A Quantitative Framework for Constructing Alpha Signals from Earnings Announcements

The Post-Earnings Announcement Drift Anomaly: A Foundation for Alpha

The construction of any robust quantitative trading strategy must begin with a sound economic or behavioral rationale. For strategies centered on corporate earnings announcements, the foundational anomaly is the Post-Earnings Announcement Drift (PEAD). This phenomenon, one of the most extensively documented and persistent patterns in financial literature, provides the theoretical bedrock upon which alpha signals can be systematically built. While the nature of this anomaly has evolved in the modern market environment, understanding its origins, drivers, and current state is paramount to exploiting it effectively.

The Granddaddy of Underreaction Events

First identified by Ball and Brown in 1968, the Post-Earnings Announcement Drift is the observed tendency for a company's stock price to continue to move in the direction of an earnings surprise for a prolonged period—often weeks or months—following the public announcement.[1] Specifically, firms reporting positive earnings surprises tend to experience a subsequent upward drift in their cumulative abnormal returns, while those reporting negative surprises see a corresponding downward drift.[2] This behavior stands in stark contrast to the semi-strong form of the efficient market hypothesis, which posits that all publicly available information should be incorporated into prices almost instantaneously.[1]

The persistence and academic robustness of PEAD led Nobel laureate Eugene Fama to characterize it as "an anomaly above suspicion" and "the granddaddy of underreaction events".[6] The primary explanation for its existence centers on investor underreaction to the information content of earnings announcements.[2] This underreaction is not a monolithic concept but is believed to stem from two interrelated sources:

1. **Behavioral Biases:** Investors are subject to cognitive biases that temper their reaction to new information. Conservatism and anchoring cause them to cling to prior beliefs

and only slowly update their expectations in the face of surprising news.[3] Crucially, investors often fail to fully appreciate the time-series properties of earnings; they do not fully incorporate the implications of *current* earnings for *future* earnings.[2] Because quarterly earnings changes exhibit positive serial correlation for several subsequent quarters, a positive surprise today makes another positive surprise more likely in the near future. The market's failure to fully price this autocorrelation is a key driver of the subsequent drift.[2]

2. **Limits to Arbitrage:** Even if sophisticated investors recognize the mispricing immediately, practical constraints can prevent them from fully and instantaneously correcting it. Factors such as transaction costs (bid-ask spreads), liquidity risk, and high idiosyncratic volatility can make it costly or risky to establish large arbitrage positions, particularly in smaller or less-liquid stocks. These frictions allow the mispricing to persist and be corrected gradually over time.[2]

The combination of widespread behavioral underreaction and tangible limits to arbitrage has historically made PEAD a durable and exploitable market inefficiency, providing a fertile ground for the development of quantitative alpha signals.

The Modern PEAD Landscape: A Story of Decline and Adaptation

While the historical evidence for PEAD is compelling, a naive implementation of a classic PEAD strategy is unlikely to be profitable in contemporary markets. A significant body of recent research documents a marked decline in the magnitude of the anomaly over the past few decades, with some studies suggesting it has all but disappeared for large, highly liquid securities.[7] Backtests of standard long/short portfolios based on Standardized Unexpected Earnings (SUE) show that the abnormal returns have trended downwards and are statistically indistinguishable from zero in recent years.[8] Understanding the drivers of this attenuation is critical for adapting a strategy to the modern environment.

Two primary forces are responsible for this decline. The first, and most intuitive, is an increase in market efficiency and arbitrage activity. The proliferation of quantitative hedge funds, the reduction in transaction costs, and vast improvements in information technology have armed sophisticated investors to act on mispricings far more rapidly than in the past.[7] The availability of powerful data platforms and the application of artificial intelligence to synthesize earnings reports and transcripts in real-time have drastically reduced the information processing lag that historically underpinned the drift.[5]

However, a more fundamental and nuanced explanation lies not in the market's reaction to the signal, but in a change in the nature of the signal itself. Recent research provides strong evidence that the decline in PEAD is significantly driven by a **decline in the persistence of earnings news**.[8] The "stickiness" of earnings surprises has diminished over time; a firm with a high positive surprise today is less likely to have a high positive surprise next quarter than was the case decades ago. This decline in the serial correlation of earnings news weakens the very foundation of the anomaly. If the current surprise is less informative about future surprises, then the economic rationale for a sustained price drift is fundamentally eroded. This suggests the change is not merely due to faster arbitrageurs (an external market force) but to a structural shift in corporate earnings dynamics, possibly due to a more volatile and competitive business environment or changes in accounting standards.[8] A successful modern strategy cannot, therefore, treat the time-series properties of earnings as a static universal constant. It must be designed to recognize that the very nature of the information content in an earnings release has changed, demanding a more sophisticated approach to signal construction.

Identifying the Pockets of Opportunity

Given the broad-market attenuation of the anomaly, a successful strategy must focus on the market segments where the effect remains most potent. The academic literature consistently shows that PEAD is stronger in firms characterized by higher information asymmetry and greater limits to arbitrage. These are the areas where information disseminates more slowly and where it is more costly for arbitrageurs to enforce market efficiency. The key characteristics of firms exhibiting stronger PEAD include:

- **Smaller Market Capitalization:** The drift is significantly more pronounced in small-cap and mid-cap stocks compared to their large-cap counterparts.[4]
- **Lower Liquidity:** Firms with higher bid-ask spreads, lower trading volumes, and lower share prices tend to show a more persistent drift.[2]
- **Lower Analyst and Institutional Scrutiny:** Companies with fewer covering analysts and lower institutional ownership have slower and less efficient information dissemination, allowing mispricing to linger for longer.[2]

These findings have direct strategic implications. A quantitative strategy can be designed to either (1) confine its investment universe exclusively to these segments (e.g., U.S. stocks with market capitalization below $10 billion) or (2) operate in a broader universe but use these characteristics as weighting schemes. In the latter approach, a signal generated from a small, illiquid, and under-covered stock would be given a higher weight in the final portfolio construction than a signal from a mega-cap, highly liquid, and heavily scrutinized firm. This targeted approach focuses capital on the areas where the underlying anomaly remains most robust.

The Anatomy of Surprise: Core Signal Construction

The cornerstone of any PEAD-based strategy is the measurement of the "surprise" component of an earnings announcement. This is the new information that challenges the market's prior expectations. While conceptually simple, the precise quantification of this surprise can be approached in several ways, each with distinct advantages and disadvantages. A sophisticated approach will not rely on a single metric but will construct and potentially combine several measures to create a more robust and reliable signal.

The Classic Approach: Standardized Unexpected Earnings (SUE)

The most traditional and widely studied measure of earnings surprise is Standardized Unexpected Earnings, or SUE.[12] The metric is designed to quantify the magnitude of a surprise relative to its historical or expected volatility, thereby making surprises comparable across different companies and time periods. The general formula is:
SUE=σErrorEPSActual−EPSForecast
Where:

- EPSActual is the actual earnings per share reported by the company.
- EPSForecast is the market's expectation for earnings per share prior to the announcement.
- σError is a scaling factor, typically the standard deviation of past forecast errors or the dispersion of current analyst forecasts.[12]

The critical component in this calculation is the definition of the forecasted EPS. Early academic work often relied on time-series models, such as a seasonal random walk, where the forecast for the current quarter's EPS was simply the EPS from the same quarter in the previous year (EPSq−4).[2] While useful for stocks with no analyst coverage, this method is now considered less accurate than using professional forecasts. The modern standard is to use the
consensus analyst forecast, which is typically the mean or median of all individual analyst EPS estimates available immediately before the earnings release.[13] The scaling factor, σError, standardizes the surprise, giving a larger SUE value to a $0.05 surprise for a stable utility company than to a $0.05 surprise for a volatile technology firm.

Listening to the Market: Earnings Announcement Return (EAR)

A significant drawback of SUE is its reliance on analyst forecasts, which can be biased or may not fully capture the market's true expectations. An alternative approach, the Earnings Announcement Return (EAR), circumvents this issue by using the market's own immediate price reaction as the measure of surprise.[11] The logic is that the short-term price movement around an announcement reflects the market's aggregate interpretation of all new information released—not just the headline EPS number, but also revenue figures, forward guidance, and qualitative commentary from management.
EAR is calculated as the cumulative abnormal return (CAR) over a short window surrounding the announcement date, typically from one day before to one day after (Day -1 to Day +1).[11] The abnormal return is the stock's raw return minus the return of a relevant benchmark (such as the S&P 500) to isolate the firm-specific price movement. The primary advantage of EAR is that it is a direct, model-free measure of the market's perceived surprise. Academic studies

have shown that a strategy that combines both SUE and EAR can generate superior abnormal returns compared to a strategy based on SUE alone, suggesting they capture partially independent pieces of information.[11]

A Robust Alternative: Fraction of Misses (FOM)

While the consensus mean forecast is the standard input for SUE, it is susceptible to distortion by a few heavily biased or outlier analyst estimates.[17] A single analyst with a wildly inaccurate forecast can skew the average, leading to a misleading SUE value. The Fraction of Misses (FOM) metric was developed to be more robust to this type of bias.

Instead of using the magnitude of the forecast error, FOM focuses solely on the direction of each individual analyst's miss relative to the actual reported earnings.[17] It is calculated as:

FOM=NTotalForecastsNForecast<Actual–NForecast>Actual

The resulting value ranges from -1 (all analysts forecasted above the actual number, a strong negative surprise) to +1 (all analysts forecasted below the actual number, a strong positive surprise). By giving each analyst an equal "vote," FOM prevents outliers from dominating the signal. Research has demonstrated that when analyst bias is a concern, FOM can have superior explanatory power for post-announcement returns compared to traditional consensus error metrics.[17]

The choice between these metrics is not merely a technical one; it represents an implicit assumption about the primary driver of the mispricing. Using SUE assumes that the key is the magnitude of the surprise relative to a potentially flawed consensus. Using EAR assumes the market's initial reaction is directionally correct but incomplete. Using FOM assumes that filtering out the noise from biased analysts is the most critical step. A truly robust system would not choose one over the others but would use them in concert. For instance, a high-conviction signal could be defined as an event where a stock exhibits a top-quintile SUE, a top-quintile EAR, *and* a strongly positive FOM (e.g., > 0.5). This "triple confirmation" ensures the surprise is large in magnitude, validated by the market's immediate reaction, and supported by a broad majority of analysts, significantly increasing the signal's reliability.

Beyond EPS: Surprises in Other Fundamentals

Corporate earnings, as measured by EPS, can be subject to accounting manipulation and management. A positive EPS surprise driven by a one-time reduction in a discretionary expense is of lower quality than one driven by fundamental business strength. To capture a cleaner signal of operational performance, the surprise framework can be extended to other, less malleable, line items on the income statement.

Specifically, standardized surprise metrics can be calculated for revenue (Standardized Unexpected Revenue, or SUREV) and gross profit (Standardized Unexpected Gross Profit, or SUGP).[19] The calculation is analogous to SUE, using the actual reported figure, the consensus forecast for that line item, and a scaling factor. Research has shown that these signals contain predictive information that is incremental to EPS surprises. In particular, gross profit surprises have been found to be strong predictors of future returns, and strategies based on SUGP have demonstrated superior performance to SUE-based strategies in more recent sample periods, suggesting investors may be underreacting to shifts in core operational profitability.[19]

Metric	Formula	Data Requirements	Pros	Cons
SUE	$(EPSActual - EPSForecast)/\sigma Error$	Actual EPS, Analyst Consensus EPS, Historical Forecast Errors or Forecast Dispersion	Standardized, widely studied, captures magnitude of surprise.	Susceptible to bias in consensus forecast, ignores non-EPS information.
EAR	Cumulative Abnormal Return (e.g., Day -1 to +1)	High-frequency price data, Benchmark price data	Model-free, captures market's interpretation of all announced information.	Can be noisy, initial reaction could be an overreaction, conflates multiple news items.
FOM	$(N{<}Actual - N{>}Actual)/NTotal$	Actual EPS, Individual Analyst Forecasts	Robust to outlier/biased forecasts, measures breadth of surprise.	Ignores magnitude of surprise, requires individual forecast data.
SUGP/SUREV	$(ActualItem - ForecastItem)/\sigma Error$	Actual & Forecast Revenue/Gross Profit	Focuses on core business operations, less subject to some accounting manipulations.	Forecast data may be less available than for EPS, may ignore important cost information.

Beyond the Consensus: Leveraging Analyst Dynamics

While the earnings surprise itself is the primary event, the subsequent actions and evolving opinions of the sell-side analyst community provide a rich, secondary source of alpha. These signals capture the expert interpretation of the earnings report and offer forward-looking clues about the likely persistence and credibility of the initial surprise. The market is often slow to fully incorporate the information contained in these analyst-driven dynamics.

The Power of Revisions: Direction, Magnitude, and Velocity

Following an earnings announcement, analysts update their financial models and revise their future earnings forecasts. This stream of revisions is a powerful signal. The market tends to underreact to these revisions, leading to a price drift in the direction of the forecast change.[20] In fact, the trend in earnings estimates is one of the most closely watched variables by institutional investors, as share prices have been shown to follow this trend over time.[23]
Several signals can be constructed from this data:

- **Revision Magnitude:** This is the most direct signal. It is calculated as the percentage change in the consensus EPS forecast for a future period (e.g., the next fiscal year, FY1, or the next quarter, Q1) over a specified window following the announcement, such as 30 or 60 days. Empirical studies show that stocks experiencing substantial upward revisions (e.g., greater than 5%) tend to generate positive abnormal returns, while those with significant downward revisions underperform.[24]
- **Revision Velocity/Acceleration:** This signal measures the rate of change of the revisions. A stock where the consensus estimate is not just rising, but where the pace of upward revisions is accelerating, may exhibit stronger subsequent price momentum. This can be calculated by looking at the change in the revision magnitude over consecutive periods.
- **Revision vs. Surprise:** The interaction between the initial surprise and the subsequent revision is particularly potent. Sorting firms based on aggregated forecast revisions post-announcement can generate an even stronger drift effect than sorting on the initial earnings surprise alone, especially for firms with large-magnitude surprises.[21] This is because the revisions act as an expert confirmation and quantification of the surprise's importance for future earnings.

Measuring Conviction: Analyst Forecast Breadth

The consensus revision magnitude can sometimes be misleading if it is driven by a small number of analysts making large changes. A more robust measure of the shift in sentiment is the **breadth** of revisions, which quantifies the level of agreement within the analyst community.[25] A positive revision to the consensus is more credible and powerful if it is the result of many analysts all revising their forecasts upward, rather than one lone bull.
The breadth signal is typically calculated as:
Breadth=NTotalAnalystswithEstimatesNUpwardRevisions−NDownwardRevisions
This metric is computed over a fixed window (e.g., 30 days) following the earnings announcement. A high positive value indicates widespread agreement that future prospects have improved, signaling strong conviction. Composite models that incorporate earnings forecasts, the magnitude of revisions, and the breadth of revisions have been shown to be highly statistically significant predictors of stock returns, with breadth adding unique

explanatory power.[25]

The Signal in the Noise: Analyst Forecast Dispersion

Analyst forecast dispersion, typically measured as the standard deviation of individual analyst EPS forecasts, is a proxy for uncertainty, information asymmetry, or differences of opinion.[28] Its role as a predictive signal is complex and subject to conflicting theories and empirical results.

- **The Overpricing Hypothesis:** One prominent theory suggests that high dispersion indicates significant disagreement among investors. In the presence of short-sale constraints, the most optimistic investors' views disproportionately influence the stock price, leading to initial overvaluation. As subsequent information resolves the uncertainty, these stocks tend to earn lower future returns.[28] This effect is often most pronounced in smaller, growth-oriented stocks that are difficult to value.
- **The Risk Hypothesis:** An alternative view posits that high dispersion is a proxy for higher information risk, for which investors should be compensated with higher expected returns.[29] Some evidence suggests a non-linear, V-shaped relationship, where dispersion is negatively related to returns for most stocks but positively related for the highest-performing segment.[29]
- **The Bias Contamination Hypothesis:** A third view argues that the observed negative relationship between dispersion and returns is not a direct effect but is driven by the fact that dispersion is often correlated with systematic analyst forecast bias.[30]

Given this ambiguity, using dispersion as a standalone directional signal is fraught with peril. A more prudent application is to use it as a **conditioning variable or a risk filter**. For example, a strategy might down-weight or entirely exclude stocks with the highest quintile of forecast dispersion. This approach treats high dispersion as a signal of high uncertainty and unpredictability, effectively avoiding "lottery ticket" stocks where the outcome of an earnings surprise is more akin to a coin flip.

Ultimately, the signals derived from analyst dynamics are not merely lagging indicators of the earnings event. They are forward-looking assessments of the *credibility* and *persistence* of the news. A positive earnings surprise is a historical fact; a wave of broad-based upward revisions following that surprise is a collective expert judgment that the good news is likely to continue. A powerful scoring system would use the initial surprise as the event trigger, and then weight that signal based on the subsequent analyst dynamics. For instance, a high positive SUE score could be amplified if it is accompanied by a high revision magnitude and high breadth, but discounted if it is followed by high dispersion, creating a more nuanced and forward-looking final alpha score.

The Quality Mandate: Integrating Fundamental

Analysis

An earnings surprise, even one confirmed by analyst revisions, is not always a reliable signal of future performance. The *quality* of the earnings that produced the surprise is a critical dimension that determines the likely persistence of the signal. A surprise generated through sustainable improvements in core operations is far more meaningful than one manufactured through aggressive accounting choices or one-time gains. Integrating fundamental analysis, with a focus on earnings quality, provides a crucial filter to separate robust signals from misleading noise.

Dissecting Profitability: The Role of Accruals

Net income as reported under Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) is composed of two main components: cash flows from operations and non-cash accruals. Accruals, which represent the timing difference between the recognition of revenues/expenses and their associated cash flows (e.g., changes in accounts receivable or inventory), are subject to significant managerial discretion and estimation.[31] High levels of income-increasing accruals can be a red flag, suggesting that earnings are being artificially inflated and are of low quality. Such earnings are less likely to persist, as accruals tend to reverse in future periods.[32]
A signal for earnings quality can be constructed by measuring the magnitude of accruals. While a balance sheet approach exists, a more direct and common method uses the statement of cash flows [31]:
$\text{AccrualsCF}=\text{Net Income}-\text{Cash Flow from Operations}$
To make this comparable across firms, the result is typically scaled by average total assets. A high value for this ratio indicates that a large portion of earnings is not backed by cash and is of lower quality. In the context of an earnings surprise strategy, this metric serves as a powerful conditioning variable. A positive earnings surprise accompanied by high accruals should be viewed with suspicion, as the PEAD effect has been shown to be weaker for such firms.

Cash is King: The Quality of Earnings (QoE) Ratio

A closely related and highly intuitive metric is the Quality of Earnings (QoE) Ratio, also known as the Cash Conversion Ratio. This directly measures how much operating cash is generated for every dollar of net income reported.[31] The formula is straightforward:
$\text{QoE Ratio}=\text{Net IncomeCash Flow from Operations}$
The interpretation is equally direct. A ratio consistently greater than 1.0 is a sign of high-quality earnings, indicating that the company is generating more cash than it reports in accounting profit. Conversely, a ratio below 1.0 suggests lower quality, as reported earnings

are outpacing cash generation, which may be unsustainable.[31] A negative signal is particularly strong if the QoE ratio is not only below 1.0 but is also on a declining trend over several quarters. This signal can be used to filter the universe of stocks, for instance, by only considering trades for companies with a QoE ratio above a certain threshold (e.g., 0.8).

A Multi-Factor View of Quality and Fundamentals

While accruals and the QoE ratio are powerful indicators, a more robust assessment of quality can be achieved by creating a composite score from a broader set of fundamental metrics.[33] This multi-factor approach smooths out the noise inherent in any single ratio and provides a more holistic view of a company's financial health. A composite "Quality Score" can be constructed by ranking and combining several key financial ratios, including:

- **Profitability:** Metrics like Return on Equity (ROE), Return on Assets (ROA), and Net Profit Margin indicate how efficiently a company is generating profits from its equity, assets, and revenues. Higher values are indicative of higher quality.[33]
- **Solvency:** Ratios such as the Debt-to-Equity Ratio and the Interest Coverage Ratio measure a company's financial leverage and its ability to meet its debt obligations. Lower leverage and higher interest coverage signal greater financial stability and lower risk.[33]
- **Efficiency:** Ratios like Asset Turnover and Inventory Turnover gauge how effectively management is utilizing its assets to generate sales. Higher turnover ratios suggest more efficient operations.[33]

To implement this, one would calculate these ratios for all firms in the universe, convert each ratio into a percentile rank, and then create the composite Quality Score by taking a simple or weighted average of the individual ranks. This score can then be used as a final filter (e.g., only taking long signals in firms that rank in the top two quintiles of both the surprise signal and the quality score) or as a continuous weight in the final signal combination model.

The integration of these quality metrics is not merely a check on historical accounting practices; it is a forward-looking enhancement to the PEAD strategy. The very mechanism of PEAD relies on the persistence of earnings news.[2] High-quality earnings, by their nature, are more persistent and recurring than earnings propped up by temporary accruals.[31] Therefore, a positive surprise from a high-quality firm contains more "persistent information" for the market to underreact to, suggesting a stronger and longer-lasting drift. Conversely, a surprise from a low-quality firm contains more "transitory noise," suggesting a weaker and shorter-lived effect. This implies that the holding period for a trade could be dynamically adjusted based on the quality score: a signal for a top-quintile quality firm might be held for a full 60-day period, while a signal for a bottom-quintile firm might be exited more quickly to capture any short-term momentum before the low-quality earnings component potentially reverses.

Metric	Formula	Interpretation	Source Snippets

Accruals Ratio (Cash Flow)	(Net Income−Operating Cash Flow)/Total Assets	Higher values indicate lower earnings quality, as a larger portion of earnings is not backed by cash.	[31]
Quality of Earnings (QoE) Ratio	Operating Cash Flow/Net Income	A ratio > 1.0 suggests high quality (more cash than income); a ratio < 1.0 suggests lower quality.	[31]
Return on Equity (ROE)	Net Income/Average Shareholders' Equity	Measures profitability relative to shareholder investment. Higher is better.	[33]
Debt-to-Equity Ratio	Total Liabilities/Total Shareholders' Equity	Measures financial leverage. Lower values indicate greater financial stability and lower risk.	[33]

From Signals to Strategy: A Framework for Combination and Scoring

Having developed distinct families of signals—capturing the initial surprise, analyst dynamics, and fundamental quality—the next critical step is to synthesize them into a single, actionable score for each stock. This process transforms a collection of disparate data points into a coherent ranking system that can be used for portfolio construction. The methodology for combination can range from simple heuristics to sophisticated statistical models, each with its own set of trade-offs.

Signal Preparation: Normalization and Sanitization

Before any combination can occur, the raw signals must be processed to ensure they are comparable and that the final model is not unduly influenced by extreme outliers. This preparation stage is a crucial step in building a robust model.

- **Normalization:** Since signals are measured in different units (e.g., SUE is a standardized score, revision magnitude is a percentage, QoE is a ratio), they must be converted to a common scale.
  - **Ranking:** The simplest and most robust method is to convert each signal's raw

value into a percentile rank (from 0 to 1) or to group them into deciles or quintiles. This non-parametric approach is insensitive to the specific distribution of the signal and is highly resistant to outliers.

    - **Z-Scoring:** A more granular method is to calculate a z-score for each signal value: $Z=(X-\mu)/\sigma$, where X is the raw signal value, and μ and σ are the cross-sectional mean and standard deviation of the signal for that period. This transforms each signal to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, preserving more information about the signal's distribution than simple ranking.[37]
- **Outlier Management:** Extreme values, often resulting from data errors or unique corporate events, can have an outsized impact on a model. **Winsorization** is a common technique to manage this, whereby values above a certain percentile (e.g., the 99th) are capped at that percentile's value, and values below a certain percentile (e.g., the 1st) are floored at that value. This reins in the influence of extreme data points without discarding them entirely.

Combination Methodologies: From Simple to Sophisticated

Once the signals are cleaned and normalized, they can be combined to produce a final score.

Simple Weighted Averaging

The most straightforward approach is to create a composite score using a linear combination of the normalized signals with pre-determined weights. The weights can be based on economic intuition, a review of academic literature, or a simple historical backtest. For example, a composite score might be calculated as:
Final Score = 0.4*SUE_zscore + 0.2*RevisionMagnitude_zscore + 0.2*Breadth_zscore + 0.2*QualityScore_zscore
This method is transparent, easy to implement, and provides a solid baseline. However, its primary weakness is that it assumes the predictive power of each signal and the relationship between them is static over time.

Regression-Based Combination

A more dynamic and data-driven approach is to use cross-sectional regression to determine the optimal weights for each period. At the end of each rebalancing period (e.g., each month), a regression is run across all stocks in the universe:

$$ R_{i, t+1} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SUE_{i,t} + \beta_2 Breadth_{i,t} + \beta_3 Quality_{i,t} +... + \epsilon_{i,t} $$

Here, $R_{i,t+1}$ is the forward return of stock i over the next period, and the independent variables are the normalized alpha signals for stock i at the current time t. The estimated coefficients (βs) from this regression represent the market-implied importance of each signal in predicting returns for that specific period. The final alpha score for each stock is then the predicted return from this model. This method has the significant advantage of adapting to changing market regimes where the efficacy of certain factors may wax and wane.[38]

Ensemble Methods (Machine Learning)

For the highest level of sophistication, ensemble machine learning models like Random Forests or Gradient Boosted Trees can be employed.[40] In this framework, the various alpha signals are treated as "features," and the model is trained to predict forward returns. These methods can capture complex, non-linear interactions between signals that linear regression would miss. For example, a model might learn that a high SUE is only predictive when earnings quality is also high and analyst dispersion is low. While computationally more intensive and less transparent ("black box"), these models can often produce more robust and powerful composite signals by leveraging a more flexible functional form.[42]

The process of signal combination should not be viewed merely as a predictive exercise but as an optimization problem. A simple regression may overweight two highly correlated signals that provide redundant information, or it may favor a high-information but high-turnover signal that is unprofitable after costs. A more advanced framework would incorporate the covariance matrix of the signals, explicitly giving higher weights to signals that are less correlated with others, thereby maximizing diversification benefits.[37] Furthermore, by integrating a turnover penalty into the optimization, the model can be guided to favor more stable, lower-cost signals, directly optimizing for post-cost, risk-adjusted alpha rather than raw predictive power.[43]

The Final Score: Creating an Actionable Signal

Regardless of the combination method used, the output is a single, composite alpha score for every stock in the eligible universe at each rebalancing date. This score provides a unified ranking of all potential opportunities. This ranked list is the direct input for portfolio construction. A standard implementation would be to form a long/short portfolio by taking a long position in the stocks with the highest scores (e.g., the top decile) and a short position in the stocks with the lowest scores (e.g., the bottom decile). The portfolio would be held for a predetermined period, such as 60 trading days, and then rebalanced based on the new scores generated after the next wave of earnings announcements.[11]

Rigorous Validation: A Blueprint for Backtesting and Performance Analysis

The development of a quantitative strategy is an empirical science. An idea, no matter how economically sound, is worthless until it has been subjected to rigorous historical testing. Backtesting is the process of simulating a strategy on historical data to assess its viability before risking capital. A properly conducted backtest provides insight into a strategy's potential profitability, risk profile, and robustness. However, it is a process fraught with potential pitfalls that can lead to dangerously misleading results. This section provides a blueprint for conducting a rigorous backtest, with a strong emphasis on avoiding common biases and employing advanced validation techniques.

The Backtesting Engine: Principles and Setup

A backtesting engine is a software framework that simulates the execution of a trading strategy over a historical dataset. At its core, it requires three components: a time series of historical market data (including prices and volumes), the time series of the generated alpha signals, and a set of rules defining the trading logic.[44] A robust backtester should be built on an event-driven architecture. This means it processes data chronologically, one time-step at a time (e.g., day by day), and makes trading decisions at each step using only the information that would have been available up to that point. This structure is fundamental to preventing look-ahead bias.

Avoiding the Pitfalls: A Guide to Common Biases

The validity of a backtest is only as good as its ability to avoid subtle but critical biases that can create an illusion of profitability.

- **Survivorship Bias:** This is one of the most common errors. It occurs when the historical dataset used for testing includes only companies that "survived" to the present day, while excluding those that were delisted due to bankruptcy, mergers, or acquisitions. Because the excluded firms are disproportionately poor performers, a backtest on a survivorship-biased dataset will produce artificially inflated returns.[47] It is essential to use a high-quality, point-in-time database that includes the full history of all securities, including those that are no longer trading.
- **Look-Ahead Bias:** This is perhaps the most insidious and dangerous bias. It occurs when the simulation inadvertently uses information that was not yet publicly available at the time a trade decision was made.[44] Examples include using a company's final annual financial statement data to make a trade in January of that year (when the data is not released until March), or using closing prices to make a decision that should have been based on the opening price. All data inputs—prices, fundamentals, analyst estimates—must be meticulously time-stamped and lagged to reflect their actual availability to the market.

- **Overfitting (Data Snooping Bias):** This occurs when a model is so finely tuned to the historical data that it ends up fitting the random noise rather than the true underlying signal. Such a model will produce spectacular backtested performance but will fail dramatically when exposed to new, live market data.[44] The risk of overfitting increases with the number of parameters and complexity of the strategy.

Advanced Validation Techniques: Ensuring Robustness

To combat overfitting and build confidence in a strategy's future performance, advanced validation techniques are essential.

- **Out-of-Sample (OOS) Testing:** This is the bedrock of robust validation. The historical data is split into at least two distinct periods. The strategy is developed, parameterized, and optimized using only the first period (the "in-sample" data). Its performance is then tested on the second, completely unseen period (the "out-of-sample" data).[45] A strategy is considered robust only if its performance characteristics (e.g., Sharpe ratio, drawdown) do not degrade significantly in the OOS period.
- **Walk-Forward Optimization:** This is a more sophisticated and realistic form of OOS testing that simulates the real-world process of periodically re-calibrating a model. The data is divided into multiple, consecutive folds. The model is trained on the first fold (e.g., years 1-2), tested on the second (e.g., year 3), and the results are recorded. Then, the entire window is rolled forward: the model is retrained on years 2-3 and tested on year 4, and so on. The final performance is the aggregated result of all the out-of-sample test periods. This method tests a strategy's stability and adaptability across many different market regimes and time periods.[52]

The goal of these procedures is not to find the single set of parameters that yielded the highest backtested return. That is a classic example of overfitting. Instead, the goal is to demonstrate that the strategy is robust across a wide range of reasonable parameters and market conditions. This can be visualized through **parameter sensitivity analysis**, where key parameters are systematically varied and the performance is plotted as a surface.[44] A robust strategy will exhibit a large, smooth "plateau" of positive performance, indicating that its success is not dependent on a single, perfectly tuned parameter set. A fragile, overfit strategy will show a single, sharp "peak" that collapses with any minor parameter change. Confidence in a strategy's future viability comes from the stability of this plateau, not the height of its highest peak.

The Real-World Filter: Modeling Transaction Costs and Slippage

A backtest that ignores the frictions of trading is an academic exercise, not a realistic assessment of potential profitability. High-turnover strategies, in particular, can see promising gross returns completely erased by trading costs.[55] A realistic backtest must model:

- **Commissions:** A fixed fee per trade or a percentage of the value traded, based on the targeted broker's fee schedule.[55]
- **Bid-Ask Spread:** Buy orders should be simulated at the prevailing ask price and sell orders at the bid price, not an idealized midpoint price. This cost can be significant for illiquid stocks.[55]
- **Slippage and Market Impact:** Slippage is the difference between the expected execution price and the actual execution price. It is caused by market volatility and the price impact of the trade itself, especially for large orders in illiquid assets. Slippage can be modeled as a fixed percentage of the price, or more dynamically as a function of the order size relative to the stock's average daily volume and its price volatility.[55]

Measuring Success: Key Performance Metrics

Once a realistic backtest is complete, its output must be evaluated using a standard set of performance metrics that assess both return and risk.

Metric Category	Metric Name	Definition	Rule of Thumb for a Good Strategy
Profitability	Annualized Return	The geometric average amount of money earned by an investment each year over a given time period.	Should be significantly positive and exceed benchmarks.
	Profit Factor	Gross Profits / Absolute Gross Losses.	> 1.75 is considered strong.[58]
Risk-Adjusted Return	Sharpe Ratio	(Annualized Return - Risk-Free Rate) / Annualized Volatility.	> 1.0 is good; > 1.5 is excellent.[58]
	Information Ratio (IR)	(Portfolio Return - Benchmark Return) / Tracking Error.	> 0.5 is good; > 1.0 is very good for an alpha strategy.
Risk & Drawdown	Annualized Volatility	The standard deviation of portfolio returns, annualized.	Context-dependent, but should be reasonable for the given return.
	Maximum Drawdown (MDD)	The largest peak-to-trough percentage decline in portfolio value.	< 20% is generally desirable; > 30% indicates high risk.[58]
Trading Activity	Annual Turnover	The percentage of the	Directly impacts

		portfolio that is traded over one year.	transaction costs. Lower is generally better, all else equal.

These metrics, taken together, provide a multi-dimensional view of a strategy's performance, moving beyond simple returns to provide a professional assessment of its risk-adjusted viability.

Concluding Remarks and Strategic Implementation

This report has outlined a comprehensive, multi-layered framework for the systematic construction and validation of alpha signals derived from corporate earnings announcements. The approach is rooted in the economic and behavioral rationale of the Post-Earnings Announcement Drift (PEAD) anomaly, but adapts to the realities of the modern market environment where this effect has become more nuanced and concentrated.

The core logic of the proposed framework follows a clear, structured progression:

1. **Foundation in Anomaly:** The strategy begins with a deep understanding of PEAD, recognizing both its historical persistence and its recent attenuation. This understanding guides the strategy toward the market segments where the anomaly remains most potent—namely, in smaller, less liquid, and less institutionally covered securities.
2. **Multi-faceted Signal Generation:** Rather than relying on a single measure, the framework advocates for the construction of a diverse set of signals. This includes robust measures of the initial earnings surprise (SUE, EAR, FOM), forward-looking indicators from analyst dynamics (revisions, breadth, dispersion), and critical filters based on fundamental earnings quality (accruals, QoE ratio). This diversity ensures that the final signal is not reliant on a single, potentially flawed, piece of information.
3. **Intelligent Combination:** The disparate signals are synthesized into a single, rankable score for each security. This can be achieved through methods ranging from simple weighted averages to more sophisticated, adaptive techniques like cross-sectional regression or machine learning ensembles. The most advanced approaches treat this combination step as an optimization problem, explicitly accounting for signal correlation and turnover to maximize post-cost, risk-adjusted alpha.
4. **Rigorous Validation:** The entire strategy is subjected to a stringent backtesting process designed to identify and mitigate common biases such as survivorship, look-ahead, and overfitting. The use of out-of-sample testing and walk-forward optimization, combined with realistic modeling of transaction costs and slippage, is essential for generating a trustworthy assessment of the strategy's viability. Performance is evaluated not just on returns, but on a holistic set of risk-adjusted metrics, including the Sharpe Ratio, Information Ratio, and Maximum Drawdown.

The successful implementation of such a quantitative strategy is not a one-time event but an iterative process of research, testing, and refinement. The market is a dynamic, adaptive system; financial anomalies can decay, the predictive power of signals can change, and new sources of information constantly emerge. The framework presented here is not a static recipe for guaranteed profits, but rather a durable and disciplined blueprint for the ongoing process of alpha discovery. By grounding signal construction in economic theory, diversifying information sources, combining them intelligently, and validating with uncompromising rigor, a quantitative investor can build a robust process for navigating the complexities of the market and systematically exploiting the opportunities that arise from corporate earnings events.

Works cited

1. A Review on the Post-Earnings Announcement Drifts: A Holistic Approach Is Warranted, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.ewadirect.com/proceedings/aemps/article/view/22875
2. Post–earnings-announcement drift - Wikipedia, accessed July 20, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Post%E2%80%93earnings-announcement_drift
3. Post-earnings-announcement drift: Explained - TIOmarkets, accessed July 20, 2025, https://tiomarkets.com/en/article/post-earnings-announcement-drift-guide
4. Signal Theory and Earnings Surprise - Duke People, accessed July 20, 2025, https://people.duke.edu/~charvey/Teaching/BA453_2004/MCM/A1webfile_MID.htm
5. Can Generative AI Disrupt Post-Earnings Announcement Drift (PEAD)? - CFA Institute Blogs, accessed July 20, 2025, https://blogs.cfainstitute.org/investor/2025/04/22/can-generative-ai-disrupt-post-earnings-announcement-drift-pead/
6. Earnings Autocorrelation and the Post-Earnings ... - MADOC, accessed July 20, 2025, https://madoc.bib.uni-mannheim.de/64450/1/earnings-autocorrelation-and-the-post-earnings-announcement-drift-experimental-evidence.pdf
7. (PDF) A Review on the Post-Earnings Announcement Drifts: A ..., accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391569422_A_Review_on_the_Post-Earnings_Announcement_Drifts_A_Holistic_Approach_Is_Warranted
8. Why Has PEAD Declined Over Time? The Role of Earnings News Persistence - Columbia Business School, accessed July 20, 2025, https://business.columbia.edu/sites/default/files-efs/imce-uploads/CEASA/Events%20Page/PEAD_Declined_over_time.pdf
9. Stock returns, aggregate earnings surprises, and behavioral finance - Dartmouth, accessed July 20, 2025, https://faculty.tuck.dartmouth.edu/images/uploads/faculty/jonathan-lewellen/Earnings.pdf
10. POST-EARNINGS ANNOUNCEMENT DRIFT - Aaltodoc, accessed July 20, 2025, https://aaltodoc.aalto.fi/bitstreams/f84c5490-6102-44e5-a6cc-8f2a932ac8fe/download
11. Post-Earnings Announcement Effect - Quantpedia, accessed July 20, 2025, https://quantpedia.com/strategies/post-earnings-announcement-effect
12. A New Measure of Earnings surprises and Post-Earnings-Announcement Drift -

Brandeis, accessed July 20, 2025, https://peeps.unet.brandeis.edu/~heidifox/ese.pdf
13. Unexpected Earnings - Overview, SUE Formula, Importance, accessed July 20, 2025, https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/accounting/unexpected-earnings/
14. Standardized Unexpected Earnings - QuantConnect.com, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.quantconnect.com/research/15369/standardized-unexpected-earnings/
15. Earnings Surprise: Overview, Examples, and Formulas - Investopedia, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/e/earningssurprise.asp
16. The critical role of earnings surprise in equity markets and factor investing | AXA IM UK, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.axa-im.co.uk/investment-strategies/equities/insights/critical-role-earnings-surprise-equity-markets-and-factor-investing
17. Robust measures of earnings surprises - InK@SMU.edu.sg, accessed July 20, 2025, https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6405&context=lkcsb_research
18. How to measure earnings surprises: Based on revised market reaction - PMC, accessed July 20, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10745228/
19. Gross Profit Surprises and Future Stock Returns - Loyola Marymount University, accessed July 20, 2025, https://cba.lmu.edu/media/lmucollegeofbusinessadministration/undergrad/Gross%20Profit%20Surprises.pdf
20. Why do analysts revise their stock recommendations after earnings ..., accessed July 20, 2025, http://www.centerforpbbefr.rutgers.edu/2012PBFEAM/papers/095-050712.pdf
21. The Value of Analyst Forecast Revisions: Evidence from Earnings Announcements - eScholarship.org, accessed July 20, 2025, https://escholarship.org/content/qt2r7980f3/qt2r7980f3_noSplash_c002fc5c3b5de2401d705fadd922a1f3.pdf
22. Analyst Responsiveness and the Post-Earnings-Announcement Drift Yuan Zhang - Columbia Business School, accessed July 20, 2025, https://business.columbia.edu/sites/default/files-efs/pubfiles/3737/zhang.pdf
23. Using Estimate Revisions to Research a Stock - Behind The ..., accessed July 20, 2025, https://behindthebalancesheet.com/investing-tips/using-estimate-revisions-to-research-a-stock/
24. Earnings Estimate - Overview, Revisions, Impact, accessed July 20, 2025, https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/equities/earnings-estimate/
25. Chapter 30 EARNINGS FORECASTS AND REVISIONS ... - FactSet, accessed July 20, 2025, https://go.factset.com/hubfs/Symposium%20Images/Guerard_EARNINGS%20FO

RECASTS%20AND%20REVISIONS,%20PRICE%20MOMENTUM,%20AND%20FUNDAMENTAL%20DATA.pdf?hsLang=en
26. Guerard Presentation[1] (Read-Only) - Jacobs Levy Center, accessed July 20, 2025, https://jacobslevycenter.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/J.-Guerard-Presentation.pdf
27. The Revenge of Traditional Investment Research and the Persistence of Financial Anomalies - FactSet Insight, accessed July 20, 2025, https://insight.factset.com/the-revenge-of-traditional-investment-research-and-the-persistence-of-financial-anomalies
28. Differences of Opinion and the Cross Section of Stock Returns - Karl Diether, accessed July 20, 2025, https://diether.org/papers/dms.pdf
29. Analysts' Forecast Dispersion and Stock Returns: A Quantile Regression Approach - Taylor & Francis Online, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/15427560.2014.942420
30. (PDF) Analysts' Forecast Dispersion, Analysts' Forecast Bias and the Cross-Sectional Stock Returns - ResearchGate, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272244135_Analysts'_Forecast_Dispersion_Analysts'_Forecast_Bias_and_the_Cross-Sectional_Stock_Returns
31. What is Earnings Quality? — Vintti, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.vintti.com/blog/what-is-earnings-quality
32. Understanding Earnings Quality | Nperspective CFO, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.nperspective.com/business-resources/insights/understanding-earnings-quality/
33. Fundamental Analysis: Principles, Types, and How to Use It, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/f/fundamentalanalysis.asp
34. What is fundamental analysis? How to assess value in trading - Saxo Bank, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.home.saxo/learn/guides/trading-strategies/how-and-when-to-use-fundamental-analysis
35. Our Alpha Signals: What's Worked Thus Far - WisdomTree, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.wisdomtree.com/api/sitecore/pdf/getblogpdf?id=eade5620-9f05-49a9-89f7-0e70282ee68e
36. (PDF) Earnings quality metrics and what they measure - ResearchGate, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228426249_Earnings_quality_metrics_and_what_they_measure
37. Signal Preparation; optimal method : r/quant - Reddit, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/quant/comments/1j7sl2j/signal_preparation_optimal_method/
38. Combining Alphas via Bounded Regression - MDPI, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9091/3/4/474
39. Regression-based macro trading signals - Macrosynergy, accessed July 20, 2025, https://macrosynergy.com/research/regression-signals/

40. Combining Alpha Signals Using Ensemble Methods for Enhanced Alpha - IRJET, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.irjet.net/archives/V7/i6/IRJET-V7I6304.pdf
41. Ensemble Strategies - Build Alpha, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.buildalpha.com/trading-ensemble-strategies/
42. Ensembles in Machine Learning, Applications in Finance - PyFi, accessed July 20, 2025, https://pyfi.com/blogs/articles/ensembles-in-machine-learning-applications-in-finance
43. Mixing Alpha Signals with Asset Turnover Control White Paper, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.factset.com/resource/white-paper/mixing-alpha-signals-with-asset-turnover-control-white-paper
44. Successful Backtesting of Algorithmic Trading Strategies - Part I | QuantStart, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.quantstart.com/articles/Successful-Backtesting-of-Algorithmic-Trading-Strategies-Part-I/
45. Backtesting: Definition, How It Works, and Downsides - Investopedia, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/b/backtesting.asp
46. Backtest Investment Strategies Using Financial Toolbox - MATLAB & Simulink Example, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.mathworks.com/help/finance/backtest-investment-strategies.html
47. How To Avoid Bias in Backtesting | Billions Club - For Traders, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.fortraders.com/blog/how-to-avoid-bias-in-backtesting
48. Data Snooping, Overfitting, Survivorship Bias, And More - FasterCapital, accessed July 20, 2025, https://fastercapital.com/topics/data-snooping,-overfitting,-survivorship-bias,-and-more.html/1
49. Backtesting with Integrity | Newfound Research, accessed July 20, 2025, http://www.thinknewfound.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Backtesting-with-Integrity.pdf
50. Risks and Limitations of Backtesting | TrendSpider Learning Center, accessed July 20, 2025, https://trendspider.com/learning-center/risks-and-limitations-of-backtesting/
51. A Complete Guide to Backtesting Algo Trading Strategies | marketfeed, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.marketfeed.com/read/en/the-ultimate-guide-to-backtesting-algo-trading-strategies
52. Walk forward optimization - Wikipedia, accessed July 20, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Walk_forward_optimization
53. [AI & Algorithmic Trading] Walk-Forward Analysis: A Comprehensive Guide to Advanced Backtesting | by Pham The Anh | Funny AI & Quant | Medium, accessed July 20, 2025, https://medium.com/funny-ai-quant/ai-algorithmic-trading-walk-forward-analysis-a-comprehensive-guide-to-advanced-backtesting-f3f8b790554a
54. Mastering Walk-Forward Optimization - Number Analytics, accessed July 20,

2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/walk-forward-optimization-guide
55. How to Avoid Common Mistakes in Backtesting? - Quantra by QuantInsti, accessed July 20, 2025, https://quantra.quantinsti.com/glossary/How-to-Avoid-Common-Mistakes-in-Backtesting
56. Backtesting Limitations: Slippage and Liquidity Explained - LuxAlgo, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.luxalgo.com/blog/backtesting-limitations-slippage-and-liquidity-explained/
57. Using Backtesting to Avoid Slippage in Equities Trading - Exegy, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.exegy.com/avoiding-slippage-equities-trading-with-backtesting/
58. Top 5 Metrics for Evaluating Trading Strategies - LuxAlgo, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.luxalgo.com/blog/top-5-metrics-for-evaluating-trading-strategies/
59. Sharpe Ratio for Algorithmic Trading Performance Measurement - QuantStart, accessed July 20, 2025, https://www.quantstart.com/articles/Sharpe-Ratio-for-Algorithmic-Trading-Performance-Measurement/
60. Mastering Performance Metrics for Traders: Boost Your Success - TradeFundrr, accessed July 20, 2025, https://tradefundrr.com/performance-metrics-for-traders/