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Abstract
Researchers in finance have since long ago been attempting to quantify information, and assess its impact on financial markets. Recent advances in computational linguistics, natural language processing, machine learning and econometrics, along with improved data access to media articles, online discussions and social networks, have enabled researchers to apply such techniques in multiple fields of financial research. The applications include (but are not limited to): the effect of media columns and online discussions on stock prices, the relationship between media coverage and institutional trading, the effect of media during mergers and acquisitions (M&As), and initial public offerings (IPOs). The paper surveys a key part of the literature, and discusses possibilities for further research.
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In the 1970’s we saw the rise of Wall Street quantitative analysts. Then came program trading. Perhaps computational linguistics and textual data mining will become the new hot technologies in financial economics.


1. Introduction

Since decades, researchers have been trying to analyse sources of information, and associate the content of information to financial returns. One of the first studies in this topic is Niederhoffer (1971), which analyses ”world events”, i.e. events that were ”significant” enough for the New York Times to cover them with using a five to eight column headline. The author uses untrained observers to classify the headlines into twenty categories, using a good/bad scale with seven points. The most interesting finding of this paper is that ”large changes” in the stock market are much more likely following ”world events” than on random days. The paper ends with the author saying ”I hope that this study will stimulate other quantitative research on the effect of information on markets.”

Indeed, a lot of papers in the following years tried to quantify the impact of information on financial markets: in one of them, Mitchell and Mulherin (1994) analyse the number of daily Dow Jones news and associate these to trading volume and stock market returns. The vast majority of the studies between 1970 and the early 2000s, used rought and unprocessed proxies to quantify information, such as a simple count of the number of news. It was not until Antweiler and Frank (2004) that researchers attempted to programmatically quantify the content of information. This paper uses computational linguistics techniques - more specifically, the Naive Bayes algorithm, to quantify the content of online board messages, and classify them as bullish or bearish[1]. The authors study the messages posted in two message boards that were quite popular in the beginning of 2000s: Yahoo! Finance and Raging Bull. This paper drew quite a lot of attention, with the New York Times asking Professor Hal Varian to write an editorial on the topic[2]. By then, it was quite clear that the field of textual analysis

[1]The authors used a software package that was developed in the Carnegie Mellon University (CMU), under the project name Rainbow, which can be found at http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~mccallum/bow/rainbow/
would become rather popular in Finance, with Hal Varian writing "in the 1970’s we saw the rise of Wall Street quantitative analysts. Then came program trading. Perhaps computational linguistics and textual data mining will become the new hot technologies in financial economics.”.

A major breakthrough in the field of textual analysis came in 2007, with the publication of Tetlock (2007): the author quantified the content of a particularly famous financial column (“Abreast of the Market”) of the Wall Street Journal. This seminal paper quantifies the content of media articles using the Harvard IV-4 psychosocial dictionary, which is used in the General Inquirer content analysis software. The paper was a big success, with the author winning the First Prize, Amundi Smith Breeden Prize of the Journal of Finance. It is worth noting that the General Inquirer was developed in the beginning of the 1960s (Stone, Bales, Namenwirth, and Ogilvie (1962), Stone, Dunphy, and Smith (1966)), which means that -quite surprisingly- it took researchers in finance over 40 years to realise how useful such tools can be for Finance research.

Since then, the field of textual analysis in finance took off, with multiple papers being written attempting to exploit these new computational tools, and to study the effect of information on financial markets under a new perspective. Another big breakthrough in the field was the publication of Loughran and McDonald (2011), who report that 73.8% of words classified as negative in the Harvard IV-4 dictionary, are not necessarily negative in a financial piece of text. Such words include the words "tax, cost, capital, vice". The authors fine tune the Harvard IV-4 dictionary, keeping the words that are relevant to finance, and classify words in a series of word lists (Negative, Positive, Uncertainty, Litigious, Constraining, Superfluous, Interesting, Modal).

Another interesting approach to quantify textual sentiment is presented in Jegadeesh and Wu (2013): the authors collapse the positive and negative words from the Loughran and McDonald (2011) word lists (LM), keeping one word for every different inflection. The initial LM list contains 353

http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/~inquirer/homecat.htm
http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/~inquirer/
http://www.afajof.org/details/page/2870731/Prizes.html

To the best of my knowledge, Tetlock (2007) is the first study in finance to use the General Inquirer.

8It has to be mentioned, however, as the authors themselves report in Loughran and McDonald (2011), that the advantage of using their Negative words over the Negative words classified in the Harvard IV-4 is not very big.
positive words and 2337 negative words, which are brought down to 123 positive and 718 negative words using the Jegadeesh and Wu (2013) approach. Instead of manually classifying words in positive and negative categories, they use 10-K (US listed firms annual reports) filing returns to obtain a “score” for every word separately. This is based on a weighting scheme that calculates the number of documents in which every word occurs, taking into account the (abnormal) stock returns that occurred during the release of the filing that contained the specific word(s). Another application of textual analysis on annual reports is proposed in Chouliaras (2015b) which associates 10-K returns with the previous period stock market return of the firm.

Finally, a recent trend in the finance research, makes use of machine learning techniques. One of these techniques, deals with topic detection. One the most widely used algorithm in this field was proposed in Blei, Ng, and Jordan (2003), and is called “Latent Dirichlet Allocation” (LDA). This approach sees documents as a collection of topics, and depending on which words are used in the text, it statistically associates a given piece of text with a topic. One of the papers in finance that use the LDA algorithm is Hoberg and Lewis (2015) who study the Management’s Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) section of 10-Ks to see how similar the topics of firms that commit fraud are.

This survey paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the data that have been used in previous studies as far as the information data sources and the financial data sources are concerned. Section 3 presents a few studies that have used the raw count of news as a proxy for information, and possibilities for further research quantifying the content of such news. Section 4 discusses a few papers that study the effect of information on institutional investors’ trading behavior. Section 5 presents how some studies were able to obtain the relevant news. Section 6 presents some causal evidence of the effect of news on financial markets. Section 7 discusses a few possibilities for further research on the field. Finally, Section 8 concludes.
2. Data sources used to study the effect of information on financial markets

2.1. News media sources

Niederhoffer (1971), being the first paper (to the best of my knowledge) to study the effects of information on financial markets, used the headlines of the New York Times as the source of news articles. Mitchell and Mulherin (1994) uses the Dow Jones announcements (known as the "Broadtape") and the Wall Street Journal articles. Antweiler and Frank (2004) uses the Yahoo! Finance and the Ragingbull.com online message boards. Fang and Peress (2009) and Fang, Peress, and Zheng (2014) use major US newspapers articles provided by the LexisNexis platform. Another popular source of news has been the Dow Jones Factiva database. This news database has been used in quite a few of the studies, such as Tetlock, Saar-Tsechansky, and Macskassy (2008). A newspaper database that has been used much less is the Proquest Historical Newspapers database, used in Engelberg and Parsons (2011).

2.2. Financial data sources

As far as the financial data are concerned, these are typically obtained from the Wharton Research Data Services (WRDS) for the Dow Jones Industrial Average index returns (Tetlock (2007)). Stock price data are obtained from the Center for Research on Security Prices (CRSP), while analyst forecasts are typically the ones provided by the Institutional Brokers’ Estimate System (I/B/E/S). Accounting information data are usually obtained from Compustat (Tetlock et al. (2008)).

3. Count (number) of news as a metric of information

Even though most of the recent studies have focused on quantifying the content of news in order to examine its impact on financial markets, a part of the literature has mainly used the number of news as a metric of information. For example, Fang and Peress (2009) use a sample of all NYSE and 500 randomly selected NASDAQ companies for a time period between 1993 and 2002, obtaining
news articles from four major US newspapers (New York Times, USA Today, Wall Street Journal and Washington Post) from LexisNexis. The authors use the "relevance" score of LexisNexis as a cutoff for keeping or discarding firm-specific news, keeping articles above the 90% relevance cutoff. The authors report that firms that are not mentioned in the media perform better than stocks that receive frequent media attention. Quite interestingly, the authors do not examine the content of news at all. The finding that stocks with higher media coverage outperform stocks with high media coverage is very interesting, but it would be useful to study what the actual news say. For example, firms that severely miss targets, report extreme losses, and/or are involved in some catastrophic incidence (such events can be accidents like plane crashes, earthquakes and other physical catastrophes) would be expected to receive very high media coverage. The same would be true for firms that severely beat earnings estimates, and/or produce some major discovery or unleash a product which ends up selling very well (for example, products such as the Apple iPhone). In a similar paper by the same authors, Fang et al. (2014) find that mutual funds have a tendency to buy more of stocks that are mentioned quite a lot in the media. The authors report evidence that funds that tend to buy highly media-covered stocks, tend to underperform on a yearly basis. Once more, the authors do not perform textual analysis to calculate the tone of articles. The authors use the stock returns and try to calculate the tone of the articles based on whether the stock had a negative or a positive return on the day the articles were released. For every day that a news article exists for a stock, the authors use the sign of returns to classify the article as negative or positive. Then, they sum up the number of negative and positive days per firm per quarter. Even though this approach is interesting, in reality it neglects the actual content of the articles. The authors report that they did not have access to the content of articles, but it would be very helpful to quantify the actual tone of news and then study whether the results hold once more.\footnote{It is not clear how LexisNexis calculate the relevance scores. Some information is provided in https://www.lexisnexis.com/infopro/resource-centers/product_resource_centers/b/smartindexing/archive/2013/09/08/relevance-scores-50-99.aspx and https://www.lexisnexis.com/communities/academic/u/wiki/100.relevance-score.aspx but not much is revealed on how the index itself is calculated. It might be interesting to study alternative methods of calculating news stories relevance, and see if the results are affected or not.}

Another recent paper to use the count of news as a proxy of information is Engelberg, McLean, and Pontiff (2015). The paper makes use of 97 anomalies that have been reported in the finance
research papers. The research question here is whether anomaly returns are different on days with earnings announcements and on days with news. The authors report that anomaly returns are found to be 7 times higher on earnings announcement days and 2 times higher on days with corporate news. The authors use 489,996 earnings announcements and over 6 million Dow Jones news stories. Once more, the authors do not actually study the content of news, and they do not study whether the firm has beaten or missed the expectations on an earnings announcement day. The findings of this paper seem to indicate that news and earnings announcements are channels through which new information is released, which causes investors to change their beliefs, this is why "anomalies" are observed.

4. Information, textual analysis and institutional investors

An area of research in finance that has not adequately been explored from the current papers is how do institutional investors use information to invest on financial markets. Apart from Fang et al. (2014) which uses the number of firm-specific news as a proxy for information, not many other studies have attempted to provide such a connection. An exception is Solomon, Soltes, and Sosyura (2014) who finds that fund holdings with high returns in the previous period affect higher flows, but only if the mentioned stocks have also received media attention in the previous period. Finally, another paper that studies the effect of information on institutional trading is Chouliaras (2015a), a paper which associates 10-K textual analysis tone with institutional holdings (via 13-F filings) and analysts’ recommendations. Overall, the effect of information on institutional investors’ trading has not been thoroughly examined in the current literature.

5. Techniques to keep relevant news

An interesting question that does not have a common answer in the research literature is how should one keep relevant news? Different papers have used different approaches to tackle this issue. For example, Tetlock et al. (2008) uses over 350,000 firm specific news stories which are retrieved from the Dow Jones and the Wall Street Journal, which contain more than 100 million words in total.
The authors use stories that refer to S&P firms and require that the story mentions the name of the firm at least once in the first 25 words. On top of that, the authors require the name of the firm to be at least twice mentioned in the full content of the article. Furthermore, the authors keep stories that have at least 50 words, at least 5 of which must belong to the “Positive” or “Negative” word lists. 3 of these 5 positive or negative words must be unique. A similar approach is followed by Chen, De, Hu, and Hwang (2014): they require the CRSP company name to show up at least once in the first 50 words of the Dow Jones News Services (DJNS) articles. The authors acknowledge that this process is not perfect because many times the name of subsidiaries are mentioned instead of the holding company (e.g. Cadbury instead of Kraft Foods), or the product is mentioned instead of the company (e.g. Camry instead of Toyota). The problem of picking up relevant stories appears mostly for papers that use the Dow Jones Newswires as the news source. On the other hand, stories that use LexisNexis do not appear to have this problem, since LexisNexis provides a relevance score for each story, and researchers can keep news articles above a certain cutoff (90% is used in Fang and Peress (2009) and Fang et al. (2014)). Chen et al. (2014) obtain online “opinions” and comments from the website Seeking Alpha (seekingalpha.com) using the relevant stock tickers provided by the website. Another approach to select relevant news, is through the use of keywords (in the title and the content of news articles), as has been used in Chouliaras and Grammatikos (2015).

6. The causal impact of media on financial markets

The majority of research studies in finance exhibit correlations between media articles and the stock markets. In some cases, researchers attempt to exhibit a causal link among the two. In one of these studies, Engelberg and Parsons (2011) were able to obtain trading data from a large discount brokerage database. This way they were able to associate local trading with the media coverage by local media. They find that local media coverage of an earnings announcement, strongly affects whether local trading occurs, as well as its magnitude, establishing a causal relationship between the media and financial markets. Another paper that attempts to establish causal links between the media and
financial markets is Dougal, Engelberg, Garcia, and Parsons (2012). The authors fixed effects for different journalists on daily regressions of the Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA) stock index. The financial column they study is the Wall Street Journal’s ”Abreast of the Market” (AOTM) column. The exogenous variation comes from the rotations of financial journalists. Journalists’ personal writing styles (captured by their fixed effects) are able to explain daily stock returns to a large extent, being evidence of a causal link between the media and financial markets.

7. Future directions for Textual Sentiment Analysis

The approaches that are based on financial dictionaries appear to be working quite well, and have found a lot of applications in the financial domain. These approaches started off from the use of General Inquirer in Tetlock (2007), and have led to the creation of specialised financial word lists in Loughran and McDonald (2011). Even though these approaches do not perfectly capture the tone of text, they appear to be working quite well. Yet, obstacles remain, that have to do with the grammatical syntax of text, the weighting of words (most current approaches place equal weights to negative/positive words), how should one deal with negators (Jegadeesh and Wu (2013) report that not counting positive/negative words within three words of a negator appears to increase the performance of their models). Perhaps a way forward would be to combine techniques developed in other fields, such as Computer Science, to see if the current finance sentiment metrics can be further improved. For example, a very popular sentiment analysis implementation is the Python Natural Language Toolkit (NLTK) platform. The Python NLTK uses techniques that actually take into account the content of sentences and their grammatical/syntactical structure. The drawbacks of such tools is that they are usually constructed using corpora such as customer reviews and movie reviews. In a finance setting, such classifications may not be very powerful (Chouliaras (2015)). A hybrid approach, one that uses tools such as Python NLTK, but combines them with word lists relevant to finance, such as

---

11 the same column has been used by Tetlock (2007)
Loughran and McDonald (2011), might prove to perform better.

One way to view the big picture of the field is that five interacting entities provide and receive information from (and to) one another: analysts, firms, institutions, retail investors, and the media. The analysts provide recommendations through their buy, sell recommendations as well as their target prices. Firms provide information through their corporate filings, press conferences, and interviews. Institutions provide information through their trading behavior and possible interventions they make (in the case of activist investors, but also in the case of letters to investors). The media provide information through articles, through interviews, and generally through the information they release. The information that each of these entities provides, is the information that the other entities receive (and vice versa). The question that emerges is how does information from and to each of these entities affect the other entities: do subgroups exist, such that they outperform their peers (star analysts, star fund managers)? Is this outperformance related to a better/faster access (processing, interpretation) of information signals? Investors have strong incentives to invest heavily in information processing mechanisms, which can allow them to profit in financial markets. Analysing the cross section of investors is not sufficient: there exists significant heterogeneity between different classes of investors (mutual funds, hedge funds, high frequency traders, algorithmic traders, et cetera). Does the information processing capacity of these investors play a role in their behavior (and ultimately success or failure in the financial markets)? Does investing in IT infrastructure and state of the art technology, hiring people from top universities, with top grades, top publications, PhD degrees and so on also play a role? What role do network effects play? Such networks could be LinkedIn networks (or other social media networks such as Twitter and Facebook), studying at the same university at the same time/program, having graduated from the same school might significantly affect investment decisions (friends might chat and influence each other’s decision making).

8. Conclusion

The field of financial research that studies the effect of information on financial markets has attracted a lot of attention in the recent years. Going one step beyond manually classifying news in
“good” or “bad”, researchers were able to automatically quantify the content of informational sources. Fields that this type of research has been applied recently include media articles (Tetlock (2007), Garcia (2013)), quarterly earnings (Tetlock et al. (2008)), annual reports (Loughran and McDonald (2011)), institutional investors trading (Solomon et al. (2014)), the study of financial anomalies (Engelberg et al. (2015), Hillert, Jacobs, and Müller (2014)), mergers and acquisitions (M&As) negotiations (Ahern and Sosyura (2014), Ahern and Sosyura (2015)).

The field has evolved from the use of agents classifying the headlines of articles (Niederhoffer (1971)) to the use of psychosocial dictionaries (Tetlock (2007)) which were later fine tuned to develop financial word lists (Loughran and McDonald (2011)). Other techniques used include computationally comparing the similarity of pieces of text (Hanley and Hoberg (2010). Moving forward, researchers are starting to use tools developed in computer science and machine learning, such as topic modeling techniques (Latent Dirichlet Allocation - LDA) (Hoberg and Lewis (2015)). There is a lot of room for further research on this field. One thing is certain: looking backwards, Niederhoffer (1971) was definitely right when he was saying "I hope that this study will stimulate other quantitative research on the effect of information on markets."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Applied to</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niederhoffer (1971)</td>
<td>New York Times</td>
<td>Dow Jones Industrial Average stock returns</td>
<td>1950 to 1966</td>
<td>Observers classified headlines to categories</td>
<td>Large changes are “substantially more likely” following “world events” than on randomly selected days. World events are ones which have a five-to-eight column headline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell and Mulherin</td>
<td>Dow Jones &amp; Company Broadtape and the Wall Street Journal</td>
<td>NYSE, AMEX, OTC returns and trading volume</td>
<td>1983 to 1990</td>
<td>Number of announcements used as a proxy for information</td>
<td>Direct relationship between the number of Dow Jones announcements and market activity (returns and trading volume)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Applied to</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang and Peress (2009)</td>
<td>US newspaper articles from LexisNexis, 13F filings.</td>
<td>All NYSE and 500 randomly selected NASDAQ companies</td>
<td>1993 to 2002</td>
<td>Count of media articles per firm</td>
<td>Stocks with no media coverage perform better than stocks that receive high media coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughran and McDonald (2011)</td>
<td>Annual reports (10-Ks) from SEC EDGAR</td>
<td>NYSE, Amex, NASDAQ firms</td>
<td>1994 to 2008</td>
<td>Financial dictionaries produced by fine tuning the General Inquirer (GI) - Harvard IV-4 psychosocial dictionary</td>
<td>A higher percentage of negative words is associated with lower stock returns in the days 0 to 3 relative to the 10-K filing date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dougal et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Wall Street Journal’s &quot;Abreast of the Market&quot; (AOTM) column</td>
<td>Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA) short term returns</td>
<td>1970 to 2007</td>
<td>Use of journalist fixed effect as a proxy to study the causal effect of different writing styles on financial markets</td>
<td>Journalist fixed effects significantly predict DJIA returns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughran and McDonald (2013)</td>
<td>SEC Filings for initial public offerings (IPOs) - Form S-1</td>
<td>1,887 completed US IPOs</td>
<td>1997 to 2010</td>
<td>Loughran and McDonald (2011) word lists</td>
<td>A higher percentage of uncertain words in IPO prospectus is associated with higher first day returns and larger ex post volatility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Applied to</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jegadeesh and Wu (2013)</td>
<td>SEC Form 10-K</td>
<td>Filing returns</td>
<td>1995 to 2010</td>
<td>Weighting scheme applied to Loughran and McDonald (2011) word lists</td>
<td>Positive and negative words created based on filing returns are found to affect filing returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahern and Sosyura (2014)</td>
<td>Mergers of US listed firms data from SDC database, firm specific news from Dow Jones Factiva</td>
<td>Acquirer valuation during mergers</td>
<td>2000 to 2008</td>
<td>Word lists from Loughran and McDonald (2011) and Harvard IV-4.</td>
<td>Fixed exchange ratio bidders increase the number of press releases when private negotiations take place, creating a short-lived increase in the valuation of the bidder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang et al. (2014)</td>
<td>NexisLexis articles for all NYSE stocks and 500 randomly selected NASDAQ stocks</td>
<td>CRSP Mutual Fund Database, daily institutional trades data from Abel Noser Solutions (Ancerno)</td>
<td>1993 to 2002</td>
<td>Number of firm specific news as a proxy for media coverage</td>
<td>Funds tend to buy more stocks with high media coverage. Such funds tend to underperform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Media articles from four major US newspapers, obtained from Factiva. Financial data from CRSP and Compustat</td>
<td>Fund flows from Thomson Reuters</td>
<td>1998 to 2008</td>
<td>Stock returns as a way to classify the content of media coverage, and Loughran and McDonald (2011) word lists</td>
<td>Funds flows are affected by past holdings returns, only if the holdings were featured in the media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillert et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Media articles from US newspapers, from LexisNexis.</td>
<td>Momentum stock returns</td>
<td>1989 to 2010</td>
<td>Media coverage defined as the natural logarithm of the number of articles, and use of Loughran and McDonald (2011) word lists</td>
<td>Firms which get more mentioned in the press have higher momentum effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Applied to</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahern and Sosyura (2015)</td>
<td>Merger rumor articles from Factiva, merger data from SDC global merger database</td>
<td>Stock returns following merger rumor articles</td>
<td>2000 to 2011</td>
<td>Examining whether merger rumor is finally realised or not, and weak modal words from Loughran and McDonald (2011)</td>
<td>Merger rumor accuracy is affected by the journalists’ education, experience. Less accurate stories use uncertain language. Rumors lead to a short lived price overreaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelberg et al. (2015)</td>
<td>News items from Dow Jones</td>
<td>97 stock return anomalies constructed with data from CRSP, Compustat and IBES</td>
<td>1979 to 2013</td>
<td>Use of variables that count the number of anomaly portfolios each stock belongs in for every month</td>
<td>Anomaly returns are found to be much higher on earnings announcement days and days with firm-specific news</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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