1**. Are the steps of the analysis clearly described?**

Each step is clearly described. We like the separate description of the data with the overview of the characteristics of the different portfolios.

How the riskfree asset returns are obtained can maybe be elaborated on. Are they the average of riskfree asset returns over the whole sample period or over some other period.

Although not necessary for the GRS test it may be interesting to show the loadings of the portfolios on the constructed hedge portfolios (in table 8), e.g. does the ‘small growth’ portfolio have a high (and significant) coefficient on the SMB factor but not on the HML factor.

In section 5 the t-test is described with variance in the denominator. However the t-test is over standard deviation (or volatility) and not variance.

**2. Are the steps of the analysis clearly motivated? Do you agree?**

Most steps are clearly motivated. The selection of portfolios is clearly motivated. We miss why the average return of the riskfree asset (over an unknown period) is taken and not for example the last known return. Why the hedge portfolios are constructed in the way they are constructed is described (“to analyse this effect”) but can be elaborated on a bit further. Why not include momentum for example?

**3. Are the results correct and clearly reported?**

We really like the overall style of the report. Especially the fact that this really feels like a standalone report with a build-up of first giving and introduction followed by the data description.

**4. Do the implications and conclusions follow from the results?**

The conclusions follow from the results and at each step the conclusions are correct.

**5. Is the use of graphs and tables good? Is the use of language good?**

Good use of tables and graphs. The use of language is also very good and on a high enough level.