Causal Inference for Asset Pricing

Valentin Haddad   Zhiguo He   Paul Huebner   Peter Kondor   Erik Loualiche

UCLA, Stanford, SSE, LSE, Minnesota

June 2025

Causal Inference for Asset Pricing

Causal inference methods

- e.g. use IV/diff-in-diff to learn about investors' portfolio choice or equilibrium asset prices
  - If the stock price of Tesla drops by 1%, how do you change your position?
  - If a group of investors starts buying GameStop, how does its price change?
- *natural experiments + inference without taking a strong stand on mechanism*

Causal Inference for Asset Pricing

Causal inference methods

- e.g. use IV/diff-in-diff to learn about investors' portfolio choice or equilibrium asset prices
  - If the stock price of Tesla drops by 1%, how do you change your position?
  - If a group of investors starts buying GameStop, how does its price change?

- *natural experiments + inference without taking a strong stand on mechanism*

<div style="text-align:center">"This is not how we do asset pricing"</div>

Causal Inference for Asset Pricing

Causal inference methods

- e.g. use IV/diff-in-diff to learn about investors' portfolio choice or equilibrium asset prices
  - If the stock price of Tesla drops by 1%, how do you change your position?
  - If a group of investors starts buying GameStop, how does its price change?

- *natural experiments + inference without taking a strong stand on mechanism*

Traditional asset pricing empirical methods

- Euler equations, factor models, Epstein-Zin preferences, …
- *equilibrium relations + fully specified models*

CAUSAL INFERENCE FOR ASSET PRICING

Causal inference methods

- e.g. use IV/diff-in-diff to learn about investors' portfolio choice or equilibrium asset prices
  - If the stock price of Tesla drops by 1%, how do you change your position?
  - If a group of investors starts buying GameStop, how does its price change?

- *natural experiments + inference without taking a strong stand on mechanism*

Traditional asset pricing empirical methods

- Euler equations, factor models, Epstein-Zin preferences, ...

- *equilibrium relations + fully specified models*

$\rightarrow$ **This paper: a causal inference framework that is compatible with finance ideas**

An example

- Alan has detailed data on corporate bond holdings of CalPERS and bond prices

- *How would portfolio positions change if, all else equal, bond prices move?*
  – demand curve of CalPERS

An example

- Alan has detailed data on corporate bond holdings of CalPERS and bond prices

- *How would portfolio positions change if, all else equal, bond prices move?*
  – demand curve of CalPERS

- OLS is a bad idea:
  – prices affect CalPERS demand
  – CalPERS (and many others) demand affect prices

An example

- Alan has detailed data on corporate bond holdings of CalPERS and bond prices

- *How would portfolio positions change if, all else equal, bond prices move?*
  – demand curve of CalPERS

- OLS is a bad idea:
  – prices affect CalPERS demand
  – CalPERS (and many others) demand affect prices

- **Natural experiment:** the Fed decides to do a one-off intervention buying random corporate bonds

ALAN'S DILEMMA

Canonical causal inference: IV with $Z_i =$ Fed purchases of bond i

$$\Delta D_i = \widehat{\mathcal{E}}\Delta P_i + \theta' X_i + e_i$$
$$\Delta P_i = \lambda Z_i + \eta' X_i + u_i$$

Canonical causal inference: IV with $Z_i = $ Fed purchases of bond i

$$\Delta D_i = \widehat{\mathcal{E}}\Delta P_i + \theta' X_i + e_i$$
$$\Delta P_i = \lambda Z_i + \eta' X_i + u_i$$

Finance: holdings decided as a portfolio

- When price of a green bond increases, CalPERS sells some of it ... and replace by investing disproportionately more in other green bonds than brown bonds

$$\Delta D = \underset{\text{matrix}}{\mathcal{E}}\ \Delta P + \epsilon$$

ALAN'S DILEMMA

Canonical causal inference: IV with $Z_i =$ Fed purchases of bond i

$$\Delta D_i = \widehat{\mathcal{E}} \Delta P_i + \theta' X_i + e_i$$
$$\Delta P_i = \lambda Z_i + \eta' X_i + u_i$$

Finance: holdings decided as a portfolio

- When price of a green bond increases, CalPERS sells some of it ... and replace by investing disproportionately more in other green bonds than brown bonds

$$\Delta D = \underset{\text{matrix}}{\mathcal{E}} \, \Delta P + \epsilon$$

$\rightarrow$ Challenge of demand estimation with many goods

- SUTVA is violated
- All other prices are omitted variables ... too many to instrument them all

THIS PAPER: ASSUMPTION

1. An elementary assumption about demand: **homogeneous substitution conditional on observables**

- When CalPERS substitutes, does so differentially for bonds with different observables (e.g. greenness, duration), but does not distinguish between bonds with the same observables

THIS PAPER: ASSUMPTION

1. An elementary assumption about demand: **homogeneous substitution conditional on observables**

- When CalPERS substitutes, does so differentially for bonds with different observables (e.g. greenness, duration), but does not distinguish between bonds with the same observables

- Markowitz finance: factor structure of covariance matrix
- Many others: targeting of portfolio level targets (e.g. regulatory scores), logit, ...

THIS PAPER: ASSUMPTION

1. An elementary assumption about demand: **homogeneous substitution conditional on observables**

- When CalPERS substitutes, does so differentially for bonds with different observables (e.g. greenness, duration), but does not distinguish between bonds with the same observables

- Markowitz finance: factor structure of covariance matrix
- Many others: targeting of portfolio level targets (e.g. regulatory scores), logit, ...

- Empirical design, supporting evidence, ...

THIS PAPER: IDENTIFICATION

2. Cross-sectional causal inference identifies the **relative elasticity** ($\widehat{\mathcal{E}}$):

- How does the relative demand for two bonds with the same greenness and duration respond to a change in their relative price?
- Difference between own-price and cross-price elasticity

THIS PAPER: IDENTIFICATION

2. Cross-sectional causal inference identifies the **relative elasticity** ($\widehat{\mathcal{E}}$):

- How does the relative demand for two bonds with the same greenness and duration respond to a change in their relative price?
- Difference between own-price and cross-price elasticity
- *Partial identification*: no information about substitution patterns

THIS PAPER: IDENTIFICATION

2. Cross-sectional causal inference identifies the **relative elasticity** ($\widehat{\mathcal{E}}$):

- How does the relative demand for two bonds with the same greenness and duration respond to a change in their relative price?

- Difference between own-price and cross-price elasticity

- *Partial identification*: no information about substitution patterns

3. A small set of time series regressions identifies **substitution**

- Substitution = meso and macro elasticity
  - Meso: How does the demand for green bonds relative to brown bonds respond to the price of the green-minus-brown portfolio and the market portfolio?
  - Macro: How does the demand for bonds responds to the price of the market portfolio and the green-minus-brown portfolio?

- Needs simultaneous instruments over time for the price of all portfolios

RELATED LITERATURE

- **Asset pricing using causal inference methods**
  - Shleifer (1986); Harris, Gurel (1986); Chang, Hong, Liskovich (2014); Pavlova, Sikorskaya (2023); Greenwood, Sammon (2024); Gompers, Metrick (2001); Coval, Stafford (2007); Lou (2012); Ben-David, Li, Rossi, Song (2022); Hartzmark, Solomon (2022); Krishnamurthy, Vissing-Jorgensen (2011); Haddad, Moreira, Muir (2021, 2025); Selgrad (2024); Du, Tepper, Verdelhan (2018); Greenwood, Vissing-Jorgensen (2018); Haddad, Muir (2021); Chen, Chen, He, Liu, Xie (2023); ...

- **Structural approach and demand systems**
  - *Koijen, Yogo (2019, 2024); Koijen, Richmond, Yogo (2024)*; Haddad, Huebner, Loualiche (2024); van der Beck (2024); Lu, Wu (2023); Gabaix, Koijen (2024); Bretscher, Schmid, Sen, Sharma (2024); Jansen, Li, Schmid (2024); Fang (2023); Fang, Xiao (2024); ...
  - Li, Lin (2024); Chaudhary, Fu, Li (2023); Aghaee (2024); An, Huber (2025); Peng, Wang (2023); Fuchs, Fukuda, Neuhann (2024); ...

- **What we don't do:**
  - Strategic responses (Haddad, Huebner, Loualiche, 2024)
  - Dynamics (Greenwood, Hanson, Liao, 2018; Huebner, 2024; Gabaix, Koijen, 2024; He, Kondor, Li)
  - State-contingent shocks (Haddad, Moreira, Muir, 2025)

- **Spillovers/substitution outside asset pricing:**
  - *Berry, Levinsohn, Pakes (1995)*, Berg, Reisinger, Streitz (2021); Chodorow-Reich, Nenov, Simsek (2021); Guren, McKay, Nakamura, Steinsson (2021), Huber (2023); Wolf (2023); ...

OUTLINE

An Assumption
for Demand in Asset Pricing

THE DEMAND FUNCTION FOR ASSETS

- Investor chooses portfolio ... taking prices are given: $D(P, ...)$
  - Similar structure with market power or learning from prices: post a demand curve

THE DEMAND FUNCTION FOR ASSETS

- Investor chooses portfolio ... taking prices are given: $D(P, ...)$
  - Similar structure with market power or learning from prices: post a demand curve

- In changes, linearize:

$$\Delta D = \underset{\text{elasticity}}{\mathcal{E}} \, \Delta P + \underset{\text{shifts}}{\epsilon}$$

  - could be logs, levels, portfolio weights, yields: choose to give regularity to $\mathcal{E}$

THE DEMAND FUNCTION FOR ASSETS

- Investor chooses portfolio ... taking prices are given: $D(P, ...)$
    - Similar structure with market power or learning from prices: post a demand curve

- In changes, linearize:

$$\Delta D = \underset{\text{elasticity}}{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}} \Delta P + \underset{\text{shifts}}{\epsilon}$$

    - could be logs, levels, portfolio weights, yields: choose to give regularity to $\mathcal{E}$

- Markowitz: $D = \frac{1}{\gamma} \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - P) \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \Sigma^{-1}$

THE DEMAND FUNCTION FOR ASSETS

- Investor chooses portfolio ... taking prices are given: $D(P, ...)$
  - Similar structure with market power or learning from prices: post a demand curve

- In changes, linearize:

$$\Delta D = \underset{\text{elasticity}}{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}} \Delta P + \underset{\text{shifts}}{\epsilon}$$

  - could be logs, levels, portfolio weights, yields: choose to give regularity to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}$

- Markowitz: $D = \frac{1}{\gamma} \Sigma^{-1} (\mu - P) \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \Sigma^{-1}$

- *Multipliers* or price impact: effect of demand shifts on equilibrium prices $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{agg}^{-1}$

The Demand Function for Assets

- Investor chooses portfolio ... taking prices are given: $D(P, ...)$
    - Similar structure with market power or learning from prices: post a demand curve

- In changes, linearize:

$$\Delta D = \underset{\text{elasticity}}{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}} \Delta P + \underset{\text{shifts}}{\epsilon}$$

    - could be logs, levels, portfolio weights, yields: choose to give regularity to $\mathcal{E}$

- Markowitz: $D = \frac{1}{\gamma}\Sigma^{-1}(\mu - P) \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{1}{\gamma}\Sigma^{-1}$

- *Multipliers* or price impact: effect of demand shifts on equilibrium prices $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{agg}^{-1}$

    This talk: what if you want to figure $\mathcal{E}$ out from data without assuming much?

AN ELEMENTARY ASSUMPTION

A1. **Homogeneous substitution conditional on observables**

$\rightarrow$ *Any pair of assets in the estimation sample $\mathcal{S}$ with the same observables shares the same cross-price elasticity with respect to any third asset, within or outside the estimation sample:*

$$\boxed{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{il} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{jl} \text{ if } X_i = X_j} \quad \text{for all } i, j \in \mathcal{S}, \text{ and } l \neq i, j,$$

- When substituting, the investor differentiates with respect to X only

An Elementary Assumption

A1. **Homogeneous substitution conditional on observables**

$\rightarrow$ *Any pair of assets in the estimation sample $\mathcal{S}$ with the same observables shares the same cross-price elasticity with respect to any third asset, within or outside the estimation sample:*

$$\boxed{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{il} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{jl} \text{ if } X_i = X_j} \quad \text{for all } i, j \in \mathcal{S}, \text{ and } l \neq i, j,$$

- When substituting, the investor differentiates with respect to X only

- X_i: $K \times 1$ vector of observables for asset i.

- Add linearity $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{il} = \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_i, X_l) = X_i' \underbrace{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_X}_{K \times K} X_l$

AN ELEMENTARY ASSUMPTION

A1. **Homogeneous substitution conditional on observables**

   → *Any pair of assets in the estimation sample $\mathcal{S}$ with the same observables shares the same cross-price elasticity with respect to any third asset, within or outside the estimation sample:*

$$\boxed{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{il} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{jl} \text{ if } X_i = X_j} \quad \text{for all } i, j \in \mathcal{S}, \text{ and } l \neq i, j,$$

- When substituting, the investor differentiates with respect to X only

- X_i: $K \times 1$ vector of observables for asset i.

- Add linearity $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{il} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{cross}}(X_i, X_l) = X_i' \underbrace{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_X}_{K \times K} X_l$

– Can apply everywhere, or just to a sample of assets $\mathcal{S}$

Regularizing a Bit More

A2. **Constant relative elasticity**

$\rightarrow$ *Assets in the estimation sample have the same value of relative elasticity $\mathcal{E}_{relative}$ with respect to other assets with the same characteristics:*

$$\boxed{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{ii} - \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{ji} = \mathcal{E}_{relative} \text{ if } X_i = X_j} \quad \text{for all } i, j \in \mathcal{S}$$

– How does the relative demand for two assets with the same observables respond to a change in their relative price?

Regularizing a Bit More

A2. **Constant relative elasticity**

→ *Assets in the estimation sample have the same value of relative elasticity $\mathcal{E}_{relative}$ with respect to other assets with the same characteristics:*

$$\boxed{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{ii} - \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{ji} = \mathcal{E}_{relative} \text{ if } X_i = X_j} \quad \text{for all } i,j \in \mathcal{S}$$

– How does the relative demand for two assets with the same observables respond to a change in their relative price?

– Similar local behavior across assets → homogeneous treatment effect
– Can relax a lot for cross-sectional results (function of characteristics, LATE)

- With few close assets, could ignore observables and assume full homogeneity
  - Demand for 10-yr bonds of Ford and GM responds in same way to price of 5-year First Solar bond


Estimation Sample

Excluded Assets

$$\mathcal{E} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}_o & \mathcal{E}_c & \cdots & \mathcal{E}_c \\ \mathcal{E}_c & & & \\ & & & \mathcal{E}_c \\ \mathcal{E}_c & \cdots & \mathcal{E}_c & \mathcal{E}_o \end{bmatrix}$$

- With few close assets, could ignore observables and assume full homogeneity
  - Demand for 10-yr bonds of Ford and GM responds in same way to price of 5-year First Solar bond
- Risk-based models: assets have common variance and covariance + *identical covariance with outside assets*

Estimation Sample   Excluded Assets

$$\mathcal{E} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}_o & \mathcal{E}_c & \cdots & \cdots & \mathcal{E}_c & \blacksquare & \spadesuit & & \blacklozenge \\ \mathcal{E}_c & & & & & & & & \\ \vdots & & & & & & \cdots & & \\ & & & & \mathcal{E}_c & & & & \\ \mathcal{E}_c & \cdots & \cdots & \mathcal{E}_c & \mathcal{E}_o & \blacksquare & \spadesuit & & \blacklozenge \end{bmatrix}$$

Estimation Sample   Excluded Assets

- With few close assets, could ignore observables and assume full homogeneity
  - Demand for 10-yr bonds of Ford and GM responds in same way to price of 5-year First Solar bond
- Risk-based models: assets have common variance and covariance + *identical covariance with outside assets*
- Diagnostic: balance between treated (high Z_i) and control (low Z_i) on covariance with broad factors

$$\mathcal{E} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}_o & \mathcal{E}_c & \cdots\cdots & \mathcal{E}_c & | & \blacksquare & \spadesuit & & \blacklozenge \\ \mathcal{E}_c & & & & | & & & & \\ & & & & | & & & \cdots & \\ & & & \mathcal{E}_c & | & & & & \\ \mathcal{E}_c & \cdots\cdots & \mathcal{E}_c & \mathcal{E}_o & | & \blacksquare & \spadesuit & & \blacklozenge \\ & & & & | & & & & \\ & & & & | & & & & \\ & & & & | & & & & \end{bmatrix}$$

Key question: What does the investor consider when substituting between assets?

- *Investor manages <aggregate statistic> hence substitution depends on <individual asset contribution>*

Using the Assumptions: Rich Cross-Sections

Key question: What does the investor consider when substituting between assets?

- *Investor manages <aggregate statistic> hence substitution depends on <individual asset contribution>*

- *Broad categories*: X_i are group dummies

USING THE ASSUMPTIONS: RICH CROSS-SECTIONS

Key question: What does the investor consider when substituting between assets?

- *Investor manages <aggregate statistic> hence substitution depends on <individual asset contribution>*

- *Broad categories*: X_i are group dummies

- *Risk based motives*: care about portfolio-level factor exposure, so X_i are factor loadings or characteristics that proxy for them

USING THE ASSUMPTIONS: RICH CROSS-SECTIONS

Key question: What does the investor consider when substituting between assets?

- *Investor manages <aggregate statistic> hence substitution depends on <individual asset contribution>*

- *Broad categories*: X_i are group dummies

- *Risk based motives*: care about portfolio-level factor exposure, so X_i are factor loadings or characteristics that proxy for them

- *Non-risk motives*: X_i is asset weight in this objective
    - Binding constraints (e.g. leverage)
    - Manages a regulatory score (e.g. capital ratio,...)
    - Stakeholders pressure (greenness, ...)

$$\max_{D} \quad D'(M - P) - \frac{\gamma}{2} D'\Sigma D - \frac{\kappa}{2} \left(D'X^{(1)} \right)^2$$

$$\text{such that} \quad D'X^{(2)} \leq \Theta$$

CROSS-SECTIONAL
CAUSAL INFERENCE

CROSS-SECTIONAL IDENTIFICATION

Back to Alan ...

CROSS-SECTIONAL IDENTIFICATION

Back to Alan ...

- He knows true model is matrix with CalPERS caring about greenness and duration (X)

$$\Delta D = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}\Delta P + \epsilon$$

- He runs the regression:

$$\Delta D_i = \widehat{\mathcal{E}}\Delta P_i + \theta' X_i + e_i$$
$$\Delta P_i = \lambda Z_i + \eta' X_i + u_i$$

CROSS-SECTIONAL IDENTIFICATION

Back to Alan ...

- He knows true model is matrix with CalPERS caring about greenness and duration (X)

$$\Delta D = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}} \Delta P + \epsilon$$

- He runs the regression:

$$\Delta D_i = \widehat{\mathcal{E}} \Delta P_i + \theta' X_i + e_i$$
$$\Delta P_i = \lambda Z_i + \eta' X_i + u_i$$

Proposition 1. Under A1, A2, and the usual exclusion and relevance restrictions, the IV estimator identifies the **relative elasticity** $\widehat{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}_{relative} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{ii} - \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{ji}$.

CROSS-SECTIONAL IDENTIFICATION

Back to Alan ...

- He knows true model is matrix with CalPERS caring about greenness and duration (X)

$$\Delta D = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}} \Delta P + \epsilon$$

- He runs the regression:

$$\Delta D_i = \widehat{\mathcal{E}} \Delta P_i + \theta' X_i + e_i$$
$$\Delta P_i = \lambda Z_i + \eta' X_i + u_i$$

Proposition 1. Under A1, A2, and the usual exclusion and relevance restrictions, the IV estimator identifies the **relative elasticity** $\widehat{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}_{relative} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{ii} - \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_{ji}$.

Mechanics for the simple case

- Take 2 assets with same characteristics, $X_1 = X_2$

First difference

$$\Delta D_1 = \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{12}\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{1k}\Delta P_k$$

$$\Delta D_2 = \mathcal{E}_{22}\Delta P_2 + \mathcal{E}_{21}\Delta P_1 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{2k}\Delta P_k$$

Second difference

- Take 2 assets with same characteristics, $X_1 = X_2$

First difference

$$\Delta D_1 = \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{12}\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{1k}\Delta P_k$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_2)\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_k)\Delta P_k$$

$$\Delta D_2 = \mathcal{E}_{22}\Delta P_2 + \mathcal{E}_{21}\Delta P_1 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{2k}\Delta P_k$$

Second difference

MECHANICS FOR THE SIMPLE CASE

- Take 2 assets with same characteristics, $X_1 = X_2$

First difference

$$\Delta D_1 = \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{12}\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{1k}\Delta P_k$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_2, X_2)\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_k)\Delta P_k$$

$$\Delta D_2 = \mathcal{E}_{22}\Delta P_2 + \mathcal{E}_{21}\Delta P_1 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{2k}\Delta P_k$$

Second difference

- Take 2 assets with same characteristics, $X_1 = X_2$

First difference

$$\Delta D_1 = \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{12}\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{1k}\Delta P_k$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_2, X_2)\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_k)\Delta P_k$$

$$\Delta D_2 = \mathcal{E}_{22}\Delta P_2 + \mathcal{E}_{21}\Delta P_1 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{2k}\Delta P_k$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_{22}\Delta P_2 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_1)\Delta P_1 + \sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_k)\Delta P_k$$

Second difference

MECHANICS FOR THE SIMPLE CASE

■ Take 2 assets with same characteristics, $X_1 = X_2$

First difference

$$\Delta D_1 = \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{12}\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k\geq 3}\mathcal{E}_{1k}\Delta P_k$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_2, X_2)\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k\geq 3}\mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_k)\Delta P_k$$

$$\Delta D_2 = \mathcal{E}_{22}\Delta P_2 + \mathcal{E}_{21}\Delta P_1 + \sum_{k\geq 3}\mathcal{E}_{2k}\Delta P_k$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_{22}\Delta P_2 + \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_1)\Delta P_1 + \sum_{k\geq 3}\mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_k)\Delta P_k$$

Second difference

$$\Delta D_1 - \Delta D_2 = \underbrace{\left(\mathcal{E}_{11} - \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_1)\right)}\Delta P_1 - \underbrace{\left(\mathcal{E}_{22} - \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_2, X_2)\right)}\Delta P_2$$

- Take 2 assets with same characteristics, $X_1 = X_2$

First difference

$$\Delta D_1 = \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{12}\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k \geq 3}\mathcal{E}_{1k}\Delta P_k$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_{11}\Delta P_1 + \mathcal{E}_{\text{cross}}(X_2, X_2)\Delta P_2 + \sum_{k \geq 3}\mathcal{E}_{\text{cross}}(X_1, X_k)\Delta P_k$$

$$\Delta D_2 = \mathcal{E}_{22}\Delta P_2 + \mathcal{E}_{21}\Delta P_1 + \sum_{k \geq 3}\mathcal{E}_{2k}\Delta P_k$$

$$= \mathcal{E}_{22}\Delta P_2 + \mathcal{E}_{\text{cross}}(X_1, X_1)\Delta P_1 + \sum_{k \geq 3}\mathcal{E}_{\text{cross}}(X_1, X_k)\Delta P_k$$

Second difference

$$\Delta D_1 - \Delta D_2 = \underbrace{\left(\mathcal{E}_{11} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{cross}}(X_1, X_1)\right)}_{\widehat{\varepsilon}}\Delta P_1 - \underbrace{\left(\mathcal{E}_{22} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{cross}}(X_2, X_2)\right)}_{\widehat{\varepsilon}}\Delta P_2$$

$$= \widehat{\varepsilon}\left(\Delta P_1 - \Delta P_2\right)$$

What About Equilibrium?

- In the data, changes in price are always in equilibrium, so no notion of "separately moving each price"
  - If the Fed doesn't buy a bond, its price might move anyways because it bought its substitutes

What About Equilibrium?

- In the data, changes in price are always in equilibrium, so no notion of "separately moving each price"
  - If the Fed doesn't buy a bond, its price might move anyways because it bought its substitutes

- **Never an issue for exogeneity**
  - Exogeneity is "Fed buying a bond or not" uncorrelated to demand shifts of CalPERS
  - $Z_i \perp \epsilon_i | X_i$

WHAT ABOUT EQUILIBRIUM?

- In the data, changes in price are always in equilibrium, so no notion of "separately moving each price"
  – If the Fed doesn't buy a bond, its price might move anyways because it bought its substitutes

- **Never an issue for exogeneity**
  – Exogeneity is "Fed buying a bond or not" uncorrelated to demand shifts of CalPERS
  – $Z_i \perp \epsilon_i | X_i$

- If equilibrium is such that the two prices cannot deviate *at all* from each other, relevance might fail
  – You can assess this empirically!

THE MISSING PIECE: SUBSTITUTION

- Key step: control for characteristics θ absorbs substitution from other assets

$$\sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_k) \Delta P_k = X_1' \underbrace{\mathcal{E}_X X \Delta P}_{\text{constant in data}}$$

THE MISSING PIECE: SUBSTITUTION

- Key step: control for characteristics θ absorbs substitution from other assets

$$\sum_{k \geq 3} \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{cross}}(X_1, X_k)\Delta P_k = X_1' \underbrace{\mathcal{E}_X X \Delta P}_{\text{constant in data}}$$

Absorbing substitution $\neq$ Estimating substitution

- "Missing intercept and coefficients" problem: doesn't know how θ would change with different prices

WHAT ABOUT LOGIT?

- Koijen Yogo (1999), Koijen Richmond Yogo (2024):

  "log utility $+$ factor model $=$ logit"

  - Logit accounts for substitution, so nothing missing

What About Logit?

- Koijen Yogo (1999), Koijen Richmond Yogo (2024):

  "log utility $+$ factor model $=$ logit"

  - Logit accounts for substitution, so nothing missing

- **An arbitrary factor model is not equivalent to logit**
  - Logit: when the price of any bond increases, CalPERS replaces it proportionally to its existing portfolio
  - Factor model: when the price of a bond increases, CalPERS replaces it dispoportionately with bonds with similar factor loadings

WHAT ABOUT LOGIT?

– Koijen Yogo (1999), Koijen Richmond Yogo (2024):

   "log utility + a specific factor model with only 1 factor equal to the current portfolio = logit"

   – Logit accounts for substitution, so nothing missing

– **An arbitrary factor model is not equivalent to logit**
   – Logit: when the price of any bond increases, CalPERS replaces it proportionally to its existing portfolio
   – Factor model: when the price of a bond increases, CalPERS replaces it dispoportionately with bonds with similar factor loadings

What About Logit?

- Koijen Yogo (1999), Koijen Richmond Yogo (2024):

  "log utility + a specific factor model with only 1 factor equal to the current portfolio = logit"

  - Logit accounts for substitution, so nothing missing

- **An arbitrary factor model is not equivalent to logit**
  - Logit: when the price of any bond increases, CalPERS replaces it proportionally to its existing portfolio
  - Factor model: when the price of a bond increases, CalPERS replaces it disproportionately with bonds with similar factor loadings

- Both models satisfy our assumptions and hence can have relative elasticity estimated from the cross-section
  - Assuming logit-specific structure makes it enough to back out substitution
  - Analogy: if you assume no substitution at all, you would also get all $\mathcal{E}$ from the cross-section

Estimating Substitution with the Time Series

Why Substitution Matters

Alan wants to know:

- Will CalPers maintain its green tilt if the price of green bonds become very expensive relative red bonds?

WHY SUBSTITUTION MATTERS

Alan wants to know:

- Will CalPers maintain its green tilt if the price of green bonds become very expensive relative red bonds?

- How much will CalPers size down its bond positions if all bond prices increase?

WHY SUBSTITUTION MATTERS

Alan wants to know:

- Will CalPers maintain its green tilt if the price of green bonds become very expensive relative red bonds?

- How much will CalPers size down its bond positions if all bond prices increase?

- Answer to these questions relies on knowing substitution!

SIMPLIFYING SUBSTITUTION

Under assumptions A1 and A2, can replace the asset-level problem of substitution with a portfolio-level problem:

- Re-package prices and demand:

$$\Delta P_{agg} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \Delta P_i, \qquad\qquad \Delta D_{agg} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \Delta D_i$$

$$\Delta P_X = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i X_i \Delta P_i \qquad\qquad \Delta D_X = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i X_i \Delta D_i$$

$$\Delta P_{idio,i} = \Delta P_i - \Delta P_{agg} - X_i \Delta P_X \qquad \Delta D_{idio,i} = \Delta D_i - \Delta D_{agg} - X_i \Delta D_X$$

Simplifying Substitution

Under assumptions A1 and A2, can replace the asset-level problem of substitution with a portfolio-level problem:

- Re-package prices and demand:

$$\Delta P_{agg} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \Delta P_i, \qquad\qquad \Delta D_{agg} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \Delta D_i$$

$$\Delta P_X = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i X_i \Delta P_i \qquad\qquad \Delta D_X = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i X_i \Delta D_i$$

$$\Delta P_{idio,i} = \Delta P_i - \Delta P_{agg} - X_i \Delta P_X \qquad \Delta D_{idio,i} = \Delta D_i - \Delta D_{agg} - X_i \Delta D_X$$

- *Decompose the response of demand to prices into three univariate components:*

$$\text{Relative:} \qquad \Delta D_{idio,i} = \widehat{\mathcal{E}} \Delta P_{idio,i}$$

Meso: $$\qquad \Delta D_X = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{agg} \Delta P_{agg} + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_X \Delta P_X$$

Macro: $$\qquad \Delta D_{agg} = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{agg} \Delta P_{agg} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_X \Delta P_X$$

AGGREGATION INTUITION

- Under assumptions A1 and A2:

$$\mathcal{E} = \widehat{\mathcal{E}}\mathbf{I} + X\mathcal{E}_X X'$$

    – $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}$ is a scalar

    – $\mathcal{E}_X$ is only $K \times K$ (factor model)

- Project the change in price along the factor X direction:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta P_X &= (X'X)^{-1}X'\Delta P \\
&= \left(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(X'X)^{-1}X'\mathbf{I}_N + (X'X)^{-1}X'X\mathcal{E}_X X'\right)\Delta D \\
&= \left(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}\mathbf{I}_K + \mathcal{E}_X(X'X)\right)\Delta D_X
\end{aligned}$$

AGGREGATION INTUITION

- Two easy cases:
    - Only one characteristic ($K = 1$):

    $$\check{\mathcal{E}} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathcal{E}} + N(\mathcal{E}_X)_{11} & N(\mathcal{E}_X)_{12} \\ N(\mathcal{E}_X)_{21} & \widehat{\mathcal{E}} + N(\mathcal{E}_X)_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{agg} & \bar{\mathcal{E}}_X \\ \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{agg} & \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_X \end{pmatrix}$$

    - Observables are group dummies: consider the case when the observables are dummy variables for disjoint groups.

    $$\Delta P_{X,k} = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i \in k} \Delta P_i$$

Estimating the Meso and Macro Elasticities

$$\text{Meso:} \qquad \Delta D_X = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{agg}\Delta P_{agg} + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_X \Delta P_X$$
$$\text{Macro:} \qquad \Delta D_{agg} = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_{agg}\Delta P_{agg} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_X \Delta P_X$$

- Substitution boils down to relation between aggregate and observable based portfolios
  - Response of overall demand and green portfolio tilt to aggregate bond price and price of green-minus-brown portfolio
  - Low dimensional
- Need joint instruments for prices **in time series**:
  - To estimate macro elasticity, need to account for simultaneous change in price of green-minus-brown
  - Only controlling for the price is generally a bad control (in particular if demand shocks are correlated)

Estimating Multipliers: an Empirical Example

Example: Corporate Bond Relative Multiplier

- U.S. investment-grade corporate bonds (following Chaudhary, Fu, Li, 2024)

- Steps to go through when conducting causal inference in asset pricing:
    1. choose a source of variation
    2. assess exogeneity
    3. assess assumptions A1 and A2 and select observables $+$ units
    4. implement the regression analysis

- Step 1: flow-induced demand shock Z_{it}: fund flow in mutual funds $\times$ portfolio composition (Coval Stafford 2007, Lou 2012)

- Step 2: assess exogeneity, i.e., $Z_{it} \perp \epsilon_{it}|X_{it}$
    - example threat to identification: another investor type (e.g., insurance companies) buying the same bonds held by mutual funds that receive a lot of inflows

STEP 3: DIAGNOSTIC FOR A1 – BALANCE ON COVARIANCES

**Do treated bonds comove the same way with broad portfolios as the control bonds?**

1. At each date t, form a long-short portfolio based on whether Z_{it} is above ("treated") or below ("control") the median

2. Compute the β of the long-short return on broad indices in a window around t (here: 2y)

3. β different from zero $\Rightarrow$ substitution likely not homogeneous

# STEP 3: DIAGNOSTIC FOR A1 – BALANCE ON COVARIANCES

Do treated bonds comove the same way with broad portfolios as the control bonds?

1. At each date t, form a long-short portfolio based on whether Z_{it} is above ("treated") or below ("control") the median

2. Compute the β of the long-short return on broad indices in a window around t (here: 2y)

3. β different from zero $\Rightarrow$ substitution likely not homogeneous

- Treated and control bonds may differ systematically based on the observables, which may drive differences in β
  $\rightarrow$ natural if investors choose their flows along dimensions like duration and credit risk

- Do the treated and control comove the same way *conditional on observables*?

- $Z_{idio,it}$: residual of instrument regressed on a date fixed effect, **duration** $\times$ date fixed effects and **credit rating** $\times$ date fixed effects

STEP 3: DIAGNOSTIC FOR A1 – BALANCE ON COVARIANCES

Do treated bonds comove the same way with broad portfolios as the control bonds?

1. At each date t, form a long-short portfolio based on whether Z_{it} is above ("treated") or below ("control") the median

2. Compute the β of the long-short return on broad indices in a window around t (here: 2y)

3. β different from zero $\Rightarrow$ substitution likely not homogeneous

- Treated and control bonds may differ systematically based on the observables, which may drive differences in β
  - $\rightarrow$ natural if investors choose their flows along dimensions like duration and credit risk

- Do the treated and control comove the same way *conditional on observables*?

- $Z_{idio,it}$: residual of instrument regressed on a date fixed effect, **duration** $\times$ date fixed effects and **credit rating** $\times$ date fixed effects

- Alternative unit to bond returns: yield changes ▸ A1 yield changes ▸ Multiplier yield changes

- Similar diagnostic for A2: balance on idiosyncratic volatility ▸ A2 diagnostic

A. Corporate Bond Index

B. High−Low Credit Rating

C. Long−Short Term Bonds

D. Stock Index

STEP 4: IMPLEMENT THE REGRESSION

Relative multiplier $\widehat{\mathcal{M}} \approx 0$

	Return $\Delta P_{it}/P_{i,t-1}$
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Demand shock:					
Z_{it}	1.541*	-0.254	0.019		
	(0.637)	(0.229)	(0.065)		
$Z_{idio,it}$				0.019	0.019
				(0.065)	(0.065)
Date Fixed Effects		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Duration $\times$ Date Fixed Effects			Yes	Yes	
Credit Rating $\times$ Date Fixed Effects			Yes	Yes	
N	646,335	646,335	646,335	646,335	646,335
R^2	0.010	0.415	0.632	0.632	0.415

Conclusion

- I hope Alan is happy now

Conclusion

- Key challenge for causal inference in asset pricing: substitution across assets

Conclusion

- Key challenge for causal inference in asset pricing: substitution across assets

- **An elementary condition for valid inference**: homogenous substitution conditional on observables
  - difference in substitution driven by a known set of observables

- **Standard cross-sectional causal inference** identifies relative elasticity or its inverse, relative multiplier
  - Guidance on designing settings such that assumptions are plausible
  - Compatible with usual covariance matrix assumptions

- **Time series identification with observable-based portfolios** reveals substitution
  - Need to consider all dimensions of substitution jointly

DIAGNOSTICS FOR A2 – BALANCE ON IDIOSYNCRATIC VOLATILITY


A. Idiosyncratic Volatility (Z_{it})

B. Idiosyncratic Volatility ($Z_{idio,it}$)

- Average idiosyncratic volatility among treated versus control bonds

▶ Back

A. Corporate Bond Index

B. High−Low Credit Rating

C. Long−Short Term Bonds

D. Stock Index

Relative multiplier $\widehat{\mathcal{M}} = -0.072$

	Yield change ΔY_{it}				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Demand shock:					
Z_{it}	-0.384*	-0.104*	-0.072**		
	(0.166)	(0.047)	(0.027)		
$Z_{idio,it}$				-0.072**	-0.072**
				(0.027)	(0.027)
Date Fixed Effects		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Duration $\times$ Date Fixed Effects			Yes	Yes	
Credit Rating $\times$ Date Fixed Effects			Yes	Yes	
N	630,255	630,255	630,255	630,255	630,255
R^2	0.004	0.071	0.089	0.089	0.070