



Fama-Miller Center
for Research in Finance

Chicago Booth Paper No. 23-22

**Production of U.S. *Rm-Rf*, *SMB*, and *HML* in the
Fama-French Data Library**

Eugene F. Fama

Booth School of Business, University of Chicago (Fama)

Kenneth R. French

Tuck School of Business, Dartmouth College (French)

Fama-Miller Center for Research in Finance
The University of Chicago, Booth School of Business

This paper also can be downloaded without charge from the
Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:

<http://ssrn.com/abstract=4629613>

Production of U.S. *Rm-Rf*, *SMB*, and *HML* in the Fama-French Data Library

Eugene F. Fama and Kenneth R. French^{*}

Abstract

We describe the effects of data corrections and rule changes on returns to the market factor, *Rm-Rf*, the size factor, *SMB* (small minus big), and the value minus growth factor, *HML* (high minus low book-to-market equity) in the Fama-French Data Library.

After circulating an early draft of “Common Risk Factors in the Returns on Stocks and Bonds” (Fama and French, *Journal of Financial Economics* 1993), several colleagues asked for the factors of that paper. The bond factors are not ours to distribute, but we shared our stock factors (*Mkt*, *SMB*, and *HML*) by email. Publication of the paper led to many more requests, so we posted the stock factors on French’s website. The resulting Data Library has grown over the last 30 years and includes data we produce for our research and series others have suggested. The Data Library includes results for markets outside the United States, but to simplify the discussion, we focus on U.S. data here. Thus, references to data should be interpreted to mean U.S. data.

The stock data we use to produce the Data Library – including prices, returns, and shares outstanding – are from the Center for Research in Security Prices (CRSP). The book equity data combine hand-collected values from the Moody’s Industrial, Public Utility, Transportation, and Bank and Finance Manuals and data from Compustat. The book equity data from the Industrial Manuals are those used in Davis, Fama, and French (2000). They and the other Moody’s data are not affected by the changes described below. All other accounting data are from Compustat.

^{*} Booth School of Business, University of Chicago (Fama) and Tuck School of Business, Dartmouth College (French). The comments of Savina Rizova are gratefully acknowledged. Fama and French are consultants to, board members of, and shareholders in Dimensional Fund Advisors.

CRSP and Compustat continually correct errors in their historical data. Like other researchers, we want the most accurate inputs for our research, so we use CRSP's most recent monthly release, with all available corrections, for our monthly data cuts. Because Compustat's data are relevant only for reforming our factor portfolios at the end of each June, we use their recent July release to produce our data cuts for July of year t to June of $t+1$. (To be clear, the July cut has data through July and is released in August. We use this timing convention throughout the paper and have switched to this convention on the Data Library website.)

CRSP Data Projects

CRSP has done major projects to improve its data over the last 30 years. They are relevant for our Data Library. Some details of the major CRSP projects described below are from the release notes that accompany monthly CRSP updates. The rest are from correspondence with CRSP staff.

1. In 2005, CRSP extended the start of its daily NYSE database from July 1962 to January 1926. Research for the project identified errors in month-end prices and dividend ex-dates in CRSP's monthly stock database. The corrections CRSP made as a result of this work affect our factor sorts and returns for 1926-1962.
2. CRSP added daily and monthly data for securities with primary listing on the Arca Exchange in July 2007. CRSP's coverage of NYSE Arca begins on March 8, 2006.
3. In December 2014, CRSP completed a review of shares outstanding data for 1925-1946. The review produced over 4000 changes to 400 PERMNOs. Most edits added shares outstanding that had been missing. The edits affect size and book-to-market equity sorts for 1925-1947.
4. CRSP corrected historical delisting codes and returns in 1998 and 1999.

5. Recent work on dividends with 1990-2022 ex-dates produced corrections, incorporated in the CRSP database from December 2021 to March 2022.

Changes in Factor Construction

The rules we use to compute the factors have changed little since 1993. We note the changes on the Data Library website when they occur. We provide more detail here.

In November 2012 we switched the market return in $R_m - R_f$ from the change in the CRSP NYSE/AMEX/NASDAQ Value-Weighted Market Index to the return on a portfolio that is more consistent with the set of stocks used to compute SMB and HML . The market return for month t is now the value-weight return on all CRSP firms incorporated in the US and listed on the NYSE, AMEX, or NASDAQ that have (i) a CRSP share code of 10 or 11 at the beginning of t , (ii) good shares and price data at the beginning of t , and (iii) good return data for t . This change does not affect SMB and HML .

Book equity is an important variable in the construction of the size and book-to-market factors, SMB and HML , of our three-factor model. We have changed the formula we use to compute book equity twice. The changes respond to Statements 106 and 109 issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB).

FASB 106 – FASB issued Statement 106 in 1990. It requires U.S. firms to switch from their then current pay-as-you-go accounting approach for postretirement benefits other than pensions to an accrual approach that recognizes the expected cost of providing future benefits in the years the employee earns them. After Statement 106 was issued, firms could switch to the accrual approach immediately by recognizing the transition obligation on their next income statement and balance sheet or they could recognize the transition obligation over plan participants' future service periods, with disclosure of the unrecognized amount. We expected the transition

obligation to have a substantial impact on the book equity of some firms that switched to the accrual approach immediately. To keep all firms on the same footing, we adjusted the book equity of switchers by subtracting the transition obligation they reported under FASB 106. In September 2020, however, we examined the historical impact of FASB 106 and found that our adjustment had little impact on the cross-section of book-to-market equity. Thus, starting with the August 2020 data cut, we simplify our process by eliminating the adjustment for all firms across all years. In other words, after the July 2020 data cut, we do not adjust any firm's reported book equity in any year for its promised non-pension postretirement benefits, regardless of how it accounted for the obligation during the FASB 106 transition. In effect, we undid our earlier response to FASB 106.

FASB 109 – When deciding in the early 1990s how to compute book equity, we consulted colleagues in the University of Chicago's accounting group and concluded that the present value of the payments implied by the Deferred Taxes and Investment Tax Credits on the typical firm's balance sheet was closer to zero than to the reported amount. As a result, our definition of book equity in FF (*Journal of Finance* 1992), FF (*JFE* 1993), and other papers that follow adds balance sheet Deferred Taxes and Investment Tax Credits to the book value of stockholders' equity (and subtracts the book value of preferred stock). In August 2016, a colleague pointed out that FASB 109, which was issued in 1993, improves the accounting for deferred income taxes. As a result, in files produced after July 2016 we do not add Deferred Taxes and Investment Tax Credit to BE for fiscal years ending in 1993 or later.

CRSP/Compustat Links – The links CRSP provided in the early 1990s between companies in its database and companies on Compustat were far from perfect. While doing our research on U.S. stock returns, we developed a framework and process that improved CRSP's links. The appendix describes the process used to construct our links.

We update the Data Library monthly, but for most series, including most factors, we form portfolios annually using data up to the end of June each year. Thus, from 1992 to 2021 we updated our CRSP-Compustat links after receiving CRSP's July release. CRSP improved its history of CRSP-Compustat links over the years. After comparing our proprietary links with CRSP's links in September 2021, we concluded that we could no longer justify the time required to update our links each year and, starting with the July 2021 data cut, we switched to CRSP's links.

To date, we have noted all changes in our processes on the Data Library webpage when we made them. Before the July 2021 data cut, differences between our CRSP-Compustat links and CRSP's links created a problem for those trying to replicate the returns in our Data Library. The distinction between CRSP's two permanent identifiers still causes some replicators to stumble. CRSP's Permno identifies share classes. Permcos, which are combinations of one or more Permno, identify companies. Compustat's accounting data are for companies, so we use Permcos to form portfolios and compute their returns, book to market ratios, and other properties.

Production

We wrote the computer programs that produce the returns and other information in our Library, and for many years we ran the monthly updates. Dimensional Fund Advisors' research group began helping with the updates in 2003. Savina Rizova, who worked for French as an undergraduate research assistant for two years at Dartmouth and was Fama's Ph.D. student at the University of Chicago, is head of Dimensional's research group. We continue to determine the rules, definitions, and process used to form factor portfolios. Under our guidance, Dimensional employees produce the monthly updates, post them on a Dartmouth server, maintain the computer code, and until 2021 updated our CRSP-Compustat links.

The portfolios for most series in the Data Library are reformed at the end of each June and the first monthly returns for each year's new portfolios are for July. Data from CRSP's August release are critical inputs when we construct the new crop of portfolios, so production of our July data cut is more involved than those for other months. Before 2021, for example, we updated our CRSP/Compustat links with CRSP's August release. We also monitor the production process before releasing the July data cut by comparing the current data with the data produced 12 months earlier. In addition to checking summary statistics, when appropriate we review a few of the largest changes in the monthly returns. To the best of our recollection, all the large changes we have reviewed have been caused by corrections vendors made to the inputs.

Evolution of $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML

We use our Data Library for our research, so we want the most accurate inputs and the best process when we update returns and other information. This means we change the historical values of $Rm-Rf$, SMB , HML , and other series when the historical data or our portfolio formation rules change.

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the evolution of $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML from the 200212 data cut to the 202307 data cut. Table 1 shows estimates of the impact on average monthly returns on the three factors for 192607-202307 caused by the four changes in our portfolio formation rules described above and by four of the five major CRSP data projects. We cannot include the project to improve delisting codes and returns because CRSP corrected the database before the earliest cut in our archive, 200212. We can report, however, that the average monthly premiums in FF (1993) for $Rm-Rf$ (43 basis points, bps), SMB (27 bps), and HML (40 bps) are two to three bps higher than the 200212 archive's average premiums for the same 196307-199112 period, 39.9, 24.7 and 37.5 bps. In other words, in the roughly ten years between production of the factor premiums for FF

(1993) and the 200212 update of our library, changes in the inputs and our process lower the three monthly averages for 196307-199112 by two to three basis points.

We measure the evolution of $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML by comparing the values produced by sequential cuts. Our archive includes annual cuts for 200212, 200312, and 200412, and we have monthly cuts for all but eight months of 200506-202307. Thus, when measuring the cumulative changes in the factors from the first cut in 200212 to the last cut in 202307, we compare 213 cuts that span 247 months.

The factor file for each cut contains monthly returns for 192607 to the cut date. Changes in the data and/or process made between a pair of cuts can cause differences between the pair's two sets of monthly $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML returns from 192607 to the pair's first cut date. We want to measure the combined impact of the changes across all pairs of consecutive cuts on the average monthly factor returns for the full 192607-202307 period. Early pairs, however, have shorter return periods and less impact on the full-period changes in the average monthly factors than later pairs. Thus, to measure each pair's contribution to the combined impact, we multiply its average change in $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML by the ratio of the number of months in its return interval, from 192607 to its first cut date, and the number of months in the whole period, 192607-202307.

The first line of Table 1 Panel A says that together, all changes in data and process from 200212 to 202307 reduce the average monthly value of SMB by 0.77 basis points (bps) and increase the average monthly value of $Rm-Rf$ and HML by 0.35 and 3.03 bps. When calculating the standard errors of these estimates, we assume return differences are uncorrelated across pairs because the changes in data or process that alter returns from one cut to the next are specific to that pair. With that assumption, the combined impact of all changes in data and process from

200212 to 202307 on the full-period changes in $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML are only 0.40, 0.54, and 1.33 standard errors from zero.

Panel B of Table 1 reports the separate effects of the eight post-200212 events we analyze – the four major CRSP projects and the four changes we made in our update process – on the three factors. Because they make changes in the CRSP data, the four CRSP projects affect all three factors. In contrast, the switch from CRSP’s market return to ours affects only $Rm-Rf$. Because they alter only the calculation of book equity, the other three changes in our update process affect only SMB and HML . The “Old” cut in Table 2 is the month of the last data cut before an event affects computed factor returns and the “New” cut is the first cut to fully incorporate the event. The Affected Period in Table 2 summarizes the monthly returns that can change between an event’s Old and New cuts.

Table 1 Panel B provides two estimates of the separate effects of the eight major changes on $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML . One is the impact of each event on the average monthly values of the factors during the period in which returns are affected. For example, while adding NYSE information for 1926-1962 to the daily database, CRSP discovered errors in prices and dividend ex-dates in the monthly data. They corrected the 1926-1962 errors between July 2005 and February 2006. The first line of Table 1 Panel B measures the effects of the corrections by comparing the monthly averages of $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML for 192607-196206 computed using the CRSP data cuts for June 2005, before CRSP made any project corrections, and February 2006, after the last correction. CRSP may have made other improvements in the 192607-196206 data between June 2005 and February 2006, but we don’t mind mislabeling stray data corrections in this brief window.

The eight events in Table Panel B affect returns for different periods. CRSP’s addition of the Arca Exchange in 200707, for example, changes the 16 monthly $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML returns

for 200603-200706 from the without-Arca values computed in 200706 to the with-Arca values computed in 200707. In contrast, the switch from CRSP's market portfolio to ours between the 201209 and 201210 cuts changes the 1035 values of $Rm-Rf$ in 192607-201210. Because the market portfolio change affects many more monthly returns than the Arca change, a one basis point change in the affected period's average monthly $Rm-Rf$ will have a bigger impact on the full-period average monthly return if it is caused by the new market portfolio.

To combine the effects of the eight major events or to compare their effects with the full-period results for All Changes or Non-Event Changes in Table 1 Panel A, we must put them on equal footing. We do that by multiplying each event's average changes during the affected period by the ratio of the number of returns it affects and the number of returns in the full period. As the first line of Table 1 Panel B reports, for example, the July 2005 to February 2006 corrections generated by the extension of CRSP's daily database increase the 192607-196206 average monthly values of $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML by 0.21 bps, 1.90 bps, and 1.52 bps. Spreading these averages for the 432-month affected period over the 1066 months of the full 1926-202308 period reduces them to 0.08 bps, 0.70 bps, and 0.56 bps per month for $Rm-Rf$, SMB , and HML .

Among the events in Table 1 Panel B, CRSP's project to correct shares outstanding has the biggest impact on the Affected-Period average values of all three factors. CRSP made the project corrections between June 2013 and December 2014 and they affect the factor returns of 192607-194706, reducing the average monthly value of SMB for the 21 years by 3.39 bps and increasing the average monthly value of $Rm-Rf$ by 0.41 bps and HML by a substantial 9.33 bps. The magnitude of this project's Affected-Period monthly average change in SMB is more than 75% larger than the next largest, the average change in $Rm-Rf$ is almost twice the next largest, and the average change in HML is more than five times the next largest. The effects of the shares

outstanding corrections on the full-period averages of *SMB*, -0.73 basis points, and *HML*, 2.02 basis points, are also the most extreme. The shares outstanding corrections also produce the most volatile monthly changes in *SMB* and *HML*, with standard deviations of 66.49 bps and 93.30 bps. These high volatilities lead to *t*-statistics for the large average changes in *SMB* and *HML* that are only -0.81 and 1.59. (Each Full Period impact is a constant times the Affected Period average, so the two share the same *t*-statistic.)

Replacing CRSP's market return in $Rm-Rf$ with our version has a modest impact of 0.13 bps on the Affected Period average and 0.11 bps on the Full Period Average in Table 1 Panel B. The three changes in our rules for computing *SMB* and *HML* produce a mixed bag of small effects. Our response to FASB 106 lowers monthly average *SMB* in the Affected Period by -1.93 bps per month ($t = -1.89$) and increases average *HML* by 1.70 bps ($t = 0.85$). (The *t*-stats are the same as those for the Full-Period Averages.) The average changes for FASB 109 are -1.70 bps ($t = -1.11$) for *SMB* and 1.50 bps ($t = 0.40$) for *HML*. The switch to CRSP's Compustat links pushes the other way; average monthly *SMB* increases by 0.51 bps ($t = 2.02$) and average monthly *HML* falls by -0.42 bps ($t = -1.13$) in the Affected Period. The effects of the three changes on the Full-Period Averages of *SMB* and *HML* are smaller: -0.40 bps and 0.35 bps for FASB 109, -0.56 bps and 0.49 bps for FASB 106, and 0.30 bps and -0.25 bps for the switch from our CRSP/Compustat links to CRSP's links. Together, the three changes reduce the 192607-202307 average monthly *SMB* by 0.66 bps and increase the monthly average *HML* by slightly less, 0.59 bps. The comparable changes for the combination of the four CRSP data projects are -0.04 bps for *SMB* and 2.57 bps for *HML*.

The second line of Table 1 Panel A says that together, the five events that affect $Rm-Rf$ increase its monthly average for 192607-202307 by 0.28 bps. Similarly, the combination of the

four CRSP projects and the three changes in our process that affect the other two factors reduce average *SMB* by 0.69 bps per month and increase the monthly average of *HML* by 3.16 bps. Thus, changes in our rules for constructing *SMB* and *HML* are responsible for almost all the reduction in average *SMB* caused by the seven events but less than 20% of the increase in average *HML*. Perhaps more important, the combined impact of the seven events almost matches the impact of All Changes from 200212 to 202307 on the average values of *SMB* (-0.69 vs. -0.77 bps) and *HML* (3.16 vs. 3.03 bps). As a result, the Non-Event averages in the last line of Table 1 Panel A are tiny, -0.08 bps ($t = -0.09$) per month for *SMB* and -0.14 bps ($t = -0.11$) per month for *HML*. In the same spirit, the impact of the five Relevant Events on average monthly $R_m - R_f$ (0.28, $t = 0.50$) is four times the impact of the Non-Events (0.07, $t = 0.10$). In short, the eight major update Events of Table 1 Panel B account for almost all the aggregate effects of data updates on average factor returns.

A final warning is in order. The details of factor construction are arguable, and there is no magic. After decades of experience, asset pricing research clearly recognizes that factor models, no matter how constructed, leave holes in the explanation of expected asset returns. Moreover, parameter instability and statistical estimation error combine to imply that expected return estimates for specific assets or portfolios from asset pricing models are unreliable. The appropriate caveat is: use at your own risk.

Table 1 – Effect of All Changes, Eight Events, and Non-Event Changes between 200212 and 202307 on *Rm-Rf*, *SMB*, and *HML* for 192607-202307

All returns in the table are in basis points per month. (A basis point is 1/100th of a percentage point.) The table summarizes changes in *Rm-Rf*, *SMB*, and *HML* returns caused by changes in CRSP and Compustat data and in our update process between 200212 and 202307. Panel B describes the effect of each of the eight major data projects of Table 2 on average factor returns. The first six columns of Panel B show the Impact of each change or set of changes on the 192607-202307 average premiums for the relevant factors and *t*-statistics testing whether a change's expected effect is different from zero. The last six columns in Panel B show the average (Ave) and standard deviation (SD) of the monthly differences between the New and Old monthly values of the relevant factors for the period in which a particular event may change them. The Sum of Relevant Effects in the Impact columns of Panel A is the sum of the project Impacts in the same column of Panel B. All Changes in Panel A shows the aggregate impact of all updates in factor returns, including those not covered by the Events in Panel B. Non-Event Changes summarizes the Impact of All Changes except those the Relevant Events in the same column of Panel B.

Panel A: Aggregate Impact on Full Period Averages of Monthly Factor Returns

	<i>Rm-Rf</i>		<i>SMB</i>		<i>HML</i>	
	Impact	<i>t</i> -stat	Impact	<i>t</i> -stat	Impact	<i>t</i> -stat
All Changes	0.35	0.40	-0.81	-0.56	3.02	1.33
Sum of Relevant Events	0.28	0.51	-0.69	-0.63	3.17	1.79
Non-Event Changes	0.07	0.10	-0.11	-0.14	-0.14	-0.12

Panel B: Events	Impact on Full Period Average						Differences in Affected Period					
	<i>Rm-Rf</i>		<i>SMB</i>		<i>HML</i>		<i>Rm-Rf</i>		<i>SMB</i>		<i>HML</i>	
	Impact	<i>t</i> -stat	Impact	<i>t</i> -stat	Impact	<i>t</i> -stat	Ave	SD	Ave	SD	Ave	SD
Daily NYSE 1926-62	0.08	0.29	0.70	1.28	0.56	0.70	0.21	14.84	1.90	30.91	1.52	45.33
Arca Exchange	0.00	NA	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.19	2.79	0.19	2.29
Shares Outstanding	0.09	0.48	-0.73	-0.90	2.02	1.75	0.41	13.50	-3.39	59.78	9.33	84.62
Quarterly Dividends	0.00	0.63	-0.00	-0.05	-0.01	-0.29	0.01	0.16	-0.00	1.08	-0.03	1.76
Market Return	0.11	0.26					0.13	15.98				
FASB 109 Adjustment			-0.40	-1.11	0.35	0.40			-1.70	25.43	1.50	62.11
FASB 106 Adjustment			-0.56	-1.89	0.49	0.85			-1.93	18.76	1.70	36.94
CRSP/Compustat Links			0.30	2.02	-0.25	-1.13			0.51	6.61	-0.42	9.79

Table 2 – Description of CRSP Data Projects and Changes in Process

Each row describes an event. The first four rows are for CRSP projects to correct data errors. The last four are for the changes we made in our update process during the sample period. The first three columns identify the factors the event can affect. The fourth column is the month of the last (“Old”) data cut before the event affects computed factor returns and the fifth column is the month of the first (“New”) data cut that fully incorporates the event. The last three columns describe the months in which the event can affect $Rm-R_f$, SMB , or HML . $Mths$ is the average number of months affected across the pairs of sequential cuts.

	Factors Affected			Month of Cut		Affected Period		
	$Rm-R_f$	SMB	HML	Old	New	Beg	End	Mths
CRSP Projects								
Daily NYSE 1925-62	X	X	X	200506	200602	192607	196206	432
Arca Exchange	X	X	X	200706	200707	200603	200706	16
Shares Outstanding	X	X	X	201305	201412	192607	194706	252
Quarterly Dividends	X	X	X	202111	202203	199001	202202	383
Changes in Process								
Source of Market Return	X			201209	201210	192607	201210	1035
FASB 109 Adjustment		X	X	201606	201607	199307	201606	276
FASB 106 Adjustment		X	X	202007	202008	199207	202007	337
CRSP/Compustat Links		X	X	202106	202107	196307	202106	696

Appendix – Constructing our Proprietary Links between CRSP and Compustat

We used proprietary links between CRSP and Compustat to compute *SMB* and *HML* before July 2021. Almost all Compustat data are for firms, not securities, so we organize the construction of *SMB* and *HML* around Permcos (CRSP's identifier for firms), not Permno (CRSP's identifier for securities). The code to compute *SMB* and *HML* cycles through Permcos and before July 2021 used our links to extract the appropriate information for each from CRSP and Compustat. This appendix describes our links. Most of it was written in 2001.

Linking Permno to Permcos

Some Permcos have more than one Permno. There are several possible reasons.

1. Multiple Share Classes – If the date ranges (MBEG-MEND) overlap for two Permno, we combine them in the same way we would combine securities in a portfolio. The firm's return is the weighted average of its securities' returns and its market equity is the sum of its securities' market equities.
2. Sequential Listings – Several companies go off the exchange and then return. Compustat tends to treat the whole sequence as one company with one GVKey (Compustat's non-permanent identifier for a firm). CRSP often treats the second security as a new company, but sometimes it gives them the same Permco. We override this. If the securities do not overlap, we give the later Permno a fake Permco, in the range 100,000-110,000.
3. Tracking Stock – Tracking stock is stock issued by a parent company that tracks the performance of a particular division or subsidiary. In most cases the parent retains almost all tracking stock shares. Since the parent's market equity includes almost all the sub's, merging the two securities would be double counting. Moreover, the parent company's

balance sheet and income statement reflect its claim on the sub. Thus, we omit tracking stocks entirely when computing *SMB* and *HML*.

4. **Separate Operating Divisions** – Some companies split the firm into separate operating divisions with a tracking stock for each division and no overall or parent stock. For example, on August 8, 1999 Quantum Corp shareholders received two shares of Quantum HDD and one of Quantum DSS for each share of Quantum. Compustat has a separate record for each division, so we treat the two as separate companies and assign one a fake Permco. US West Communications / MediaOne Group is also in this category.
5. **“Distinct” Companies** – CRSP links some companies through Permco that Compustat separates. For example, the three Bally Permnos are linked through a common Permco. Compustat has a separate GVKey for each and their annual reports, 10K’s, etc., suggest we can treat them as separate companies. In these cases, we override CRSP and assign each security (Permno) its own fake Permco.

Identifying the Permnos for a Permco

We identify Permno links by matching Permcos in the CRSP header structure. There are 400 Permcos, for example, with more than one Permno in the October 2001 monthly CRSP database. The Permnos for 250 of these overlap – at least two Permnos have data for the same month. The remaining 150 Permcos do not have overlapping Permnos. (These counts exclude Permnos that do not have at least one name record with a share code of 10 or 11 – ordinary shares.)

When developing our link procedure, we tried to identify additional Permco links using the Compustat CST_Link structure. Every additional Compustat link, however, was not in the CRSP links because at most one of the Permnos had a share code of 10 or 11. Of the approximately 20 additional links, several were REIT’s, others were ADR’s, and others were not even on CRSP.

Linking to Compustat

We link each Permco to at most one GVKey each year. We do, however, concatenate Compustat records. For example, we might use GVKey A for Compustat years 10-40 and GVKey B for 41-51. As a result, we have to identify not only the GVKey's that are linked to a Permco, but also the time period to use each GVKey.

We use the Compustat CST_Link structure to identify the GVKey's linked to each Permco. Starting with the Permco, there are four cases:

1. The Permco is not linked to any GVKey's.
2. The Permco is linked to only one GVKey. This may involve links through multiple Permno's but this is no problem. If the Permno's overlap, they are merged into one company portfolio, so the multiple links are irrelevant. Each non-overlapping Permno will link to the GVKey for the appropriate period.
3. The Permco is linked to multiple GVKey's through one Permno. Since there are multiple GVKey's, we have to identify the appropriate period for each. There are 220 Permcos in this category. For 97 of these, the GVKey periods do not overlap, so the appropriate periods are obvious. For the remaining 123 Permcos, we identify each GVKey's period by hand. (CRSP's apparent rule – when GVKey's overlap, use the one with the later LEND – makes many bad decisions.)
4. The Permco is linked to multiple GVKey's through multiple Permno's. Many of these are special cases, such as Bally, Quantum, and tracking stocks. The remainder are not a problem if the Permno's do not overlap. Each Permno will have its own (true or fake) Permco and each Permco should be linked to only one GVKey. Operationally, when linking GVKey's to Permcos through CST_Link, we must confirm that the CST_Link's

Permno is in this Permco's list of Permno's. If the Permno's overlap, we must identify which GVKey to use each year.

We use the Compustat CST_Link structure to identify multiple Permcos linked to a single GVKey. There are two cases.

1. One GVKey points to multiple Permcos that do not overlap. This is not a problem.

When starting with CRSP, we almost always use only the Compustat data that matches the CRSP period. Thus, each Permco will use its own section of the GVKey data. Note, to do this right, we have to be concerned with Permco-linked Permno's that overlap with the linked Permno and induce overlap with the GVKey-linked Permco. Of the 198 firms in this category, the CST_Link says that one (WebFinancial) does have multiple Permco-linked Permno's, but it does not induce overlap. To do this right, however, we must use the CRSP links.

2. One GVKey points to multiple Permcos that overlap. These 24 cases are complicated and many plagued us earlier in the linking process. In fact, in 16 of the cases, one of the Permcos points to an additional GVKey. The best way to deal with these is to use the LinkBeg and LinkEnd from the CST_Link structure.

The case of Ventas/Vencor, in Table A1, is typical. There we link Permco 34766 to GVKEY 17239 for the whole period CRSP links them, from LinkBeg = 19980501 to LinkEnd = 19990605. We link Permco 10302 to GVKEY 17239 from 19890919 to 19980430 and we link it to GVKey 110179 after 19980430.

Table A1 – CST Links for Ventas/Vencor

GVKey 17239

	Permco	Permno	LinkBeg	LinkEnd	LBeg	LEnd	BegDat	EndDat	Delist	Compustat Name	CRSP Name
1	10302	75819	19890919	19980430	39	51	198909	200110	100	Vencor Inc	Ventas Inc
2	34766	86103	19980501	19990604	39	51	199805	199906	584	Vencor Inc	Vencor Inc New

Permco 10302

	GVKey	Permno	LinkBeg	LinkEnd	LBeg	LEnd	BegDat	EndDat	Delist	Compustat Name	CRSP Name
1	17239	75819	19890919	19980430	39	51	198909	200110	100	Vencor Inc	Ventas Inc
2	110179	75819	19980501	99999999	49	51	198909	200110	100	Ventas Inc	Ventas Inc
