



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

Faculty of Economic Sciences

WORKING PAPERS

No. 4/2012 (70)

ROBERT ŚLEPACZUK
GRZEGORZ ZAKRZEWSKI
PAWEŁ SAKOWSKI

INVESTMENT STRATEGIES BEATING THE MARKET.
WHAT CAN WE SQUEEZE FROM THE MARKET?

WARSAW 2012



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW
Faculty of Economic Sciences

Investment strategies beating the market. What can we squeeze from the market?

Robert Ślepaczuk

University of Warsaw
Faculty of Economic Sciences
e-mail: rslepaczuk@wne.uw.edu.pl

Grzegorz Zakrzewski¹
Deutsche Bank PBS SA

Paweł Sakowski

University of Warsaw
Faculty of Economic Sciences

Abstract

The paper presents the new approach to optimizing automatic transactional systems. We propose the multi-stage technique which enables us to find investment strategies beating the market. Additionally, new measures of combined risk and returns are applied in the process of optimization. Moreover, we define new elements of risk control system based on volatility measures and consecutive signals confirmation. As the result, we formulate three complex investment systems, which maximize returns and simultaneously minimize risk in comparison to all other alternative investments (IR=2, Maximum Drawdown<21%, Maximum Loss Duration=0.75 year). Our analysis is based on historical daily data (1998-2010, in- and out-of-sample period) for index and commodity futures. Afterwards, systems are reoptimized and reallocated each half a year in order to include the most recent financial data. Finally, we show the results for joint model consisting of our three systems.

Keywords:

investment strategies, automatic trading systems, optimization, technical and fundamental analysis, market volatility, efficient risk and return measures, EMH, mutual and hedge funds

JEL:

G14, G15, C61, C22

¹ This paper reflects the author's personal opinions and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Deutsche Bank PBC SA.

1. Introduction

We observe that fluctuations of prices on contemporary financial markets, which are disrupted by crashes or turmoils, are much more volatile than it was in the past. This is one of the reasons why investment techniques (buy&hold strategies, simple portfolio techniques or fundamental analysis) that were the basis of asset management institutions (mutual, pension or hedge funds) for a long time have become less efficient. We notice that contemporary financial markets require more sophisticated investment strategies. Therefore, we observe significant increase in development of automated transactional systems (Chlistalla, 2011) which are the basis of investment activity of financial institutions.

The development of these systems has many reasons. On the one hand, computational speed and amount of data that has to be handled by the decisive person are not significant problems since access to fast computing processors, programming environment, and general techniques of data handling is widespread. On the other hand, decisions made by the fund manager or even by investment committee have to rely on numerous, often sophisticated analysis and indications of various statistics. Such approach is fundamentally close in its nature to the automated transactional systems called ATS in the later stage of the paper. Putting the decisions process into well described and defined scheme should lead to better results due to lack of human subjective opinion bias. Above mentioned does not change dramatically whether we use ATS based on daily data or if we want to use high frequency (HF) trading systems in order to replicate some intraday patterns in financial market fluctuations. Additional dimension of the issue is that the financial markets' globalization process forces investors to solve the problem of interpretation of increasing number of financial markets phenomenon simultaneously.

All these facts enable us to set initial hypothesis that automated transactional systems will play increasingly significant role in the investment decision process. Technology development, especially growing computation speed and ability to handle higher amount of data will benefit institutions that apply automated transactional systems to their investment strategies. Even more important in our opinion, is that it will be continuous process in terms of research on the adaptation of developed systems to rapidly changing environment. This process should be well defined and incorporated in the ATS construction methodology since it is one of the most important criteria of ATS stability across the time.

International markets have witnessed increasing interest of practitioners from financial institutions as well as academics on the subject of employing automated transactional systems for investment decision processes. It has driven us to undertake attempts of verifying hypothesis that are fundamental for this process. We defined one main hypothesis that is related to few additional supportive questions.

The basic goal is to verify following research question: **Can we create investment systems beating the market in consecutive way independently of cyclically occurring market turmoils?** The investigations of ATS allow us to define additional research questions:

- What kind of criteria work out the best in the process of verification and testing of investment strategies? Which of them are the most important in terms of efficiency of final results?
- What kind of modifications improves efficiency of such systems in practice and in theory?

- What kind of modifications is necessary in standard transactional systems in order to implement them on the market? How often systems should be reoptimized and rebalanced in practice?
- Is there really a place on the market for conventional stock mutual funds assuming increasing pressure from more effective alternatives?

Additionally, we highlight other important issues that are only partly answered within this research. We indicate them just to shed more light on the problem which potential investors will surely face during the process of development and implementation of automated transactional systems. The issues are listed below:

- How frequently the system should be reoptimized to incorporate impact of new data on the shape of system's formula?
- The importance of cash management within the automated transactional system and its impact on investment's efficiency increase.
- How to deal with the gaps in the prices of futures time series when optimizing the systems?
- Which of the available alternative financial instruments should we choose for particular market/signal? Should we concentrate on futures or options?

Main hypothesis and research questions defined above finally lead us to propose the specific methodology of ATS construction and testing that should be a part of automated systems implementation process and investment strategy. The structure of this paper is set in order to verify main hypothesis and find the answer to research questions. After introduction in the first section we come to the literature review. Then in the third section we describe the methodology and data which are followed by the results in the fourth section. The fifth section concludes.

2. Literature review

The question whether financial assets prices are predictable has its long history. The hypothesis has been tested on various assets (stocks and indices, commodities, currencies, and futures), different markets (emerging and developed) using many strategies (technical analysis, fundamental analysis, macroeconomic models, etc.). Generally, we may state that all studies presenting evidence of prices predictability assume negation of weak- and/or semi-strong form of Efficient Markets Hypothesis.

A broad review of studies about profitability of technical trading strategies can be found in excellent paper by [Park and Irwin \(2007\)](#). The authors divide the empirical literature into two groups: 'early' and 'modern' studies. **Early studies** (published in the period of 1960-1987) concern testing several technical trading strategies, among them filters ([Fama and Blume 1966](#), [Sweeney 1986](#)), stop-loss orders ([Houthakker 1961](#), [Gray and Nielsen 1963](#)), moving-averages ([James 1968](#)), channels ([Irwin and Uhrig 1984](#)), momentum oscillators ([Smidt 1965](#)) and relative strength ([Jensen and Benington 1970](#)). General conclusion from this group of studies is that technical trading strategies can generate profits in foreign exchange markets and futures markets ([Smidt 1965a](#), [Stevenson and Bear 1970](#), [Leuthold 1972](#), [Cornell and Dietrich 1978](#), [Dooley and Shafer 1983](#), [Irwin and Uhrig 1984](#), [Sweeney 1986](#), [Taylor 1986](#)), but not in stock markets ([Fama and Blume 1966](#), [Van Horne and Parker 1967, 1968](#), [James 1968](#), [Jensen and Benington 1970](#)). However, there are some limitations in the testing

procedures used. Early studies consider only two trading systems, they often ignore risk of trading rules, no statistical tests of return significance are performed and also data snooping problem is ignored. Additionally, usually no parameter optimization and no out-of-sample verification are conducted. This was one of the reasons why we put strong attention to these issues in our research.

On the other hand, **modern studies** (1988-2004) improve significantly upon limitations of early studies. However, there are still present some relevant problems concerning profitability testing methodologies: data snooping, ex-post selecting of investing strategies, and difficulties in risk assessment and estimating of transaction costs. Generally, modern studies prove that technical analysis is profitable in several markets. Among total of 95 modern studies analyzed, 56 of them find technical analysis to be profitable, and 20 do not. Mixed results are reported in 19 studies. For three market categories, i.e. stock markets (Brock 1992, Mills 1997, Bessembinder and Chan 1998, Raj and Thurston 1996, Ito 1999, Coutts and Cheung 2000, Taylor 2000, Gunasekarage and Power 2001), foreign exchange markets (Taylor and Tari 1989, Taylor 1992, 1994, Levich and Thomas 1993, Silber 1994, Szakmary and Mathur 1997, LeBaron 1999, Olson 2004) and futures markets (Lukac et al 1988, Lukac and Brorsen 1990, Bessembinder and Chan 1998, Sullivan 1999, Sullivan 2003, Wang 2000 and Nelly 2003), the majority of results support hypothesis of predictability of technical trading strategies.

Park and Irwin (2007) also provide detailed discussion about **possible explanations for technical trading profits**. They can be described as theoretical and empirical. In theoretical models, technical trading profits may arise because of market ‘frictions’, such as noise in current equilibrium prices and traders’ sentiments (Hellwig 1982, Brown and Jennings 1989, Grundy and McNichols 1989, Blume et al. 1994) or herding behavior (Froot et. al. 1992, Schmidt 2002), market power or chaos (Clyde and Osler 1997, Stengos 1996). On the other hand, empirical explanations focus on technical trading profits as an effect of central bank interventions (Dooley and Shafer 1983, Sweeney 1986, Lukac et al 1988, Silber 1994 and more recently Szakmary and Mathur 1997, LeBaron 1999, Neely and Weller 2001, Neely 2002, Saacke 2002, Sosvilla-River et al 2002, Sapp 2004), order flow (Osler 2003, Kavajecz and Odders-White 2004, Gehrig and Menkhoff 2003, 2004), temporary market inefficiencies (Sweeney 1986, Taylor 1986, Lukac et al 1988, Brock 1992, Sullivan 1999, 2003, Olson 2004, Kidd and Brorsen 2004), risk premiums (Lukac and Brorsen 1990, Kho 1996, Chang and Osler 1999, LeBaron 1999, Sapp 2004) and market microstructure deficiencies (Greener 1992).

In more recent study, Dunis et al. (2010) provide evidence of contrarian returns, using the information contained in open-to-close (days) and close-to-open (night) periods, rather than more frequently used close-to-close period. The authors show that strategy of buying worst performing shares during the day and holding them during the night generates a significant alpha and its returns cannot be explained by the 3-factor model of Fama and French (1993) or 5-factor model of Carhart (1997). These results support evidence of profitability of mean reverting strategies in previous studies (Jegadeesh 1990, Lehman 1990, Forner and Marhuenda 2003, Choi and Jayaraman 2009, McInish et al 2008, Serletis and Rosenberg 2009, Leung 2009). To some extent, contrarian profits can be explained by the overreaction hypothesis (Lo and MacKinlay 1990). Another study of Hameed et al. (2010) shows that return reversal effects are strong and pervasive also at intra-industry level, even when adjusted for exposure for common risk factors in Fama and French (1993). Similar results obtained Da et al. (2010).

Another strand in the literature constitute studies testing investment strategies based on factor loadings or fundamental approach. Examples are studies of Fama and French (1992) or Daniel and Titman (1997) and strategies based on price-to-earnings ratio (Basu 1977, Danielson and Dowdell 2001), price-to-dividends ratio (Campbell and Schiller 1998), market-to-book value or company size (Banz 1981, Jagannathan and Wang 1993). Other studies provide evidence that company capital structure can be used as a predictor of abnormal returns (Bhandari 1988, Hull 1999, Ghosh and Cai 1999, Korteweg 2004). In more recent study, Baturevich and Muradoglu (2010) find that long run relationship between leverage and stock returns can be used to build a profitable trading strategy and that investing in low-debt companies yields significant abnormal returns.

Separate group of articles are those **evaluating performance of hedge funds industry**. Assessing this performance is a relatively difficult task because of complex and diverse investing strategies used by fund managers. It seems that the Sharpe ratio and the Treynor ratio are two simple and common measures of risk-adjusted performance of hedge funds (Gehin 2004). In order to identify risk-adjusted performance usually popular asset pricing models are used. These can be CAPM single-factor model (Sharpe 1964), Fama-French (1993) three-factor model, four-factor model of Carhart (1997) and their several extensions allowing for company size, PE and book-to-market ratios, dividends and momentum effects. There is some evidence that hedge funds outperform other investment strategies (Ackerman 1999, Liang 1999, Eling 2006), although some researchers emphasize some methodological problems: autocorrelation in returns (Lo 2002), leptokurtic return distributions (Eling 2006) or the fact that returns can be affected by survivorship bias and backfill bias (Park et al. 1999, Fund and Hsieh 2000, Capocci and Hübner 2004). On the other hand, Sandvik et al. (2011) report results based on relatively long period (1994-2009) and several investing strategies indicating that hedge fund industry fails to create significant alpha.

As final word, it has to be emphasized that results from studies answering the question whether financial assets prices are predictable (especially profitability of technical trading systems) may be to some extent subject to „**publications bias**”. This occurs when the researcher, having identified the way how to beat the market, has little incentives to publish his methodology in details in academic journals and simultaneously may be willing to sell it to some investment banks. As a result, we may have a good reason to believe, that evidence of assets prices predictability can be somewhat “underestimated”.

3. Methodology and data

3.1. Data description

Data applied in the research cover the period from 1998 to 2010. All analyzed time series are based on daily interval. All data were downloaded from Polish data provider www.stooq.pl. The following instruments were utilized in the analysis:

- continuation time series for WIG20 index futures (single futures time series were changed based on maximum open interest) - I_system_fw20,
- stock indexes, and futures on stock indexes and commodities, e.g.: RTS index, PX50 index, platinum futures, gold future, cotton futures – II_system_high-low_USD,
- continuation time series for DAX index futures – III_system_daxfuture_EUR,
- risk free rate in Poland, USA and Germany,

Additionally, we used data for financial instruments included in benchmarks:

- WIG index, ARKA Akcji FIO mutual fund, OFE ING NN pension fund,
- Gold spot, Bovespa index, S&P500 index,

For research purposes time series were split into two subsamples dividing the sample into in-sample period and out-of-sample period as follows:

- in the case of optimization (I_system and III_system):
 - *in-sample*: I.1998-XII.2009 (I_system),
 - *in-sample*: IX.1998-XII.2009 (III_system),
 - *out-of-sample*: I-XII.2010 -> it was very challenging year for all financial institutions relying on ATS because of long lasting horizontal trend,

In the case of II_system, where no optimization process was applied, whole period i.e. I.1999-XII.2010, was subjected to backtesting procedure. However, the results were split into two subperiods in order to compare them with the out-of-sample results for I_system and III_system.

3.2. Theoretical background

Searching for the answer to our main question defined in the previous chapter we made assumption related to Efficient Market Hypothesis. Literally, we assume that information included in the past prices is valuable in the process of prediction of their futures prices. This assumption is in obvious contradiction to weak version of EMH in the information sense. This approach directs us towards practical usage of one of investment techniques i.e. automated transactional systems which has been widely researched in the recent years, mainly by mutual and hedge funds. However, there are not many research results revealed to the public. Our goal is to investigate the areas that have the most significant impact on ATS performance. To analyze the most sensitive areas we decided to go through the whole process of ATS construction paying special attention to risk management on all levels of ATS construction.

There are two main streams that present two different approaches to construction of ATS: the optimization based selection and expert based selection type. The first rely on defined, iterative process of selecting the most effective concept and parameters of the system for out-of-sample period using only in-sample data. Then the best systems are verified on the out-of-sample period to assess the stability of achieved results. The aim of optimization is to find the best version of the investment system through adjusting of buy/sell/stops algorithms to historical prices taking into account given boundary conditions (presented in details in Table 1).

Second approach use human expert selection process of the ATS formula which requires the experience of the researcher in practical investment. Then selected ATS are backtested on the whole available period. The aim of backtesting is to verify whether the formulas found in the expert way are valid on historical time series. We applied both approaches in our research: first – optimized approach for I_system and III_system and second – expert one for testing of II_system concept.

At the beginning of ATS construction process, we tried to define few conceptual aims that are easily translated into practice of investment world. These goals helped us to focus our attention on the most important and sensitive areas. The aims are as follows:

- to define investment systems, which can make profit on various financial markets (equity, commodities, currencies or interest rates) independently of actual market conditions

(upward, downward or horizontal trend) and regardless of current macroeconomic cycle phase,

- to find investment systems maximizing annual compound rate and minimizing risk in comparison to all other alternative investments (in the period of last 12-13 years),
- to minimize the liquidity risk through investments on various markets considering their volume of turnover and open interests, or level of development (emerging and developed markets),
- to define risk management system already on the level of setting the optimal size of open position for each trade.

3.3. The description of final systems

The analysis of above aims drove us to define main steps of the process of ATS construction. Some of them, like risk management and system monitoring, play crucial role in efficiency of final ATS selection. The below mentioned steps helped us to find systems that reach our investment goals:

- Looking for investment algorithms (technical analysis indicators, fundamental analysis, macro models, econometric models, etc),
- Testing and finding the final version of the system, based on the final version of each of the strategies (I_system and III_system) or the composition of one system for n -different financial instruments (II_system),
- In case of optimization (I_system and III_system) we find the final version of the system on the basis of in-sample data optimization for each of the strategies separately:

$$\underset{x_1, \dots, x_i}{\text{Max}}(\text{indicator}_j) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{indicator}_j = \frac{NP_j}{SE_j^{\text{EqLine}}} \quad (2)$$

where:

x_1, \dots, x_i - different parameters for each of the strategies set in the process of optimization,

j - the number of the strategy (from 1 to 8) which is the part of investment system,

NP_j - net profit of the j th strategy,

SE_j^{EqLine} - standard error of equity line of the j th strategy,

- In case of expert formulas we only backtest the system on in-sample data in order to check the system performance on historical data,
- Setting the number of open positions for each system based on the cumulative single results from the set of strategies ($L_i^{\text{optimisation}}$ for I_system and III_system) or actual risk level compared with the historical one (L_i^{backtest} for II_system),

$$L_i^{\text{optimisation}} = \sum_{j=1}^8 \text{result}_{j,t} \quad (3)$$

$$L_t^{backtest} = \frac{EqLine_{t-1}}{Close_{t-1}} * RF * \frac{1}{SF_{t-1}} \quad (4)$$

$$SF_t = if \begin{cases} (\frac{RV_t^{3m}}{HV_t^0})^2, & for \quad (\frac{RV_t^{3m}}{HV_t^0})^2 > 1 \\ 1, & for \quad (\frac{RV_t^{3m}}{HV_t^0})^2 \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where:

- t - the number of the consecutive day,
 - $result_{j,t} = \{-1,0,1\}$ - the results of buy/sell/stop algorithm for the j_{th} strategy on day t ,
 - $EqLine_t$ - the value of equity line for day t ,
 - $Close_t$ - close price for financial instrument on day $t-1$,
 - RF - the risk factor set on the level of 2,
 - SF_t - the scaling factor decreasing the number of open position when actual volatility sharply increases,
 - RV_t^{3m} - the actual volatility calculated as realized volatility on the basis of 3-month price history,
 - HV_t^0 - the historical volatility calculated as the standard deviation of returns on the basis of data from the first day to day t ,¹
- Risk monitoring of the system on out-of-sample data and comparing it with the average and extreme results from in-sample data, in order to switch off the parts (one of the systems in case of the final joint system or one of the strategies) of the system which exceed the defined risk limits,

$$if \quad y_i > y_i^*, i = 1, \dots, k \Rightarrow switch \ off \quad \& \quad reconstruction \quad (6)$$

where:

- y_1, \dots, y_k - risk statistics for out-of-sample period formulated in details in Table 1,
 - y_1^*, \dots, y_k^* - risk statistics for in-sample period,
- Reoptimization, rebalancing and reconstruction of the system after the given period of time (e.g. half a year),
 - The analysis of results for in-sample and out-of-sample on the basis of daily data for yearly periods in order to estimate the stability of outcomes. Additionally, the data are analyzed in yearly rolling window.

It is important to note at this place that for most of the time about 10% of our portfolio is allocated to the deposit for different futures contracts used and about 90% remains in cash.

¹ The detailed explanation of calculation formulas for RV and HV can be found for example in Ślepaczuk and Zakrzewski (2009),

Intentionally, we do not take into account the interests on this cash in order to not increase the results and reserve some space for potential downward bias of our results. Construction of the three finally selected systems are presented below.

3.3.1. I_system_fw20 and III_system_dax-future

In the processes of construction of I_system and III_system the only difference is the underlying asset. I_system is based on futures contract on WIG20 index of Warsaw Stock Exchange (FW20), while III_system uses futures contracts on DAX index of Deutsche Borse (Dax future). Detailed description of both systems is listed below:

- The combination of 8 various transactional strategies² based on technical analysis and statistical measures for one of the financial instrument respectively: FW20 (I_system), Dax future (III_system):
 - I strategy: LRS – the combination of simple statistical tools,
 - II strategy: OSC – the combination of different technical analysis oscillators,
 - III strategy: MACD – moving average crossover divergence,
 - IV strategy: SMA – simple moving average,
 - V strategy: TEMA – triple exponential moving average,
 - VI strategy: RSI – relative strength index,
 - VII strategy: CCI – commodity channel index,
 - VIII strategy: HLV - high-low values crossover,
- Strategies generate mid-term buy/sell/stop signals,
- Every strategy is separately optimized on in-sample data,
- Variable capital allocation considering the size of open position on the level of the system. Single signals from each strategies are aggregated in order to define the direction and transactional unit on the level of the system (formula 3),
- Finally, based on the boundary conditions calculated on the basis of in-sample period (summarized in Table 1) we set financial leverage, risk factor and initial equity on the level which enables us to maximize annual compounded return (ARC),
- This system is easy to replicate for different financial instruments like stock indexes (e.g. RTS, Bovespa, KLSE, and PX50), commodities, bonds, and currencies.

3.3.2. II_system_high-low

One of the main differences between systems described above and II_system is lack of optimization process in terms of formula selection for the latter one. The construction of this system is summarized below:

- The investment algorithm is based on crossover of the reference price recorded n -days ago (non-optimized algorithm and the same for each financial instrument). It is applied for various financial instruments (stock indexes, commodities and futures), e.g.:

² Detailed description of the way of signals generation by the given buy/sell/stop algorithm can be found for example in Murphy (1999) or Ślepaczuk (2006).

- CRB futures,
- Gold futures,
- Shanghai composite index,
- RTS index,
- DAX futures,
- Cotton futures,
- ATGI index,
- Platinum future, etc.
- System generates long-term buy/sell signals,
- No optimization applied in the selection process, only backtesting,
- Variable allocation considering the size of open position. The algorithm set the transactional unit based on the comparison of actual and historical volatility (formula 4),
- Finally, based on the boundary conditions calculated on the basis of in-sample period (summarized in Table 1) we set financial leverage, risk factor and initial equity on the level which enables us to maximize annual compounded return (ARC),
- Periodic reallocation of funds between each financial instrument within the system (e.g. each half a year),

3.4. Statistics used to evaluate the performance and the boundary conditions

In the literature one can find many various measures of efficiency of ATS. These measures are used in order to assess the performance of ATS and finally choose the best one which should be used in the future. The problem is that mostly we refer to profitability measures than to risk measures. In reality, it affects our selection process in such a way that we choose the most profitable system. This produces highly volatile results, what usually makes the results non persistent in the out-of-sample period. Therefore, we focused rather on risk than profitability measures in the process of selection of optimal version of strategies and then systems. To provide complex assessment of the presented systems we also calculated wide range of measures. They relate to three dimensions: profitability, risk and third area covering statistics that combine risk and profitability. Applied statistics with short definitions are listed below:

- **aSD** – Annual Standard Deviation – annualized standard deviation calculated in the standard way,

$$aSD = \sqrt{252} * \sqrt{\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{t=1}^N (R_t - \bar{R})^2} \quad (7)$$

where:

R_t – logarithmic rate of return,

- **5%-VaR** – Value at Risk at 5% - Value at Risk measure (5th percentile on the daily data) calculated on the basis of historical daily returns,
- **maxFL** – Maximum Financial Leverage – maximum level of financial leverage used in the testing period; 33% means leverage on the level of 1:3,

- **MD** – Maximum Drawdown – maximum level of drawdown in the testing period, where drawdown identifies the distance of equity line (measured in percentages) between the previous local maximum to the forthcoming local minimum³:

$$MD = \underset{i=1, \dots, t; t=1, \dots, N}{Min} \left(\sum_{j=i}^t R_j \right) \quad (8)$$

where:

R_j – logarithmic return on day j ,

- **AMD** – Average per year Maximum Drawdown – the average yearly maximum drawdown in the testing period,

$$AMD = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n MD_i^{yearly} \quad (9)$$

where:

MD_i^{yearly} – yearly maximum drawdown calculated for each year separately,

n – number of years under investigations,

- **MLD** – Maximum Loss Duration (in years) – informs about maximum number of years, between the previous local maximum to the forthcoming local maximum,

$$MLD = \underset{j > i}{Max} \frac{n}{252} \quad where \quad \begin{cases} n = m_j - m_i \\ Val_{m_j} > Val_{m_i} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where:

m_j, m_i – the number of day indicating consecutive local maximum of equity line,

Val_{m_j}, Val_{m_i} – values of local maximums in day m_j and m_i ,

- **Correlation** – correlation coefficient – coefficient reflecting the correlation of rates of return between the given system and the market; I_system with WIG20 futures, II_system with S&P500 futures, and III_system with DAX futures,
- **AllRisk** = $aSD * MD * MLD * AMD * 1000$ – aggregated measure of risk reflecting risk of the system as a product of 4 basic risk measures used in the process of designing of automated transactional systems,

$$AllRisk = aSD * MD * MLD * AMD * 1000 \quad (11)$$

- **ARC** – Annual Return Compounded – calculated in the standard way,

$$ARC = 252 * \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N R_t \quad (12)$$

- **Sharpe** – Sharpe ratio – calculated in the standard way as a quotient of difference of annual compounded rate and risk free rate and annualized standard deviation,

³ Dunis et al. (2010),

- **IR** – Information Ratio – indicator calculated as a quotient of annual compounded rate and annualized standard deviation,

$$IR = \frac{ARC}{aSD} \quad (13)$$

- **ARC/MD** - Annual Return Compounded/Maximum Drawdown – quotient of annual compounded rate and maximum drawdown,
- **ARC/AMD** - Annual Return Compounded/ Average per year Maximum Drawdown - quotient of annual compounded rate and average per year maximum drawdown,

Risk management is of huge importance to ATS management. Therefore, one of the first steps of the research was to define satisfactory levels of statistics describing systems performance (the boundary conditions) for in-sample period. Using the best available investment alternatives, we set cut-offs for measures used during selection of final shape of the systems. Obviously, defined criteria were not the only rules of the selection, and systems were simultaneously subjected to other investigations. However, they were one of the most significant. Eligibility criteria for performance characteristics are defined in the Table 1 below.

Table 1. Cut-off criteria for statistics (the boundary conditions)

Dimension	Statistics	Criterion
Risk	aSD - Annual Standard Deviation	< 20%
	5%-VaR - Value at Risk at 5%	< 2%
	maxFL - Maximum Financial Leverage	< 33% (the equivalent of 1:3)
	MD - Maximum Drawdown	< 21%
	MLD - Maximum Loss Duration (in years)	< 0.8
	AMD - Average per year Maximum Drawdown	< 14%
	AllRisk = aSD*MD*MLD*AMD*1000	< 3
Profitability	ARC - Annual Return Compounded	> 30%
Risk and Profitability	Sharpe - Sharpe ratio	> 1.5
	IR - Information Ratio	> 1.75
	ARC/MD - Annual Return Compounded/Maximum Drawdown	> 1.5
	ARC/AMD - Annual Return Compounded/ Average per year Maximum Drawdown	> 2.5
	The number of transactions	< x-yearly

* Table 1 presents boundary conditions which were taken into account when searching for the final version of each system on the basis of in-sample period. The boundary conditions set the limit for maximum risk undertaken in the process of investment.

3.5. Benchmark strategies

As it was mentioned previously, to obtain complex assessment, benchmarks were selected accordingly to the best results obtained in in-sample period. As the most intuitive benchmarks for I_system were chosen the following assets:

- main Polish stock market index WIG index.
- *ARKA Akcji FIO* mutual fund and
- *OFE ING NN* pension fund,

For II_system and III_system worldwide best alternatives were considered, i.e. stock indexes, commodities, bonds, and currencies. Finally three benchmarks were selected:

- Gold spot,
- Bovespa index,
- S&P500 index, as the most profitable alternatives and highly representative.

4. Results

This section presents results for three systems described previously. Tables with detailed statistics, as well as respective figures, are shown to provide full view of the achieved performance. For each system results are presented taking into account assumptions, figures and detailed statistics of the system. Results are presented separately for in-sample and out-of-sample period and are compared to respective benchmarks. Finally, the comparison of the three ATS is presented together with the results for the concept which aggregate three separate systems into one: I+II+III_system.

4.1. I_system_fw20_PLN

Results for I_system, which utilizes investment algorithms based on basic signals from 8 single strategies, are presented in the Table 2. Data were split into two periods: in-sample, which covers 01.01.1998-31.12.2009 and out-of-sample for 01.01.2010-31.12.2010.

Table 2. Performance statistics for I_system_fw20

Statistic name	Abbreviation of statistics	I system_fw20 in-sample and out-of-sample	I system_fw20 out-of-sample
annual return compounded	ARC	35,2%	29,0%
annualstddev	aSD	19,3%	14,0%
information ratio	IR	1,83	2,08
maximum drawdown	MD	15,2%	9,9%
max financial leverage	maxFL	73%	73%
maximum loss duration (in years)	MLD	0,48	0,32
Sharpe ratio	Sharpe	1,6	1,7
annual return compounded (%) / max drawdown (%)	ARC / MD	2,3	2,9
average per year max drawdown (%)	AMD	9,5%	9,9%
annual return compounded (%) / average per year max drawdown (%)	ARC / AMD	3,7	2,9
Allrisk	allrisk	1,34	0,44


* Table 2 presents performance statistics for I_system_fw20 in two subsamples: in-sample period, which covers 01.01.1998-31.12.2009 and out-of-sample period for 01.01.2010-31.12.2010.

Statistics presented in the Table 2 met our targets defined in Table 1 (for in-sample period). *annual return compounded* rate reaching 35.2% is a not surprising effect when using optimization. However, in conjunction with annual standard deviation below 20% (19.3%), it indicates substantially better performance than one may expect. Such results are able to be obtained due to application of multi-stage technique (i.e. buy/sell/stops rules selection, parameters optimization, combining many strategies into one system, cash management and risk management on the level of setting optimal number of open positions and consecutive reoptimization, reallocation, and reconstruction of the systems). Efficiency of applied technique is proven by validation results for out-of-sample period. There are no significant

changes in the levels of statistics. The decrease in the *ARC* by 6.2 pp was balanced by decrease in *aSD* by 5.3 pp and three other risk statistics. Finally, *Sharpe ratio* (and *IR*), which combines risk and return dimension, slightly increased for validation sample to 1.7 from 1.6 (to 2.08 from 1.83).

Figure 1 presenting equity lines was prepared to analyze investment behavior of *I_system_fw20* and benchmarks across the whole period. For clarity of analysis, assumption was made, that initial capital equals 1 million PLN. Investigation of the equity lines for *I_system* and benchmarks confirms conclusions drawn during analysis of the statistics. Linearity of *I_system* equity lines shows that it is possible to create sustainable performance over the long period. Especially worth mentioning is the resistance of results to the market cycles⁴. *I_system* creates stable returns regardless of the market direction.

Figure 1. Equity lines for *I_system_fw20* and its benchmarks.




* Figure 1 presents equity lines (assuming the initial investment of 1 million PLN) for *I_system_fw20* in comparison to WIG index, Arka akcji fio mutual fund and OFE ING NN pension fund in the period: 1998.01.20-2010.12.31. We use logarithmic scale.

The fluctuations of drawdown for *I_system* and benchmarks are presented below (Figure 2) in order to analyze in more detail the risk of the investment alternatives. It shows that even OFE ING NN pension fund, which is supposed to be less risky, witnessed higher drawdown during last crisis 2007-2009 and the crisis after the internet bubble in 2000-2001. *I_system_fw20* keeps drawdown below 15.2%, only few times exceeding 10%.

⁴ We mean recession periods indicated by sharp downward movement of the markets in 2001-2002 and 2007-2009.

Figure 2. Drawdown for I_system_fw20 and the benchmarks.



* Figure 2 presents the fluctuations of drawdown for I_system_fw20 in comparison to WIG index, Arka akcji fio mutual fund and OFE ING NN pension fund in the period: 1998.01.20-2010.12.31.

Statistics shown in the Table 3 confirm better performance of discussed ATS than any available alternative. It is especially visible when comparing statistics that combine risk and return measures. *Sharpe ratio* for I_system outpaced significantly these for the alternative investments: 1.6 for I_system vs. 0.2, 0.3 and 0.7 for WIG20, Arka akcji FIO, OFE ING NN respectively. When analyzing risk dimension, especially worth underlining is *Maximum Loss Duration*: 0.48 for ATS while for alternatives it varies from 3.23 for OFE ING NN to 3.83 for WIG20 (as numbers of years).

Table 3. Performance statistics for benchmarks and I_system_fw20 statistics (in-sample and out-of-sample period).

Statistic name	Abbreviation of statistics	WIG20	Arka akcji FIO	OFE ING NN	I_system_fw20
annual return compounded	ARC	9,8%	11,3%	9,6%	35,2%
Annualstdev	aSD	23,9%	20,1%	6,8%	19,3%
information ratio	IR	0,41	0,56	1,40	1,83
maximum drawdown	MD	68,5%	66,7%	25,6%	15,2%
max financial leverage	maxFL	100%	100%	100%	73%
maximum loss duration (in years)	MLD	3,83	3,4	3,23	0,48
Sharpe ratio	Sharpe	0,2	0,3	0,7	1,6
annual return compounded (%) / max drawdown (%)	ARC / MD	0,1	0,2	0,4	2,3
average per year max drawdown (%)	AMD	37,2%	29,9%	9,2%	9,5%
annual return compounded (%) / average per year max drawdown	ARC / AMD	0,3	0,4	1,0	3,7
Allrisk	allrisk	234,00	136,20	5,22	1,34

*Table 3 presents detailed statistics for I_system in comparison to the benchmarks from the Polish capital market (WIG index, Arka akcji fio mutual fund and OFE ING NN pension fund).

4.2. II_system_high-low_USD

The construction of II_system (II_system_high-low_USD) differs from the methodology used for I_system and III_system. The results are obtained basing on one investment algorithm used for n various financial instruments. Data sample was split along with previous methodology into in-sample and out-of-sample in order to assess the stability of achieved results. Statistics for validation period (out-of-sample) are again worse than for the total sample, but the deterioration does not disqualify this system from further investigations. *Sharpe ratio* reaching level 1.1 and *IR* which equals 1.27 is far above alternative benchmarks. Detailed statistics are gathered in the Table 4.

Table 4. Performance statistics for II_system.

Statistic name	Abbreviation of statistics	II_system_high-low_USD in-sample and out-of-sample	II_system_high-low_USD out-of-sample
annual return compounded	ARC	35,6%	23,0%
Annualstdev	aSD	14,1%	18,0%
information ratio	IR	2,52	1,27
maximum drawdown	MD	20,7%	20,1%
max financial leverage	maxFL	37%	45%
maximum loss duration (in years)	MLD	0,61	0,55
Sharpe ratio	Sharpe	2,4	1,1
annual return compounded (%) / max drawdown (%)	ARC / MD	1,7	1,1
average per year max drawdown (%)	AMD	13,3%	20,1%
annual return compounded (%) / average per year max drawdown (%)	ARC / AMD	2,7	1,1
Allrisk	allrisk	2,37	3,99

* Table 5 presents performance statistics for II_system_high-low in two subsamples: in-sample period, which covers 01.01.1999-31.12.2009 and out-of-sample period for 01.01.2010-31.12.2010.

4.3. III_system_daxfuture_EUR

Performance statistics for III_system (III_system_daxfuture_EUR) are presented in the Table 5. Data, similarly as for I_system, were split into two subperiods: in-sample, which covers 01.19.1998-31.12.2009 and out-of-sample for 01.01.2010-31.12.2010. Out-of-sample statistics show slight deterioration vs. levels from the whole period. However, risk and returns combined measures remain at satisfactory levels (*Sharpe ratio* is on the level of 0.8 and *IR* remains above 1.0).


The performance of the II and III systems and their benchmarks across the whole period is presented on the Figure 3. The plots clearly show significantly better results for our two ATS than for alternatives. The outperformance of ATS is visible not only in higher return rates but also in risk statistics i.e. stability of returns. Again, the ATS sustainably survived market downturns, while compared benchmarks were severely affected by market crashes. This stability of returns assures us that applied steps, especially method of setting number of open positions based on several subsystems combined into one, allow to significantly reduce volatility of results while keeping returns on highly satisfactory level.

For deeper investigation of volatility of the results for II and III systems, the comparison of drawdown fluctuations is presented on the Figure 4. One can easily notice that the only alternative for which drawdown may be compared to the ATS is gold spot investment. However, moving to the more detailed data in the Table 6 we see that even though *Maximum*

Table 5. Performance statistics for III_system

Statistic name	Abbreviation of statistics	III_system in-sample and out-of-sample	III_system out-of-sample
annual return compounded	ARC	35,3%	21,8%
Annualstdev	aSD	16,2%	21,3%
information ratio	IR	2,19	1,02
maximum drawdown	MD	14,3%	13,9%
max financial leverage	maxFL	41%	30%
maximum loss duration (in years)	MLD	0,79	0,24
Sharpe ratio	Sharpe	1,9	0,8
annual return compounded (%) / max drawdown (%)	ARC / MD	2,5	1,6
average per year max drawdown (%)	AMD	8,2%	7,4%
annual return compounded (%) / average per year max drawdown (%)	ARC / AMD	4,3	3,0
allrisk	allrisk	1,50	0,53

* Table 4 presents performance statistics for III_system_daxfuture in two subsamples: in-sample period, which covers 01.09.1998-31.12.2009 and out-of-sample period for 01.01.2010-31.12.2010.


Figure 3. Equity lines for II_system, III_system and benchmarks.

* Figure 3 presents equity lines (assuming the initial investment of 1 million) for II_system_high-low and III_system_daxfuture in comparison to Gold spot, Bovespa index and S&P500 index in the period: 1998.09.01-2010.12.31. We use logarithmic scale.

Drawdown for gold is relatively low, the maximum loss duration is substantially higher than for ATS: 2.6 years for gold vs. 0.6 and 0.8 for systems II and III respectively. It means that II and III system require only 6 and 9 months respectively to reach capital levels observed in the last maximum. Measures combining risk and return also make us confident that defined process of ATS construction provide user with results significantly better than the market. *Sharpe ratio*, *information ratio* and *annual return compounded (%) / average per year max*

drawdown presented in the Table 6 prove that defined multi-stage technique will benefit the investor with stability of the system while providing satisfactory level of return.

Figure 4. Drawdown for II_system, III_system and benchmarks.



* Figure 4 presents the fluctuations of drawdown for II_system_high-low and III_system_daxfuture in comparison to Gold spot, Bovespa index and S&P500 index in the period: 1998.09.01-2010.12.31.

Table 6. Performance statistics for system II, III and their benchmarks.

Statistic name	Abbreviation of statistics	bovespa	gold spot	s&p 500	II_system_high-low_USD	III_system_daxfuture_EUR
annual return compounded	ARC	16,2%	12,8%	1,9%	35,6%	35,3%
annualstdev	aSD	35,6%	18,1%	21,6%	14,1%	16,2%
information ratio	IR	0,46	0,71	0,09	2,52	2,19
maximum drawdown	MD	61,3%	28,8%	56,8%	20,7%	14,3%
max financial leverage	maxFL	100%	100%	100%	37%	41%
maximum loss duration (in years)	MLD	3,60	2,61	7,14	0,61	0,79
Sharpe ratio	Sharpe	0,3	0,4	-0,1	2,4	1,9
annual return compounded(%)/max drawdown(%)	ARC / MD	0,3	0,4	0,0	1,7	2,5
average per year max drawdown (%)	AMD	39,8%	17,3%	31,6%	13,3%	8,2%
annual return compounded (%)/average per year max drawdown (%)	ARC/AMD	0,4	0,7	0,1	2,7	4,3
allrisk	allrisk	312,33	23,46	277,00	2,37	1,50


*Table 6 presents detailed statistics for II_system_high-low and III_system_daxfuture in comparison to Gold spot, Bovespa index and S&P500 index in the period: 1998.09.01-2010.12.31.

4.4. I+II+III_system

Investigations presented above in this section allow to conclude that careful combination of several strategies into one system, and/or several strategies for various financial instruments into one system, results in significant reduction of risk. Finally, having developed three separate systems (i.e. I, II and III), we will analyze conjunction effect of applying system as a single investment portfolio⁵. Two general assumptions have to be made for the purpose of the analysis. First, equal amount is invested into each of three systems. Second assumption is made with regards to different currency issue. We assume that all currency risks are fully hedged, so that we may focus only on adequate recalculation of returns.

This final step delivers complex system (I+II+III_system) that in terms of risk and return measures outperforms its components. Figure 5 compares equity behavior of such combined system with its separate components. Additional and the most important value of the final step is also visible while investigating drawdown fluctuations over whole analyzed period (please see Figure 6).

Figure 5. Equity lines for systems I, II, III and combination of these three systems.




* Figure 5 presents equity lines (assuming the initial investment of 1 million) for I_system-fw20, II_system_high-low and III_system_daxfuture in comparison to I+II+III_system in the period: 1998.01.20-2010.12.31. We use logarithmic scale.

The fluctuations of drawdown on Figure 6 present significant decrease of maximum and average drawdown for the combination of our three systems (I+II+III_system) in comparison to single systems. What is more important, the same can be seen for other risk statistics (*aSD*, *MLD*) for in-sample period (Table 7 in the last column), and this phenomenon is observed

⁵ The correlation coefficients between our three systems were close to 0.

Figure 6. Drawdown for I, II, III systems and the combination of these three systems.



* Figure 6 presents the fluctuations of drawdown for I_system-fw20, II_system_high-low and III_system_daxfuture in comparison to I+II+III_system in the period: 1998.01.20-2010.12.31.

with unchanged profitability statistics and highly increased statistics presenting joint picture of risk and returns.


The extent of generated additional value from this combination one may precisely asses by comparing performance statistics presented in the Table 7. To avoid bias of in-sample effect, statistics were calculated for out-of-sample data. The results are in line with expectations. Significantly lower risk was produced by the final system simultaneously keeping stable level of returns. *Annual standard deviation* decreased to 13.6% while for separate components it reaches 14.0%, 18.0% and 21.3% for I, II and III system respectively. The fluctuations of equity lines for out-of-sample period are presented on Figure 7. This figure once again confirms stabilizing effect of the combination of n different systems on the level of overall risk. What is more important, presented results show that that process of adding new components to the final system could be infinite.

Table 7. Performance statistics for system I, II, III and combination of these three systems (out-of-sample period).

Statistic name	Abbreviation of statistics	I_system_fw20	II_system_high-low_USD	III_system_daxfuture_EUR	I+II+III system out-of-sample	I+II+III system in-sample
annual return compounded	ARC	29,0%	23,0%	21,8%	24,6%	35,5%
annualstdev	aSD	14,0%	18,0%	21,3%	13,6%	12,3%
information ratio	IR	2,08	1,27	1,02	1,81	2,88
maximum drawdown	MD	9,9%	20,1%	13,9%	11,6%	11,2%
max financial leverage	maxFL	73%	45%	30%		50%
maximum loss duration (in years)	MLD	0,32	0,55	0,24	0,42	0,42
Sharpe ratio	Sharpe	1,7	1,1	0,8	1,4	2,5
annual return compounded (%) / max drawdown (%)	ARC / MD	2,9	1,1	1,6	2,1	3,2
average per year max drawdown (%)	AMD	9,9%	20,1%	7,4%	11,6%	6,4%
annual return compounded (%) / average per year max drawdown (%)	ARC / AMD	2,9	1,1	3,0	2,1	5,5
allrisk	allrisk	0,44	3,99	0,53	0,78	0,37

* Table 7 presents detailed statistics for I_system_fw20, II_system_high-low and III_system_daxfuture in comparison to I+II+III_system in out-of-sample period.

Figure 7. Equity lines for systems I, II, III and the combination of these three systems (out-of-sample period).



* Figure 7 presents equity lines (assuming the initial investment of 1 million) for I_system_fw20, II_system_high-low and III_system_daxfuture in comparison to I+II+III_system in out-of-sample period.

5. Conclusions

Presented investigation confirms that we are able to beat the market in the consecutive way. This positively verifies our main hypothesis defined at the beginning. Hence, we can say that we **can create investment systems beating the market in consecutive way independently of cyclically occurring market turmoils?** Key driver of the success is multi-stage technique which enables us to obtain results that are much closer to the ones from in-sample period and consequently much higher comparing to alternative investments practically in each context: profit, risk and measures connecting risk and profit. I, II and III systems earned approximately 35% annually in comparison to 10% annually on average for the best alternative investments. At the same time, our ATS is characterized with several times lower risk statistics. This enables us to obtain *information ratio* close to 2 (in-sample-period) and above 1 for out-of-sample period.

Moreover, applied techniques allow to reach risk statistics for tested ATS even lower than for potentially "risk-free investment", e.g. pension funds, while their rates of return were several times higher than this potentially "risk free" alternative.

Applying developed techniques for not optimized ATS (II_system) provided us with the similar results. This proves that key driver of the system efficiency is not optimization process. Major role plays the whole process of the construction covering especially cash management rules, selection of various financial instruments and various strategies, reoptimization, rebalancing and reconstruction of the system when new financial data inflow.

Presented ATS operate on several markets which on the one hand prove that developed techniques are scalable and applicable for several financial instruments. On the other hand, multi-market approach allows minimizing the liquidity risk and overall risk. New approach used to allocation setting the transactional unit for each system is one of the most important factors for system performance (cash management system). It has to be considered in conjunction with risk management methodology. Next important factor are strategy evaluation criteria (the boundary conditions) used during the testing phase, which enable to find the best final version of the system. Additionally, focusing on risk statistics in the in-sample period increases the probability that similar results will persist in out-of-sample period.

Finally, the crucial elements of ATS construction process are reoptimization, rebalancing and reconstruction of the system after the testing period. Having already all mentioned elements in place significantly increases probability of reaching defined results for the system.

Last but not least, results presented for I+II+II_system enable us to conclude that there is no final point in the ATS construction process. Assuming that we can find additional systems characterized by very low correlation coefficients we should continue the process of adding them to our complex system (I+II+II+..._system). This means that there is still a huge space for further research.

References

1. Ackerman, C., R. McEnally, and D. Ravenscraft (1999) The Performance of Hedge Funds: Risk, Return and Incentives. *Journal of Finance* 54 (3): 833-874.
2. Banz, R. (1981) The Relationship Between Return and Market Value of Common Stocks. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 9 (1), 3-18.
3. Basu, S. (1977) Investment Performance of Common Stocks in Relation to their Price-Earnings Ratios: A Test of the Efficient Market Hypothesis. *Journal of Finance*, 32 (3), 663-682.
4. Baturevich and Muradoglu (2010) Would you follow MM or Profitable Trading Strategy? *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* 7 (2): 69-89.
5. Bessembinder, H. and Chan, K. (1998) Market efficiency and the returns to technical analysis. *Financial Management* 27: 5–17.
6. Bhandari, L.C. (1988) Debt/Equity Ratio and Expected Common Stocks Returns: Empirical Evidence. *Journal of Finance*, 43: 507-528.
7. Blume, L., Easley, D. and O'Hara, M. (1994) Market statistics and technical analysis: the role of volume. *Journal of Finance* 49: 153–181.
8. Brock, W., Lakonishock, J. and LeBaron, B. (1992) Simple technical trading rules and the stochastic properties of stock returns. *Journal of Finance* 47: 1731–1764.
9. Brown, D.P. and Jennings, R.H. (1989) On technical analysis. *Review of Financial Studies* 2: 527–551.
10. Campbell, J. and R. Shiller 1998. Valuation Ratios and the Long-run Stock Market Outlook. *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 24 (2), 11-26.
11. Capocci, D. (2004) An Analysis of Hedge Funds Performance. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 11, pp. 55-89.
12. Carhart (1997) On Persistence in Mutual Fund Performance. *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 57-82.
13. Chang, P.H.K. and Osler, C.L. (1999) Methodical madness: technical analysis and the irrationality of exchange-rate forecasts. *Economic Journal* 109: 636–661.
14. Chlistalla M., 2011, High-frequency trading, Deutsche Bank Research.
15. Choi, H. S. and Jayaraman, N. (2009) Is Reversal of Large Stock-Price Declines Caused by Overreaction or Information Asymmetry: Evidence from Stock and Option Markets. *Journal of Futures Markets*, 29, 4, 348-376.
16. Cornell, W.B. and Dietrich, J.K. (1978) The efficiency of the market for foreign exchange under floating exchange rates. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 60: 111–120.
17. Coutts, J.A. and Cheung, K. (2000) Trading rules and stock returns: some preliminary short run evidence from the Hang Seng 1985–1997. *Applied Financial Economics* 10:579–586.
18. Da Z., Q. Liu and E. Schaumburg (2010) Decomposing the Short-term Return Reversal, Working Paper, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1551025
19. Daniel, K. and S. Titman 1997. Evidence on the Characteristics of Cross Sectional Variation in Stock Returns. *Journal of Finance*, 52 (1), 1-33.
20. Dooley, M.P. and Shafer, J.R. (1983) Analysis of short-run exchange rate behavior: March 1973 to November 1981. In D. Bigman and T. Taya (eds) *Exchange Rate and Trade Instability: Causes, Consequences, and Remedies* (pp. 43–69). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
21. Dunis Ch. L., J. Laws and J. Rudy (2010) Profitable Mean Reversion after Large Price Drops: A story of Day and Night in the S&P500, 400 Mid Cap and 600 Small Cap Indices, Liverpool John Moores University, Working Paper 2010
22. Eling, M. (2006) Autocorrelation, Bias and Fat Tails—Are Hedge Funds Really Attractive Investments? *Derivatives Use, Trading and Regulation*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 28-47.
23. Fama, E.F. and Blume, M.E. (1966) Filter rules and stock market trading. *Journal of Business* 39: 226–241.
24. Fama, E. and K. French,. 1992. The Cross Section of Expected Stock Returns. *The Journal of Finance*, 47 (2), 427-465.
25. Fama, E. F. and French, K. R. (1993) Common Risk Factors in the Returns on Stocks and Bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 33, 1, 3-56.
26. Forner, C. and Marhuenda, J. (2003) Contrarian and Momentum Strategies in the Spanish Stock Market. *European Financial Management*, 9, 1, 67-88.

27. Fung, W. and Hsieh, D.A. (1997) The information content of performance track records: investment style and survivorship bias in the historical returns of commodity trading advisors. *Journal of Portfolio Management* 24: 30–41.
28. Gehin, W. (2004) A Survey of the Literature on Hedge Fund Performance. Working paper, 2004.
29. Gehrig, T. and Menkhoff, L. (2003) Technical analysis in foreign exchange – the workhorse gains further ground. Discussion paper, University of Hannover.
30. Gehrig, T. and Menkhoff, L. (2004) The use of flow analysis in foreign exchange: exploratory evidence. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 23: 573–594.
31. Ghosh and Cai 1999,
32. Gray, R.W. and Nielsen, S.T. (1963) Rediscovery of some fundamental price behavior characteristics. Paper presented at the meeting of the Econometric Society held in Cleveland, Ohio.
33. Greer, T.V., Brorsen, B.W. and Liu, S.M. (1992) Slippage costs in order execution for a public futures fund. *Review of Agricultural Economics* 14: 281–288.
34. Grundy, B.D. and McNichols, M. (1989) Trade and the revelation of information through prices and direct disclosure. *Review of Financial Studies* 2: 495–526.
35. Gunasekarage, A. and Power, D.M. (2001) The profitability of moving average trading rules in South Asian stock markets. *Emerging Markets Review* 2: 17–33.
36. Hameed A., J. Huang and G. M. Mian (2010) Industries and Stock Return Reversals, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1570566
37. Hellwig, M. (1982) Rational expectations equilibrium with conditioning on past prices: a mean–variance example. *Journal of Economic Theory* 26: 279–312.
38. Houthakker, H. (1961) Systematic and random elements in short-term price movements *American Economic Review* 51: 164–172.
39. Hull, R. 1999. Leverage Ratios, Industry Norms, and Stock Price Reaction: An Empirical Investigation of Stock-for-Debt Transactions. *Financial Management*, 28 (2), 32–45.
40. Irwin, S.H. and Uhrig, J.W. (1984) Do technical analysts have holes in their shoes? *Review of Research in Futures Markets* 3: 264–277.
41. Ito, A. (1999) Profits on technical trading rules and time-varying expected returns: evidence from Pacific-Basin equity markets. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 7: 283–330.
42. Jagannathan and Wang (1993) The CAPM is Alive and Well. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Staff Report 165.
43. James, F.E. (1968) Monthly moving averages – an effective investment tool? *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* September, 315–326.
44. Jegadeesh, N., 1990, Evidence of Predictable Behavior in Security Prices, *Journal of Finance* 45, 881–898.
45. Jensen, M.C. and Benington, G.A. (1970) Random walks and technical theories: some additional evidence. *Journal of Finance* 25: 469–482.
46. Kavajecz, K.A. and Odders-White, E.R. (2004) Technical analysis and liquidity provision. *Review of Financial Studies* 17: 1043–1071.
47. Kho, B. (1996) Time-varying risk premia, volatility, and technical trading rule profits: evidence from foreign currency futures markets. *Journal of Financial Economics* 41:249–290.
48. Kidd, W.V. and Brorsen, B.W. (2004) Why have the returns to technical analysis decreased? *Journal of Economics and Business* 56: 159–176.
49. Korteweg A 2004. Financial leverage and Expected Stock Returns: Evidence from pure exchange offers. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=597922>
50. LeBaron, B. (1999) Technical trading rule profitability and foreign exchange intervention. *Journal of International Economics* 49: 125–143.
51. Lehman, B. (1990) Fads, martingales, and market efficiency, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 105, 1–28.
52. Leung, W. K. (2009) Price Reversal and Firm Size in the U.S. Stock Markets, New Evidence. In *Proceedings of International MultiConference of Engineers and Computer Scientists*. London, 1396–1399.
53. Leuthold, R.M. (1972) Random walk and price trends: the live cattle futures market. *Journal of Finance* 27: 879–889.
54. Levich, R.M. and Thomas, L.R. III (1993) The significance of technical trading rule profits in the foreign exchange market: a bootstrap approach. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 12: 451–474.

54. Liang, B. (1999) On the Performance of Hedge Funds. *Financial Analysts Journal*, Vol. 55, No. 4, pp. 72-85.
55. Lo, A. (2002) The Statistics of Sharpe Ratios. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 58, pp. 36-50.
56. Lo, A. and MacKinlay, A.C. (1990a) Data snooping biases in tests of financial asset pricing models. *Review of Financial Studies* 3: 431-467.
57. Lo, A. W. and Mackinlay, A. C. (1990b) When Are Contrarian Profits Due to Stock Market Overreaction? *The Review of Financial Studies*, 3, 2, 175-205.
58. Lukac, L.P. and Brorsen, B.W. (1990) A comprehensive test of futures market disequilibrium. *Financial Review* 25: 593-622.
59. Lukac, L.P., Brorsen, B.W. and Irwin, S.H. (1988) A test of futures market disequilibrium using twelve different technical trading systems. *Applied Economics* 20: 623-639.
60. Mcinish, T. H., Ding, D. K., Pyun, C. S. and Wongchoti, U. (2008) Short-Horizon Contrarian and Momentum Strategies in Asian Markets: An Integrated Analysis. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 17, 2, 312-329.
61. Mills, T.C. (1997) Technical analysis and the London Stock Exchange: testing trading rules using the FT30. *International Journal of Finance and Economics* 2: 319-331.
62. Murphy J., *Technical analysis of the Financial Markets*, Prentice Hall, New York 1999.
63. Neely, C.J. (2002) The temporal pattern of trading rule returns and exchange rate intervention: intervention does not generate technical trading profits. *Journal of International Economics* 58: 211-232.
64. Neely, C.J. (2003) Risk-adjusted, *ex ante*, optimal technical trading rules in equity markets. *International Review of Economics and Finance* 12: 69-87.
65. Neely, C.J. and Weller, P.A. (2001) Technical analysis and central bank intervention. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 20: 949-970.
66. Osler, C.L. (2003) Currency orders and exchange rate dynamics: an explanation for the predictive success of technical analysis. *Journal of Finance* 58: 1791-1819.
67. Olson, D. (2004) Have trading rule profits in the currency markets declined over time? *Journal of Banking and Finance* 28: 85-105. *Journal of Economic Surveys* (2007) Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 786-826
68. Park and Irwin (2007) What do we know about the profitability of technical analysis? *Journal of Economic Surveys* 21(4): 786-826.
69. Park, J., S. Brown, and W. Goetzmann (1999) Performance Benchmarks and Survivorship Bias for Hedge Funds and Commodity Trading Advisors. *Hedge Fund News*
70. Raj, M. and Thurston, D. (1996) Effectiveness of simple technical trading rules in the Hong Kong futures markets. *Applied Economics Letters* 3: 33-36.
71. Saacke, P. (2002) Technical analysis and the effectiveness of central bank intervention. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 21: 459-479.
72. Sandvik S.H., S. Frydenberg, S. Westgaard and R. K. Heitmann (2011) Hedge Fund Performance in Bull and Bear Markets: Alpha Creation and Risk Exposure, *The Journal of Investing*, Spring 2011
73. Sapp, S. (2004) Are all central bank interventions created equal? An empirical investigation. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 28: 443-474.
74. Schmidt, A.B. (2002) Why technical trading may be successful? A lesson from the agent-based modeling. *Physica A* 303: 185-188.
75. Serletis, A. and Rosenberg, A. A. (2009) Mean Reversion in the U.S. Stock Market. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 40, 4, 2007-2015.
76. Sharpe, W. F. (1964) Capital Asset Prices: A Theory of Market Equilibrium under Conditions of Risk. *Journal of Finance*, 19, 3, 425-442.
77. Silber, W.L. (1994) Technical trading: when it works and when it doesn't. *Journal of Derivatives* 1: 39-44.
78. Smidt, S. (1965a) A test of serial independence of price changes in soybean futures. *Food Research Institute Studies* 5: 117-136.
79. Smidt, S. (1965b) *Amateur Speculators*. Ithaca, NY: Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University.
80. Sosvilla-Rivero, S., Andrada-Félix, J. and Fernández-Rodríguez, F. (2002) Further evidence on technical trade profitability and foreign exchange intervention. *Applied Economics Letters* 9: 827-832.

81. Stengos, T. (1996) Nonparametric forecasts of gold rates of return. In W.A. Barnett, A.P. Kirman and M. Salmon (eds), *Nonlinear Dynamics and Economics: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium on Economic Theory and Econometrics* (pp. 393–406). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
82. Stevenson, R.A. and Bear, R.M. (1970) Commodity futures: trends or random walks? *Journal of Finance* 25: 65–81.
83. Sullivan, R., Timmermann, A. and White, H. (1999) Data snooping, technical trading rule performance, and the bootstrap. *Journal of Finance* 54: 1647–1691.
84. Sullivan, R., Timmermann, A. and White, H. (2003) Forecast evaluation with shared data sets. *International Journal of Forecasting* 19: 217–227.
85. Sweeny, R.J. (1986) Beating the foreign exchange market. *Journal of Finance* 41: 163–182.
86. Szakmary, A.C. and Mathur, I. (1997) Central bank intervention and trading rule profits in foreign exchange markets. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 16: 513–535.
87. Ślepaczuk R., *Technical Trading Strategies and Market Efficiency*, in S. Motamen-Samadian: *Global Stock Market and Portfolio Management*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York 2006.
88. Ślepaczuk R., Zakrzewski G., 2009, High-frequency and model-free volatility estimators, University of Warsaw, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Working Papers 13/2009 (23).
89. Taylor, S.J. (1986) *Modelling Financial Time Series*. Chichester: Wiley.
90. Taylor, S.J. (1992) Rewards available to currency futures speculators: compensation for risk or evidence of inefficient pricing? *Economic Record* 68: 105–116.
91. Taylor, S.J. (1994) Trading futures using a channel rule: a study of the predictive power of technical analysis with currency examples. *Journal of Futures Markets* 14: 215–235.
92. Taylor, S.J. (2000) Stock index and price dynamics in the UK and the US: new evidence from a trading rule and statistical analysis. *European Journal of Finance* 6: 39–69.
93. Taylor, S.J. and Tari, A. (1989) Further evidence against the efficiency of futures markets. In R.M.C. Guimaraes, B.G. Kingsman and S.J. Taylor (eds), *A Reappraisal of the Efficiency of Financial Markets* (pp. 577–601). Berlin: Springer.
94. Van Horne, J.C. and Parker, G.G.C. (1967) The random-walk theory: an empirical test. *Financial Analysts Journal* 23: 87–92.
95. Van Horne, J.C. and Parker, G.G.C. (1968) Technical trading rules: a comment. *Financial Analysts Journal* 24: 128–132.
96. Wang, J. (2000) Trading and hedging in S&P 500 spot and futures markets using genetic programming. *Journal of Futures Markets* 20: 911–942.



FACULTY OF ECONOMIC SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW
44/50 DŁUGA ST.
00-241 WARSAW
WWW.WNE.UW.EDU.PL