Generating Alpha from Earnings Events: A Multi-Factor Approach to Scoring Stocks with IBES and Worldscope Data

Section 1: The Foundation - Quantifying Earnings Surprise and the PEAD Anomaly

The pursuit of alpha in quantitative equity trading often begins with the identification of persistent market inefficiencies. Among the most robust and extensively studied of these is the phenomenon surrounding corporate earnings announcements. While the initial stock price reaction to an earnings release is typically swift and significant, a more subtle and prolonged effect often follows. This section establishes the theoretical and practical foundation for building alpha signals around earnings events by dissecting this market anomaly, known as the Post-Earnings Announcement Drift (PEAD), and detailing the primary methodologies for quantifying the "surprise" that serves as its catalyst.

1.1 The Post-Earnings Announcement Drift (PEAD): A Persistent Anomaly

The Post-Earnings Announcement Drift, or PEAD, is a well-documented market anomaly where a company's stock price exhibits a continued, predictable drift in the direction of its earnings surprise for an extended period following the announcement date.[1] This behavior stands in direct contradiction to the strong form of the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH), which posits that all public information should be fully and instantaneously incorporated into a security's price.[1] Instead of a single, sharp price adjustment on the announcement day, stocks with positive earnings surprises tend to experience positive abnormal returns over the subsequent weeks and months, while those with negative surprises tend to underperform.[2] This persistent drift suggests a systematic underreaction by the market to the information contained within the earnings release.

The persistence of PEAD has prompted decades of academic inquiry into its underlying causes. The explanations can be broadly categorized into three areas: behavioral biases, market frictions, and risk-based theories.

- **Behavioral Explanations:** These theories are the most widely accepted and attribute the drift to cognitive biases among investors. Limited attention is a primary driver, where investors may be overwhelmed by the sheer volume of information released during earnings season and fail to fully process the long-term implications of a given surprise.[1] This is compounded by conservatism bias, where investors are slow to update their prior beliefs about a company, causing them to anchor to old information and only gradually incorporate the new earnings data into their valuation models.

- **Market Frictions:** This set of explanations points to real-world impediments that prevent immediate and complete price adjustment. These include transaction costs, liquidity constraints, and limits to arbitrage, which can make it costly or difficult for sophisticated investors to fully exploit the mispricing immediately after an announcement.[1]
- **Risk-Based Explanations:** Some research suggests that the drift may be a form of compensation for bearing unaccounted-for risk.[4] However, many studies have struggled to link the drift to traditional risk factors, and the anomaly often persists even after adjusting for size, value, and momentum exposures.[1] One interesting finding is that while earnings autocorrelation—the tendency for earnings trends to persist—is not a necessary condition for PEAD to exist, it can act as an "accelerator," strengthening the drift when present.[4]

In the contemporary market environment, there is growing evidence that the predictive power of the simplest forms of earnings surprise is diminishing.[3] As the PEAD anomaly has become more widely known and systematically exploited by quantitative funds and active managers, its alpha has naturally decayed. This does not mean the underlying inefficiency has vanished; rather, it suggests that capturing its value now requires more sophisticated, multi-faceted scoring models that move beyond a single, simple surprise metric. The modern challenge is to build models that can more accurately identify the nuances of an earnings release and the subsequent investor reactions that drive the persistent drift.[3]

1.2 A Taxonomy of Earnings Surprise Metrics

At the heart of any PEAD-based strategy is the quantitative definition of "surprise." An earnings surprise, or unexpected earnings, is fundamentally the difference between a company's actual reported earnings and its expected earnings.[6] The magnitude and direction of this difference form the basis of the initial signal. While conceptually simple, the calculation of this surprise can take several forms, each with its own assumptions and data requirements.

Simple Surprise

The most direct method for calculating earnings surprise is to measure the absolute or percentage difference between the reported Earnings Per Share (EPS) and the consensus analyst forecast.

The absolute surprise is calculated as:

$$\text{Surprise}_{abs} = \text{Actual EPS} - \text{Expected EPS}$$

where 'Expected EPS' is typically the mean or median analyst forecast immediately preceding the announcement.6
The percentage surprise normalizes this value, making it more comparable across stocks with different EPS levels:

$$\text{Surprise}\% = \frac{\text{Actual EPS} - \text{Expected EPS}}{|\text{Expected EPS}|}$$

This measure can be sensitive to very small denominators, so care must be taken when expected EPS is close to zero.9 While intuitive, these simple measures do not account for the level of uncertainty or disagreement surrounding the forecast. A $0.05 surprise for a utility stock with a tight consensus of analyst estimates is far more significant than the same $0.05 surprise for a volatile biotech company with a wide dispersion of forecasts.

Standardized Unexpected Earnings (SUE)

To address the shortcomings of simple surprise metrics, academic and practitioner research heavily relies on Standardized Unexpected Earnings (SUE). The core principle of SUE is to scale the earnings surprise by a measure of its historical volatility or the dispersion of forecasts.[6] This standardization makes the surprise metric comparable across different stocks, industries, and time periods. The underlying logic is that a given forecast error is more meaningful if historical errors or forecast dispersion have been small.[6] A SUE score can be interpreted as the number of standard deviations by which the actual earnings deviated from the expectation, providing a probabilistic context for the magnitude of the surprise.[11]
There are two primary families of SUE calculation, distinguished by how they define the "expected" earnings and the standardization factor. The choice between them represents a fundamental decision about what type of information the market is believed to underreact to. An analyst-based SUE model assumes the market underreacts to deviations from explicit, professional expectations. A time-series SUE model, conversely, assumes the market underreacts to shifts in a company's own fundamental, seasonal trajectory, regardless of analyst predictions. These two approaches capture different facets of the market's information processing inefficiency and can produce complementary signals.

1.3 Practical Implementation: Calculating SUE with IBES and Worldscope

Constructing a robust SUE factor requires careful data management, linking disparate datasets, and applying rigorous cleaning procedures. The primary data sources are IBES for analyst estimate data and Worldscope (or Compustat) for fundamental data, including reported actuals. These must be linked to a pricing database like CRSP for returns and, crucially, for corporate action adjustment factors.[2]

Data Requirements and Linking

The initial step is to establish a reliable link between the different data universes. Company identifiers are not consistent across IBES (ticker, CUSIP), Worldscope/Compustat (GVKEY), and CRSP (PERMNO). Therefore, a linking table, such as the CRSP/Compustat Merged (CCM) database or a custom-built table (often referred to as ICLINK), is an essential prerequisite to map securities across these datasets accurately over time.[2] This ensures that the analyst estimates from IBES for a given company can be correctly matched with the actual reported earnings from Worldscope and the corresponding stock returns from CRSP.

Analyst-Based SUE Calculation (IBES)

This formulation defines surprise relative to the consensus of sell-side analyst forecasts. It is the most direct measure of how a company performed relative to market expectations.

1. **Numerator (The Surprise):** The surprise is the difference between the actual reported EPS and the consensus mean or median forecast for that period. The IBES database provides specific fields for this purpose. The key data items are the actual reported EPS for the quarter and the SURMN field, which represents the last I/B/E/S mean estimate for the quarter that has just been reported.[11] IBES also often provides a pre-calculated difference field,
   SURPD.[11]
   $\text{Surprise} = \text{Actual EPS} - \text{SURMN}$
2. **Denominator (The Standardization Factor):** The surprise is standardized by the dispersion of the analyst estimates that made up the consensus mean. This captures the level of uncertainty or disagreement among analysts prior to the announcement. The key IBES field is SURSD, the standard deviation of all estimates that comprise the SURMN for the reported quarter.[11]
3. **Final SUE Formula:** The final SUE score is the ratio of the surprise to the standard deviation.
   $\text{SUE}_{\text{Analyst}} = \frac{\text{Actual EPS} - \text{SURMN}}{\text{SURSD}}$
   It is important to note that IBES also provides a pre-calculated SUE field, which performs this calculation directly.[11] Using the pre-calculated field can save significant time, but building it from the constituent parts allows for greater control and customization of the methodology.

Time-Series SUE Calculation (Worldscope/Compustat)

This formulation avoids reliance on analyst forecasts and instead models expected earnings based on the company's own historical seasonal patterns. This is particularly useful for companies with little or no analyst coverage or as a complementary signal to the analyst-based measure.

1. **Numerator (The Surprise):** The surprise is defined as the change in quarterly EPS from the same quarter in the previous year. This is based on a seasonal random walk model, which assumes that the best predictor of this quarter's earnings is the earnings from four quarters ago.[12]
   $Surprise = EPS_q - EPS_{q-4}$
   Both EPS_q (current quarter EPS) and EPS_{q-4} (EPS from four quarters prior) are sourced from Worldscope/Compustat fundamental data.[12]
2. **Denominator (The Standardization Factor):** The surprise is standardized by the historical volatility of these seasonal changes. This is typically calculated as the standard deviation of the quarterly EPS changes ($EPS_q - EPS_{q-4}$) over a lookback window, such as the prior eight quarters.[12]
   $\sigma(EPS_q - EPS_{q-4})$ over the prior 8 quarters
3. **Final SUE Formula:** The time-series SUE is the ratio of the seasonal surprise to its historical standard deviation.
   $SUE_{Time\text{-}Series} = \frac{EPS_q - EPS_{q-4}}{\sigma(EPS_q - EPS_{q-4})}$
   This calculation requires a sufficient history of quarterly EPS data (e.g., at least 9 quarters to calculate one SUE value with an 8-quarter lookback for the standard deviation).[12]

Data Cleaning and Filtering

Raw data from these services cannot be used directly. Several cleaning and filtering steps are essential to ensure the quality and validity of the resulting alpha signal.

- **Corporate Action Adjustments:** This is arguably the most critical data processing step. Companies frequently undergo corporate actions like stock splits, reverse splits, and stock dividends. These actions change the number of shares outstanding and thus alter the per-share value of earnings and estimates. Comparing a pre-split analyst estimate with a post-split actual EPS would create a large, artificial surprise. To prevent this, all historical analyst estimates must be adjusted to the same share basis as the actual reported earnings. This is accomplished by applying adjustment factors from a source like CRSP to the historical estimate values (new_value = old_value * adjustment_factor) for the period between the estimate date and the announcement date.[2]
- **Universe Definition and Filtering:** To ensure the tradability and reliability of the

results, the universe of stocks should be filtered based on standard criteria used in academic research. Common filters include:

- **Price:** Minimum share price greater than $1 or $5 to avoid issues with penny stocks and high transaction costs.[2]
- **Market Capitalization:** Minimum market cap (e.g., > $5 million) to ensure a basic level of size and liquidity.[2]
- **Data Availability:** Requiring valid market and book value of equity, and non-missing earnings announcement dates in Worldscope/Compustat.[2]
- **Date Consistency:** Ensuring that the earnings announcement dates reported in Compustat and IBES do not differ by more than one calendar day to confirm the correct matching of actuals and estimates.[2]

1.4 Table: Comparative Analysis of SUE Formulations

The following table provides a comparative summary of the primary SUE formulations, highlighting their differing assumptions, data requirements, and interpretations. A comprehensive scoring model may benefit from incorporating multiple definitions of surprise, as they are not perfectly correlated and capture different aspects of market underreaction.

SUE Formulation	Numerator (Surprise Definition)	Denominator (Standardization Factor)	Primary Data Source(s)	Underlying Assumption	Key Snippet(s)
Analyst-Based SUE	Actual Reported EPS - Analyst Mean/Median Forecast	Standard Deviation of Analyst Forecasts for the period.	IBES	Surprise is a deviation from *market expectations* as captured by analysts.	7
Time-Series SUE	Current Quarter EPS - EPS Four Quarters Prior ($EPS_q - EPS_{q-4}$)	Standard Deviation of ($EPS_q - EPS_{q-4}$) over a prior lookback window (e.g., 8 quarters).	Worldscope	Surprise is a deviation from the company's own *historical seasonal earnings pattern*.	12
Generic SUE	Reported EPS - Expected EPS	Standard Deviation of *historical forecast errors* (Actual - Expected).	IBES / Worldscope	Surprise is contextualized by the *historical accuracy* of the	6

				expectation model itself.	

Section 2: Decoding Analyst Sentiment - Advanced Signals from IBES Data

While the consensus earnings estimate and the resulting SUE score provide a powerful starting point, they represent only a fraction of the information embedded in the collective activity of sell-side analysts. The IBES database is a rich source of data that allows for the construction of more nuanced signals capturing the dynamics of analyst sentiment. These advanced signals move beyond the static, point-in-time surprise to measure the *flow* of information and the *degree of conviction* among market professionals. By decoding these subtle cues, it is possible to build a more forward-looking and robust picture of a stock's post-earnings trajectory.

2.1 Analyst Revisions: Capturing the "Drift" in Expectations

The earnings announcement itself is just the beginning of the information dissemination process. The period immediately following the release is characterized by analysts updating their models and revising their future earnings estimates. This revision activity is, in itself, a potent alpha signal. Research has consistently shown that past earnings estimate revisions are highly predictive of future revisions, which in turn are highly correlated with stock price movements.[18] A strategy based on "earnings revision momentum" seeks to identify stocks where analyst sentiment is improving and avoid those where it is deteriorating.

A prominent commercial implementation of this concept is the StarMine suite of models from LSEG, including the Analyst Revisions Model (ARM) and SmartEstimates.[18] The core innovation of these models is to move beyond a simple consensus mean. The StarMine SmartEstimate, for example, is a proprietary weighted average of analyst forecasts that places greater emphasis on more recent estimates and on the forecasts of analysts who have demonstrated superior historical accuracy for that specific company.[18] This intelligent weighting is designed to filter out stale information and the biases of historically inaccurate analysts, theoretically producing a more accurate predictor of future earnings and potential surprises.[20]

For quantitative analysts building their own models, several custom revision signals can be constructed from raw IBES data:

- **Revisions Diffusion:** This is a simple yet effective breadth measure of sentiment change. It is calculated as the ratio of upward EPS estimate revisions to downward EPS estimate revisions over a defined lookback period, such as the past one or three months.[19] A high diffusion ratio indicates a broad consensus of positive sentiment shifts.
  Diffusion=Number of Downward RevisionsNumber of Upward Revisions

- **Magnitude-Weighted Revisions:** This signal enhances the diffusion measure by incorporating the size of the revisions, not just their direction. It can be calculated as the sum of all percentage increases in estimates minus the sum of all percentage decreases over the lookback period. This gives more weight to large, meaningful revisions and less to minor tweaks.

A composite earnings revision factor can be constructed by combining these measures, for instance, by taking a 50/50 blend of a diffusion score and a proprietary score like the StarMine ARM score, as demonstrated in some practitioner research.[19]

2.2 The Predictive Power of Dispersion and Disagreement

The dispersion, or standard deviation, of analyst estimates provides a valuable measure of uncertainty and disagreement surrounding a company's prospects. Interestingly, the predictive power of dispersion differs significantly depending on the type of estimate being analyzed, offering an opportunity to create a sophisticated signal based on the *nature* of analyst disagreement.

- **Earnings Forecast Dispersion:** The dispersion of near-term earnings forecasts (e.g., for the next fiscal quarter or year) has been shown to have a *negative* relationship with future stock returns. Portfolios of firms with low dispersion (high analyst agreement, or "transparent" earnings) tend to outperform portfolios of firms with high dispersion (low agreement, or "opaque" earnings).[21] High earnings forecast dispersion is often interpreted as a proxy for higher information uncertainty or risk, for which the market appears to demand a premium that is insufficient to compensate for the poor subsequent performance.
- **Target Price Dispersion:** In stark contrast, the dispersion in analysts' target prices exhibits a significant *positive* relationship with future stock returns.[22] The return spread between the highest and lowest deciles of stocks sorted by target price dispersion can be over 2% in the subsequent month.[22] This finding is consistent with a risk-based hypothesis, where high disagreement about a firm's long-term valuation (as captured by target prices) represents a form of ex-ante risk for which investors demand higher future returns as compensation.[22]

This dichotomy is a critical element for signal construction. It suggests that while consensus on near-term earnings is a positive attribute, disagreement on long-term valuation is also associated with higher returns. A powerful composite signal could, for example, identify firms with a combination of low earnings forecast dispersion (clarity on the near term) and high target price dispersion (uncertainty and high risk premium on the long term). This moves beyond a simple view of "disagreement is bad" to a more nuanced understanding of what analysts are disagreeing about.

2.3 Subtle Clues: Inconsistent Revisions and Changes in Report Tone

The most advanced signals from analyst data often come from second-order effects and non-obvious patterns in their behavior. Two such areas that have been explored in recent academic literature are seemingly inconsistent revisions and the qualitative tone of research reports.

- **"Seemingly Inconsistent" Revisions:** These are instances where an analyst, on the same day, revises their target price and their earnings estimate in opposite directions—for example, raising the target price while lowering the EPS forecast.[24] While this might appear to be a sign of confusion or low-quality analysis, research indicates the opposite. These "inconsistent" forecasts are often *more accurate* than consistent ones, and the market tends to react positively to *both* the target price and the earnings revision, suggesting that each conveys credible, incremental information.[24] These situations are often driven by sound economic reasoning. For instance, a company might announce a significant R&D investment that will depress near-term earnings (leading to a lower EPS forecast) but is expected to create significant long-term value (leading to a higher target price).[24] Identifying these inconsistent revisions can provide a powerful signal that an analyst is communicating a nuanced, long-term view that diverges from a simple focus on next quarter's earnings.
- **Changes in Qualitative Tone:** Analysts often telegraph their future actions through the language they use in their written reports before making a formal change to their recommendation (e.g., from "Hold" to "Buy").[25] They may subtly shift the tone of their narrative to indicate a more positive or negative outlook.[25] By applying Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques to parse analyst reports, it is possible to quantify this tone and, more importantly, the *change in tone* over time. Research shows that a positive change in report tone is a statistically significant predictor of a future recommendation upgrade.[25] Furthermore, when an upgrade is predictable based on prior tone changes, the market's immediate price reaction to the official upgrade is muted, as the information has already been partially priced in.[25] This suggests that tracking changes in analyst tone can provide a leading indicator of sentiment shifts, allowing a strategy to anticipate formal revisions.

The collection of these analyst-based signals represents a powerful toolkit for understanding the flow of information and the evolution of professional sentiment following an earnings announcement. The initial earnings surprise (SUE) acts as the catalyst, the shock that sets the system in motion. The subsequent analyst revisions represent the first wave of professional reaction and belief updating. The dispersion of these new estimates measures the degree of consensus or debate that emerges from this process. Finally, subtle signals like inconsistent revisions and tone changes provide a deeper, more nuanced view into the sophisticated, long-term perspectives of individual analysts. A truly effective model would not treat these as independent signals but would seek to understand their dynamic interplay as a narrative of how the market digests and re-evaluates a company in the wake of new fundamental information.

Section 3: Assessing Financial Health - Fundamental Signals from Worldscope

An earnings surprise, whether positive or negative, does not occur in a vacuum. Its significance and, more importantly, its persistence are heavily dependent on the underlying financial health and operational trajectory of the company. A positive surprise from a company with deteriorating fundamentals and low-quality earnings is far less meaningful than the same surprise from a financially robust firm with a strong operational track record. This section explores how to construct alpha signals from fundamental data, primarily using the LSEG Worldscope database, to serve as a "credibility filter" for earnings surprises.
Worldscope's key advantage is its provision of globally standardized financial statement data, which allows for the creation of consistent and comparable metrics across different companies, industries, and accounting regimes.[27]

3.1 The Concept of "Fundamental Surprise"

The market's fixation on a single Earnings Per Share (EPS) number can obscure the broader picture of a company's performance. A true "surprise" can manifest across various fundamental dimensions, such as revenue growth, margin expansion, or cash flow generation.[29] The concept of "fundamental surprise" extends the time-series SUE methodology to other key line items on the income statement and cash flow statement.
The methodology involves calculating a standardized surprise for any given fundamental metric (e.g., Revenue, Gross Profit, Operating Cash Flow) available in Worldscope. This is analogous to the calculation of Time-Series SUE [12]:

1. **Calculate the Surprise:** For a given quarterly metric X, the surprise is the change from the same quarter in the prior year: $X_q - X_{q-4}$.
2. **Standardize the Surprise:** The surprise is divided by the standard deviation of these seasonal changes over a historical lookback window (e.g., the prior eight quarters): $\sigma(X_q - X_{q-4})$.

This approach allows for the creation of a dashboard of fundamental momentum signals. For example, a company might report an in-line EPS number (low SUE) but exhibit a significant positive surprise in revenue growth and a negative surprise in operating margins. This nuanced picture provides far more information than the headline EPS figure alone. This concept is closely linked to academic factor models, such as the Fama-French 5-factor model, which demonstrate that fundamental characteristics related to profitability and investment are systematic drivers of stock returns.[30] A positive surprise in profitability metrics, for instance, can be seen as a dynamic signal that a firm is loading up on a compensated risk factor.

3.2 Measuring Earnings Quality: The Accrual Anomaly

One of the most powerful fundamental signals for contextualizing reported earnings is the level of accounting accruals. Earnings, as defined by Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), are composed of two main components: a cash flow component and an accrual component. Accruals represent the non-cash portion of earnings, arising from accounting conventions like revenue recognition and expense matching.[34]

The "accrual anomaly" refers to the robust empirical finding that companies with high levels of accruals (i.e., where reported earnings are significantly higher than underlying cash flow) tend to experience lower future stock returns.[34] The market appears to fixate on the headline earnings number and fails to properly discount the lower-quality, accrual-based portion of those earnings.[34] High accruals can be a red flag for several reasons:

- **Earnings Management:** Managers may use aggressive accounting choices, such as prematurely recognizing sales (increasing accounts receivable) or understating expenses, to inflate reported earnings. These practices are often unsustainable and can lead to future earnings disappointments.[34]
- **Slowing Business Conditions:** A buildup of inventories or accounts receivable can also be a natural consequence of slowing sales or operational inefficiencies, signaling a deterioration in the underlying business that is not yet fully reflected in the income statement.[34]

A low accruals ratio is an indicator of high earnings quality, while a high accruals ratio signals low quality.[36] Two primary methods exist for calculating an aggregate accruals ratio using Worldscope data:

- **Balance Sheet Method:** This approach defines accruals as the change in Net Operating Assets (NOA).
  $NOA=(\text{Total Assets}-\text{Cash})-(\text{Total Liabilities}-\text{Total Debt})$
  The accruals ratio is then the change in NOA, scaled by the average NOA for the period to control for firm growth.[37]
  $\text{Accruals Ratio}_{BS}=(NOA_t+NOA_{t-1})/2NOA_t-NOA_{t-1}$
- **Cash Flow Statement Method:** This is often considered a "cleaner" measure as it is less affected by non-operating activities like acquisitions.[37] It defines accruals directly from the cash flow statement.
  $\text{Accruals}_{CF}=\text{Net Income}-(\text{Cash Flow from Operations}+\text{Cash Flow from Investing})$
  This value is then typically scaled by average total assets to create a comparable ratio.[36]

A positive earnings surprise accompanied by a high accruals ratio is a significant warning sign. It suggests the "beat" may have been engineered through aggressive accounting rather than genuine operational improvement, and the subsequent stock price drift is less likely to be positive and may even reverse.

3.3 Systematic Fundamental Scoring: The Piotroski F-Score

While individual fundamental signals are useful, combining them into a single, composite score of financial health can provide a more robust and holistic signal. The Piotroski F-Score is a simple yet remarkably effective 9-point scoring system designed to identify fundamentally strong firms within a universe of potentially undervalued (low price-to-book) stocks.[38] The original strategy, which involved buying high F-Score (8-9) value stocks and shorting low F-Score (0-2) value stocks, generated significant abnormal returns in historical backtests.[39]
The F-Score is calculated by assigning one point for each of nine binary criteria that are met, grouped into three categories. All necessary data can be sourced from Worldscope's standardized financial statements.[41]
The Nine F-Score Criteria [38]:

1. **Profitability (4 points):**
   - Positive Return on Assets (ROA) in the current year.
   - Positive Cash Flow from Operations (CFO) in the current year.
   - Higher ROA in the current year compared to the previous year ($\Delta ROA > 0$).
   - CFO > Net Income (a measure of accruals quality).
2. **Leverage, Liquidity, and Source of Funds (3 points):**
   - Lower ratio of long-term debt to assets in the current year compared to the previous year ($\Delta Leverage < 0$).
   - Higher current ratio this year compared to the previous year (ΔCurrent Ratio>0).
   - No new shares were issued in the last year (measures lack of dilutive financing).
3. **Operating Efficiency (2 points):**
   - Higher gross margin compared to the previous year (ΔGross Margin>0).
   - Higher asset turnover ratio compared to the previous year (ΔAsset Turnover>0).

In the context of an earnings event, the F-Score serves as an excellent tool for assessing the fundamental context of the surprise. A positive EPS surprise from a firm with a high and/or improving F-Score is a highly credible signal of genuine business improvement. Conversely, a surprise from a firm with a low F-Score (e.g., 0-2) should be viewed with extreme skepticism, as it may be a temporary blip in a deteriorating fundamental story.

3.4 Momentum in Fundamentals

The concept of momentum is not limited to stock prices. There is strong evidence that fundamental trends also persist. Seminal research by Abarbanell and Bushee (1997, 1998) demonstrated that a strategy based on a collection of fundamental signals could earn significant abnormal returns.[43] Their work showed that signals related to changes in inventories, accounts receivable, gross margins, selling expenses, capital expenditures, and labor force productivity contain valuable information about future earnings changes that the market is slow to incorporate into prices.[44] A significant portion of the abnormal returns from their strategy was generated around subsequent earnings announcements, reinforcing the link between fundamental momentum and the PEAD phenomenon.[44]

The core idea is to create signals based on the year-over-year or quarter-over-quarter changes in key financial ratios sourced from Worldscope. A positive change in a favorable ratio (e.g., gross margin) or a negative change in an unfavorable ratio (e.g., inventory growth relative to sales growth) contributes to a positive fundamental momentum score.

Collectively, these fundamental signals provide a crucial layer of validation for any earnings-based alpha factor. The headline EPS surprise tells us *what* happened relative to expectations. The fundamental analysis tells us *how* and *why* it happened. A surprise driven by genuine operational improvements (improving margins, efficient asset use), backed by strong cash flows (low accruals), and occurring within a context of overall financial health (high F-Score) is the hallmark of a high-quality, persistent alpha signal. A surprise lacking this fundamental support is more likely to be noise or manipulation, and a potential trap for unwary investors.

Section 4: Advanced Signal Generation and Refinement

While signals derived from historical earnings and fundamentals provide a robust, backward-looking assessment of a company's performance, the most potent alpha signals often incorporate forward-looking information. This section explores advanced signals that capture management's expectations and the frontiers of quantitative research, including corporate guidance revisions and the application of machine learning. These signals move the analysis from what a company *has done* to what it *expects to do*, providing a more complete picture for predicting future stock performance.

4.1 The Impact of Corporate Guidance Revisions

Corporate guidance refers to the forward-looking projections that a company's management provides to investors regarding its expected future performance, typically covering metrics like revenue, earnings, or capital spending.[46] This information is highly influential, as it represents an insider's view of business trends and market conditions. Changes in guidance are studied closely by analysts and can trigger significant stock price re-ratings.[46]

A critical finding from research is that the market reacts asymmetrically to guidance revisions. Specifically, the negative stock price reaction to lowered guidance is significantly stronger than the positive reaction to raised guidance.[47] This suggests that the market has a built-in expectation for positive performance, and any deviation below that baseline is penalized harshly. Furthermore, when a company maintains its previous guidance (i.e., provides no new upward revision), the market often interprets this as negative news, leading to a decline in the stock price.[47] This "no news is bad news" phenomenon underscores the market's demand for continuous positive momentum.

A powerful signal can be constructed by quantifying the surprise in management's guidance. This can be measured in several ways:

- **Guidance vs. Prior Guidance:** The change in the midpoint of the new guidance range compared to the midpoint of the guidance issued in the prior quarter.
- **Guidance vs. Analyst Consensus:** The difference between the midpoint of the new guidance range and the prevailing analyst consensus estimate for the future period.

The IBES database is an invaluable resource for this analysis, as it collects and standardizes both company guidance data and analyst estimates at the time of guidance, allowing for a direct and consistent comparison.[20]

The interaction between historical performance and forward guidance is particularly important. A "beat and raise"—where a company reports a positive earnings surprise for the past quarter and simultaneously raises its guidance for future quarters—is one of the most powerful bullish signals in finance. Conversely, a "beat and lower"—a positive historical surprise coupled with reduced forward guidance—is often a bearish signal, as the market weighs the negative future outlook more heavily than the positive past performance. A comprehensive scoring model must be able to differentiate between these scenarios.

4.2 The Next Frontier: Machine Learning Approaches

As traditional quantitative factors become more widely known, the search for alpha is pushing into more complex and data-intensive methodologies. Machine learning (ML) offers a powerful toolkit for uncovering non-linear relationships and subtle patterns in financial data that may be missed by traditional linear models.

Recent academic research has begun to apply sophisticated ML techniques to the problem of predicting Post-Earnings Announcement Drift, with promising results:

- **Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs):** One innovative approach involves transforming a company's historical quarterly earnings time series into an image, such as a simple bar chart. A Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)—a type of deep learning algorithm inspired by the human visual system and commonly used for image recognition—is then trained on these images to detect visual patterns that are predictive of future post-announcement drift.[5] Out-of-sample tests have shown that the features identified by the CNN can significantly predict post-announcement returns, outperforming traditional SUE-based predictors and providing incremental information over other well-known anomalies.[5] This research suggests that there are predictive patterns in the shape and sequence of earnings history that are not captured by simple surprise metrics.
- **Multi-Task Learning (MTL):** A key limitation of most PEAD models is that they attempt to predict the stock price drift directly from the earnings event data (a single-task learning approach). However, the price drift is not a direct result of the announcement; it is mediated by the *responses of investors* to that announcement.[3] A more advanced Multi-Task Learning (MTL) framework addresses this by designing a model that

simultaneously learns to predict two things: the ultimate price drift (the primary task) and the intermediary investor responses, such as subsequent analyst revisions or changes in trading volume (the auxiliary tasks).[3] By explicitly modeling this entire mechanism—from event to investor response to price drift—the MTL framework can achieve a more robust understanding of the PEAD phenomenon. Evaluations of such models have shown they can generate risk-adjusted returns two to three times larger than traditional earnings surprise-based models.[3]

While implementing these state-of-the-art ML models requires significant expertise and computational resources, understanding their conceptual basis is crucial. They highlight a shift from relying on a few pre-defined factors to allowing algorithms to discover complex, predictive features from vast amounts of data, including structured financial data and unstructured text from sources like earnings call transcripts.[3]

The most sophisticated alpha models must effectively differentiate between and integrate both backward-looking and forward-looking information. Signals like SUE, accruals, and the F-Score provide a rigorous assessment of what has already occurred. Signals from management guidance, analyst target prices, and advanced predictive models provide a probabilistic view of the future. The interplay between these two dimensions of information is where the most durable alpha is likely to be found. A model that can correctly interpret the tension between a strong historical report and weak forward guidance, or vice versa, will possess a significant analytical edge.

Section 5: From Signals to Strategy - Combination and Portfolio Construction

The development of individual alpha signals, while essential, is only the first stage of building a quantitative strategy. The next critical step involves synthesizing the potentially dozens of signals—spanning earnings surprise, analyst sentiment, fundamental quality, and forward-looking guidance—into a single, coherent score for each stock. This composite score must then be translated into portfolio positions. This section details the methodologies for signal combination, risk control, and portfolio construction, addressing the challenges of maximizing predictive power while maintaining robustness and controlling for unintended risk exposures.

5.1 Methodologies for Aggregating Alpha Signals

Combining multiple alpha signals is a non-trivial task fraught with potential pitfalls, most notably the risk of overfitting.[48] The goal is to create a composite signal that is more robust and predictive than any of its individual components. This requires careful signal preparation and a thoughtful combination methodology.

Signal Preparation

Before signals can be combined, they must be processed to ensure they are comparable and to mitigate undesirable characteristics like excessive turnover.

- **Normalization:** Alpha signals are generated on different scales (e.g., a SUE score is a z-score, a diffusion ratio is a positive number, an F-score is an integer from 0 to 9). To make them comparable, they must be normalized. A common practice is to convert each raw signal into a cross-sectional rank or a z-score (by subtracting the cross-sectional mean and dividing by the cross-sectional standard deviation) at each point in time.[49]
- **Smoothing:** Some signals, particularly those based on very recent information, can be noisy and lead to high portfolio turnover. Applying a smoothing function, such as a simple or exponential moving average, can help reduce this noise and lower transaction costs, though it comes at the cost of reduced responsiveness and potentially lower raw information content (IC).[49]

Combination Approaches

Once prepared, the signals can be combined using several techniques, ranging from simple heuristics to complex statistical models.

1. **Heuristic/Equal Weighting:** The most straightforward method is to simply average the normalized scores of the selected alpha factors. For example, a composite score could be an equal-weighted average of the z-scores for SUE, Analyst Revisions, and F-Score. While simple and less prone to overfitting than complex models, this approach can inadvertently overweight correlated signals. If three of five signals are all capturing different facets of "value," the composite score will have a strong, potentially unintended, value tilt.
2. **Optimal Weighting (Regression-Based):** A more sophisticated approach uses historical data to determine the optimal weights for each signal. This is typically done by running a cross-sectional regression of future stock returns on the various alpha signals at each point in time. The resulting regression coefficients, often averaged over time, can be used as weights for combining the signals.[50] This method explicitly accounts for the historical predictive power (information coefficient, or IC) and the correlations between the signals.[52] The key principle is to assign higher weights to signals that are not only highly predictive ("believability") but also less correlated with other signals ("originality").[49] This ensures a more diversified and robust alpha stream. A portfolio of five moderately predictive but uncorrelated signals is often superior to a portfolio of five highly predictive but highly correlated signals, as the former is less likely to fail when a particular market regime shifts.

3. **Ensemble Models (Machine Learning):** For capturing non-linear interactions between signals, machine learning techniques like Random Forests or Gradient Boosting Machines (GBMs) can be employed.[53] Instead of a simple weighted average, these models use a collection of decision trees to learn complex rules from the data. For example, a model might learn that a high SUE score is only a strong positive signal *if* the F-Score is also high, effectively capturing the "credibility filter" concept discussed previously.[53] This approach, often called stacked generalization, can create models that "generalize" well to new data but requires careful implementation to avoid severe overfitting.[48]

5.2 Controlling for Risk: Factor Neutralization

A common pitfall in quantitative investing is creating a complex alpha signal that, in reality, is just a noisy proxy for a well-known systematic risk factor like Value (HML), Size (SMB), or Price Momentum (UMD). A true alpha signal should provide predictive power that is *orthogonal* to, or independent of, these common risk factors.[55] The process of removing the influence of these factors is known as neutralization.

The methodology involves using a risk model (such as one based on the Fama-French factors) to determine each stock's exposure (beta) to these systematic risks. A cross-sectional regression is then run, with the composite alpha signal as the dependent variable and the risk factor exposures as the independent variables.

$AlphaComposite=c+\beta 1\cdot ExposureValue+\beta 2\cdot ExposureSize+\cdots+\epsilon$

The residual from this regression, ϵ, is the factor-neutral alpha signal.[55] This "pure" alpha represents the portion of the signal's predictive power that cannot be explained by common market factors. Using this neutralized signal for portfolio construction helps ensure that the strategy is generating genuine alpha rather than simply collecting known risk premia.

5.3 Portfolio Formation: From Scores to Weights

The final step is to translate the risk-neutral composite alpha scores into a tangible portfolio of long and short positions.

- **Ranking and Sorting:** The most common approach, particularly in academic research, is to rank all stocks in the investment universe based on their final alpha score at each rebalancing date (e.g., monthly). These ranked stocks are then sorted into quantiles, such as quintiles (5 groups) or deciles (10 groups).[16]
- **Portfolio Construction:**
    - **Quintile/Decile Long-Short Portfolios:** A classic factor-testing portfolio is constructed by going long the stocks in the top quantile (e.g., Quintile 5) and short the stocks in the bottom quantile (e.g., Quintile 1).[56] The positions within each quantile are typically equally weighted or value-weighted. This method is

excellent for testing the efficacy of a signal but may not be the most capital-efficient way to trade it.
    - **Direct Weighting and Optimization:** In a live portfolio, weights can be assigned directly based on the magnitude of the alpha scores, often subject to a portfolio optimization process. An optimizer can take the alpha scores as an input for expected returns and construct a portfolio that maximizes the exposure to the alpha signal while adhering to various constraints, such as a target level of volatility, limits on individual position sizes, sector neutrality, and turnover limits.[52] This approach allows for a more nuanced and risk-managed implementation of the alpha signal.

The journey from raw data to a final portfolio is a multi-stage process of refinement. It begins with the creation of individual signals, proceeds through careful normalization and intelligent combination, is purified through risk neutralization, and culminates in a systematic portfolio construction process that translates the final scores into actionable trades.

Section 6: Robust Validation - A Framework for Backtesting and Performance Analysis

The construction of a sophisticated, multi-factor alpha model is a significant analytical achievement, but it is of little practical value until its performance has been rigorously validated. Backtesting—the process of simulating a trading strategy on historical data—is the primary tool for this validation. However, backtesting is a perilous exercise, susceptible to numerous biases that can produce deceptively attractive but ultimately spurious results. This section outlines a framework for conducting a robust backtest of an earnings event strategy, from choosing the appropriate simulation methodology to interpreting a comprehensive dashboard of performance metrics.

6.1 Methodological Considerations: Event-Driven vs. Vectorized Backtesting

The architecture of a backtesting engine has a profound impact on the realism of its simulation. Two main paradigms exist: vectorized and event-driven.

- **Vectorized Backtesting:** This approach processes data in large, time-aligned batches (vectors or matrices). For example, it might take the entire history of daily closing prices for all stocks and compute a 50-day moving average for all of them simultaneously using efficient matrix operations. This method is computationally very fast and is well-suited for strategies that rebalance on fixed, regular intervals (e.g., monthly) based on data known at the close of the prior period.[61] Its primary drawback is a lack of realism; it cannot easily model intraday logic, complex order types, or the sequential nature of trading.

- **Event-Driven Backtesting:** This approach provides a much higher-fidelity simulation by processing information sequentially, one "event" at a time, in chronological order. The system operates on an event loop, pulling events (such as a new market price, a signal being generated, or an order being filled) from a queue and reacting to them individually.[61] This architecture more closely mirrors how a live trading system operates. For a strategy based on earnings announcements—which are discrete, irregularly timed events—an event-driven framework is vastly superior.[63] It allows the strategy to react precisely when an announcement occurs, and it can realistically model the entire trade lifecycle, including order submission, potential delays, partial fills, and transaction costs like slippage.[59]

Regardless of the chosen architecture, it is imperative to be vigilant against common backtesting pitfalls [64]:

- **Survivorship Bias:** Using a historical dataset that only includes companies that are still active today. This inflates returns by excluding firms that went bankrupt or were delisted.[64] A proper backtest must use a point-in-time database that includes all historical securities.
- **Lookahead Bias:** Using information in the simulation at a time before it would have been realistically available. A classic example is using a company's full-year accounting data (released in March) to make a trading decision in January of that year.[64]
- **Data Snooping/Overfitting:** Developing a strategy by testing thousands of parameter combinations and selecting the one that performed best historically. This often results in a model that is perfectly tuned to the noise of the past and fails out-of-sample.[48] Robust validation requires testing the strategy on a separate, unseen "out-of-sample" dataset.

6.2 Evaluating Signal Efficacy: Quintile Analysis

Before simulating a fully-fledged portfolio with optimization and constraints, it is crucial to test the raw predictive power of the final composite alpha score. The standard academic method for this is quintile (or decile) analysis.

The methodology is as follows: at each rebalancing point in the backtest (e.g., the start of each month), all stocks in the investment universe are ranked based on their alpha score. They are then sorted into five equal-sized groups (quintiles). Portfolio 1 (Q1) contains the stocks with the lowest scores, and Portfolio 5 (Q5) contains the stocks with the highest scores.[57] The performance of these quintile portfolios is then tracked until the next rebalancing date.

This analysis provides several key diagnostics:

1. **Return Spread:** The primary metric is the performance of a long-short portfolio that is long Q5 and short Q1. A consistently positive and statistically significant return for this spread portfolio is strong evidence that the alpha signal has predictive power.[16]
2. **Monotonicity:** An ideal alpha signal will produce a monotonic relationship in the returns

of the quintile portfolios. That is, the average return should decrease steadily from Q5 down to Q1. A clear monotonic pattern indicates that the signal is effective not just at the extremes but across the entire distribution of stocks.

3. **Performance Metrics per Quintile:** Calculating performance metrics like the Sharpe Ratio for each of the five quintile portfolios can provide further insight. This can reveal, for example, whether the alpha comes primarily from the long side (high returns in Q5), the short side (poor returns in Q1), or both.

6.3 A Dashboard of Key Performance Metrics

The final output of a backtest is a set of performance metrics that summarize the strategy's historical behavior from various perspectives. A comprehensive evaluation should include measures of risk-adjusted return, absolute risk, and trading efficiency.

Risk-Adjusted Returns

These metrics assess the return generated by the strategy relative to the risk taken.

- **Sharpe Ratio:** The most common measure, calculated as the excess return of the portfolio over the risk-free rate, divided by the standard deviation (total volatility) of the portfolio's returns.[67] A higher Sharpe Ratio indicates better risk-adjusted performance.
  $\text{Sharpe Ratio} = \frac{R_p - R_f}{\sigma_p}$
- **Sortino Ratio:** A refinement of the Sharpe Ratio that only considers downside volatility. It replaces the standard deviation in the denominator with the standard deviation of only the negative returns.[68] This can be a more intuitive measure for investors who do not view upside volatility as "risk".[70]
- **Information Ratio (IR):** This is the most appropriate metric for evaluating a pure alpha strategy (like a market-neutral long-short portfolio). It measures the portfolio's active return (alpha) divided by its tracking error (the standard deviation of the active returns).[72] An IR above 0.5 is generally considered good, while an IR above 1.0 is excellent.[72]
  $\text{Information Ratio} = \frac{\text{Active Return}}{\text{Tracking Error}}$

Risk and Drawdown

These metrics focus on the potential for losses and the volatility of the strategy.

- **Maximum Drawdown (MDD):** This measures the largest single peak-to-trough percentage decline in the portfolio's value over the course of the backtest.[74] It is a crucial indicator of the strategy's tail risk and the potential for catastrophic losses.
- **Calmar Ratio:** This metric relates return to drawdown risk, calculated as the annualized

rate of return divided by the maximum drawdown.[75] A higher Calmar Ratio indicates that the strategy generated returns more efficiently relative to its worst historical loss.[77]

Cost and Efficiency

- **Portfolio Turnover:** This measures how frequently the assets in the portfolio are bought and sold. It is typically calculated as the lesser of total purchases or total sales over a period, divided by the average net asset value of the portfolio.[79] High turnover is a significant concern as it leads to higher transaction costs (commissions and slippage), which can severely erode the strategy's net returns.[79] A strategy that looks great before costs can easily become unprofitable if its turnover is too high.

A rigorous and honest backtest, utilizing an appropriate simulation engine and a comprehensive set of performance metrics, is the final and most important filter before any capital is committed to a quantitative strategy.

Section 7: Synthesis and Strategic Recommendations

The preceding sections have systematically deconstructed the process of building alpha signals around earnings announcement events, moving from the foundational concept of earnings surprise to advanced signals derived from analyst sentiment, fundamental analysis, and forward-looking guidance. This final section synthesizes these components into a coherent strategic blueprint, addresses the critical challenges of transitioning from backtest to live trading, and offers concluding thoughts on the nature of sustainable alpha generation in modern financial markets.

7.1 Blueprint for a Multi-Factor Earnings Event Model

The central thesis of this report is that robust alpha generation in the context of earnings events stems not from a single "best" signal, but from the intelligent combination of multiple, diverse sources of information. A successful model should be designed to capture a holistic narrative of a company's performance and prospects. The following workflow outlines a blueprint for such a model.

A Multi-Factor Scoring Workflow:

1. **Event Trigger:** The process begins with an earnings announcement event for a stock within the defined investment universe.
2. **Signal Generation Layer:** Upon the announcement, a suite of signals across four key dimensions is calculated:
   - **Core Surprise:** Calculate both Analyst-Based SUE (from IBES) and Time-Series SUE (from Worldscope). These form the initial measure of surprise relative to

market and historical expectations.
    - **Fundamental Quality & Momentum:** Calculate the updated Piotroski F-Score and an Accruals Ratio using the newly released financial data from Worldscope. These act as a "credibility filter" for the surprise.
    - **Analyst Sentiment Dynamics:** In the days following the announcement, track and quantify analyst revisions (e.g., Diffusion), changes in forecast dispersion (both earnings and target price), and any "inconsistent" revisions.
    - **Forward-Looking Information:** Quantify the surprise in management's guidance by comparing it to prior guidance and the prevailing analyst consensus (from IBES).
3. **Signal Combination & Scoring Layer:**
    - **Normalization:** All raw signals are converted to standardized cross-sectional ranks or z-scores.
    - **Combination:** The normalized signals are combined into a single composite score. This can range from a simple equal-weighted average to a more complex, dynamically weighted model based on historical regression or machine learning techniques that prioritize signal efficacy and low inter-correlation. The model should be explicitly designed to capture the crucial interaction effects, such as weighting a positive SUE more heavily when accompanied by a high F-Score and a "raise" in guidance.
4. **Risk Control Layer:**
    - **Factor Neutralization:** The composite alpha score is regressed against exposures to common risk factors (e.g., Value, Size, Momentum, Beta). The residual from this regression becomes the final, "pure" alpha score, ensuring the strategy is not simply repackaging known risk premia.
5. **Portfolio Construction Layer:**
    - **Ranking:** All stocks in the universe are ranked based on their final, risk-neutral alpha scores.
    - **Execution:** A portfolio is formed, typically by going long the top quintile of stocks and short the bottom quintile. The positions are held until the next rebalancing cycle or until a new earnings event for a given stock triggers a score update.

This structured, multi-layered approach ensures that the final trading decision is based on a comprehensive assessment that balances historical surprise, fundamental quality, evolving sentiment, and forward-looking expectations.

7.2 Navigating Pitfalls in Live Trading

A successful backtest is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for a profitable live trading strategy. The transition from a simulated environment to the real world introduces a new set of challenges that can significantly impact performance.

- **Signal Decay:** Alpha signals, particularly well-documented ones like PEAD, are subject to decay over time as they become more widely known and arbitraged by market participants. The most durable sources of alpha are likely to come from more complex, proprietary combinations of signals and from a continuous process of research and refinement to stay ahead of the curve.

- **Transaction Costs & Slippage:** Real-world trading incurs costs that are often underestimated in backtests. These include commissions, bid-ask spreads, and market impact (slippage), which is the adverse price movement caused by the act of trading itself. Strategies that rely on high-turnover signals or trade in less liquid stocks are particularly vulnerable to having their theoretical alpha consumed by these costs. A realistic backtest must include conservative estimates of all transaction costs.
- **Overfitting:** This remains the cardinal sin of quantitative research. The danger of creating a model that is perfectly tailored to historical data but fails in the future is ever-present. To mitigate this risk, several best practices are essential:
    - Maintain a strong economic or behavioral rationale for every signal included in the model. Avoid "black box" signals with no intuitive justification.
    - Keep the model as parsimonious as possible. Complexity increases the risk of overfitting.
    - Rigorously test the model on out-of-sample data that was not used in any way during the model's development phase.
    - Perform sensitivity analysis by varying key parameters (e.g., lookback windows, rebalancing frequency) to ensure the results are not dependent on a specific, finely-tuned set of assumptions.

7.3 Concluding Remarks: The Path to Sustainable Alpha

The evidence strongly suggests that significant and persistent alpha opportunities continue to exist in the period following corporate earnings announcements. However, capturing this alpha in today's competitive markets requires moving beyond simple, one-dimensional measures of surprise. The path to developing a sustainable and robust trading strategy lies in a multi-factor, "quantamental" approach that integrates the quantitative rigor of signal processing with a deep understanding of fundamental analysis and market behavior.

The most successful models will be those that can synthesize a wide array of information—from the historical surprise in reported earnings, to the quality of those earnings as revealed by fundamentals, to the evolving sentiment of analysts, to the forward-looking statements of management. The true edge is found not in any single signal, but in understanding the complex interplay between them. Ultimately, alpha generation is not a one-time discovery but a continuous and disciplined process of research, hypothesis testing, rigorous validation, and prudent risk management.

Works cited

1. A review of the Post-Earnings-Announcement Drift - IDEAS/RePEc, accessed July 19, 2025,

https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/beexfi/v29y2021ics2214635020303750.html
2. Freda Song Drechsler - pead, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.fredasongdrechsler.com/data-crunching/pead
3. Post-Earnings-Announcement Drift Prediction: Leveraging ..., accessed July 19, 2025, https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/10.1287/isre.2022.0358
4. Earnings Autocorrelation and the Post-Earnings-Announcement Drift ..., accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-financial-and-quantitative-analysis/article/earnings-autocorrelation-and-the-postearningsannouncement-drift-experimental-evidence/61CD6A2065A4686418A3C47DEF3AC24B
5. Visualizing Earnings to Predict Post-Earnings ... - biz.uiowa.edu, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.biz.uiowa.edu/faculty/jgarfinkel/working/CNN.pdf
6. Momentum Valuation Indicators - CFA, FRM, and Actuarial Exams Study Notes, accessed July 19, 2025, https://analystprep.com/study-notes/cfa-level-2/momentum-valuation-indicators/
7. Unexpected Earnings - Overview, SUE Formula, Importance - Corporate Finance Institute, accessed July 19, 2025, https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/accounting/unexpected-earnings/
8. Earnings Surprise Definition and Formula - YCharts, accessed July 19, 2025, https://ycharts.com/glossary/terms/earnings_surprise
9. Unexpected Earnings - Overview, SUE Formula, Importance, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.wallstreetoasis.com/resources/skills/accounting/unexpected-earnings
10. Understanding Earnings Surprise | FXPRIMUS, accessed July 19, 2025, https://fxprimus.com/blog/earnings-surprise
11. User Guide - mail.ncku.edu.tw, accessed July 19, 2025, https://libapp.lib.ncku.edu.tw/libref/handout/20110107_IBES_user_guide.pdf
12. Standardized Unexpected Earnings - QuantConnect.com, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.quantconnect.com/research/15369/standardized-unexpected-earnings/
13. quantpedia.com, accessed July 19, 2025, https://quantpedia.com/strategies/post-earnings-announcement-effect#:~:text=SUE%20is%20constructed%20by%20dividing,standard%20deviation%20of%20earnings%20surprises.
14. Standardized Unexpected Earnings Strategy by Xin Wei - QuantConnect.com, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.quantconnect.com/forum/discussion/6515/standardized-unexpected-earnings-strategy/
15. Earnings-Surprise-Code.txt, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.bhwang.com/txt/Earnings-Surprise-Code.txt
16. Post-Earnings Announcement Effect - Quantpedia, accessed July 19, 2025, https://quantpedia.com/strategies/post-earnings-announcement-effect
17. Standardized Unexpected Earnings - University of West Georgia, accessed July

19, 2025, https://www.westga.edu/~bquest/2002/unexpected.htm
18. Starmine quantitative analytics brochure - LSEG, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.lseg.com/content/dam/data-analytics/en_us/documents/brochures/starmine-quantitative-analytics-brochure.pdf
19. Causeway Convergence Series: Value and Earnings Estimates ..., accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.causewaycap.com/wp-content/uploads/CCM-Aug2018_Earnings-Estimates-Revisions.pdf
20. I/B/E/S Estimates | Company Data | Data Analytics - LSEG, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.lseg.com/en/data-analytics/financial-data/company-data/ibes-estimates
21. (PDF) Analyst Forecasts and Stock Returns - ResearchGate, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228316747_Analyst_Forecasts_and_Stock_Returns
22. Dispersion in analysts' target prices and stock returns - Penn State, accessed July 19, 2025, https://pure.psu.edu/en/publications/dispersion-in-analysts-target-prices-and-stock-returns
23. Dispersion in analysts' target prices and stock returns - IDEAS/RePEc, accessed July 19, 2025, https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/ecofin/v56y2021ics106294082100022x.html
24. Seemingly Inconsistent Analyst Revisions - Wharton Accounting, accessed July 19, 2025, https://accounting.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/IPV-11_9_17.pdf
25. Predictability of Analyst Stock Recommendation Revisions Mark ..., accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.bayes.citystgeorges.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/690111/BFP_20220807.pdf
26. Soft Information in the Financial Press and Analysts' Recommendation Revisions - NYU Stern, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.stern.nyu.edu/sites/default/files/assets/documents/Mark%20Bradshaw.pdf
27. Worldscope Fundamentals | Data Analytics - LSEG, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.lseg.com/en/data-analytics/financial-data/company-data/fundamentals-data/worldscope-fundamentals
28. Worldscope Database Datatype Definitions Guide - Tilburg University, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.tilburguniversity.edu/sites/default/files/download/WorldScopeDatatypeDefinitionsGuide_2.pdf
29. Fundamental Surprises Zvi Lanir Decision Research 1201 Oak Street Eugene, Oregon 97401 And Center for Strategic Studies Universi, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.theisrm.org/documents/Lanir%20(1984)%20Fundamental%20Surprises.pdf

30. The Surprising Alpha From Malkiel's Monkey and Upside-Down ..., accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.researchaffiliates.com/publications/journal-papers/p_2013_aug_surprising_alpha
31. Surprise! Factor Betas Don't Deliver Factor Alphas - Research Affiliates, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.researchaffiliates.com/content/dam/ra/publications/pdf/823-surprise-factors-betas-dont-deliver-factor-alphas.pdf
32. Surprise! Factor Betas Don't Deliver Factor Alphas | Research Affiliates, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.researchaffiliates.com/publications/articles/823-surprise-factors-betas-dont-deliver-factor-alphas
33. Fama-French 5-factor model: Why more is not always better | Robeco Global, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.robeco.com/en-int/insights/2024/10/fama-french-5-factor-model-why-more-is-not-always-better
34. NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES EARNINGS QUALITY AND STOCK RETURNS Konan Chan Louis K. C. Chan Narasimhan Jegadeesh Josef Lakonishok W, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w8308/w8308.pdf
35. Earnings Quality and Stock Returns - LSV Asset Management, accessed July 19, 2025, https://lsvasset.com/pdf/research-papers/Accruals_Earnings.pdf
36. Earnings Quality - Financial Edge, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.fe.training/free-resources/accounting/earnings-quality/
37. Issues Related to Balance Sheet Modifications, Earnings Normalization, and Cash Flow Statement Related Modifications on a Company's Financial Condition - CFA, FRM, and Actuarial Exams Study Notes - AnalystPrep, accessed July 19, 2025, https://analystprep.com/study-notes/cfa-level-2/issues-related-balance-sheet-modifications-earnings-normalization-cash-flow-statement-related-modifications-companys-financial-condition/
38. Piotroski F-score - Wikipedia, accessed July 19, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Piotroski_F-score
39. Unlocking Stock Market Winners: A Guide to the Piotroski F-Score - Kavout, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.kavout.com/market-lens/unlocking-stock-market-winners-a-guide-to-the-piotroski-f-score
40. What Is the Piotroski Score? Definition, Meaning, and Example, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/piotroski-score.asp
41. Piotroski F-Score Strategy: Backtest and Performance Analysis - QuantifiedStrategies.com, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.quantifiedstrategies.com/piotroski-f-score-strategy/
42. How to Identify Financially Strong Companies With the Piotroski F-Score | StableBread, accessed July 19, 2025, https://stablebread.com/piotroski-f-score/
43. (PDF) Abnormal Returns to a Fundamental Analysis Strategy: Evidence from India, accessed July 19, 2025,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272246712_Abnormal_Returns_to_a_Fundamental_Analysis_Strategy_Evidence_from_India
44. Fundamental Signals, Future Earnings, and Abnormal Returns, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337244327_Fundamental_Signals_Future_Earnings_and_Abnormal_Returns
45. Fundamental Analysis, Future Earnings, and Stock Prices - Labordoc, accessed July 19, 2025, https://labordoc.ilo.org/discovery/fulldisplay?docid=cdi_proquest_journals_206721576&context=PC&vid=41ILO_INST:41ILO_V1&lang=en&search_scope=MyInst_and_CI&adaptor=Primo%20Central&tab=Everything&query=creator%2Cequals%2CAbarbanell%2C%20Jeffery%20S.%20&offset=0
46. What Is Company Guidance on Earnings, Its Impact and Risks? - Investopedia, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/g/guidance.asp
47. How Stock Market Reacts to Guidance Revisions and ... - Zenodo, accessed July 19, 2025, https://zenodo.org/record/1088642/files/17231.pdf
48. Testing strategies based on multiple signals - mySimon, accessed July 19, 2025, https://mysimon.rochester.edu/novy-marx/research/MSES.pdf
49. Signal Preparation; optimal method : r/quant - Reddit, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/quant/comments/1j7sl2j/signal_preparation_optimal_method/
50. (PDF) Finding New Alphas for Multi-Factor Model - ResearchGate, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/393590623_Finding_New_Alphas_for_Multi-Factor_Model
51. Combining Alphas via Bounded Regression - MDPI, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9091/3/4/474
52. EFFICIENTLY COMBINING MULTIPLE SOURCES OF ALPHA, accessed July 19, 2025, https://joim.com/wp-content/uploads/emember/downloads/P0494.pdf
53. Combining Alpha Signals Using Ensemble Methods for ... - IRJET, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.irjet.net/archives/V7/i6/IRJET-V7I6304.pdf
54. Regression trees and quantitative investing - Federated Hermes, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.federatedhermes.com/us/insights/article/regression-trees-and-quantitative-investing.do
55. Combining risk and alpha : r/quant - Reddit, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/quant/comments/1d5puie/combining_risk_and_alpha/
56. Investment Factor - Quantpedia, accessed July 19, 2025, https://quantpedia.com/strategies/investment-factor
57. Understanding the Quintile Portfolio - ResearchGate, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342650539_Understanding_the_Quintile_Portfolio
58. Portfolio Backtesting, accessed July 19, 2025, https://cran.r-project.org/package=portfolioBacktest/vignettes/PortfolioBacktest.html

59. Event-Driven Backtesting with Python - Part V | QuantStart, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.quantstart.com/articles/Event-Driven-Backtesting-with-Python-Part-V/
60. Chapter 12 Portfolio backtesting | Machine Learning for Factor Investing, accessed July 19, 2025, http://www.mlfactor.com/backtest.html
61. A Practical Breakdown of Vector-Based vs. Event-Based Backtesting - Interactive Brokers, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.interactivebrokers.com/campus/ibkr-quant-news/a-practical-breakdown-of-vector-based-vs-event-based-backtesting/
62. Event-Driven Backtesting with Python - Part I | QuantStart, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.quantstart.com/articles/Event-Driven-Backtesting-with-Python-Part-I/
63. Event Driven Backtest - Quantra by QuantInsti, accessed July 19, 2025, https://quantra.quantinsti.com/glossary/Event-Driven-Backtest
64. 8.2 The Seven Sins of Quantitative Investing | Portfolio Optimization - Bookdown, accessed July 19, 2025, https://bookdown.org/palomar/portfoliooptimizationbook/8.2-seven-sins.html
65. slides-backtesting.pdf - Portfolio Optimization Book, accessed July 19, 2025, https://portfoliooptimizationbook.com/slides/slides-backtesting.pdf
66. Event-Driven Trading Strategies - Number Analytics, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/advanced-event-driven-trading-strategies
67. The Sharpe Ratio: Understanding and Using it for quant trading ..., accessed July 19, 2025, https://quantmonitor.net/sharpe-ratio-understanding-using-investing-decisions/
68. The Difference Between the Sharpe Ratio and the Sortino Ratio - Investopedia, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/010815/what-difference-between-sharpe-ratio-and-sortino-ratio.asp
69. Sortino Ratio: Definition, Formula, Calculation, and Example, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/sortinoratio.asp
70. www.phoenixstrategy.group, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.phoenixstrategy.group/blog/sharpe-vs-sortino-risk-metrics-for-growth-companies#:~:text=The%20Sharpe%20ratio%20evaluates%20total,where%20minimizing%20losses%20is%20key.
71. Sortino Ratio vs Sharpe Ratio - Key Differences - Bajaj Finserv, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.bajajfinserv.in/investments/sortino-ratio-vs-sharpe-ratio
72. Information Ratio in Quant Trading Performance | QuestDB, accessed July 19, 2025, https://questdb.com/glossary/information-ratio-in-quant-trading-performance/
73. Interpreting Information Ratio Values - FasterCapital, accessed July 19, 2025, https://fastercapital.com/topics/interpreting-information-ratio-values.html/1
74. Optimal Strategies for Portfolio Backtesting: Maximize Your Investments -

InvestGlass, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.investglass.com/de/optimal-strategies-for-portfolio-backtesting-maximize-your-investments/
75. Calmar ratio - Wikipedia, accessed July 19, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Calmar_ratio
76. Calmar Ratio - Overview, How To Calculate, Importance - Corporate Finance Institute, accessed July 19, 2025, https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/career-map/sell-side/capital-markets/calmar-ratio/
77. What Is the Calmar Ratio, Its Strenths & Weaknesses? - Investopedia, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/calmarratio.asp
78. Calmar ratio: Explained | TIOmarkets, accessed July 19, 2025, https://tiomarkets.com/en/article/calmar-ratio-guide
79. Portfolio Turnover Formula, Meaning, and Taxes - Investopedia, accessed July 19, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/portfolioturnover.asp