchmarked against Long-Short portfolios of hedge funds formed based upon their rolling exposure to a range of macroeconomic variables. The following equation is estimated:

$$R_{i,t} = \alpha_{i,t} + \beta_{i,1}LSDIV_t + \beta_{i,2}LSIP_t + \beta_{i,3}LSINF_t + \beta_{i,4}LSDEF_t + \beta_{i,5}LSNFP_t + \varepsilon_{i,t}. \quad (2)$$

Here, $LSDIV_t$, $LSIP_t$, $LSINF_t$, $LSDEF_t$ and $LSNFP_t$ reflect the monthly dividend yield on the Russell 3000 stock index, and the monthly change in industrial production, inflation, default risk and non-farm payrolls, respectively. To create the factors for each macroeconomic variable, each month, we estimate the rolling exposure for each fund to the macroeconomic variable (estimated using a 24-month rolling window). Beginning in January 1996, we sort funds into deciles each month based upon their prior month beta to the factor. Finally, we form the factors as Long-Short portfolios of hedge funds where we Long the top decile and Short the bottom decile of funds.

[9] See Fung and Hsieh (2001) for details on the construction of the trend-following factors.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

II. Historical Fund-Specific Skewness and Future Hedge Fund Returns

If fund-specific skewness reflects managerial skill, it should persist over time. In this section, we test for persistence in the skewness of hedge fund returns.

A. Estimating Fund-Specific Skewness (FSK)

To measure fund-specific skewness, we first estimate the factor model of Fung and Hsieh (2004) for each hedge fund. Then, we take the residuals, ε_i, and estimate fund-specific skewness for fund *i* at time *t*, $FSK_{i,t}$, as:

$$FSK_{i,t} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}\left(\frac{\varepsilon_{i,t}-\bar{\varepsilon}_i}{\sigma_{\varepsilon,t}}\right)^3. \quad (3)$$

Here, $\sigma_{\varepsilon,t}$ is the standard deviation of residual returns and *n* is the number of observations. We also estimate the total skewness $TSK_{i,t}$ of the fund using its net-of-fee returns, which allows us to estimate the systematic skewness, $SSK_{i,t}$, as:

$$SSK_{i,t} = TSK_{i,t} - FSK_{i,t}. \quad (4)$$

B. FSK Persistence: Historical Versus Future FSK

To measure skewness persistence, we estimate the FSK for each fund in our sample with the first two years of monthly returns (January 1994 to December 1995) and then use a 24-month rolling-window to generate monthly time series estimates of observed FSK. We also estimate 12-month, 24-month, 36-month and 48-month ahead values for FSK and run the following Fama and MacBeth (1973) type cross-sectional regression each month:

$$FSK_{i,t+n} = \gamma_t + \delta_t FSK_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}. \quad (5)$$

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Here, $FSK_{i,t+n}$ is the *n* month-ahead future fund-specific skewness, $FSK_{i,t}$ is historical fund-specific skewness at time t, and γ_t and δ_t are the intercept and slope coefficient estimates, respectively.

The skewness persistence results are reported in Table II. Our evidence confirms that there is persistence in fund-specific skewness. The average δ coefficients are positive and statistically significant at horizons ranging from twenty-four months to forty-eight months, with *t*-statistics ranging from 9.29 to 12.36. Only when we consider the relatively short twelve-month ahead skewness estimation window, the statistical significance disappears. The *t*-statistic of 1.22 in this instance suggests that twelve fund-month observations yield noisy estimates of fund-specific skewness.

C. Fund-Specific Skewness and Future Hedge Fund Returns

We next use both cross-sectional regressions and sorting methods to assess the relation between fund-specific skewness and future hedge fund returns more accurately.

1. Regression Estimates

We begin by estimating the fund-specific skewness for each fund in our sample. We start with first two years of monthly returns (January 1994 to December 1995) and then use a 24-month rolling-window estimation period to generate monthly time series estimates of fund-specific skewness. In the second stage, which begins in January 1996, we run a series of Fama and MacBeth (1973) type cross-sectional regressions of one-month-ahead and twelve-month-ahead individual fund benchmark-adjusted fund return on fund-specific skewness:

$$BAR_{i,t+1:t+n} = \gamma_t + \delta_t FSK_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}. \quad (6)$$

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Here, $BAR_{i,t+1:t+n}$ is the benchmark-adjusted return on fund *i*, for period t + 1 to t + n, $FSK_{i,t}$ is the fund-specific skewness estimate at time t generated in the first stage, and γ_t and δ_t are the intercept and slope coefficients, respectively.

Table III reports the skewness-return regression estimates for the full sample. Crisis and non-crisis sub-sample results are also included to assess the skewness-return relation under different market conditions.[10] We find that historical fund-specific skewness is positively related to one-month-ahead and twelve-month-ahead benchmark-adjusted returns for the full sample and in three of the four sub-samples, with *t*-statistics ranging from 2.52 to 4.83. The relation is not significant for one-month-ahead results in crisis periods. This evidence is not surprising, given the elevated volatility and accompanying noise in short-term hedge fund return during periods of economic uncertainty (Billio et al., 2010).

2. Sorting Results

In the next test, each month, from January 1996 to April 2015, we form quintile portfolios by sorting hedge funds based on their fund-specific skewness estimated from the residuals from the Fung and Hsieh (2004) factor model. Quintile 1 contains funds with the lowest fund-specific skewness and Quintile 5 contains funds with the highest fund-specific skewness. For each portfolio we report one-month-ahead mean return, Sharpe ratio, Fung and Hsieh (2004) alpha, and the macroeconomic factor alpha. The results reported in Table IV confirm the positive relation between fund-specific skewness and one-month-ahead

[10] We follow Billio et al. (2010) and define crises periods as Asian (June 1997 - January 1998), Russian and LTCM (August 1998 - October 1998), Brazilian (January 1999 - February 1999), Internet Crash (March 2000 - May 2000), Argentinean (October 2000 - December 2000), September 11, 2001, drying up of merger activities, increase in defaults, and WorldCom accounting problems (June 2002 - October 2002), the 2007 subprime mortgage crisis (August 2007 - January 2008), and the 2008 Global financial crisis (September 2008 - November 2008). We extend this, adding the 2009 European Debt crisis (December 2009 - September 2010) and the US debt downgrade (August 2011).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

hedge fund return. The top quintile portfolio outperforms the bottom quintile portfolio by 2.44% on a risk-adjusted basis.

We also conduct double sorts using historical fund-specific skewness and Fung and Hsieh (2004) alpha estimates.[11] The results reported in Table V provide further evidence on the relation between historical fund-specific skewness, historical alpha, and future hedge fund return. For the subset of the most positively skewed funds, the annual risk-adjusted return for the high historical alpha tercile is 8% higher than the return for the low historical alpha tercile, with a *t*-statistic of 4.64 for the Fung and Hsieh (2004) alpha and 3.63 for the macroeconomic alpha. This return differential is about 4% per year, with slightly lower statistical significance for the medium skewness tercile and marginal statistical significance for the lowest skewness tercile. Overall, the sorting results provide further support to our key conjecture that fund-specific return skewness can predict future fund performance.

III. Identifying Skilled Hedge Fund Managers

In this section, we present our new performance measure (ADJ alpha) that accounts for skewness in fund returns.

A. Skewness-Adjusted Alpha Estimation

To compute the new ADJ alpha measure, we use the residual augmented least squares (RALS) method of Im and Schmidt (2008).[12] In particular, we adjust the risk-adjusted performance ranking of managers upward (downward) if they are able to generate the same level of return as the OLS alpha, but with positive (negative) return skewness. We choose the RALS estimator for this performance adjustment because it is relatively easy to estimate

[11] Each month, funds are sorted into tercile portfolios based upon historical fund-specific skewness estimated using the preceding 24 months of returns. Within each tercile, funds are then sorted into terciles based upon historical Fung and Hsieh (2004) alpha estimated using the preceding 24 months of returns.

[12] See the Appendix for details of the RALS estimator.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

using two-stage least squares. Specifically, to account for skewness in fund returns we augment the linear factor model with two new variables that are functions of the OLS residuals derived from that factor model.

We use a three-step procedure. First, using OLS and all available return data for the fund, we estimate the factor model. Next, we create the skewness function $\widehat{w}$ using each fund's OLS residual. This function consists of two terms: (i) $\hat{u}_t^2 - \hat{\sigma}^2$ and (ii) $\hat{u}_t^3 - m_3 - 3\hat{\sigma}^2\hat{u}_t$. Here, $\hat{u}_t$ is the OLS residual at time *t,* m_3 is the OLS residual skewness, and $\hat{\sigma}^2$ is the OLS residual variance. By setting $m_3 = 0$, we can estimate the linear factor model augmented with $\hat{u}_t^2 - \hat{\sigma}^2$ and $\hat{u}_t^3 - 3\hat{\sigma}^2\hat{u}_t$. The residual skewness will be reflected in the new skewness-adjusted alpha.[13] For estimation purposes, the two new regressors act as additional risk factors and are functions of the 3rd and 4th moments of the first-stage residuals constructed under the assumption that first-stage residuals are independent of the initial factors used to account for fund risk.[14]

B. Skewness-Sensitive Performance Estimates

We present our main empirical results using both simulations and actual hedge fund data. Our key finding is that OLS performance estimates systematically under-rates managers when fund returns exhibit positive skewness and systematically over-rates managers when the returns have negative skewness. Our ADJ alpha measure allows us to identify superior hedge fund managers on an *ex ante* basis because it can detect performance persistence more effectively than traditional performance measures.

[13] If $m_3 = \frac{\sum u_t^3}{T}$, then the RALS alpha coefficient will be invariant to skewness, though the RALS coefficients will be estimated more precisely than OLS (Im and Schmidt, 2008). Taylor and Peel (1998), Sarno and Taylor (1999), Gallagher and Taylor (2000) and Garino and Sarno (2004) use an identical specification.

[14] To ensure that our results are robust to the assumption that the first-stage residuals are independent of the initial factors used to benchmark risk, we repeat all analysis limiting our sample to the 3,870 funds that fully satisfy this condition. In unreported results, we find that our results are stronger for this group of funds. There is a larger performance differential between portfolios sorted on skewness-adjusted and OLS alpha.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

The ADJ alphas are performance metrics that have the advantages of OLS alphas but also increase (decrease) the ranking of a manager to reflect the positive (negative) fund-specific skewness in their returns. An investor benefits if a fund manager can generate the same alpha as another manager but can do it with more positive fund-specific skewness because positive fund-specific skewness reflects the skill needed to avoid exposing the portfolio to extreme negative returns and drawdowns.

1. Skewness and Performance Rankings: Simulation Based Evidence

We first use simulations to demonstrate differences between OLS and skewness-adjusted alphas. We allow for fund-specific skewness in returns by considering hedge fund portfolios that are identical except for skewness in the error distribution. This exercise allows us to compare performance ratings based on OLS and ADJ alphas for different levels of fund-specific skewness.

In our simulations, we first estimate equation (1) with OLS for the monthly excess returns of the HFRI Aggregate Hedge Fund Index over the January 1994 to April 2015 period. Next, we simulate $\tilde{e}_t^i$, a random series of errors from the Pearson distribution with standard deviation and kurtosis set equal to those estimated for the Aggregate Hedge Fund Index, and various skewness levels S_i. We allow S_i to vary between –2.0 and +2.0 in increments of 0.5.[15] We then generate $\tilde{r}_{it}$, a simulated hedge fund return series, as follows:

$$\tilde{r}_{it} = \hat{\alpha}_i + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{\beta}_k^i F_{k,t} + \tilde{e}_t^i. \quad (7)$$

We repeat the simulation 1,000 times for each S_i.

[15] We are constrained to use skewness values ranging from –2.0 to 2.0 because skewness must be less than the square root of (kurtosis minus 1). For the Aggregate Index, these values are ±2.04.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Table VI reports the descriptive statistics of simulated hedge funds from January 1994 to April 2015. The mean returns and standard deviations are identical across the fund groups but large differences occur in exposure to large profits and losses. For example, for the most positive (negative) fund-specific skewness funds the maximum monthly return is +7.3% (+5.2%) and the most negative (positive) fund-specific skewness funds have maximum monthly losses of –9.3% (–7.2%). Figure 1, which compares the maximum drawdowns, is striking. The most negative fund-specific skewness funds have maximum drawdowns of –31.8% compared to –22.5% for the most positive fund-specific skewness funds, a difference of 9.3%.

In Panel A of Table VII, we report the OLS alpha estimate ($\hat{\alpha}$ = 0.29%, 3.52% annualized) and coefficient estimates of each of the Fung and Hsieh (2004) risk factors, i.e., $\hat{\beta}_k^i$. We also present the residual standard deviation ($\hat{\sigma}$ = 0.01), residual kurtosis ($\hat{K}$ = 5.35) and residual skewness ($\hat{S}$ = 0.06). Last, we estimate both OLS and ADJ alphas for each of the simulated portfolios. In Panel B of Table VII, we report simulation results with annualized $\hat{\alpha}_i$ = 3.53%, as estimated for the HFRI Aggregate Hedge Fund Index.

We find that the ADJ alphas, which allow for fund-specific skewness in returns, are sensitive to cross sectional differences in S_i whereas the OLS alpha estimates are similar. Further, the OLS alphas overstate managerial performance for negative values of S_i, (i.e., ADJ alphas are smaller than OLS alphas) but the OLS alphas understate managerial performance for positive values of S_i, (i.e., ADJ alphas are larger than OLS alphas).

Overall, the simulation evidence confirms that the preference for positive fund-specific skewness and avoidance of negative fund-specific skewness is rational if it does not come at the cost of traditional alpha. Further, the efficiency gain obtained from using an estimator that allows for fund-specific skewness in fund returns, which is reflected in higher

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

values of ρ^*, becomes more pronounced as the return skewness, S_i, increases in absolute value.

2. Actual Performance Rankings

When we consider the actual returns of individual hedge funds, we find results that are similar to the simulation results. Table VIII reports the performance of all funds in the sample estimated by the two different approaches when funds are sorted into skewness deciles. The results are striking. OLS mis-states fund performance for all fund deciles except decile 6, where skewness is close to zero. The OLS performance overstatement increases from 0.48 to 2.28% per year as skewness in returns becomes more negative and the OLS performance understatement increases from 0.72 to 4.68% per year as skewness in returns becomes more positive.

We find similar results when we repeat this analysis for subsets of funds that use different strategies.[16] OLS consistently overrates managerial performance for negatively skewed funds and consistently underrates managerial performance for hedge funds with positive skewness. Specifically, the OLS performance assessment ranking error is largest for Managed Futures fund style. Here, OLS overstates the performance of the most negatively skewed funds by 6.72% and understates the performance of the most positively skewed funds by 7.44%. Other strategies where the performance of positively skewed funds is heavily understated by OLS are Emerging Markets and Global Macro funds. Performance mis-rating is greatest for Fixed Income Arbitrage funds with negatively skewed returns.

IV. Skewness in Fund Returns and Selection of Hedge Fund Managers

[16] Results by strategy are not tabulated to save space but are available upon request.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Our results so far provide strong evidence that assessing hedge fund performance based on OLS alphas under-rates the skills of hedge fund managers who earn positively skewed returns and over-rates the skills of fund managers who earn negatively skewed returns. In this section, we investigate whether managerial selection can be improved *ex ante* by selecting hedge funds based on historical ADJ alphas instead of historical OLS alphas.

A. ADJ Alpha and Future Hedge Fund Returns

We first estimate the historical ADJ alphas and OLS alphas for the first two years of monthly returns (January 1994 to December 1995) and then a 24-month rolling-window. This procedure generates monthly time series estimates of ADJ and OLS alphas for each fund in the sample. Then, we estimate 12-month-ahead benchmark-adjusted returns for each fund. Finally, we estimate the following Fama and MacBeth (1973) cross-sectional regressions of future benchmark-adjusted returns on historical OLS and ADJ alphas:

$$BAR_{i,t+1:t+12} = \gamma_t + \delta_t ALP_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}. \quad (8)$$

Here, $BAR_{i,t+1:t+12}$ is the twelve-month-ahead benchmark-adjusted fund return, $ALP_{i,t}$ is the ADJ or OLS alpha observed at time t, and γ_t and δ_t are the intercept and slope coefficients, respectively.

We report the results for the full sample as well as crisis and no-crisis sub-samples in Table IX Panel A shows results for the Fung and Hsieh (2004) risk benchmarks and confirms the predictive power of both OLS and ADJ alpha for twelve-month-ahead benchmark-adjusted hedge fund returns for the full sample. The t-statistics for $\delta_{OLS\alpha}$ and $\delta_{ADJ\alpha}$ estimates are 5.15 and 7.93, respectively for the full sample, and 6.51 and 5.58, respectively for the no-crisis sub-sample.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

In comparison, we find that only $\delta_{ADJ\alpha}$ is statistically significant (*t*-statistic = 2.89) in the crisis sub-period. Panel B confirms these results for the alternative macroeconomic factor model based benchmark-adjusted hedge fund returns. Both OLS and ADJ alphas have predictive power during the full sample period and outside of the crisis period. However, only ADJ alpha maintains its statistical significance in the crisis sub-sample.

B. Hedge Fund Selection: Adjusted vs OLS Alphas

In the last set of tests, we investigate whether our ADJ alpha estimates allow us to identify superior fund managers on an *ex ante* basis. We sort funds into decile portfolios using their OLS alphas estimated over the preceding 24 months and then repeat the process using the ADJ alphas of those funds. We re-sort the portfolios at the beginning of each calendar year and compare the results. Continuously re-sorted top decile portfolios allow us to measure the difference in performance that arises from making forward-looking investment decisions based on historical skewness-adjusted alphas instead of OLS alphas.

Full sample results in Table X show that the one-year ahead alpha of the top decile portfolio sorted on ADJ alphas exceeds the one-year ahead alpha of the top decile portfolio sorted on OLS alphas by 0.84% per year with Fung and Hsieh (2004) risk factors and 0.26% per year with macroeconomic factors. We also report the Goetzmann et al. (2007) manipulation-proof performance measures ($MPPM_3$ and $MPPM_4$) for each portfolio and find that they are both larger for the top-decile ADJ alpha portfolio than for the top-decile OLS portfolio.

When we split the estimation period into crisis and non-crisis periods, we find that during non-crisis periods, the annualized alpha of the portfolio formed from ADJ alphas is similar to the OLS alpha portfolio. But, the differences are striking during crisis periods.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

During these periods, the alpha performance differential between the two decile portfolios is 5.5% per year, significant at the 5% level. For robustness, when we consider the macroeconomic factor model, the difference between the intercepts of the OLS and ADJ alpha portfolios during crisis periods narrows to 1.51% but remains statistically significant.

In Table X, Panel B we repeat the portfolio sorts using the Getmansky et al. (2004) specification to unsmooth hedge fund returns and in Panel C we control for the effects of backfill bias by removing the first twenty-four months of returns for each fund. These results are generally stronger than those reported in Panel A and confirm that ADJ alphas allow us to select better-performing hedge funds *ex-ante* despite these two well-known hedge fund data biases.

V. Summary and Conclusions

Most hedge fund returns exhibit significant skewness, especially during periods of economic uncertainty. In this paper, we show that fund-specific skewness is positively associated with *future* hedge fund performance. In particular, managerial skill in reducing exposure to large losses and consequent drawdowns generates positive fund-specific skewness at the fund-level. To quantify this skill, we introduce the ADJ alpha measure, which allows us to better assess and predict the performance of hedge fund managers. Our new performance measure rates a fund manager as superior if they deliver both high traditional alpha and positive fund-specific skewness.

Using the TASS/Lipper hedge fund database, we show that standard performance measures are unlikely to capture the skill of hedge fund managers who introduce positive fund-specific skewness through hedging, risk management, or dynamic trading. We find considerable differences between the ADJ and OLS alpha ratings. While both performance

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

measures produce similar results for funds with non-skewed returns, the OLS alpha overrates performance (i.e., $\alpha_{OLS} > \alpha_{ADJ}$) when returns are negatively skewed, and underrates performance (i.e., $\alpha_{OLS} < \alpha_{ADJ}$) when returns are negatively skewed.

We also examine whether our new ADJ alpha is better able to select fund managers based on historical return characteristics. When we sort funds into deciles based on rolling two year estimates of ADJ alphas, we find that the performance assessment error is significant. Further, funds with superior prior ADJ alphas outperform funds with high prior OLS alphas, which suggests that our new performance measure is able to select managers who deliver superior future performance more effectively than OLS.

When we compare these performance differences during periods of economic uncertainty, we find that performance differences are relatively small during periods of low economic uncertainty. However, portfolios formed using historical estimates of ADJ alphas outperform portfolios formed using historical OLS alphas by an impressive amount during crisis periods.

Collectively, these results argue in favor of adjusting for fund-specific skewness to identify skilled hedge fund managers, especially during periods of greater market uncertainty. Standard estimation methods err in a systematic fashion when rating the performance of hedge fund managers when portfolio returns exhibit fund-specific skewness, and this performance difference is amplified during crisis periods.

In future work, it may be useful to investigate the effectiveness of other fund return attributes that are easier to quantify (e.g., intra-day return spread) and have the same predictive power as fund-specific skewness. It would also be interesting to examine whether incorporating higher order return moments in traditional performance measures further improves their predictive power.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Appendix

RALS Methodology

Im and Schmidt (2008) Residual Augmented Least Squares (RALS) improves estimation efficiency when the error term is non-normal. The procedure augments an OLS linear regression with functions of the residuals. This method extends Newey (1988) and MaCurdy (2001), who show that parameter estimation can be improved when higher moments of the errors are assumed to be unrelated to the explanatory variables.

Im and Schmidt (2008) start with a multivariate linear regression model:

$$y_i = \alpha + \beta x'_i + \varepsilon_i. \tag{A1}$$

Here, x_i is a *k x 1* vector of explanatory variables.

Then, they develop a simple two stage approach that can be estimated, by first estimating equation (A1), then re-estimating equation (A1) augmented with (A2), again with OLS.

$$\widehat{w}_i = [(\hat{\varepsilon}_i^2 - \hat{\sigma}^2)(\hat{\varepsilon}_i^3 - \widehat{m}_3 - 3\hat{\sigma}^2\hat{\varepsilon}_i)]'. \tag{A2}$$

Here, $\hat{\varepsilon}_i$ denotes the residual, $\widehat{m}_3$ denotes the third sample moment of the residuals and $\hat{\sigma}^2$ denotes the standard residual variance estimate obtained from OLS applied to equation (A1). The resulting estimates are the RALS estimates of α and β, i.e., α^* and β^*.

Im and Schmidt (2008) make two key assumptions. First, the error term, ε, is assumed to be uncorrelated with the explanatory variables, *x*:

$$E[\varepsilon|x] = 0. \tag{A3}$$

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Second, they assume that functions of the error term, $h(\varepsilon)$, are also uncorrelated with *x*:

$$E[h(\varepsilon)|x] \equiv H(x) = H. \tag{A4}$$

These two assumptions allow Im and Schmidt (2008) to augment the regression model (A1) with additional functions of the residuals to improve estimation efficiency, when residuals are non-normal.

Im and Schmidt (2008) show that if there is residual skewness then the standardized third central moment is non-zero,

$$E(\varepsilon_i^3 - \sigma^3) \neq 0, \tag{A5}$$

which implies that $(\varepsilon_i^2 - \sigma^2)$ is correlated with ε_i but not with the explanatory variables (since ε_i and x_i are independent by assumption):

$$E[\varepsilon_i(\varepsilon_i^2 - \sigma^2)] \neq 0. \tag{A6}$$

Hence, augmenting the regression model (A1) with $(\hat{\varepsilon}_i^2 - \hat{\sigma}^2)$ will improve estimation efficiency.

Similarly, when the standardized fourth central moment of the series exceeds three, Im and Schmidt (2008) show that augmenting the regression model with $(\hat{\varepsilon}_i^3 - m_3 - 3\hat{\sigma}^2\hat{\varepsilon}_i)$ again improves estimation efficiency, as it is correlated with ε_i but not with x_i.

Im and Schmidt (2008) also derive ρ^*, a measure of the asymptotic gain in efficiency from employing RALS as opposed to OLS. ρ^* is constructed as $(1-\sigma_A^2/\sigma^2)$, where σ^2 is the asymptotic variance of the OLS estimation of β and σ_A^2 is the asymptotic variance of the RALS estimator:

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

$$\sigma_A^2 = \sigma^2 - \frac{\mu_3^2(\mu_6 - 6\mu_4\sigma^2 + 9\sigma^6 - \mu_3^2) - 2\mu_3(\mu_4 - 3\sigma^4)(\mu_5 - 4\mu_3\sigma^2) + (\mu_4 - 3\sigma^4)^2(\mu_4 - \sigma^4)}{(\mu_4 - \sigma^4)(\mu_6 - 6\mu_4\sigma^2 + 9\sigma^6 - \mu_3^2) - (\mu_5 - 4\mu_3\sigma^2)^2}. \quad \text{(A7)}$$

Here, μ_j is the *j*-th central moment of ε_i. The inclusion of the RALS terms that are functions of the first-stage OLS residuals generates a more efficient model estimate if the distribution of the OLS error term is non-normal. For normally distributed first-stage errors, OLS is efficient and the ratio equals zero.

References

Agarwal, V., Arisoy, Y. E., & Naik, N. Y. (2017). Volatility of aggregate volatility and hedge fund returns. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *125*, 491-510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2017.06.015

Agarwal, V., Bakshi, G., & Huij, J. (2009). Do higher-moment equity risks explain hedge fund returns? *Georgia State University Working Paper*.

Agarwal, V., Daniel, N. D., & Naik, N. Y. (2009). Role of managerial incentives and discretion in hedge fund performance. *Journal of Finance, 64*, 2221-2256. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2009.01499.x

Agarwal, V., Daniel, N. D., & Naik, N. Y. (2011). Do hedge funds manage their reported returns? *Review of Financial Studies, 24*, 3281-3320. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhr058

Amin, G. S., & Kat, H. M. (2003). Hedge fund performance 1990 to 2000: Do the money machines really add value? *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 38*, 251-274.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

https://doi.org/10.2307/4126750

Aragon, G. O. (2007). Share restrictions and asset pricing: Evidence from the hedge fund industry. *Journal of Financial Economics, 83*, 33-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2005.11.001

Avramov, D., Kosowski, R., Naik, N. Y., & Teo, M. (2011). Hedge funds, managerial skill, and macroeconomic variables. *Journal of Financial Economics, 99*, 672-692. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2010.10.003

Avramov, D., Barras, L., & Kosowski, R. (2013). Hedge fund return predictability under the magnifying glass. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 48*, 1057-1083. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109013000422

Back, K., Crane, A. D., & Crotty, K. (2018). Skewness consequences of seeking alpha. *Review of Financial Studies, 31*, 4720-4761. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhy029

Bali, T. G., Brown, S. J., & Caglayan, M. O. (2011). Do hedge funds' exposures to risk factors predict their future returns? *Journal of Financial Economics, 101*, 36-68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2011.02.008

Bali, T. G., Brown, S. J., & Caglayan, M. O. (2012). Systematic risk and the cross section of hedge fund returns. *Journal of Financial Economics, 106*, 114-131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2012.05.005

Bali, T. G., Brown, S. J., & Caglayan, M. O. (2014). Macroeconomic risk and hedge fund returns. *Journal of Financial Economics, 114*, 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2014.06.008

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Barber, B. M., & Lyon, J. D. (1997). Detecting long-run abnormal stock returns: The empirical power and specification of test statistics. *Journal of Financial Economics, 43*, 341-372. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X(96)00890-2

Barroso, P., & Santa-Clara, P. (2015). Momentum has its moments. *Journal of Financial Economics, 116*, 111-120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2014.11.010

Billio, M., Getmansky, M., & Pelizzon, L. (2011). Crises and hedge fund risk. *University of Massachusetts at Amherst Working Paper*.

Bollen, N. P. B., & Pool, V. K. (2009). Do hedge fund managers misreport returns? Evidence from the pooled distribution. *Journal of Finance, 64*, 2257-2288. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2009.01500.x

Boyer, B., Mitton, T., & Vorkink, K. (2009). Expected idiosyncratic skewness. *Review of Financial Studies, 23*, 169-202. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhp041

Brown, S., Goetzmann, W., & Ibbotson, R. G. (1999). Offshore hedge funds: Survival and performance 1989-95. *Journal of Business, 72*, 91-117. https://doi.org/10.1086/209603

Buraschi, A., Kosowski, R., & Sritrakul, W. (2014). Incentives and endogenous risk taking: A structural view on hedge fund alphas. *Journal of Finance, 69*, 2819-2870. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12167

Caglayan, M. O., & Ulutas, S. (2014). Emerging market exposures and the predictability of hedge fund returns. *Financial Management, 43*, 149-180. https://doi.org/10.1111/fima.12029

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Chan, L. K. C., & Lakonishok, J. (1992). Robust measurement of beta risk. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 27*, 265-282. https://doi.org/10.2307/2331371

Conrad, J., Dittmar, R. F., & Ghysels, E. (2013). Ex ante skewness and expected stock returns. *Journal of Finance, 68*, 85-124. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2012.01795.x

Dell'Aquila, R., Ronchetti, E., & Trojani, F. (2003). Robust GMM analysis of models for the short rate process. *Journal of Empirical Finance, 10*, 373-397. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5398(02)00050-6

Fama, E. F., & MacBeth, J. D. (1973). Risk, return, and equilibrium: Empirical tests. *Journal of Political Economy, 81*, 607-636. https://doi.org/10.1086/260061

Fung, W., & Hsieh, D. A. (2001). The risk in hedge fund strategies: Theory and evidence from trend followers. *Review of Financial Studies, 14*, 313-341. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/14.2.313

Fung, W., & Hsieh, D. A. (2004). Hedge fund benchmarks: A risk based approach. *Financial Analyst Journal, 60*, 65-80. https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v60.n5.2657

Fung, W., Hsieh, D. A., Naik, N. Y., & Ramadorai, T. (2008). Hedge funds: Performance, risk, and capital formation. *Journal of Finance, 63*, 1777-1803. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2008.01374.x

Gallagher, L. A., & Taylor, M. P. (2000). Measuring the temporary component of stock prices: Robust multivariate analysis. *Economics Letters, 67*, 193-200. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1765(99)00258-X

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Garino, G., & Sarno, L. (2004). Speculative bubbles in U.K. house prices: Some new evidence. *Southern Economic Journal, 70*, 777-795. https://doi.org/10.2307/4135272

Getmansky, M., Lo, A. W., & Makarov, I. (2004). An econometric model of serial correlation and illiquidity in hedge fund returns. *Journal of Financial Economics, 74*, 529-609. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2004.04.001

Glode, V. (2011). Why mutual funds "underperform". *Journal of Financial Economics, 99*, 546-559. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2010.10.008

Goetzmann, W., Ingersoll, J., Spiegel, M., & Welch, I. (2007). Portfolio performance manipulation and manipulation-proof performance measures. *Review of Financial Studies, 20*, 1503-1546. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhm025

Gupta, A., & Liang, B. (2005). Do hedge funds have enough capital? A value at risk approach. *Journal of Financial Economics, 77*, 219-253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2004.06.005

Huber, P. J., & Ronchetti, E. (2009). *Robust statistics*. New York, Wiley.

Im, K. S., & Schmidt, P. (2008). More efficient estimation under non-normality when higher moments do not depend on the regressors, using residual augmented least squares. *Journal of Econometrics, 144*, 219-233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2008.01.003

Jagannathan, R., Malakhov, A., & Novikov, D. (2010). Do hot hands exist among hedge fund managers? An empirical evaluation. *Journal of Finance, 65*, 217-255. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2009.01528.x

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Kadan, O., & Liu, F. (2014). Performance evaluation with high moments and disaster risk. *Journal of Financial Economics, 113*, 131-155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2014.03.006

Knez, P. J., & Ready, M. J. (1997). On the robustness of size and book-to-market in cross-sectional regressions. *Journal of Finance, 52*, 1355-1382. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb01113.x

Kosowski, R., Naik, N. Y., & Teo, M. (2007). Do hedge funds deliver alpha? A bayesian and bootstrap analysis. *Journal of Financial Economics, 84*, 229-264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2005.12.009

Kosowski, R., Timmermann, A., Wermers, R., & White, H. (2005). Can mutual fund stars really pick stocks? New evidence from a bootstrap analysis. *Journal of Finance, 61*, 2551-2595. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2006.01015.x

Leland, H. E. (1999). Beyond mean-variance: Performance measurement in a nonsymmetrical world. *Financial Analysts Journal, 55*, 27-36. https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v55.n1.2239

Liang, B., & Park, H. (2010). Predicting hedge fund failure: A comparison of risk measures. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 45*, 199-222. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109009990482

MaCurdy, T. E. (2001). Using information on the moments of disturbances to increase the efficiency of estimation. In: Hsiao, C., K. Morimune, & J. Powell (Eds.), *Nonlinear statistical modeling, Proceedings of the thirteenth international symposium in economic theory and econometrics: Essays in honor of Takeshi Amemiya*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Newey, W. K. (1988). Adaptive estimation of regression models via moment restrictions. *Journal of Econometrics, 38*, 301–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(88)90048-6

Newey, W. K., & West, K. D. (1987). A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix. *Econometrica, 55*, 703-708. https://doi.org/10.2307/1913610

Sarno, L., & Taylor, M. P. (1999). Moral hazard, asset price bubbles, capital flows, and the East Asian crisis: the first tests. *Journal of International Money and Finance, 18*, 637-657. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5606(99)00018-2

Taylor, M. P., & Peel, D. A. (1998). Periodically collapsing stock price bubbles: A robust test. *Economics Letters, 61*, 221-228. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1765(98)00171-2

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Figure 1. Simulated Maximum Drawdown at Different Fund-Specific Skewness Levels

This figure reports the maximum peak to trough drawdown of simulated hedge fund returns with fund-specific skewness ranging from -2.0 to +2.0. Max drawdown is the maximum peak to trough drawdown, reported from 1,000 simulated hedge fund distributions estimated at each fund-specific skewness level. Simulated hedge fund returns are formed as follows. We first estimate equation (1) with OLS for the monthly excess returns of the HFRI Aggregate Hedge Fund Index over the period from January 1994 to April 2015. We next generate a random series of errors from the Pearson distribution with standard deviation and kurtosis set equal to those estimated for the Aggregate Hedge Fund Index and the relevant fund-specific skewness level. Finally, we generate a simulated hedge fund return series, using the Fung and Hsieh (2004) factor returns, estimated coefficients and generated errors.




Table I. Summary Statistics: Hedge Fund Returns

The following summary statistics are reported: the numbers of funds, N; the equally-weighted averages of the mean monthly return, μ; standard deviation of monthly returns, σ; the Sharpe ratio, SR; and skewness, Skew, calculated using all returns for each fund. A fund is classified as negative or positive-skewness if the estimated sample skewness *t*-statistic is significant at the 5% level. The sample period is from January 1994 to April 2015.

	Negative-Skewness Funds						**No-Skewness Funds**						**Positive-Skewness Funds**				
	N	**μ**	**σ**	**SR**	**Skew**		**N**	**μ**	**σ**	**SR**	**Skew**		**N**	**μ**	**σ**	**SR**	**Skew**
Panel A: Live Funds																	
Converti	49	6.2	10.1	0.5	-		18	-	10.0	-	0.03		16	-	19.5	-	0.50
Event	267	3.0	12.1	0.3	-		39	3.36	14.2	0.4	0.00		102	10.5	16.7	0.6	1.26
Equity	79	4.0	9.46	0.2	-		11	4.56	8.63	0.3	-		48	8.16	8.14	1.0	0.77
Emerging	131	9.9	17.0	0.5	-		11	12.9	14.8	0.8	0.00		81	14.4	18.0	0.9	0.96

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Fixed	58	4.4	7.03	0.4	-		2	4.08	7.72	0.5	0.08		35	9.60	11.1	1.1	1.16
Global	76	4.4	13.8	0.2	-		21	2.40	14.5	0.0	0.01		76	9.72	14.6	0.6	0.84
Long	670	6.3	13.8	0.3	-0.8		74	10.3	12.9	0.8	-		439	9.96	15.1	0.6	0.88
Managed	86	5.2	17.1	0.3	-		37	4.20	18.2	0.2	0.00		180	9.36	18.5	0.4	0.65
Multi-	220	3.9	9.80	0.3	-		32	1.80	9.87	0.1	-		82	9.72	13.2	0.6	0.94
All Funds	169	5.4	12.7	0.3	-		25	8.40	13.5	0.9	-		109	9.84	15.3	0.7	0.89
Panel B:																	
Converti	119	5.5	7.52	0.4	-		23	4.44	4.64	0.6	-		38	8.88	7.14	2.1	1.07
Event	214	6.3	9.42	0.8	-		42	9.96	12.8	0.8	0.00		111	10.9	13.5	1.0	1.20
Equity	178	3.8	8.63	0.1	-		47	6.24	6.72	0.6	-		106	8.16	8.97	0.7	0.87
Emerging	283	6.8	17.9	0.3	-		38	7.32	20.3	0.5	0.00		142	14.1	20.5	0.6	0.85
Fixed	158	1.8	10.2	0.8	-		11	3.60	6.20	0.1	0.01		63	9.60	6.03	3.2	1.02
Global	112	2.2	12.5	0.0	-		32	3.24	11.3	0.1	-		138	7.68	15.0	0.3	0.95
Long	817	6.2	15.0	0.3	-		23	7.44	13.5	0.3	0.00		711	13.9	18.5	0.8	0.94
Managed	161	4.5	16.0	0.2	-		76	5.04	16.5	0.1	0.00		254	8.40	19.8	0.2	0.74
Multi-	291	1.4	10.2	0.3	-		50	6.84	10.6	0.4	-		141	10.3	10.6	1.4	1.06
All Funds	241	4.9	12.8	0.4	-		57	6.60	12.8	0.4	0.00		178	11.4	16.0	0.9	0.94

Table II. Persistence in Fund-Specific Skewness

This table reports, for the sample period January 1996 to April 2015, average intercept and slope coefficients from the Fama and MacBeth (1973) cross sectional regressions of future fund-specific skewness on historical fund-specific skewness. In the first stage, fund-specific skewness is estimated for each fund from the time-series regressions of hedge fund excess returns on the Fung and Hsieh (2004) factors over a 24-month rolling-window. In the second stage, each month the cross section of future funds' fund-specific skewness is regressed on the current month funds' fund-specific skewness. Results are reported for twelve, twenty-four, thirty-six and forty-eight month-ahead fund-specific skewness. Newey-West (1987) adjusted *t*-statistics are reported in parentheses below mean coefficient estimates.

	***N*-Month-Ahead Fund-Specific Skewness**					
Intercept	**12 Month**	**24 Month**	**36 Month**	**48 Month**	**Avg N**	**Avg R^2**
0.00	0.01				1501	0.09%
(0.33)	(1.22)					
0.03***		0.06***			1286	0.48%
(3.50)		(10.34)				
0.04***			0.09***		1099	0.76%
(3.74)			(12.36)			
0.06***				0.11***	937	0.99%
(4.24)				(9.29)		

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.
** Significant at the 0.05 level.
* Significant at the 0.10 level.

Table III. Historical Skewness and Future Returns: Fama-MacBeth Cross-Sectional Regression Estimates

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

This table reports, for the sample period January 1996 to April 2015, average intercept and slope coefficients from the Fama and MacBeth (1973) cross-sectional regressions of future benchmark adjusted hedge fund returns on current fund-specific skewness. In the first stage, monthly fund-specific skewness is estimated for each fund from the time-series regressions of hedge fund excess returns on the Fung and Hsieh (2004) factors over a 24-month rolling-window. In the second stage, each month the cross section of funds' future benchmark-adjusted return is regressed on the funds' fund-specific skewness. In row 1 to 3 we report coefficients for one month-ahead benchmark adjusted returns for the full sample (FS), crisis (Crisis) and non-crisis (No Crisis) periods. In row 4 to 6 we report coefficients for twelve month-ahead benchmark adjusted returns. Newey-West (1987) adjusted *t*-statistics are reported in parentheses below mean coefficient estimates. Crisis and non-crisis periods are classified following Billio et al. (2011).

	One-Month-Ahead Returns			**Twelve-Month-Ahead Returns**				
Intercept	**FS**	**Crisis**	**No Crisis**	**FS**	**Crisis**	**No Crisis**	**Avg N**	**Avg R^2**
0.36***	0.16***						1725	0.34%
(6.82)	(4.58)							
0.54***		0.00					2193	0.18%
(4.29)		(-0.02)						
0.34***			0.17***				1732	0.35%
(5.75)			(4.83)					
0.38***				0.09***			1501	0.45%
(9.98)				(3.82)				
0.50***					0.15**		1839	0.20%
(12.63)					(2.52)			
0.36***						0.09***	1528	0.49%
(7.99)						(3.13)		

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.
** Significant at the 0.05 level.
* Significant at the 0.10 level.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Table IV. Performance of Funds Sorted on Fund-Specific Skewness

Each month funds are sorted into quintile portfolios based upon Fung and Hsieh (2004) fund-specific skewness, estimated using the preceding 24 months of returns. Mean returns, Sharpe ratio, Fung and Hsieh (2004) alpha (FH Alpha) and macroeconomic alpha (Macro Alpha) are reported. The final column shows the differences in monthly returns, the differences in Sharpe ratios, the difference in alphas with respect to the Fung and Hsieh (2004) model and the difference in alphas with respect to the macroeconomic model between quintiles 5 and 1. Newey-West (1987) adjusted *t*-statistics are reported in parentheses below coefficient estimates. Performance measures are estimated using all available returns over the sample period from January 1996 to April 2015.

	Fund-Specific Skewness Quintile					
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Diff**
Mean Return	7.70***	7.46***	8.31***	8.83***	9.94***	2.24**
	(5.50)	(4.88)	(5.39)	(5.85)	(7.07)	(2.21)
Sharpe Ratio	0.84	0.73	0.85	0.95	1.19	0.36
FH Alpha	3.48***	3.01***	3.85***	4.46***	5.91***	2.44*
	(3.22)	(3.35)	(3.99)	(4.65)	(6.34)	(1.71)
Macro Alpha	4.50***	4.39***	5.17***	5.50***	6.73***	2.23
	(3.76)	(3.73)	(4.19)	(4.45)	(5.75)	(1.33)

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.
** Significant at the 0.05 level.
* Significant at the 0.10 level.

Table V. Performance of Funds Sorted on Historical Fund-Specific Skewness and Alpha

Each month funds are sorted into tercile portfolios based on fund-specific skewness, estimated using the preceding 24 months of returns. Within each tercile funds are sorted into terciles based upon Fung and Hsieh (2004) alpha, estimated using the preceding 24 months of returns. Mean returns, Sharpe ratio, Fung and Hsieh (2004) alpha (FH Alpha) and macroeconomic alpha (Macro Alpha) are reported in Panel A. Panel B shows the differences in monthly returns, the differences in Sharpe ratios, the difference in alphas with respect to the Fung-Hsieh model and the difference in alphas with respect to the macroeconomic model between alpha terciles 3 and 1. Newey-West (1987) adjusted *t*-statistics are reported in parentheses below coefficient estimates. Performance measures are estimated using all available returns over the sample period from January 1996 to April 2015.

Panel A: Portfolios Sorted by Fund-Specific Skewness and Alpha

	Low Fund-Specific Skewness			**Medium Fund-Specific Skewness**			**High Fund-Specific Skewness**		
	Low Alpha	**Medium Alpha**	**High Alpha**	**Low Alpha**	**Medium Alpha**	**High Alpha**	**Low Alpha**	**Medium Alpha**	**High Alpha**
Mean	6.65***	6.08***	9.96***	6.64***	7.06***	11.23***	5.96***	8.43***	14.04***
Return	(3.32)	(5.26)	(5.57)	(3.97)	(5.73)	(5.45)	(3.76)	(7.28)	(7.29)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Sharpe Ratio	0.46	0.69	0.94	0.55	0.83	0.96	0.49	1.15	1.36
FH	1.86	2.23***	5.62***	1.96*	3.13***	6.60***	1.45	4.60***	9.82***
Alpha	(1.07)	(3.16)	(4.35)	(1.75)	(4.21)	(4.35)	(1.33)	(6.20)	(6.83)
Macro	2.73	3.71***	6.92***	3.34**	4.15***	7.66***	2.70**	5.48***	10.64***
Alpha	(1.54)	(4.15)	(4.35)	(2.48)	(4.39)	(4.24)	(2.00)	(5.95)	(6.16)
Panel B: Performance Difference Between High and Low Alpha Portfolios									
	Low Fund-Specific Skewness High - Low Alpha			**Medium Fund-Specific Skewness High - Low Alpha**			**High Fund-Specific Skewness High - Low Alpha**		
Mean		3.31			4.59***			8.08***	
Return		(1.63)			(2.95)			(5.67)	
Sharpe Ratio		0.48			0.40			0.87	
FH		3.76*			4.65**			8.37***	
Alpha		(1.74)			(2.47)			(4.64)	
Macro		4.19*			4.32*			7.95***	
Alpha		(1.76)			(1.92)			(3.63)	

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.
** Significant at the 0.05 level.
* Significant at the 0.10 level.

Table VI. Descriptive Statistics of Simulated Hedge Fund Monthly Returns at Different Fund-Specific Skewness Levels

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

This table reports the return distributions of simulated hedge funds from January 1994 to April 2015. Descriptive statistics of the simulated returns with fund-specific skewness from -2.0 to + 2.0 are reported. Mean and Std Dev are the annualized mean and standard deviation and Min and Max are the minimum and maximum of monthly returns for the 1,000 simulated hedge fund distributions estimated at each skewness level. Max DD is the maximum peak to trough drawdown an investor would have experienced by investing in simulated hedge fund returns at each skewness level. The final column shows the difference in mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum monthly returns and maximum drawdowns between the +2.0 and -2.0 fund-specific skewness simulations.

	Fund-Specific Skewness									
	-2.0	**-1.5**	**-1.0**	**-0.5**	**0.0**	**0.5**	**1.0**	**1.5**	**2.0**	**Diff**
Mean	8.40	8.40	8.40	8.40	8.40	8.40	8.40	8.40	8.40	0.00
Std Dev	6.93	6.93	6.93	6.93	6.93	6.93	6.93	6.93	6.93	0.00
Max	5.20	5.30	5.40	5.60	5.80	6.10	6.50	6.90	7.30	2.10
Min	-9.30	-8.90	-8.50	-8.10	-7.80	-7.60	-7.40	-7.30	-7.20	2.10
Max DD	-31.80	-31.10	-30.20	-28.80	-27.20	-28.00	-26.00	-23.90	-22.50	9.30

Table VII. Skewness Adjusted (ADJ) Alpha Simulation Results

Panel A reports results for estimating the Fung and Hsieh (2004) factor model, with OLS, for the monthly returns of the HFRI Aggregate Hedge Fund Index over the period from January 1994 to April 2015. This yields an annualized alpha estimate ($\hat{\alpha}$ = 3.52) and coefficients on each of the Fung and Hsieh (2004) risk factors. Also reported are residual standard deviation, $\hat{\sigma}$, residual kurtosis, $\hat{K}$, and residual skewness, $\hat{S}$. Panel B reports the estimated performance measures for simulated HFRI Aggregate monthly returns with different levels of residual skewness and annualized OLS alpha set equal to 3.52, for the period January 1994 to April 2015. The first (last) column in Panel B reports the results for the 1,000 simulated fund returns with the most negative (positive) skewness. In Panel B the first row reports the mean annualized OLS alpha estimate for each skewness level. The second row reports the mean annualized ADJ alpha (alpha adjusted for skewness) estimate for each skewness level. The third row reports the difference between the mean annualized ADJ alpha and OLS alpha at each skewness level. The final row reports *ρ**, the efficiency gain from using the ADJ alpha estimator relative to OLS. Newey-West (1987) adjusted *t*-statistics are reported in parentheses below coefficient estimates. Coefficients are bold if significant at the 5% level.

Panel A: HFRI Index Fung and Hsieh Factor Model

α	β_{SNPRF}	β_{SCMLC}	$\beta_{BD10RET}$	β_{BAAMTS}	β_{PTFSBD}	β_{PTFSFX}	$\beta_{PTFSCOM}$	$\overline{R}^2$	$\hat{\sigma}$	$\hat{K}$	$\hat{S}$
3.52		0.2	-0.02	-0.04	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.71	0.01	5.35	0.06
(4.38)	(18.	(9.5	(-	(-	(-	(1.5	(0.21)				

Panel B: Fung and Hsieh Performance Measures at Different Fund-Specific Skewness Levels

Fund-Specific Skewness	**-2.0**	**-1.5**	**-1.0**	**-0.5**	**0.0**	**0.5**	**1.0**	**1.5**	**2.0**
OLS Alpha	**3.52**	**3.53**	**3.52**	**3.54**	**3.54**	**3.53**	**3.53**	**3.53**	**3.51**
	(4.46)	(4.52)	(4.47)	(4.44)	(4.39)	(4.37)	(4.37)	(4.38)	(4.35)
ADJ Alpha	**-1.01**	**-0.84**	-0.35	**1.02**	**3.54**	**6.03**	**7.45**	**8.00**	**8.00**
	(-3.57)	(-	(-						(30.30)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

		2.51)	0.80)	(1.94)	(5.96)	(11.44)	(17.97)	(24.74)	
OLS Alpha Error	**4.53**	**4.38**	**3.87**	**2.51**	0.00	**-2.50**	**-3.92**	**-4.46**	**-4.49**
	(233.30)	(283.51)	(279.61)	(165.41)	(0.30)	(-163.71)	(-291.66)	(-274.72)	(-245.98)
*ρ**	0.94	0.89	0.78	0.59	0.43	0.59	0.78	0.89	0.94

Table VIII. Alphas of Individual Hedge Funds Sorted on Historical Skewness

This table reports the performance measures for individual hedge funds sorted into skewness deciles. The first (last) column reports the decile of funds with the lowest (highest) skewness. The first row reports the mean estimate of skewness for each decile. The second row reports the mean annualized OLS alpha estimate. The third row reports the mean annualized ADJ alpha (alpha adjusted for skewness) for each decile. The fourth row reports the estimated OLS performance rating error. Newey-West (1987) adjusted *t*-statistics are reported in parentheses below coefficient estimates. Coefficients are bold if significant at the 5% level. Results are estimated using all available returns for each fund over the sample period from January 1994 to April 2015.

Skewness Decile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Skewness	-3.13	-1.24	-0.75	-0.47	-0.25	-0.06	0.14	0.39	0.78	1.02
OLS Alpha	-0.96	1.08	2.04	2.52	2.40	2.40	4.08	5.64	7.08	11.64
	(0.44)	(0.83)	(0.74)	(0.83)	(0.89)	(0.85)	(1.18)	(1.42)	(1.95)	(2.37)
ADJ Alpha	-3.24	-1.44	0.36	1.56	1.92	2.28	4.80	7.44	10.08	16.32
	(-0.06)	(0.36)	(0.40)	(0.66)	(0.84)	(0.87)	(1.50)	(1.98)	(2.88)	(3.89)
OLS Alpha Error	2.28	2.52	1.68	0.96	0.48	0.12	-0.72	-1.80	-3.00	-4.68
	(5.17)	(10.62)	(9.01)	(4.60)	(2.81)	(0.45)	(-3.62)	(-7.20)	(-9.10)	(-6.38)

Table IX. Historical Alpha and Future Returns: Fama-MacBeth Cross-Sectional Regression Estimates

This table reports, for the sample period January 1996 to April 2015, average intercept and slope coefficients from the Fama and MacBeth (1973) cross-sectional regressions of twelve-month ahead average benchmark adjusted fund return, on current Fung and Hsieh (2004) model alpha adjusted for fund-specific skewness (ADJ alpha) and OLS alpha. In the first stage, monthly alpha and ADJ alpha is estimated for each fund from the time-series regressions of hedge fund excess returns on the Fung and Hsieh (2004) factors, over a 24-month rolling-window. In the second stage, the cross section of 12-month-ahead funds' benchmark adjusted return are regressed on the funds' alpha each month for the period January 1996 to April 2015. Newey-West (1987) adjusted t-statistics are reported in parentheses below average coefficient estimates. In Panel A (Panel B) results are reported for Fung and Hsieh model (macroeconomic model) benchmark adjusted hedge fund returns. Results are reported for full sample (FS), crisis (Crisis) and non-crisis (No Crisis) periods, classified following Billio et al. (2011).

	ADJ alpha			**OLS alpha**				
Intercept	**FS**	**Crisis**	**No Crisis**	**FS**	**Crisis**	**No Crisis**	**Avg N**	**Avg R^2**

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Panel A: Fung and Hsieh Benchmark Adjusted Returns								
0.28***	0.12***						1501	11.22%
(7.10)	(7.93)							
0.36***		0.12***					1838	33.31%
(6.71)		(2.89)						
0.27***			0.12***				1528	8.73%
(5.83)			(6.51)					
0.21***				0.25***			1501	14.96%
(3.53)				(5.15)				
0.51***					-0.01		1839	29.93%
(2.83)					(-0.06)			
0.19***						0.28***	1528	13.20%
(2.98)						(5.58)		
Panel B: Macroeconomic Model Benchmark Adjusted Returns								
0.29***	0.09***						1612	9.62%
(6.06)	(5.35)							
0.14		0.16***					1838	31.11%
(1.46)		(6.70)						
0.29***			0.08***				1622	6.75%
(5.54)			(3.97)					
0.24***				0.15***			1612	10.98%
(4.88)				(3.44)				
0.20					0.12		1839	26.51%
(1.60)					(0.72)			
0.23***						0.15***	1623	8.83%
(4.07)						(3.24)		

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.
** Significant at the 0.05 level.
* Significant at the 0.10 level.

Table X. Performance of Fund Portfolios Formed Using OLS and Skewness Adjusted (ADJ) Alphas

This table reports estimated performance measures for the OLS and ADJ alpha portfolios. Hedge funds are sorted on January 1 each year into decile portfolios, based on their ADJ alpha and OLS alpha estimated over the previous twenty-four months. Funds with the highest past performance measure are allocated into the ADJ alpha and OLS alpha portfolios. Panels A, B and C show the results for portfolios formed based on Fung and Hsieh (2004) alphas, alphas corrected for return serial correlation and backfill bias corrected alphas, respectively. We perform a means test for differences in Fung and Hsieh (2004) alpha and macroeconomic alpha for the ADJ alpha and OLS alpha portfolios. Results are estimated using annually re-sorted returns from January 1996 to April 2015. Crisis and non-crisis periods are classified following Billio et al. (2011). Alphas and differences in alphas in bold are significant at the 5% level.

	Mean	**$MPPM_3$**	**$MPPM_4$**	**FH Alpha**	**Macro Alpha**
Panel A: Full Sample					
ADJ Full Sample	11.57	0.07	0.07	**6.71**	**7.84**

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

OLS Full Sample	10.78	0.05	0.06	**5.87**	**7.59**
ADJ-OLS Full Sample	0.79	0.02	0.01	0.84	0.26
ADJ No Crisis	13.92	0.10	0.09	**8.01**	**8.24**
OLS No Crisis	13.68	0.09	0.09	**7.96**	**8.28**
ADJ-OLS No Crisis	0.24	0.01	0.00	0.05	-0.04
ADJ Crisis	2.74	-0.02	-0.03	-0.10	7.28
OLS Crisis	-0.12	-0.06	-0.07	**-5.67**	5.77
ADJ-OLS Crisis	2.86	0.04	0.04	**5.57**	**1.51**
Panel B: Unsmoothed Returns					
ADJ Full Sample	9.67	0.07	0.07	3.48	3.46
OLS Full Sample	8.23	0.05	0.06	2.40	2.57
ADJ-OLS Full Sample	1.44	0.02	0.01	1.08	0.89
ADJ No Crisis	11.62	0.10	0.09	3.04	2.93
OLS No Crisis	10.49	0.09	0.09	2.82	2.52
ADJ-OLS No Crisis	1.13	0.01	0.00	0.22	0.41
ADJ Crisis	2.33	-0.02	-0.03	**8.95**	5.59
OLS Crisis	-0.27	-0.06	-0.07	2.52	2.60
ADJ-OLS Crisis	2.60	0.04	0.04	**6.43**	**2.99**
Panel C: No Backfill					
ADJ Full Sample	9.44	0.05	0.05	**5.09**	**5.31**
OLS Full Sample	7.48	0.03	0.02	3.38	3.99
ADJ-OLS Full Sample	1.96	0.02	0.03	**1.71**	**1.32**
ADJ No Crisis	11.58	0.08	0.07	**5.85**	**5.39**
OLS No Crisis	10.69	0.07	0.06	**5.85**	**4.59**
ADJ-OLS No Crisis	0.89	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.80
ADJ Crisis	1.92	-0.04	-0.05	5.77	4.96
OLS Crisis	-3.78	-0.10	-0.12	**-10.94**	1.33
ADJ-OLS Crisis	5.70	0.06	0.07	**16.71**	**3.63**

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.