"So, after looking at the results from our Granger causality tests – we did this for one, two, and three days after the news came out – we noticed something interesting. Only a few specific types of news seemed to really have a statistically significant impact on stock prices.

What stood out the most was negative news about entertainment. It consistently showed a significant effect across all three time periods. This suggests that bad news in the entertainment world has a pretty reliable way of predicting where stock prices might go, whether it's the next day, in two days, or even three days later.

Now, when we looked at different time lags, other types of news also showed some influence, but it depended on the timing. For example, if we looked at just one day after the news, negative tech news and positive sports news seemed to matter. If we stretched it out to two days later, then positive tech news and positive health/fitness news started to become significant. And by the time we looked at three days later, neutral entertainment news, positive political news, and neutral health/fitness news were the ones that seemed to have a predictive power.

What this kind of shows is that different news affects stock prices in different ways over time, and investors probably react at different speeds depending on the kind of news it is. The fact that negative entertainment news kept popping up might mean the market is always pretty sensitive to that kind of information. Other news, though, might take a bit longer to really sink in and be reflected in the market. Overall, these findings give us some good insights into how news and market reactions are connected over time, which could be useful for making investment decisions and trying to predict the market."

"Now, even though we saw these patterns over different time periods – especially how negative entertainment news kept showing up – when we split our data into two separate parts (we called them Part 1 and Part 2), things got even more interesting and showed us that these connections aren't always straightforward.

For instance, that neutral or negative entertainment news, which seemed important no matter the time lag in our first analysis, only stayed statistically significant in Part 1. On the flip side, negative news about business and politics became important in Part 2. This makes us think that outside factors, like what's happening in the market or if there are any big policy changes, can change which news topics really drive the market at different times. Interestingly, things like positive political news and neutral health/fitness news only seemed to matter in one of our data parts, which suggests their impact might depend a lot on the specific situation rather than being a universal rule.

These findings really back up and add to what we saw earlier about the timing. While some news, like negative entertainment, seems to have a pretty consistent effect over time, other types of news can be unpredictable, not just across different time periods but also depending on the specific data we're looking at. This is probably because there are other things we haven't accounted for or just because of the way we sampled the data. So, what this all means from a research perspective is that if we want to understand how news affects the market, we really need to look at both the timing and the broader context."