

Is the annualized compounded return of Medallion over 35%?

Shuxin GUO

School of Economics and Management

Southwest Jiaotong University

Chengdu, Sichuan, P. R. China

shuxinguo@home.swjtu.edu.cn

ORCID: 0000-0001-8188-6517

Qiang LIU

Institute of Chinese Financial Studies

Southwestern University of Finance and Economics

Chengdu, Sichuan, P. R. China.

qiangliu@swufe.edu.cn

ORCID: 0000-0001-8466-3108

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant numbers 71701171 and 71271173, by the Liberal Arts and Social Sciences Foundation of the Chinese Ministry of Education (21XJC790003), and by Huaxi Futures Co., Ltd.

Is the annualized compounded return of Medallion over 35%?

Abstract: It is a challenge to estimate fund performance by compounded returns. Arguably, it is incorrect to use yearly returns directly for compounding, with reported annualized return of above 60% for Medallion for the 31 years up to 2018. We propose an estimation based on fund sizes and trading profits and obtain a compounded return of 32.6% before fees with a 3% financing rate. Alternatively, we suggest using the manager's wealth as a proxy and arriving at a compounded growth rate of 25.6% for Simons for the 33 years up to 2020. We conclude that the annualized compounded return of Medallion before fees is probably under 35%. Our findings have implications for how to compute fund performance correctly.

Keywords: compounded return; fund size; trading profit; manager's net wealth; Medallion fund; fund performance.

First draft: November 30, 2020

In *The Man Who Solved the Market: How Jim Simons Launched the Quant Revolution*, the annualized compounded returns of Simons' Medallion fund are reported to be as high as 66.1% (before fees) and 39.1% (after fees) for the 31 years from 1988 to 2018, respectively. "A[a] compound return of 63.3%" is later given in Cornell (2020). Are such huge returns reliable? Very unlikely. Medallion started with \$20 million in 1988 (Zuckerman, 2019). With an annual 66.1% compounding, Medallion would have grown to \$374 trillion by the end of 2020, a mind-boggling amount!¹

Even though annual fund net returns² can be found trivially (from letters to investors), the annualized compounded return cannot be estimated easily. The reason is simple but subtle because the returns have not been fully accumulated or, in financial terms, correctly compounded.

It is a challenge to estimate fund performance by compounded returns. One important reason is that fund sizes are usually discontinuous due to cash inflows and/or outflows. As Table 1 later shows for the Medallion fund, there were multiple jumps in fund sizes from 1988 to 2001. Further, the size was mostly around 5.2 billion between 2002 and 2009, while capped at 10 billion from 2010 to 2018. How can we compute the correct compounded returns with discontinuous sizes? This is an exciting question for us to explore.

In this short note, we first show why compounding using yearly net returns can be wrong for the discontinuous value process. Then, we propose an approach based on the initial fund size or value, total trading profit, total cash inflow, and the final fund size for estimating a compounded return for a fund. Further, we suggest that the growth rate of a manager's net wealth can be utilized as a proxy for the compounded return of a fund.

Naïve Compounding

¹ The US equity market is \$51 trillion at the end of 2020 (see <https://siblisresearch.com/data/us-stock-market-value/>).

² Net return (Cochrane, 2005), the difference between the ratio of final price to initial price and one, is the most commonly reported number in finance.

Because the annual net returns of a fund are usually known (i.e., reported to investors), it is tempting to compound by joining those returns together naively. Let's denote the yearly net returns by μ_t . One might obtain the (naïve) average compounded return as follows:

$$\mu_{nc} = \left(\prod_{t=1}^n (1 + \mu_t) \right)^{1/n} - 1 \quad (1)$$

Each year, both the trading profit and fund size are usually reported by fund managers. Consequently, a fund's net return is simply the ratio of trading profit to the fund size at the beginning of the year. For Medallion, we show fund sizes and trading profits between 1988 and 2018, taken from Appendix 1 of Zuckerman (2019), in Table 1. Using Formula (1) and net returns in Table 1, we obtain a naïve compounded return of 63.2%, quite close to the 63.3% of Cornell (2020). The average return reported in Zuckerman (2019) is somewhat higher, at 66.1%, which is probably the simple average of yearly net returns.³ Zuckerman (2019) uses "returns before fees," which are slightly different from the net returns in Table 1 for some of the early years within the sample period.

Table 1 here

Unfortunately, we cannot combine the yearly net returns in this way or use Formula (1) to obtain a correct annualized compounded return because the fund size of Medallion is discontinuous. We use two numerical examples to illustrate this point.

Our first example is simple. Assume the size is capped at 100 at the beginning of each year, with a 50% net return for two years in a row. The naïve compounded return would be 50%, too. If compounded at 50%, 100 will grow to 225 in two years, which is incorrect. The actual final value is 200 instead, if we first assume zero financing cost for simplicity. Consequently, the annualized compounded return would be better measured by

³ We obtain an average annual return of 66.0%, using the formula $\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{31} \sum_{t=1}^{31} \mu_t$ with returns in Table 1.

$(200/100)^{1/2} - 1 = 41.4\%$, which is significantly lower than 50%. With a 50% return for ten years in a row, the annualized compounded return would be much lower at 19.6%, while the naïve compounded return would still be 50%. Clearly, the longer the investment horizon, the bigger the error of the naïve compounded return at measuring the actual compounding effect. For 17 years up to 2018, the sizes of Medallion had been fixed at two different levels (see Table 1). Therefore, the naïve compounded return will be incorrect as a measure of Medallion's performance.

The second example is more complex. Assume Year 1 grows from 100 to 150, and Year 2 does from 200 to 300. The naïve compounded return would again be 50%. Starting with 100, we end up again at 225 in two years with the naïve compounded return. The actual final value is 250 (assuming zero borrowing cost or deposit income), however -- starting with 100, we end at 150 in Year 1; Then, beginning with 200 by borrowing 50, we end at 300 in Year 2; After repaying the loan of 50, we will net 250. We can use the initial value of 100 and the final value of 250 to estimate a compounded return, which yields 58.1%. Once again, the naïve compounded return is incorrect.

With the compounded return of 63.2%, 20 million, the fund size of Medallion at the beginning of 1988 (Table 1) would become a staggering 78 trillion at the end of 2018. This is doubtlessly an absurd amount of money and wrong egregiously because the total trading profit of Medallion for 31 years up to 2018 is only a little bit over 100 billion (see Table 2 later).

Given the two examples above, one may ask how we can get a better measure for the compounded return?

Size-Profit Compounding

To address the above issue, we propose to estimate an annualized compounded return for an N -year fund as follows while considering the time value of money:

$$\mu_c = \left[\frac{1}{V_1} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^N P_t \prod_{s=t+1}^N (1 + r_s^d) - \sum_{t=2}^N (V_t - V_{t-1}) \prod_{s=t}^N (1 + r_s^f) + V_N \right\} \right]^{1/N} - 1 \quad (2)$$

where P_t denotes the year- t trading profit, r_t^d denotes the deposit rate for year t , V_t denotes the year- t fund size, and r_t^f denotes the financing rate for year t . The cash inflow or outflow for year t is simply $V_t - V_{t-1}$. If $r_t^d = 0$ and $r_t^f = 0$, only V_1 is needed in Formula (2).

Let's first assume zero financing cost or deposit income. Table 2 shows estimated annualized compounded returns over five sub-periods for the Medallion fund. Three observations can be made. First, the return becomes lower with bigger fund sizes. The return for the first 14 years is high at 51.9%, but for the last 17 years relatively low at 19.1%. Similarly, the return over 2002-2009 is higher than that over 2010-2018. Second, the return is lower for longer periods for similar sizes. The returns over 2002 and 2009 and over 2010 and 2018 are higher than that over 2002 and 2018. Third, higher returns are due to the initial tiny size of the fund. The returns over the first 14 years and the whole 31 years are higher than the other three sub-periods.

Table 2 here

Further, the Medallion fund may have a maximum capacity of 10 billion because it has been capped at that level for almost a decade as of 2018. Therefore, it can be predicted that the annualized compounded return for the 2010-2018 sub-period will go down further in the long run if the yearly profits in the future are going to be at the same level on average.

Note that our estimated annualized compounded return of Medallion for the 31-year period is only 31.8% before fees, way lower than the naïve result of 63.2%. A better estimation shall consider the time value of money. Assume a 3% per annum financing cost or deposit rate. The total cash inflow and trading profit would be 15.329 billion and 131.654 billion at the end of 2018, respectively. Note that the cash inflow shall be computed from the beginning of the year, while trading profit from the beginning of next year. With the final

fund size still at 10 billion, the final value would be 126.326 billion. With these numbers, the annualized compounded return of Medallion turns out to be 32.6% before fees, which is no doubt truly impressive and remarkable. It is less than 35% however, and significantly lower than the naïve compounded return of 63.2%, or those reported previously by others (Zuckerman, 2019; Cornell, 2020).

Net Wealth Compounding

Another possible approach is to use the growth of Simons' net wealth as a proxy because the total net assets of rich people are tracked by many media companies. According to Forbes, Simons had a net worth of 23.5 billion as of November 16, 2020, after charitable givens of 2.7 billion. In other words, Simons had a total asset of 26.2 billion.

Simons' net wealth many years ago is not easy to locate, unfortunately, but a rough estimation is still possible. Zuckerman (2019) writes that Simons had over 50% equity as of around 1998, after giving 10% to an associate (and later sizable to three other employees). Let's assume 50%. This amounted to 550 million for Simons in Medallion, which had a size of 1.1 billion at the beginning of 1998 (Table 1). Consequently, the wealth of Simons grows by an annualized compounded rate of 18.3% for 23 years up to 2020.

Medallion started with a size of 20 million in 1988. Using the information from the previous paragraph, we assume that Simons had 70% equity (50%+10%+10%), or 14 million capital. In this case, he would have an annualized compounded growth of 25.6% for 33 years up to 2020.

Both numbers are after fees and taxes, and truly impressive! But they can be wrong, because the initial net assets are rough estimates. Still, it is probably safe to guess that they are less than 35%! Note that again the initial tiny size of wealth leads to higher growth for the longer 33-year period.

It is unclear how taxes and fees together will alter personal returns of Simons. Even

though taxes lower the wealth growth of Simons, fees will actually inflate his returns (over Medallion's). We use a hypothetical example to illustrate the effect of fees. Assume a 50% stake for Simons, a 10 billion size for Medallion, an annual trading profit of 60%, and a 40% cut for the profit.⁴ All investors, including early investors or employees not working for the firm anymore, will share 3.6 billion, which leaves Simons with 1.8 billion. Current employees will share 2.4 billion, which gives Simons 1.68 billion, assuming Simons has 70% equity among current Employees. As a result, Simons would earn 3.48 billion (not the 3 billion from the overall 50% stake), or a return of 69.6%. This implies that the net returns of Medallion might be lower than the returns of Simons. Therefore, it may probably be correct to conclude that the annualized compounded return of Medallion is less than 35%.

Conclusions

This paper shows that the naïve compounded return, which is obtained by compounding yearly net returns, turns out to be over 60% for the Medallion fund and is incorrect. This is because the value process of a fund, such as Medallion, is discontinuous.

A better estimation for the compounded return can be obtained by considering the fund sizes, trading profits, and cash inflows or outflows. This leads to an estimated annualized compounded return of 32.6% for Medallion (before fees) for the 31 years up to 2018, if a 3% financing rate is applied. Alternatively, the wealth growth of the manager can be utilized as a proxy for the compounded return of a fund. For Simons, the estimated annualized compounded growth is 25.6% for the 33 years up to 2020. Therefore, the annualized compounded return of Medallion is improbable to be more than 35% for the same period.

References

⁴ We ignore the 5% annual expense here.

Cornell, Bradford. 2020. Medallion Fund: The Ultimate Counterexample? *The Journal of Portfolio Management*. 46, 156-159.

Cochrane, John H. 2005. *Asset pricing*, rev. ed. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Zuckerman, Gregory. 2019. *The Man Who Solved the Market: How Jim Simons Launched the Quant Revolution*. Portfolio, Penguin Group.

Table 1. Fund sizes and trading profits of Medallion from 1988 to 2018.

Year No.	Fund Size	Trading Profit	Return (%)	Year No.	Fund Size	Trading Profit	Return (%)
1	20	3	15.00	17	5,200	2,572	49.46
2	20	0	0.00	18	5,200	2,999	57.67
3	30	23	76.67	19	5,200	4,374	84.12
4	42	23	54.76	20	5,200	7,104	136.62
5	74	35	47.30	21	5,200	7,911	152.13
6	122	66	54.10	22	5,200	3,881	74.63
7	276	258	93.48	23	10,000	5,750	57.50
8	462	244	52.81	24	10,000	7,107	71.07
9	637	283	44.43	25	10,000	5,679	56.79
10	829	261	31.48	26	10,000	8,875	88.75
11	1,100	628	57.09	27	9,500	7,125	75.00
12	1,540	549	35.65	28	9,500	6,582	69.28
13	1,900	2,434	128.11	29	9,500	6,514	68.57
14	3,800	2,149	56.55	30	10,000	8,536	85.36
15	5,240	2,676	51.07	31	10,000	7,643	76.43
16	5,090	2,245	44.11				

Notes: Fund size and trading profits before fees (in millions) are taken from Zuckerman (2019). Return: the ratio of trading profit to fund size. Year No. 1 is 1988, and Year No. 31 is 2018.

Table 2. Annualized compounded returns of Medallion for various sub-periods.

Period	1988-2001	2002-2009	2010-2018	2002-2018	1988-2018
Number of years	14	8	9	17	31
Initial size or value	20	5,240	10,000	5,240	20
Final fund size	3,800	5,200	10,000	10,000	10,000
Total cash inflow	3,780	-40	0	4,760	9,980
Total trading profit	6,956	33,762	63,811	97,573	104,529
Final value	6,976	39,002	73,811	102,813	104,549
Compounded return (%)	51.9	28.5	24.9	19.1	31.8

Notes: value, size, cash inflow, and profit are in millions. The financing cost and deposit income are assumed to be zero.