

Which Factors Matter Jointly? A Bayesian Approach

Siddhartha Chib¹, Francis J. DiTraglia² and Irina Pimenova²

¹Olin Business School, Washington University in St. Louis

²Department of Economics, University of Pennsylvania

This Version: March 28, 2016

Abstract

In this paper we use Bayesian methods to revisit a classic question in empirical finance: which asset pricing factors explain the time-series and cross-section behavior of asset returns? To answer this question one must consider an extremely large collection of models formed from all possible subsets of the proposed factors. And with so many models under consideration, there is a serious risk of over-fitting. We address this challenging high-dimensional model selection problem by calculating and comparing marginal likelihoods in a Bayesian seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) model with multivariate Student-t errors and an objective, training-sample prior. Unlike approaches based on hypothesis testing, marginal likelihood comparisons automatically penalize models based on complexity, avoiding the problem of over-fitting. Our proposed method performs well in a calibrated simulation, selecting the correct model even when we intentionally mis-specify the error distribution. We then consider an application using monthly returns for ten industry portfolios and twelve leading asset pricing factors. Our exhaustive search over 98,304 models, 2^{13} for each of twelve error specification suggests that, in addition to the usual suspects, quality is important for explaining the behavior of returns.

Keywords: Asset Pricing, Factor Models, Bayesian Model Selection

JEL Codes: C11, C52, G00, G12

1 Introduction

An abiding question in empirical finance is the following: which factors are useful for explaining the time series and cross-section behavior of equity and portfolio returns? There is by now a vast literature on this topic concerned with the development of possible factors and the empirical evaluation of those factors. Along with the original market factor introduced in [Sharpe \(1964\)](#) and [Lintner \(1965\)](#), an array of new factors has emerged as documented in [Harvey et al. \(2015\)](#). Determining the empirical relevance of these factors is an ongoing statistical challenge and different avenues continue to be energetically explored. For instance, [Hou et al. \(2014a\)](#) compare the [Hou et al. \(2014b\)](#) and [Fama and French \(2015\)](#) five-factor models based on the conceptual meaning of the factors and their ability to explain asset-pricing anomalies. A more statistical evaluation is provided by [Harvey and Liu \(2015\)](#) who start with a collection of 12 leading factors and use a bootstrap procedure to forward-select relevant factors.

We propose a different method for finding the best collection of factors based on two important observations. First, factors should be considered *jointly* in all possible combinations. If D is the number of factors under consideration, this requires the consideration of 2^{D+1} models, allowing for the possibility of a non-zero intercept. Stepwise selection, whether based on a t-statistic or related statistics, ignores the question of joint significance and the potentially high correlation between factors. As such it can perform poorly in practice and does not necessarily select the best model in the limit: it is not asymptotically consistent.¹ Second, with so many models under consideration, there is a serious danger of over-fitting. Indeed, as suggested by [Harvey et al. \(2015\)](#), many of the novel factors identified in recent years may well be spurious. To avoid this problem, any proposed selection procedure should account for the high-dimensional nature of the factor selection problem by appropriately penalizing more complex models relative to simpler ones.

In this paper we take both of these observations to heart, using monthly observations for twelve leading asset pricing factors and ten industry portfolios to carry out an exhaustive Bayesian comparison of 98,304 asset pricing specifications based on a seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) model with Student-t errors. Ten of the factors used in our exercise are used by [Harvey and Liu \(2015\)](#) while two others are drawn from different sources. Our model comparisons are based on the calculation of Bayesian marginal likelihoods, using the method of [Chib \(1995\)](#). Marginal likelihoods automat-

¹See, for example [Judd et al. \(2011\)](#).

ically penalize models based on complexity, assuring that those with more factors will not rank higher merely because their greater flexibility allows them to fit the noise in the data. Moreover, model selection based on the comparison of marginal likelihoods has attractive asymptotic properties. If the true model is among the candidates under consideration, marginal likelihood comparisons will select it with probability approaching one in the limit; if it is not among the candidates, they will select the model that is closest to the truth. As we show in a calibrated simulation example, marginal likelihood comparisons also perform well in finite samples. The flexibility of marginal likelihoods as a tool for model comparison allows us to simultaneously select over asset pricing factors and features of the error distribution. Thus we allow the data to dictate the heaviness of the tails of the return distribution, considering multivariate Student-t distributions with 5, 5.5, 6, 6.5, 7, 7.5, 8, 8.5, 9, 9.5 and 10 degrees of freedom in addition to Gaussian errors. Marginal likelihood comparisons also allow us to “test” the factor pricing models under consideration. Because all of our candidate factors are returns, factor pricing theory implies that the intercept should be zero for all test portfolios. By comparing identical specifications with and without an intercept, we can determine whether the data supports this prediction of theory. Unlike the p-value from a frequentist hypothesis test, which is a probability calculated *under* the assumption that the theory is correct, our Bayesian approach can be used to determine how much more probable it is *that* the theory is correct than that it is not.

Marginal likelihood comparisons require the specification of proper priors. Because the meaning and importance of factor coefficients vary by model, however, it would be inappropriate to place priors independently on each factor. The same is true for the error precision matrix, which we estimate without restriction from the data rather than, say, restricting to be diagonal: its meaning, too, depends on the model. To specify 98,304 priors in an automatic and objective way, we employ a small training sample that precedes our estimation sample.

Our paper adds to the growing literature on the use of Bayesian techniques in finance. [Avramov \(2002\)](#) and [Cremers \(2002\)](#), for example, use Bayesian model-averaging to explore the question of market-return predictability with multiple predictors, while [Shanken \(1987\)](#), [Harvey and Zhou \(1990\)](#) and [Avramov and Chao \(2006\)](#) take a Bayesian approach to consider the question of the significance (or lack thereof) of the intercept in the CAPM context, providing a Bayesian alternative to the frequentist test of this hypothesis developed by [Gibbons et al. \(1989\)](#).

Our main results are as follows. A number of similar factor models find support from the data and are difficult to distinguish empirically: in particular our top two models are practically identical in terms of their marginal likelihoods and differ only slightly in the factors that they contain. All of the top thirty models have a Student-t error distribution with 5.5 to 8 degrees of freedom and include all five of the Fama-French (Fama and French, 1993, 2015) five factors – namely the market, value (HML), size (SMB), profitability (RMW) and investment (CMA) factors – along with momentum (Carhart, 1997) and quality (Asness et al., 2014). The liquidity factor of Pastor and Stambaugh (2003) appears in some of the top models. Intriguingly, our top two models include *two* size factors – the Fama-French SMB factor in addition to ME, the size factor suggested by Hou et al. (2014b). They also include *two* profitability based factors: the Fama-French RMW factor and QMJ, quality factor constructed by Asness et al. (2014). While these pairs of factors are closely related, they appear to be capturing enough different information to be useful in concert. Our top-rated models do not include a constant. Comparing its marginal likelihood to that of an otherwise identical specification *with* a constant, we find a difference of approximately 3.79 on the \log_{10} scale. In other words, the model without a constant is just under ten thousand times more plausible *a posteriori* than the model with a constant. Based on these results we would *not* have reason to reject the theoretical prediction of the factor pricing model for our selected model.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the model with Student-t errors and the estimation framework while Section 3 provides a simulation example to motivate our approach. Section 4 describes our main empirical results and Section 5 concludes.

2 The Model

Consider a linear K -factor model for D assets of the form

$$y_{dt} = \alpha_d + \mathbf{f}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}_d + \varepsilon_{it}$$

where y_{dt} denotes the excess return for test portfolio d in period t for $d = 1, \dots, D$ and $t = 1, \dots, T$ and $\mathbf{f}_t' = (f_{t1}, \dots, f_{tK})$ vector of factor returns. This is a special case of the seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) model in which the regressors are *identical* across equations. Note that the factors included into the regression \mathbf{f} , the

number of factors K as well as the presence of the intercept depend on the model under consideration. In order to simplify the notation, we do not introduce a model index, however, it is important to keep in mind that the techniques discussed below are applied to each possible combination of factors.

Stacking observations for a given time period across assets, define $\mathbf{y}'_t = (y_{1t}, \dots, y_{Dt})$ and analogously $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_t = (\varepsilon_{t1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{tD})$. Both \mathbf{y}_t and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ are $D \times 1$ vectors. Now let $\mathbf{x}'_t = (1, \mathbf{f}'_t)$ be a $1 \times (K + 1)$ vector and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_d = (\alpha_d, \boldsymbol{\beta}'_d)$ to be a $1 \times (K + 1)$ so we have

$$\mathbf{y}_t = X_t \boldsymbol{\gamma} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$$

where $X_t = I_D \otimes \mathbf{x}'_t$, a $D \times D(K + 1)$ matrix, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}' = (\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\gamma}'_D)$, a $1 \times (K + 1)D$ vector. If the model does not include a constant we simply remove the column of ones from the definition of \mathbf{x}_t . Let Y_T denote the full data sample, i.e. $\{\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t\}_{t=1}^T$.

In order to apply Bayesian inference, we need to specify the distribution of the errors. Because asset returns are typically thought to be heavy-tailed our models will be based on a multivariate Student-t distribution in which we will allow the data to choose the degrees of freedom.² We have:

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \sim t_{D,\nu}(0, \Omega)$$

where ν denotes the degrees of freedom of the distribution, the location parameter is zero and the scale matrix is Ω . If $\nu > 1$ then $E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = 0$. If $\nu > 2$ then $Var(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \nu\Omega/(\nu - 2)$. The SUR model lets us explicitly explore the cross-sectional dependence of errors by jointly fitting the model for all assets. The possible variance linkages between different assets are captured by the scale matrix Ω . While acknowledging the importance of these linkages and the possible influence they may have on the model selection, we avoid placing *a priori* restrictions on this matrix, such as assuming that it is diagonal, and instead infer the covariance structure of errors from the data.

To permit use of Gibbs sampler draws, we use representation of the Student-t distribution as a scale mixture of normal distributions, as in [Chib and Greenberg](#)

²Our model selection exercise below will also consider a Gaussian error distribution although this specification is soundly rejected by the data.

(1995). In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t|\lambda_t &\sim N(0, \lambda_t^{-1}\Omega) \\ \lambda_t &\sim G\left(\frac{\nu}{2}, \frac{\nu}{2}\right)\end{aligned}$$

where $G(\alpha, \beta)$ denotes the Gamma distribution with shape parameter α and rate parameter β . We parameterize this problem in terms of the $D \times D$ *precision* matrix Ω^{-1} and the $p \times 1$ vector of regression coefficients $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, where $p = D(K + 1)$. In any inference that we carry out, as well as in the calculation of the marginal likelihood, we will marginalize over $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ by simply ignoring these draws. We will place a normal prior on $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and a Wishart prior on Ω^{-1} .

2.1 The Gibbs Sampler

In order to approximate the posterior distribution we implement Gibbs sample following Chib and Greenberg (1996) and Carlin and Polson (1991). The sampler proceeds by fixing the degrees of freedom parameter ν . If ν is to be chosen from the data, this can be accomplished using the marginal likelihood, as described below. Holding ν fixed, the full set of conditional posteriors is as follows:

Regression Coefficients: $\boldsymbol{\gamma}|\Omega^{-1}, Y_T \sim \mathcal{N}_p(\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_\lambda, G_{T,\lambda})$

$$\begin{aligned}G_{T,\lambda} &= \left[G_0^{-1} + \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t X_t' \Omega^{-1} X_t \right]^{-1} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_\lambda &= G_{T,\lambda} \left[G_0^{-1} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0 + \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t X_t' \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{y}_t \right]\end{aligned}$$

Inverse Scale Matrix: $\Omega^{-1}|Y_T \sim \mathcal{W}_D(\rho_0 + T, R_{T,\lambda})$

$$R_{T,\lambda} = \left[R_0^{-1} + \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t (\mathbf{y}_t - X_t \boldsymbol{\gamma})(\mathbf{y}_t - X_t \boldsymbol{\gamma})' \right]^{-1}$$

Auxiliary Parameter: $\lambda_t|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \nu, Y_T \sim G\left(\frac{\nu + D}{2}, \frac{\nu + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t' \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t}{2}\right), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = \mathbf{y}_t - X_t \boldsymbol{\gamma}$

To implement the Gibbs sampler, we simply need to draw sequentially from these distributions, in the order given above. We will require, however, starting values for

both Ω^{-1} and each of the λ_t parameters. A reasonable starting value for λ_t is one.

2.2 Marginal Likelihood

We calculate the marginal likelihood using the method of [Chib \(1995\)](#). Consider the re-arranged Bayes rule:

$$f(y) = \frac{f(y|\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \Omega^{-1})\pi(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \Omega^{-1})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \Omega^{-1}|y)}$$

which holds for any specified values $(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \Omega^{-1})$ of the parameters. In particular this holds at the *posterior mean* $(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*, \Omega^{-1*})$ which is where we will evaluate the expression. Hence, the *log* marginal likelihood is given by

$$\log f(y) = \log(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*, \Omega^{-1*}) + \log f(y|\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*, \Omega^{-1*}) - \pi(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*, \Omega^{-1*}|y)$$

Since our priors over $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and Ω^{-1} are independent, we can re-write the equation above as follows:

$$\log f(Y_T) = \log \pi(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*) + \log \pi(\Omega^{-1*}) + \log f(Y_T|\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*, \Omega^{-1*}) - \log \pi(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*, \Omega^{-1*}|Y_T)$$

We can evaluate the marginal likelihood using the [Chib \(1995\)](#) method that approximates $\log f(Y_T)$ by evaluating each of the terms on the right-hand-side of the preceding expression using the output of the Gibbs sampler.

2.3 Priors

In order for the marginal likelihood comparison to be valid, proper priors should be constructed for each candidate model. In particular, they should differ depending on the set of included factors. For example, consider the market beta for non-durable consumption goods. We cannot set the same prior for all models that contain the market factor: the priors should be adjusted depending on which other factors are included. In order to solve this problem we employ a small training sample and use the posterior means to construct model-specific prior.

For each model we use normal prior for the coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ which is centered around the posterior mean obtained from the training sample. In order to reflect the uncertainty, we inflate the covariance matrix of training sample draws by a factor of 4.

We place a Wishart prior with 25 degrees of freedom on the precision matrix Ω^{-1} .

The prior mean is equal to the mean based on the training sample.

This trick allows us to automatically set an individual prior for each model in an objective way. For example, for a simple CAPM with a single market factor the prior for market beta of non-durable consumption goods is centered around 0.97 with the variance of 0.011. However, when estimating Fama-French 3 factor model the prior is adjusted to reflect the presence of two other factors with the prior mean for the market beta being shifted to 1.00 with the variance of 0.015.

3 Motivational Example

In order to motivate our research we simulate asset returns and demonstrate that the true factors are selected as the result of our procedure. We intentionally mis-specify the distribution of errors to show that even if the true model is not among the candidates under consideration but the imposed distribution is close enough to the true one, the correct factor structure is selected. In order to address a wide-spread concern that some non-factor assets may be selected if they are correlated with the market, we include such an asset as one of the candidate factors to demonstrate the robustness of the proposed selection procedure.

As asset returns we take 10 value-weighted Fama-French industry portfolios. The returns are assumed to be follow the famous Fama-French 3 factor structure without intercept. The factors include market portfolio (Mkt.RF), size (SMB) and value (HML). The true errors follow Student-t distribution with 2.5 degrees of freedom. The model parameters (coefficient vector γ and the error precision matrix Ω^{-1}) are equal to posterior means obtained from fitting the model to the real data. The simulation is based on the sample range Apr 1986 - Dec 2014 (345 observations). The training sample includes observations Apr 1986 - Dec 1990 (57 observations). The pool of candidate models includes all combinations of Fama-French 5 factors (Mkt.RF, HML, SMB, RMW and CMA), a constant and a non-factor asset - Microsoft stock (MSFT). We assume that the true distribution of errors (Student-t with 2.5 degrees of freedom) is not considered. Instead, the pool of distributions includes normal and Student-t with 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 degrees of freedom. We fit in total $6 \times 2^7 = 768$ model.

The simulation setup is described below:

1. Fit the Fama-French three factor model without an intercept to 10 value-weighted industry portfolios using the full sample under the assumption that errors follow

Student-t distribution with 2.5 degrees of freedom. The posterior means γ^* and Ω^{-1*} obtained from the Gibbs sampler as a product of fitting this model are assumed to be the true parameter values for the simulation purposes.

2. Simulate asset returns for the full sample range. Errors follow Student-t distribution with 2.5 degrees of freedom with zero mean and scale matrix Ω^* :

$$\epsilon_t^s \sim t_{10,2.5}(0, \Omega^*)$$

Asset returns follow the factor structure with factor loadings γ^* . Use true values of the three Fama-French factors observed in the data:

$$\mathbf{y}_t^s = X_t \gamma^* + \epsilon_t^s$$

3. Estimate all candidate models and evaluate the marginal likelihood employing the training sample to specify priors for each candidate model.

As can be seen from the simulation results [3](#) the model with the highest marginal likelihood correctly identified the three factors(Mkt.RF, HML and SMB). Moreover, even though the true error distribution (Student-t with 2.5 degrees of freedom) was not considered, the distribution of the best model (Student-t with 4 degrees of freedom) is the closest to the truth. The second best model includes the same factors but features Student-t distribution with 6 degrees of freedom. Following models include more factors and/or a constant. However, the difference in the marginal likelihood suggests that there is a strong evidence against all the candidate models when compared with the top model. Interesting to note that for any value of degrees of freedom ν in this example the top model always imposes the correct factor structure. Models including the non-factor (Microsoft stock) are not in the list of 30 best models which demonstrates the robustness of the proposed approach. This simulation shows that marginal likelihood performs well in the finite sample.

4 Application

4.1 Data

The choice of the underlying assets is very important because different models may be selected depending on the left hand side variables. We apply our method to 10 value-weighted industry portfolios available at the Kenneth French’s website: Consumer NonDurables(NoDur), Consumer Durables(Dur), Manufacturing(Manuf), Oil, Gas, and Coal Extraction and Products(Enrgy), Business Equipment(HiTec), Telephone and Television Transmission(Telcm), Wholesale, Retail, and Some Services (Shops), Healthcare, Medical Equipment, and Drugs(Hlth), Utilities(Utils), Other(Other). We choose industry-based portfolios instead of characteristics-based ones in order to avoid the potential bias that favors models which include factors similar to the sorting used to construct such portfolios. The correlation table and average returns of assets can be found in table 5.

The 12 candidate factors include (aside from the constant)³:

- five factors by Fama and French (1993) and Fama and French (2015): market(Mkt.RF), size(SMB), value(HML), profitability(RMW) and investment(CMA)
- three factors proposed by Hou et al. (2014b): size(ME), profitability(ROE) and investment(IA)
- momentum factor(MOM) as in Carhart (1997)
- liquidity(LIQv) introduced in Pastor and Stambaugh (2003)
- quality factor(QMJ) as offered by Asness et al. (2014)
- alternative value factor(HMLDev) constructed by Asness and Frazzini (2013)

We use monthly data with the full sample ranging from Jan 1982 - Dec 2014 (396 observations). The training sample is Jan 1982 - Dec 1989 (96 observation). Mean returns of factors and their correlation structure are reported in table 7. As can be seen from the correlation matrix, many factors co-move together. Sometimes this correlation arises because of the conceptual similarity of the factors. In our sample we have two highly correlated size factors: SMB by Fama and French (2015) and ME by

³We thank Lu Zhang for providing us the factors constructed in Hou et al. (2014b). Other factors are obtained from authors’ web-pages.

Hou et al. (2014b) (correlation is 0.97). Another cluster of factors is related to value and investment activity. We include two value factors (HML by Fama and French (2015) and HMLDev by Asness and Frazzini (2013)) and two investment factors (CMA by Fama and French (2015) and IA by Hou et al. (2014b)). Finally, we have three profitability-based factors: RMW by Fama and French (2015), ROE by Hou et al. (2014b) and QMJ by Asness et al. (2014). The question of joint rather than individual significance is especially relevant for this setup given so many correlated factors.

4.2 Results

In total we explore 2^{13} models and consider 12 possible distribution of errors: Student-t with 5, 5.5, 6, 6.5, 7, 7.5, 8, 8.5, 9, 9.5 and 10 degrees of freedom and normal. As can be seen from the table 8, the suggested number of factors is quite large. The top-ranked model features 9 out of 12 factors: all five Fama-French factors, momentum, liquidity, quality and a duplicate size factor ME (we call it 9 factor model). The preferred number of degrees of freedom is 6, however, other values ranging from 5.5 to 7.5 are also supported by the data.

The second best model includes the same factors except for liquidity (henceforth, 8 factor model). This factor structure favors 6.5 degrees of freedom but all the other values in the interval 5.5 to 7.5 again cannot be rejected. These two models with 9 and 8 factors cannot be distinguished well: the difference in the marginal likelihood given the preferred error distribution is $3000.40 - 3000.02 = 0.38$ on the \log_{10} scale.

The next best model replaces duplicate size factor with a duplicate profitability factor and features Student-t distribution with 7 degrees of freedom. With the marginal likelihood difference $3000.40 - 2998.54 = 1.86$ and $3000.02 - 2998.54 = 1.48$, there is very strong evidence against this model in favor of the 9 and 8 factor models. Thus, it can be concluded that the data supports two models with 8 or 9 factors while the suggested error distribution is Student-t with 6 or 6.5 degrees of freedom.

Note that the model ranking in this framework may change depending on the distributional assumption. For example, under the normally distributed errors there is substantial evidence in the support of the 8 factor model over the 9 factor model with the difference of 0.91 on the \log_{10} scale. The best model with Gaussian errors delivers the marginal log likelihood of 2950.60 and this error specification is strongly rejected in favor of the Student-t.

Two best models don't include a constant. Consider the best model and compare

it with an alternative specification that includes the same factors and a constant. The difference between these two models is approximately $3000.40 - 2996.61 = 3.79$ on the \log_{10} scale which can be interpreted as a decisive support for the model without a constant by the Jeffrey's scale. This finding suggests that we can not reject the hypothesis that the intercept should not be included into the model. This result is especially notable as our selection criteria are not based on the mis-pricing represented by the intercept as, for example, in [Harvey and Liu \(2015\)](#).

4.3 Top Model

The 9 factor model multiple factors from each cluster. It features two size factors – SMB and ME, two factors from the value-investment group – HML and CMA, and two profitability-based factors – RMW and QMJ. It also includes market, momentum and liquidity. The presence of duplicate factors is probably explained by the fact that they are imperfect proxies for the underlying "true" latent factor. As each of these factors adds some new information about the true latent factor, all of them should be included despite of the similarity. Coefficients and error covariance matrix computed from the posterior means can be found in table 10.

We find size factor to be important which is consistent with findings in [Asness et al. \(2014\)](#) that the presence of the quality factor resurrects the size effect.

the coefficients for SMB and ME seem to cancel each other out??

The presence of two profitability-based factors (RMW and QMJ) may be partially due to the value-weighting approach used to construct testing portfolios. Profitability factors were also identified by [Harvey and Liu \(2015\)](#) for the value-weighted portfolios. They attribute this to the fact that larger firms that have bigger influence for value-weighted portfolios have fewer frictions and thus function in accordance with firm-investment theories that motivate the construction of the profitability factors.

5 Conclusion

Conclusion goes here...

References

- Asness, C., Frazzini, A., 2013. The Devil in HML's details. *Journal of Portfolio Management* 39 (4), 49.
- Asness, C. S., Frazzini, A., Pedersen, L. H., 2014. Quality minus junk. Available at SSRN 2312432.
- Avramov, D., 2002. Stock return predictability and model uncertainty. *Journal of Financial Economics* 64 (3), 423–458.
- Avramov, D., Chao, J. C., 2006. An exact bayes test of asset pricing models with application to international markets. *The Journal of Business* 79 (1), 293–324.
- Carhart, M. M., 1997. On persistence in mutual fund performance. *The Journal of Finance* 52 (1), 57–82.
- Carlin, B. P., Polson, N. G., 1991. Inference for nonconjugate bayesian models using the gibbs sampler. *Canadian Journal of statistics* 19 (4), 399–405.
- Chib, S., 1995. Marginal likelihood from the gibbs output. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90 (432), 1313–1321.
- Chib, S., Greenberg, E., 1995. Hierarchical analysis of SUR models with extensions to correlated serial errors and time-varying parameter models. *Journal of Econometrics* 68 (2), 339–360.
- Chib, S., Greenberg, E., 1996. Markov chain monte carlo simulation methods in econometrics. *Econometric theory* 12 (03), 409–431.
- Cremers, K. M., 2002. Stock return predictability: A Bayesian model selection perspective. *Review of Financial Studies* 15 (4), 1223–1249.
- Fama, E. F., French, K. R., 1993. Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics* 33 (1), 3–56.
- Fama, E. F., French, K. R., 2015. A five-factor asset pricing model. *Journal of Financial Economics* 116 (1), 1–22.
- Gibbons, M. R., Ross, S. A., Shanken, J., 1989. A test of the efficiency of a given portfolio. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 1121–1152.

- Harvey, C. R., Liu, Y., 2015. Lucky factors. Available at SSRN 2528780.
- Harvey, C. R., Liu, Y., Zhu, H., 2015. ... and the cross-section of expected returns. Review of Financial Studies, hhv059.
- Harvey, C. R., Zhou, G., 1990. Bayesian inference in asset pricing tests. Journal of Financial Economics 26 (2), 221–254.
- Hou, K., Xue, C., Zhang, L., 2014a. A comparison of new factor models. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Hou, K., Xue, C., Zhang, L., 2014b. Digesting anomalies: An investment approach. Review of Financial Studies, hhu068.
- Judd, C. M., McClelland, G. H., Ryan, C. S., 2011. Data analysis: A model comparison approach. Routledge.
- Lintner, J., 1965. The valuation of risk assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets. The Review of Economics and Statistics, 13–37.
- Pastor, L., Stambaugh, R. F., 2003. Liquidity risk and expected stock returns. Journal of Political Economy 111 (3).
- Shanken, J., 1987. A Bayesian approach to testing portfolio efficiency. Journal of financial economics 19 (2), 195–215.
- Sharpe, W. F., 1964. Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk. The journal of finance 19 (3), 425–442.

	NoDur	Durbl	Manuf	Enrgy	HiTec	Telcm	Shops	Hlth	Utils	Other
Data	Apr 1986 - Dec 2014	0.0080	0.0056	0.0078	0.0080	0.0074	0.0062	0.0084	0.0061	0.0058
	Apr 1986 - Dec 1990	0.0099	-0.0033	0.0034	0.0092	-0.0037	0.0084	0.0095	0.0033	-0.0020
	Jan 1991 - Dec 2014	0.0076	0.0073	0.0086	0.0078	0.0096	0.0057	0.0082	0.0066	0.0073
Simulated	Apr 1986 - Dec 2014	0.0035	0.0104	0.0063	0.0036	0.0062	0.0089	0.0045	0.0044	0.0085
	Apr 1986 - Dec 1990	-0.0016	0.0039	0.0020	0.0005	0.0032	0.0106	-0.0016	0.0047	0.0036
	Jan 1991 - Dec 2014	0.0045	0.0117	0.0071	0.0042	0.0068	0.0086	0.0057	0.0043	0.0094

Table 1: Simulation: Average Portfolio Returns

	Mkt.RF	HML	SMB	RMW	CMA
Apr 1986 - Dec 2014	0.0062	0.0023	0.0011	0.0036	0.0033
Apr 1986 - Dec 1990	0.0028	0.0003	-0.0068	0.0047	0.0054
Jan 1991 - Dec 2014	0.0069	0.0027	0.0027	0.0034	0.0029

Table 2: Simulation: Average Factor Returns

model	DF	\log_{10} margLike
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB	4	3124.56
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB	6	3120.80
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA	4	3120.09
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB	4	3118.29
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW	4	3116.71
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA	6	3116.10
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB	8	3114.92
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB	6	3114.45
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA	4	3113.75
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW	6	3113.14
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW + CMA	4	3111.65
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW	4	3110.15
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA	8	3110.10
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA	6	3109.69
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB	10	3108.77
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB	8	3108.54
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW + CMA	6	3107.79
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW	8	3107.38
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW	6	3106.43
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW + CMA	4	3104.77
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA	10	3103.94
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA	8	3103.67
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB	12	3103.02
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB	10	3102.31
Mkt.RF + HML	4	3101.91
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW + CMA	8	3101.83
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW	10	3101.34
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW + CMA	6	3100.83
constant + Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW	8	3100.64
Mkt.RF + HML	6	3098.64

Table 3: Simulation: 20 Best Models

	NoDur	Durbl	Manuf	Enrgy	HiTec	Telcm	Shops	Hlth	Utils	Other
Jan 1982 - Dec 2014	0.0092	0.0071	0.0080	0.0070	0.0074	0.0069	0.0087	0.0087	0.0069	0.0067
Jan 1982 - Dec 1989	0.0156	0.0103	0.0083	0.0066	0.0025	0.0136	0.0130	0.0104	0.0093	0.0081
Jan 1990 - Dec 2014	0.0072	0.0060	0.0079	0.0072	0.0090	0.0047	0.0074	0.0082	0.0061	0.0062

Table 4: Average Portfolio Returns

	NoDur	Durbl	Manuf	Enrgy	HiTec	Telcm	Shops	Hlth	Utils	Other
NoDur										
Durbl	0.59									
Manuf	0.76	0.84								
Enrgy	0.45	0.47	0.62							
HiTec	0.49	0.65	0.73	0.41						
Telcm	0.61	0.6	0.67	0.43	0.65					
Shops	0.78	0.73	0.81	0.4	0.69	0.66				
Hlth	0.75	0.49	0.66	0.38	0.54	0.57	0.66			
Utils	0.55	0.37	0.47	0.53	0.22	0.44	0.36	0.46		
Other	0.77	0.8	0.88	0.53	0.68	0.7	0.82	0.69	0.5	

Table 5: Correlation Matrix of Assets(based on full sample)

	Mkt.RF	HML	SMB	CMA	RMW	ME	IA	ROE	MOM	LIQv	QMJ	HMLDev
Jan 1982 - Dec 2014	0.0068	0.0031	0.0011	0.0035	0.0037	0.0018	0.0040	0.0055	0.0059	0.0048	0.0046	0.0028
Jan 1982 - Dec 1989	0.0085	0.0059	-0.0017	0.0059	0.0041	-0.0012	0.0068	0.0071	0.0070	0.0043	0.0060	0.0056
Jan 1990 - Dec 2014	0.0063	0.0022	0.0020	0.0028	0.0036	0.0028	0.0031	0.0050	0.0055	0.0049	0.0041	0.0020

Table 6: Average Factor Returns

	Mkt.RF	HML	SMB	CMA	RMW	ME	IA	ROE	MOM	LIQv	QMJ	HMLDev
Mkt.RF												
HML	-0.31											
SMB	0.21	-0.22										
CMA	-0.4	0.68	-0.09									
RMW	-0.32	0.34	-0.46	0.12								
ME	0.21	-0.17	0.97	-0.05	-0.43							
IA	-0.37	0.7	-0.19	0.91	0.21	-0.15						
ROE	-0.29	0.11	-0.39	0.05	0.72	-0.29	0.13					
MOM	-0.18	-0.14	0.03	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.48				
LIQv	-0.05	0	-0.04	0.01	-0.01	-0.04	0	-0.06	0.03			
QMJ	-0.57	0.13	-0.49	0.15	0.8	-0.47	0.19	0.75	0.28	0		
HMLDev	-0.07	0.74	-0.11	0.45	0.1	-0.12	0.49	-0.32	-0.67	0.03	-0.17	

Table 7: Correlation Matrix of Factors (based on full sample)

model	DF	\log_{10} margLike
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	6	3000.40
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	6.5	3000.34
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	7.5	3000.27
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	5.5	3000.13
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + QMJ	6.5	3000.02
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	7	3000.02
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + QMJ	6	3000.01
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + QMJ	7	2999.98
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + QMJ	7.5	2999.79
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	5	2999.56
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + QMJ	5.5	2999.49
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	8	2999.48
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + QMJ	8	2999.34
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	8.5	2999.11
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + QMJ	8.5	2999.08
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + QMJ	5	2999.05
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	9	2998.77
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + MOM + QMJ	9	2998.71
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ROE + MOM + QMJ	7	2998.54
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + ROE + MOM + QMJ	6.5	2998.53
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ROE + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	6.5	2998.53
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + ROE + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	7.5	2998.44
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ROE + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	7	2998.41
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ROE + MOM + QMJ	6.5	2998.32
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + ROE + MOM + QMJ	7	2998.28
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + ROE + MOM + QMJ	7.5	2998.26
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + RMW + ME + IA + MOM + QMJ	6	2998.25
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ME + ROE + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	6	2998.25
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ROE + MOM + LIQ _v + QMJ	6	2998.24
Mkt.RF + HML + SMB + CMA + RMW + ROE + MOM + QMJ	8	2998.24

Table 8: 30 Best Models

	Mkt.RF	HML	SMB	CMA	RMW	ME	MOM	LIQv	QMJ
NoDur	1.02	-0.20	-0.54	0.43	0.19	0.55	0.24	0.24	0.34
Durbl	1.14	0.13	0.24	-0.17	-0.24	-0.28	0.01	-0.17	0.28
Manuf	1.09	-0.05	0.12	0.02	-0.12	-0.03	-0.05	-0.08	0.04
Enrgy	0.82	-0.18	0.80	1.36	1.05	-1.19	-0.39	-0.13	-1.02
HiTec	1.03	-0.25	0.98	-0.23	-0.33	-0.71	-0.28	-0.35	0.53
Telcm	0.83	0.19	-0.28	-0.01	0.77	-0.17	0.09	-0.10	-0.16
Shops	1.19	-0.29	-0.46	0.36	-0.01	0.92	0.14	0.24	0.29
Hlth	0.95	-0.60	-0.85	0.39	-0.23	0.55	0.17	0.15	0.20
Utils	0.71	0.89	-0.53	-0.78	-0.51	0.18	0.10	0.03	0.43
Other	1.05	0.25	-0.26	-0.33	-0.07	0.46	0.06	0.09	-0.17

Table 9: Coefficients for the Best Model

	NoDur	Durbl	Manuf	Enrgy	HiTec	Telcm	Shops	Hlth	Utils	Other
NoDur	4.46									
Durbl	-1.28	11.44								
Manuf	-0.47	1.72	3.2							
Enrgy	-3.05	-4.22	-1.53	14.8						
HiTec	-2.19	4.94	0.7	-1.21	8.27					
Telcm	0.47	-2.86	-1.23	-2.09	-1.86	10.58				
Shops	0.94	1.64	-0.13	-3.6	0.1	0.12	5.88			
Hlth	1.78	-2.52	-1.28	-0.94	-2.63	0.93	0.68	6.17		
Utils	1.11	-2.94	-1.57	-0.42	-2.53	1.42	-1.09	0.76	6.51	
Other	0.2	-0.87	-0.64	-1.4	-0.88	0.41	0.05	0	0.18	2.17

Table 10: Error Covariance Matrix for the Best Model ($\times 10^4$)